



NAPPO

North American Plant Protection Organization
Organización Norteamericana de Protección a las Plantas

NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group:	Revision of RSPM 26 (<i>Certification of commercial arthropod biological control agents moving into NAPPO member countries</i>)	
Location:	Video conference (Zoom meeting)	
Date:	May 25, 2023	
Chairperson	Bruno Gallant (CFIA)	
Participants:		
Vicente Rosas Medina (SENASICA)	Hugo Arredondo (MX industry)	Brian Spencer (Canada industry)
Carlos Lázaro Castellanos (SENASICA)	Melissa Tacolla (U. S. Industry)	Kirk Martin (APHIS PPQ)
Peter Mason (Agri. Canada)	Bob Pfannenstiel (APHIS PPQ)	Heather Cumming (CFIA)
Nedelka Marín-Martínez (NAPPO)	Alonso Suazo (NAPPO)	
Summary		
Project:	Revision of RSPM 26 (<i>Certification of commercial arthropod biological control agents moving into NAPPO member countries</i>)	
General comments:	Welcome remarks by the EG Chairperson.	
Item 1:	Background study paper (BSP) for the review of RSPM 26	
Consensus:	<p>The Chairperson:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided an outline of the background study paper (BSP) and indicated that two sections were not included: Recommendations and options. • Suggested to discuss the comments provided on the document and to discuss the “Current Status” section. • Discuss the “Options” section. <p><i>Discussions on the BSP</i></p> <p>Relevant comments from EG members included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document was developed based on industry concerns and needs but needs more on the regulatory component. • Needs to highlight the need to update the biological control species list (table). • Includes language on Mandatory inspection in the paragraph section “How was RSPM26 meant to resolve the issue?” in the “Background” section. It is important to make sure the distinction between pre-clearance for export at the port of origin and inspection at the port of entry is clear. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mexico indicated that a way for their system to speed up the importation of BCA is to make sure the shipment contains a statement of biological purity and origin and that the information in the documentation matches what is being imported. This first step is done by the customs agent. This way, inspectors from SENASICA spend less time in the inspection process. • List of species: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The intent of the list was to standardize the taxonomic names of BCAs. ○ The list was also developed to identify the low-risk species to reduce inspection time. ○ Need to make sure the link between the standard and the list is clear. This should be included in the next steps or as part of the recommendations section. ○ The US has a list of BCAs that do not require permits to move between states but modifying that list requires a significant amount of work. ○ Canada maintains the same list on their website and is integrated into their domestic import rules. ○ List can help demonstrate the safeguard of BCAs with other agencies outside the NPPO (for example Fish and Wildlife Services in the US). ○ There are commercial aspects to consider when standardizing the names in the list. ○ Mexico also indicated that synonyms are always included in the import permits. ○ BCA list updates should include addition/deletion of species. • The current status section will be important in informing the scope and degree of issue today, as to inform on the ongoing need for the RSPM and possible options and content.
Item 2:	Face-to-face meeting
Consensus:	<p>The EG discussed the possibility of having a face-to-face meeting to work on the revision of RSPM 26 including periodical updates on the BCA table included in the standard.</p> <p>The TD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicated that part of the process is to inform the NAPPO Secretariat and the AMC to request and get approval for future face-to-face meetings with the EG. • Informed that face-to-face meeting normally takes 2 days of discussion. • Indicated that he will bring this issue for discussion in the upcoming NAPPO Management Team meetings that will take place in San Diego, California from May 31 to June 2, 2023. • Indicated that he will provide an update on the discussion

	with the NAPPO AMC.	
Next Steps		
Responsible Person	Action	Date
EG	Continue providing feedback to the background study paper, especially the current situation and options sections.	
NAPPO TD	Discuss face-to-face meetings for the EG with the NAPPO AMC and provide an update to the EG.	
Bob Pfannenstiel	Will develop the “Current Status” section from the regulatory perspective. Requested input from Canada, Mexico, and the industry.	
Next Meeting		
Location:	Video conference (Zoom meeting)	
Date:	June 28 from 2:00-3:00 pm EST	
Proposed Agenda Items		
1. Continue discussion of BSP		
2. Provide an update regarding the discussions with the AMC Re: face-to-face meetings.		