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

NAPPO Conference Call Report
Informe sobre conferencia telefónica/ reunión de la NAPPO

Expert Group:	Seeds	
Location:	Conference call – momentum telecom	
Date:	Nov 7, 2016 11 am EST	
Chairperson	Christina Devorshak, PPQ	
Participants:		
S. Bloem, NAPPO	Noe Demetrio Sanchez, SENASICA	Ale Elizalde, industry
Mario Puente, industry	Pati Abad, PPQ	Jean Francois Dubuc, CFIA
Angela McMellen Brannigan, PPQ	Ric Dunkle, industry	Claudio Chavarin, SENASICA
Dean Komm, PPQ	Janine Maruschak, CFIA	Karine Pare, CFIA
Summary		
Project:	Seed Phytosanitary Treatments	
General comments/ Comentarios generales:		
Item 1:	Section 2: Suggestion to move one section in the document to later in the document. There was a question related to the types of treatments. Also for seeds, could we add another bullet point – some treatments may be combined. Also, the way is written, focus is on exporting country in terms of treatment protocols/ research. What about case for importing country wanting to develop treatment protocol? Chair suggested to address this pt. modify the wording.	
Consensus:	EG agreed (after CFIA suggestion) to move section 2 (on developing a research protocol) to later in the document after Section 4 (so that the section on type of treatments/ purpose is closer to background at beginning of document). EG agreed to modify following sentence in Section 2 as follows: *Research protocols should be submitted to the NPPO that will be considering the treatment ~~of the importing country~~ before the research begins.* Edit is to address focus of exporting	

	country and also importing country wanting to develop treatment protocol.
Item 2:	SECTION TYPES OF TREATMENTS (now this is New Section 2) MX industry had a question on classification of treatments. Document has clearly defined physical and biological treatment. However, need to more clearly define and identify chemical treatments a bit better. These are not clear (ie. disinfectants in Appendix 1 are referred to as chemical treatments; need to try to be more consistent in Section 2). (ensure chemical treatments separated from physical and biological). Another EG member asked whether that some treatments are combined for seeds, ie soaking plus disinfection. The Chair responded that the last sentence already says: A particular treatment may be effective against one or more pathogens, or two or more treatments may be combined to target one or more pathogens. This is fine for MX.
Consensus:	The Chair agreed to re-arrange the appendix so that it matches the content of Section 2.
Item 3:	DETERMINING EFFECTS OF THE TREATMENT US industry had some suggested edits to paragraph on- *Some biological seed treatments do not actually kill or devitalize plant pathogens;* MX agrees in principle; but was a bit concerned in practicality when these situations occur; indicate conversation would need to occur between countries to consider issue and practical conduction of these grow out studies.
Consensus:	EG agreed to add following language- “These biological treatments rapidly colonize the rhizosphere; and roots that are under growth”. (Clarify edits with Ric). EG also agreed to add: In these situations, efficacy should (could) vary depending upon environmental conditions and therefore may have to be evaluated ~~determined by evaluating effects on the resulting plants~~ through grow-out studies, conducted in different locations and conditions. In such cases, these issues should be discussed with the NPPO prior to testing…] Also agreed to add: [In such cases, these issues should be discussed with the NPPO prior to testing…]
Item 4:	Testing treated seed was discussed by the group. In response to questions and comments, some modifications were made to this section. Also made edit on “authorized” above to replace accreditation and

	also refer to RSPM 9 after CFIA raised question on what we mean by accredited laboratory above. Authorized meaning- lab authorized by NPPO to perform a specific function
Consensus:	*If treated seed has been tested using an approved test method by an authorized ~~accredited~~ laboratory prior to export with acceptable results, the importing NPPO should take those test results into account before requiring further testing. (make reference to RSPM 9).* EG agreed to move section #8 second and third paragraphs (language below) to SECTION 7.1 before last paragraph (on some treatments conflict with diag tests). *Further testing of treated seed should only be done if it is technically justified according to relevant standards (ISPM 28, 11, 1, etc.). After a treatment has been agreed upon to be used in trade, the NPPO(s) may need to verify the efficacy of the treatment through testing. Additional testing may not be informative or technically justified if the treatment is demonstrated to reach the required level of efficacy (e.g. the appropriate level of protection of the importing country).*
Item 5:	The group decided to reword a subject heading to "SHARING RESEARCH PROTOCOLS AND DATA AMONG NAPPO NPPOs" MX industry asked- If authorized treatment is approved between MX and US, will this also be automatically recognized by CAN? If 2 countries agree on protocol or 1 NPPO develops and shares info on treatment R&D with others, does this mean all NAPPO NPPOs accept? The Chair responded/clarified that the idea behind sharing data is if 1 NPPO or company develops R&D of treatment and is accepted, that can be provided to other NPPOs to also "consider" for acceptance. This does not mean approval is automatic; regional norms are not mandatory but are guidance to help countries/ NPPOs as they develop their phytosanitary measures.
Consensus:	EG agreed to eliminate the following sentence: *Any testing that is done to verify the efficacy of a treatment, either for research or for routine purposes, should be documented to describe the test used and the results.*

Next Steps

Responsible Person	Action/	Date
Christina Devorshak	Send revised document to NAPPO for translation and to be provided to EG for one final look	November 18

	EG would look at revised document and if no further comments, then the document will be ready for country consultation	December 12
Next Meeting		
Location:	TBD after country consultation	
Date:		
Proposed Agenda Items		