



# NAPPO

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

## NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group:	Khapra beetle	
Location:	Conference call	
Date:	May 19, 2017	
Chairperson	Hector Enrique Vega (SENASICA) – unable to join	
Participants:		
Nallely Acevedo Reyes (SENASICA)	Stephen Bullington (APHIS PPQ)	Wendy Asbil (CFIA)
Kristina Pauk (CFIA)	Patricia Abad (APHIS PPQ)	Gary Martin (US Ind.) (Joined for 30 min)
Stephanie Bloem (NAPPO)	Nedelka Marin-Martinez (NAPPO)	Alonso Suazo (NAPPO)
<b>Summary</b>		
Project:	A North American approach to preventing introduction, establishment and spread of khapra beetle ( <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> ) in various pathways.	
General comments:	The NAPPO TD welcomed and thanked all members that joined the call and informed the group that the main objective of this call was to outline an action plan to complete the khapra beetle document by October 15, 2017.	
Item 1:	Action plan to complete the document by October 15.	
Consensus:	<p>The NAPPO TD gave a brief description of the “summarized” document that was placed in the EG Google Drive folder. He explained that the document is a resource for the group to use as a reference for the final ST document that needs to be completed by the group. The following changes were made to the original document in Google Drive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Country distribution/presence of khapra beetles and host lists were removed and will be placed in the Annex.</li> <li>• Repetitive information was removed. The information that was common to all three countries was included once and a statement was added indicating that the information was standard for all three NAPPO countries.</li> <li>• Additional information was added in different sections of the document to provide more details (example, in the regulatory section).</li> </ul> <p>EG members indicated that the main objectives of the khapra</p>	

	<p>beetle project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. determine the approaches used by all three NAPPO countries to prevent the introduction of khapra beetle, establish the differences and determine how we could harmonize these approaches at the regional level and</li> <li>2. coordinate the response of a khapra beetle introduction by all three NAPPO countries.</li> </ol> <p>The NAPPO TD described some examples of these approaches found in the document and their differences including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the differences between NAPPO countries in countries listed as high risk because the beetles are present</li> <li>• the categorization of different types of quarantines (total vs partial)</li> <li>• treatments</li> <li>• regulations: a national standard in Mexico, directives in Canada and specific regulations in the US.</li> </ul>
Item 2:	Document writing
Consensus:	<p>It was discussed whether the document should be written by one or several EG members. The main consensus was to have one or two people writing the document and have other members contribute with the harmonization component specially when considering the policies. When writing the document it was suggested to have members from all NAPPO countries in close collaboration so that the policy aspects and practical issues are detailed in the document.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> The deadline established is for a draft document to be completed but not necessarily ready for country consultation.</p>
Item 3:	Conference calls
Consensus:	The NAPPO TD requested feedback on having monthly conference calls. Some members were in agreement and other expressed concerns because of their workloads.
Item 4:	Additional information to complete the document
Consensus:	<p>It was suggested that members should add the specific information from their countries that is missing in the document.</p> <p>The NAPPO TD will send emails to the group requesting specific information to complete sections of the document.</p>

Item 5:	Face to face meeting
Consensus:	The possibility of having a face to face meeting with the EG was discussed. Although members agreed that a face to face meeting will be very valuable in getting the document finished, some members did not want to commit in participating because of scheduling conflicts or other limitations. The possibility of a face to face meeting will be discussed later pending progress of the draft document.
Other subjects	Mexico had communication issues and joined at the end of the conference call. The NAPPO TD debriefed Mexico.

### Next Steps

Responsible Person	Action	Date
NAPPO Secretariat	Send email to EG members requesting specific information from their countries that is missing in the document.	As needed

### Next Meeting

Location:	
Date:	

### Proposed Agenda Items

1.	
2.	
3.	