



NAPPO

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

NAPPO Conference Call/Meeting Report

Panel:	Plants for Planting	
Location:	Conference Call	
Date:	January 24, 2013	
Chairperson	Ed Podleckis, APHIS, USDA	
Participants:		
Ian McDonell, NAPPO	Craig Regelbrugge, ANLA	Eric Wierenga, CFIA
Rebecca Lee, NAPPO	Bruce McTavish, CNLA	Adriana Miranda Andalón, MX
Kerry Britton, USA	Faith Campbell, NGO	Ana Lilia Montealegre, MX

The call was devoted to the panel's one and only assignment for 2012-2013: *Compare RSPM 24, Integrated pest risk management measures for the importation of plants for planting into NAPPO member countries, with ISPM 36, Integrated measures for plants for planting, and recommend whether to revise or archive the NAPPO standard. If the NAPPO standard is maintained, update and continue to monitor its implementation.*

Summary

In 2012, panel members Faith Campbell and Ed Podleckis drafted a line –by-line comparison of RSPM 24 and ISPM 36. That review concluded that the two standards were very similar except for several differences: RSPM 24 specifically excludes plants as pests while ISPM 36 does not; ISPM 36 specifically excludes seeds but RSPM 24 does not; ISPM 36 applies only to places of production while RSPM 24 has a broader reach also covering brokers; and, unlike RSPM 24, ISPM 36 sets out two levels of integrated measures – “general” integrated measures intended to be widely applicable to all plants for planting and more rigorous programs to address taxon/origin/type combinations that pose a higher risk. That document concluded that in light of the many similarities with ISPM 36, maintaining RSPM 24 may well cause confusion for NAPPO countries trying to implement both standards and recommends that RSPM 24 not be maintained. However, there were aspects of RSPM 24 that should not be lost to archiving. Specifically, the insights provided in the attachment to RSPM 24, Risk and Risk management Associated with the Importation of Plants for Planting into NAPPO Member Countries- A Concept Paper Prepared by the NAPPO Plants for Planting Panel are a valuable resource that should remain available for consultation NAPPO should somehow retain the broker responsibilities outlined in RSPM 24.

Ed Podleckis outlined options open to NAPPO:

1. Retain RSPM 24 as is;
2. Retain RSPM 24 with comprehensive revision to harmonize it with ISPM 36;
3. Retain parts of RSPM 24 (brokers, attachment) as revised standard
4. Archive RSPM 24

A discussion of the options followed. Several members disagreed with the comparison document's recommendation and/or favored maintaining and implementing both standards provided there were no impediments to implementation. Ian offered another option to retain 24 with just minor updating to add references to ISPM 36.

Ed Podleckis noted that RSPM 24 does not provide a definition of the term “broker”. Craig Regelbrugge

raised the question of whether addressing brokers in the standard creates an opportunity for increased risk since the chain of custody may be broken. Eric Wierenga wondered whether brokers are only an issue for domestic movement since exports are linked to a shipment and an importer/exporter.

After discussing brokers panel proposed a modification of Ian's suggested option to maintain RSPM 24 with a minor revision to reference ISPM 36 by also revising the discussion of brokers.

Next Steps

- NAPPO will maintain RSPM 24 with revisions referencing the adoption of ISPM 36 and updating the section of the standard describing the responsibilities of brokers.
- Panel members will circulate their comments/revisions among other panel members by 22 February, 2013. Ed Podleckis will gather and organize all comments.
- The panel will convene for a conference call to discuss comments on 13 March, 2013 at 1:30 PM Eastern.

Submitted by Ed Podleckis
30 January, 2013.