



NAPPO PANEL REPORTS FOR 2006 - 2007

**ACCREDITATION PANEL
2006 - 2007**

Panel Members: Mike Ward, United States
 Mike Ward, United States
 Robert Bailey, United States
 Steve Côté, Canada
 Toni-Lynn DeHaan, Canada
 Brian Double, Canada
 David Gutierrez, Mexico

Assignment 1

Conduct an in-depth audit of the Canadian adherence to RSPM-8

Results

The panel used the checklist that was developed last year to perform the audit. The panel audited the adherence of Canada to RSPM-8 and developed an audit report. The audit of the Canadian adherence to RSPM-8 did not find any major or minor non-compliances, however, the audit team did make three recommendations, which are listed in the audit report.

Assignment 2

Review of findings from 2006 audit of US adherence to RSPM-8

Results

US provided an update on the actions taken with respect to the recommendations of the 2006 Audit

Assignment 3

Review checklist for RSPM-9

Results

Panel reviewed and reformatted the checklist. Panel agreed to use existing checklist for audit against RSPM-9.

Assignment 4

Review suggested revisions to RSPM-8 in advance of the September technical consultation of RPPOs regarding an international standard for Authorization of Individuals to Issue Federal Phytosanitary Certificates

Results

Panel reviewed RSPM-8 and developed recommended revisions.

BIOLOGICAL CONTROL PANEL 2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Hugo Cesar Arredondo, Chairperson , Mexico
 John A. Goolsby, USA
 Kenneth Bloem, USA
 Peter Mason, Canada
 Doug Parker, Canada
 Barbara Peterson, Canada

Assignment 1

Revision of RSPM No.7 on the release of exotic phytophagous agents for the biological control of weeds and of RSPM No. 12 on the release of exotic entomophagous agents for the biological control of pests, so as to determine whether they must remain NAPPO standards, in view of the changes to ISPM No. 3 on the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms.

Results

The Biological Control Panel discussed and analyzed these standards. It arrived at the conclusion that RSPMs No. 7 and 12 must remain NAPPO standards, since they are intended and implemented for phytosanitary protection in North America, and NAPPO member countries undertake the responsibility for the import and release of exotic agents. The ISPM serves as a guideline to establish legislation concerning the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms in countries without such legislation; it is broader and it includes provisions for importing native biological control agents, and other aspects such as packaging. Therefore, the panel considers that RSPM No. 7 and 12, and ISPM No. 3 do not overlap.

Assignment 2

Exchange information on biological control activities in the three NAPPO member countries.

Results

Every NAPPO member country provided a detailed report on the main biological control programs currently under implementation in each country, as well as information on the development of research on this discipline of applied entomology. Countries also shared information on phytosanitary problems they may face in the future which are causes of concern. The panel has a detailed summary including the activities that each member country is carrying out. It is available from the panel's chairperson or at: <http://www.nappo.org/Reports/2007/Biocontrol-MtgRep-02-07-e.pdf>

Assignment 3

Review and revise NAPPO'S RSPM No. 7, *Guidelines for petition for release of exotic phytophagous agents for the biological control of weeds.*

Results

The title was changed to: "*Guidelines for petition for the first release of exotic phytophagous agents for biological control.*" The panel identified the need to update references and include new ones. Definitions were updated and the text of the standard was modified. It has already been sent to NAPPO's Executive Director for approval.

Assignment 4

Complete NAPPO's discussion paper on taxonomic expertise concerning biological control activities.

Results

The panel discussed the importance of taxonomic resources for biological control. It concluded that Systematics Federal Laboratories are responsible for the identification of insects and that, although the State and university taxonomists may provide their support, they are not to be held responsible. A letter was drafted and sent to NAPPO's Executive Director, which will be forwarded to government authorities in NAPPO member countries. This letter shows how important and necessary it is to strengthen taxonomy with human resources; it includes a proposal to enrich national collections of arthropods, plants, fungi, bacteria and other organisms, to promote regulatory actions and policies, and to provide a database for taxonomic research. In addition, it proposes the idea of ensuring the maintenance of a critical mass of knowledge in each member country and of bridging existing gaps, as well as maintaining a National Identification Service to provide a reliable identification of species, supporting regulatory actions and policies of NPPOs and other stakeholders interested in preserving native biodiversity.

Assignment 5

Developing NAPPO guidelines to introduce non *Apis* beneficial insects.

Results

The panel discussed the Biological Control Panel's competence to develop guidelines on pollinating insects. The panel decided to begin developing these guidelines. Mexico will decide who will take part in developing these guidelines. The working title for the new standard is: *Guidelines for the import and release of non Apis pollinating insects within NAPPO member countries*. Some aspects to be considered are:

- a) Potential of pollinating insects for naturalization
- b) Known pollination preferences by species
- c) Competition against non *Apis* native pollinating insects
- d) Entomophagous agents associated with non *Apis* pollinating insects

BIOTECHNOLOGY PANEL 2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Terri Dunahay, Chairperson, USA
Michael Watson, USA
Hong Chen, Canada
Philip Macdonald, Canada, New Member
William Anderson, Canada (through April 2007)
Francisco Garcia, Mexico, New Member
Juan Jose Jiménez, Mexico, New Member
Juan Pablo Martínez-Soriano, Mexico (through April, 2007)
Jorge Aguilar, Mexico (through April 2007)

The work of the Biotechnology Panel was limited in 2006-2007 due to a change in representation on the Panel by Mexico and Canada. The Panel met by phone on "August 9, 2007 to introduce new Panel members and to provide a status report and project update for the new members.

Assignment 1

Complete the discussion paper on importation of transgenic plants for non-propagative uses and conduct a country consultation to determine the feasibility of including this as a component of RSPM No.14, *Importation and Release into the Environment of Transgenic Plants in NAPPO Member Country*.

Results

The Panel continued discussions on development of guidance for importation of transgenic plants into NAPPO member countries. The Panel has been struggling with the development of Module 4 of RSPM-14, intended to provide guidance on importation of transgenic plants for non-propagative use only. At the Panel meeting in July 2006, a draft of the document was developed, however additional concerns were raised by Canada following further domestic review of the draft.

The Panel met by phone in November 2006. Canada agreed to develop a new discussion paper based on the draft standard to use for country consultation, to get additional stakeholder input on the issues of concern. This paper was presented to the Panel in April 2007, and briefly discussed by a subset of Panel members on the side of technical discussions between US, Canadian, and Mexican regulatory officials in Ottawa in May. Based on the discussion, the US has offered to merge the two documents, and the Panel will meet by phone in September 2007 to discuss next steps.

Assignment 2

Review the definitions in RSPM No 14, *Importation and Release into the Environment of Transgenic Plants in NAPPO Member Countries* for consistency of use and propose new definitions, as necessary.

Results

No work has been done on this assignment in 2006-2007.

Assignment 3

Consider the implications of new and emerging issues related to transgenic products that could pose a risk to plant health, for example, pharmaceutical plants, trees, other perennials and other key issues such as adventitious presence.

Results

The Panel has begun discussions on new work to addressing emerging issues related to transgenic organisms, in particular, developing guidance on the importation and use of transgenic plants developed to produce industrial or pharmaceutical compounds (not intended for food or feed) and on importation and use of transgenic perennial crops or other plants, or trees, that could pose new or additional plant health concerns beyond those posed by annual crops. The Panel will discuss these options at our next Panel meeting and determine next steps.

Additional work – 2006-07

Two members of the Biotechnology Panel, Terri Dunahay and Jorge Aguilar, are participating in a NAPPO Expert Working Group to develop a standard for the use of transgenic arthropods. The EWG met in Penticton, Canada from March 13-17, 2006 to begin work on drafting the standard. Work has progressed well, mostly via e-mail and telephone, and a draft standard was developed and sent for country consultation in summer, 2007. The EWG is currently revising the draft document based on comments received and hopes to finalize a draft for submission to the Standards Committee in fall, 2007. The U.S. also submitted a proposal to the IPPC for new work to develop an international standard on transgenic arthropods based on the NAPPO standard.

Development of a proposal for a workshop

The Biotechnology Panel has submitted a proposal to the NAPPO Executive Committee to develop a symposium on Living Modified Organisms (LMOs) and Plant Health, for the NAPPO Annual Meeting in October 2008. The symposium would cover pest risk analysis of living modified organisms; LMOs as tools for plant protection, and the use of biotechnology to combat new and emerging pest threats.

CITRUS PANEL 2005- 2006

Panel Members:	Héctor Sánchez, Chairperson, Mexico Pedro Robles, Mexico Luis Villarreal, Mexico Marie-Pierre Mignault, Canada Ted Boratynski, USA José Hernández, USA Gregorios Vidalakis, USA
Industry Representatives	Chuck Orman, Sunkist Growers, USA Juan Lorenzo Palau, Comité Estatal de Sanidad Vegetal del Estado de Nuevo Leon, Mexico Jose Luis Rodríguez, Asociación Nacional de Viveristas de Mexico, Mexico Luis Angel Villareal, SAGARPA Nuevo Leon, Mexico

In order to carry out the assignments entrusted by NAPPO's Executive Committee, the Citrus Panel held two meetings: the first one took place in Manzanillo, Colima, Mexico, on March 15-17 2007, and the second, in Riverside, California, USA, on July 23-25 2007. These are the results:

Assignment 1

Revising RSPM No. 16, *Guidelines for the Importation of Citrus Propagative Material into a NAPPO Member Country.*

Results

The Panel reviewed the contents of RSPM No. 16 and modified it as required for the standard to be understood properly and applied correctly.

Assignment 2

Revising and updating the pest and pathogen appendices to RSPM No. 16, *Guidelines for the Importation of Citrus Propagative Material into a NAPPO Member Country.*

Results

The Panel revised and updated the appendices to NAPPO's RSPM No. 16, which include: 1) insects and mites; and 2) diseases and pathogens that may spread through citrus propagative material. The presence-absence of pests of concern in both countries was updated and the accepted diagnostic tests were determined.

Assignment 3

Exchanging scientific information on emerging citrus pests.

Results

The US members of the Citrus Panel reported on the current situation of canker and huanglongbing (HLB) of citrus in Florida. In turn, the Mexican members of the Citrus Panel reported on the current situation of leprosis and the Asian psyllid of citrus (*Diaphorina citri*).

As part of the cooperation agreements between both countries, Mexican technical staff attended a workshop on sampling, symptom identification in field, and HLB diagnosis in Maryland and Florida, US. This will make it possible to adapt diagnostic techniques in official and approved laboratories and begin disease monitoring in Mexican citrus areas.

**ELECTRONIC PHYTOSANITARY CERTIFICATION PANEL
2006 - 2007**

Panel Members: Patrice Sinave, Chairperson, Canada
Christian B. Dellis, USA
Daniel Valderrábano, Mexico
Roman Ruiz, Mexico (until July 07)

Technical Panel: Jason Dittrich, Chairperson, USA
Edmundo Esparragoza, Mexico
Rubén Alcantar, Mexico (until July 07)
Corinne Balasa, Canada

Assignment 1

Conduct a pilot project for electronic phytosanitary certification within the NAPPO region.

Results

The group had a change in membership and our estimated colleagues, Roman Ruiz Garcia and Ruben Alcantar, from Mexico, left the panel after very valuable and estimated contributions.

The panel which also to welcome Daniel Valderrábano and Edmundo Esparragoza, the new Panel participants from Mexico.

In order to avoid putting too much pressure on our new Mexican participants, it was requested that the US team leads the technical Panel instead of Mexico. M. Jason Dittrich has accepted to be the new Chair for the group. Many thanks, Jason.

During the year 2006 /2007, the Panel had three meetings, in Ottawa July 4 – 7, 2006, in Mexico, February 19-23, 2007 and in Ottawa, July 10-12, 2007.

All those meetings were mainly technical meetings and the work was oriented on the delivery of the Panel assignment.

Numerous highly technical issues were addressed during those meetings (see Panel reports for details) with the result that no major technical obstacles were left unresolved. The group is fairly confident to be able to demonstrate the feasibility of the transfer of Phytosanitary data between NAPPO countries within a secure environment.

The group decided to plan a “Proof of concept” demonstration during the next NAPPO annual meeting in Newfoundland, October 2007.

Although all parameters of this “Proof of concept” are not finalized, it will consist of a demo of the exchange of data as well as a presentation that will explain the techniques and technologies used for it.

This “Proof of concept” will open the door for a real data exchange pilot as the next step of the panel work.

**FORESTRY PANEL
2006 - 2007**

Panel Members:	Shane Sela, Chairperson, Canada Eric Allen – Canada Jean-Luc Poupart, Canada Francisco García García - Mexico Juan Jose Jimenez Zacarias - Mexico Jonathan Jones – USA Michael Simon - USA Kerry Britton – USA
Industry Representatives	Nils Larson, Canada Brian Zak, Canada Tom Searles, USA Alan Sereno Muñoz, Mexico Jacob Podlivsky, Mexico
NGO	Faith Campbell, USA Edgar Deomano, USA

Assignment 1

Draft a NAPPO standard on preventing the entry of Asian gypsy moth (AGM) to North America.

Results

A team of technical specialists from the three countries has met on several occasions to review the current knowledge of the distribution of AGM in Asia. The team has established an agenda for meeting with national plant protection organizations (NPPOs) to review the status of AGM in the countries. NAPPO has drafted a joint three country communiqué requesting assistance from specific Asian NPPOs to meet in early 2007 to review the strategy for dealing with AGM on conveyances moving from infested countries. Once initial consultations with the affected countries are complete, the Panel will be developing a standard. The group has also been working with Australia and New Zealand, who have indicated an interest in working with NAPPO countries in establishing appropriate controls to preclude the movement off AGM from Asia.

Assignment 2

Continue to provide leadership in the design and delivery of NAPPO workshops on the implementation of ISPM No.15.

Results

The Panel assisted a workshop on methods for the implementation of ISPM No. 15 in Peru in November 13-17th 2006. The workshop was attended by about a 100 participants from the countries of the Andean community. Many of the industry and NPPO participants indicated that the NAPPO information was timely and would assist them in implementing ISPM No. 15 in their countries.

Assignment 3

Investigate and report on the technical impacts of *Phytophthora ramorum* on conifer forests.

Results

The NAPPO Forestry Panel sponsored a workshop of scientists working on various aspects of *P. ramorum* research from Europe, Canada, Australia and the United States to review current information on *P. ramorum* and the risks the disease presents to conifers. The workshop was held in conjunction with the SOD Science Symposium in Santa Rosa California, in March 2007. The group concluded that “...*the risks of conifer commodities (lumber, logs, etc.) carrying the pathogen to new areas is extremely low. Incidences of pathogen movement on human commodities has been restricted to movements of infected nursery stock, the movement of infected soils or the movement of deciduous plant parts such as leaves and branches.*”

Assignment 4

Analyze data collected and report on the incidence of pests associated with bark on wood packaging which has been marked according to ISPM No. 15, *Guidelines for regulating wood packaging material in international trade*.

Results

NAPPO Forestry Panel members undertook a survey of wood packaging marked in compliance with ISPM No. 15 to determine the incidence of pests associated with bark on the wood packaging. A total of 8 insects were found in association with the 865 bark pieces on about 9000 pieces of wood packaging inspected. The wood packaging originated from 48 countries and insects were only found in association with bark. In at least 5 of the 8 pest finds infestations likely occurred before the logs were cut into lumber and the panel concluded that misapplication of the treatment was more likely responsible for the occurrence of the insects in the wood.

Assignment 5

Provide technical support to the International Plant Protection Convention, (International Forest Quarantine Research Group, and Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine) particularly with regard to the risks associated with bark on treated wood packaging.

The results of the NAPPO bark audit was forwarded to both IFQRG and the Technical Panel on Forest Quarantine. The information was included as part of an IPPC survey conducted by NPPOs regarding the incidence of pests on marked wood packaging with bark.

Additionally, the NAPPO Forestry Panel drafted specific comments related to Technical Panels revision of ISPM No. 15.

Assignment 6

Share pest status information related to forest pests in the three NAPPO countries, including control and eradication efforts.

Results

Panel members continue to share information on pests occurring in their region. Information on endemic pests and alien invasive pests and the methods for eradication continue to form a significant component of Panel discussions.

**FRUIT PANEL
2006 - 2007**

Panel Members:	José Manuel Gutiérrez, Chairperson, Mexico José Luis Zavala, México Lisa Neven, USA Joe Cavey, USA Susan McCombs, USA Dominique Pelletier, Canada Charles Brisco, Canada
Industry Representatives:	James Christie, USA Mike Willett, USA Chuck Orman, USA Jorge Suarez, Mexico

Assignment 1

Develop a NAPPO standard on accreditation of laboratories conducting fruit pest diagnostics.

Results

The panel reviewed the draft standard on accreditation and decided that there was significant overlap with the RSPM 9 and ISPM 27. The focus will be on validation and equivalency of diagnostic protocols among the NAPPO countries. The Panel members identified fruit pests of interest and the status of the diagnostics will be determined by a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) the members of which are subject matter experts from each country. Panel members discussed the specific parameters to be considered for each identified pest. The protocols will be detailed by the experts and circulated for consistency among the countries. These protocols will be submitted as appendices to an existing NAPPO standard, to be determined.

Assignment 2

Develop a NAPPO standard on equivalence in the application of detection and identification tools for fruit pests, including guidelines for quality control.

Results

Protocol equivalence is to be incorporated into a revised RSPM 9. Equivalent protocols would be attached to either to an existing commodity standard and/or as a separate list of NAPPO validated diagnostic protocols. An outline for the “Process for establishing equivalent diagnostic protocols” was developed. The draft process was circulated to all NAPPO panel members for comment prior to the July 2007 Fruit Panel meeting. Revisions were made in the draft document.

Four Technical Advisory Groups (TAG) were requested to address critical diagnostic needs identified by the Panel. These include: mite, fruit fly, Tortricidae, and PPV diagnostic protocols.

In selecting the protocols, each TAG will be asked to:

- Reference ISPM 27 in developing protocols.

-
- Conduct literature search for available identification and diagnostic protocols for regulated species and closely related species. Include protocols from other NPPOs.
 - Discuss the purpose for which the diagnostic protocol was developed, e.g., to support a systems approach for export of host commodities.
 - Include at least two levels of molecular or biochemical testing for screening and confirmation of id.
 - Determine how rigorously the molecular test was evaluated. How many specimens were included, how many populations? Was the taxonomic identification done by an 'expert' in the field? What other closely related taxa were included in the analysis?
 - Rate the protocols in terms of 'ease of execution', cost, and time to completion. What type of equipment is necessary to conduct the tests?
 - Determine validation processes for recommended protocols.
 - Determine equivalency of protocols (ISPM 24).
 - Submit recommendations to Fruit Panel for consideration.

In 2008, the Fruit Panel will hold conference calls with each TAG to discuss issues to be considered.

Point 1

The USA industry representative presented the concept of a risk metric applied to temperate fruit pests. Industry requested that a NAPPO position paper be developed on the likelihood of temperate pest establishment and spread in tropical countries. This would include a process to measure risk metric assessment.

Results

The Fruit Panel determined that these issues should be considered by the PRA Panel. The concept needs to be more thoroughly evaluated by pest risk assessment scientists. There is a need to determine which variables and information are necessary for further development of the risk metric.

Point 2

Discuss capacity building among NAPPO member countries by conducting training workshops.

Results

A format for workshops involving arthropod pests was developed. Once tested, this format could be used for other diagnostic workshops.

Two workshops are planned: 1) fruit fly molecular diagnostics for two SAGARPA staff in Texas and 2) *Bactrocera* identification workshop in April 2008 in the USA.

Point 3

Review of draft ISPM on systems approach for risk management of tephritid fruit flies.

Results

This will be considered by the IPPC Fruit Fly Working Group in 2008. Panel members reviewed the document and comments on the concept will be conveyed to the IPPC. Panel members supported the general concept of systems approach. This may lead to the development of a NAPPO standard or adoption of the IPPC standard by NAPPO member countries.

Point 4

Review of host status draft document prepared by USA for consideration as the basis of NAPPO standard.

Results

Several questions related to this document were discussed by Panel members:

Why so rigorous? To counter historical record of finds in what is now thought to be non-host or conditional non-hosts. Historical record may have no voucher specimens, low sample sizes, misidentification of host, etc.

Should this be written as a more general standard to cover more than fruit fly host status? This may be more acceptable at the IPPC level.

Request as Fruit Panel assignment for 2008-2009. Could move this forward with fruit fly standard. Modify as more general standard for arthropods.

Need to update definitions to FAO 2006. Define terms in statistical analysis section.

Would be used for commodities that are questionable as hosts. If extensive historical record of infestations, then should not be necessary to do this evaluation.

Can this be written as a stepwise evaluation process?

2007 Panel meetings:

Canada-March 2007

USA-July 2007

FRUIT TREE PANEL
2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Dan Thompson – Chairperson, Canada
Thierry Poiré – Canada
Ricardo Perez Zubiri – Mexico
Arnold Tschanz – United States
Walter Gould – United States

Technical Advisory Group (TAG) – Pathology: Solke De Boer – Chairperson, Canada
Ian MacLatchy – Canada
Antonio Carcamo Rodriguez – Mexico
Camilo Hernandez Juarez – Mexico
Scott Redlin – United States

Industry Contacts: Robert Woolley, USA
Carlos H. Chavez, Mexico

Assignment 1

Finalize the bacteria and fungi appendices for RSPM No. 25, *Guidelines for international movement of pome and stone fruit trees into a NAPPO member country.*

Results

The Pathology TAG has finalized the list of bacteria and fungi that infest fruit trees, including data for the scientific name, hosts, disease name, and a general reference. Presence/absence data for each NAPPO country will be added to the final draft due Sept. 28, 2007.

Assignment 2

Begin work on the insect and nematode appendices.

Results

Work was not started on the fruit tree insect and nematode lists because the TAG groups are still working on the grapevine lists.

Assignment 3

Update the Appendix on viruses in RSPM N° 25 with additions or changes, host and literature references.

Results

The virus appendix is currently being updated but is not yet completed. Final draft due Sept. 28, 2007.

Assignment 4

Review the text of RSPM N° 25 and make any necessary changes to accommodate bacterial, fungal, insect and nematode pests.

Results

RSPM N° 25 was originally written to deal with virus pests which have limited options for pest management. The text of will be amended to incorporate the concepts from RSPM N° 24 "Plants for Planting" and ISPM N° 14 "Systems Approach for Pest Risk Management".

GRAINS PANEL 2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Alejandra Elizalde, Chairperson, Mexico
 Vicente Rosas, Mexico
 Andrew Dawson, Canada
 Matthew Royer, USA
 Thomas O'Connor, USA

Assignment 1

Reviewing the most recent scientific information on Karnal bunt, *Tilletia indica* Mitra, in collaboration with the Pest Risk Assessment Panel.

Results

The United States will provide Canada and Mexico with a detailed study for review and comments. The panel will recommend a follow-up of this assignment and, possibly, the development of a pathway analysis for Karnal bunt in North America.

Assignment 2

Developing recommended actions to harmonize soybean rust management (*Phakopsora pachyrizi*) in NAPPO countries.

Results

Canada and United States have harmonized their regulatory positions, based on the high potential for natural spread through the wind in both countries, and consider regulatory actions unnecessary. Mexico is still uncertain of the safety of pathways regarding the importation of seeds and so, an assessment is required to support a change of the current legislation.

On another note, information was shared at a regional level through a geographical platform, when detection points were geographically referenced. Efforts are being focused on training soybean growers and growers of other crops that may be affected, to assist the sustainable management of this pest.

Assignment 3

Developing a NAPPO strategic plan to be ready for the potential arrival of new strains of wheat stem rust, e.g. *Puccinia graminis* f sp. strain TTKS, based on the pest risk assessment prepared by the NAPPO panel.

Results

The Grains Panel began developing the strategic plan, whose main objective is to be prepared for the potential arrival of new races of Pgt. The strategic plan for soybean rust developed in the United States was used as a reference and tailored to *P. graminis*. It was agreed that this plan will include preparation, detection, response and management elements. The plan will provide guidelines for each country to develop its own specific response to this pest.

The panel has considered the possibility of conducting a workshop and inviting international colleagues, researchers and key stakeholders that may contribute to the completion and implementation of this project.

**GRAPEVINE PANEL AND
GRAPEVINE TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUPS - NEMATODES & ARTHROPODS
2006 - 2007**

Panel Members: Ray Johnson, Chairperson, Canada
Charles Brisco, Canada
Ricardo Pérez Zubiri, México
Shaharra Usnick, USA
Heather Hartzog, USA

TAG - Arthropods: Nancy Villegas, Chairperson, Mexico
Hector Enrique Vega, Mexico
Bruce Gill, Canada
Shaharra Usnick, USA
Tracey Horner, USA

TAG - Nematodes: Angel Ramirez, Chairperson, Mexico
Sylvia Miller, Canada
Howard Ferris, USA

Assignment 1

Complete the appendices of significant arthropod and nematode pests of grapevines for RSPM N° 15, *Guidelines for the importation of grapevines into a NAPPO member country*.

Results

The final format of each appendix was determined at a meeting of the arthropod and nematode TAGs in May, 2007 and the contents of each appendix reviewed. The newly re-structured appendices were distributed by the TAG chairs to their members for review. Both TAGs expect to finalize their respective appendix in the fall of 2007.

Assignment 2

Begin work on the bacteria and fungi appendices for RSPM N° 15.

Results

The Grapevine Panel met jointly with the Fruit Tree Panel and the Fruit Tree Technical Advisory Group - Pathology in May, 2007 to discuss the transfer of the Pathology TAG to the Grapevine Panel. The Fruit Tree TAG expected to complete its assignment by the end of September, 2007 and would subsequently start to work on the Grapevine bacterial and fungal appendices.

Assignment 3

Update the appendix on viruses in RSPM N° 15.

Results

The Panel members contacted virologists in their country requesting amendments to the appendix. No changes were made.

Assignment 4

Review the text of RSPM N° 15 and make any necessary changes to accommodate bacterial, fungal, arthropod and nematode pests.

Results

The text of RSPM N° 15 was reviewed and changes made during the May meeting. The new version remains to be finalized by the Panel and TAG members.

**INVASIVE SPECIES PANEL
2006 - 2007**

Panel Members:	Richard Orr, Chairperson, USA Penny Kriesch, USA Polly Lehtonen, USA Phillip Mason, USA Alejandra Elizalde, Mexico Patricia Koleff Osorio, Mexico Daryl Seip, Canada Christine Tibelius, Canada Claire Wilson, Canada
Screening TAG:	Polly Lehtonen, Chairperson, USA Craig Ramsey, USA Craig Regelbrugge, USA Cory Lindgren, Canada Andrea Sissons, Canada Alejandra Elizalde, Mexico
Pathway Analysis TAG:	Penny Kriesch, Chairperson, USA Wendy Asbil, Canada Karen Castro, Canada Ana Isabel González, Mexico Alejandra Elizalde, Mexico
Industry:	Jeff Hicks, Pickett Nurseries Craig Regelbrugge, ANLA Lin Schmale-Tate, Society of American Florists Rita Weerdenburg, CNLA
Environmental:	Catherine Hazlewood, TNC

Assignment 1

Define the scope of Invasive Alien Species in the context of NAPPO.

Results

The Panel reviewed, during the Toluca meeting, the draft *Scope of Invasive Species under the IPPC/NAPPO* document. Discussion covered areas of where there is legislative authority and where there are gaps in that authority that are covered by other agencies. Additions to the draft's charts were noted and updated at the meeting. Discussion then centered on what the document may be used for, and how can it be extended. Decision was made to add another column called *gaps covered by other organizations*. The terms of strain/biotype caused much discussion, since these terms often do not have national legislative authority for consideration. Continued development and a timeline was agreed upon for completing this project by the end of 2007.

Assignment 2

Begin development of a NAPPO Standard for evaluating the potential invasiveness of plants for planting.

Results

The *Screening Technical Advisory Group* (STAG) was created under the auspices of the Panel to write the draft NAPPO guidelines. In addition, the STAG has created a *Screening Resource Group* that is composed of outside experts for the purpose of providing peer review guidance during the development of the draft NAPPO guidelines. A timeline was developed along with milestones during the Toluca meeting. A number of STAG conference calls and emails have taken place since the Toluca meeting to finalize the *Terms of Reference Paper* and to develop the draft *Discussion Paper*.

Assignment 3

Begin development of a NAPPO Standard for identifying and prioritizing pest introduction pathways (pathway analysis)

Results

The development of a NAPPO Standard for Pathway Analysis was a new charge for the Panel. A considerable amount of effort was spent by the Panel at the Toluca meeting in outlining what the Standard would do and the totality of its coverage (scope). A timeline for the development of the Standard was developed at the Toluca meeting. Additional clarification was provided by the NAPPO Executive Working Group in July of 2007 on the scope of the proposed standard. The Pathway Analysis Technical Advisory Group (PATAG) was created under the auspices of the Panel to write the draft NAPPO standard. The PATAG is in the processes of starting the development of its *Pathways Analysis Research Group* and in further refining the scope of the standard.

Assignment 4

Coordinate and clarify NAPPO's invasive species efforts with those of the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation and other North American international treaties, conventions and trilateral activities.

Results

The Panel discussed during the Toluca meeting the need for support and expertise from the environmental community of North America. Equally important was to raise the awareness within the environmental community as to the importance of invasive species and how it relates to other conservation activities. The Nature Conservancy agreed to invite the Panel chair to a meeting of the joint environmental groups to present what NAPPO and the NAFTA-CEC are currently undertaking as it relates to invasive species. In addition, the need for other agency representatives representing environmental protection was discussed.

Assignment 5

Coordinate with the NAPPO Working Group to develop the agenda and speakers for the Invasive Species symposium at the October, 2007 NAPPO Annual Meeting.

Results

Completed

PEST RISK ANALYSIS PANEL 2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Olegario Barrera - Chairperson, México
 Scott Redlin, United States
 Marina Zlotina, United States
 Dorthea Zadig, United States
 Louise Dumouchel, Canada
 Ken Allison, Canada
 Gary Kristjansson, Canada

Assignment 1

Prepare a NAPPO PRA on the black stem rust, UG99, *Puccinia graminis*, for the NAPPO Grains panel.

Results

The Grains Panel met with the pest Risk Analysis Panel to discuss the science and technical issues related to *Puccinia graminis*, and considered appropriate to have first a Fact Sheet about black stem rust to make decisions in a shorter period of time. As a consequence the Pest Risk Analysis Panel Members prepared a Fact Sheet using available scientific and economic information (See Annex I). (Wheat Stem Rust strain Ug-99)

Additionally the Pest Risk Analysis Panel members agreed that the arrival of new races of *P. graminis* in North America is inevitable and therefore there is a need to be prepared to manage it upon its arrival. Therefore the Panel Members worked a Strategic Plan in order to describe pest management tools that can be applied in North America, upon arrival of new races of *P. graminis* (See Annex II). (Black Stem Rust Ug-99)

Assignment 2

In collaboration with the *Grains Panel*, review the latest scientific information on Karnal bunt, *Tilletia indica* Mitra.

Results

During the joint Grains and PRA Panels meeting it was presented by Glenn Fowler of USDA-APHIS the modeling work it has been done. The focus was on the likelihood of introduction of Kb in the event of global de-regulation, through US grain exports. Also, it was intended to provide scientific information to facilitate safe trade and to develop a model for future regulatory policy making. It was considered a follow-up assignment for next year to develop a harmonized North American pathway analysis for Karnal bunt.

Assignment 3

Prepare and present NAPPO activities related to Sudden Oak Death, *Phytophthora ramorum* at the conference in Santa Rosa, California, March 5-9, 2007.

Results

NAPPO sponsored the Risk to Conifers symposium at the Sudden Oak Death Science Symposium III - March 5, 2007 in Santa Rosa, California. Researchers and regulators from the US, Canada and Europe learned of the latest findings regarding the susceptibility of conifers to *Phytophthora ramorum* and their significance in terms of disease spread.

Researchers and regulators became concerned regarding the potential role of conifers in disease epidemiology following the discovery that some conifers are hosts and that stem cankers could be induced in these hosts by artificial inoculations even though these symptoms had not been observed in nature.

The information collected to date indicates that known conifer hosts become infected only when exposed to high inoculum pressure and that the pathogen does not thrive, reproduce or even persist on these hosts. It therefore appears that there is a negligible risk of significant mortality due to *P. ramorum* in known conifer hosts. Such hosts do not support infection overwinter and produce little if any inoculum suggesting that they lack the potential to make a significant contribution to the natural spread of the pathogen.

A more detailed report on this workshop was published in the June issue of the NAPPO Newsletter.

PHYTOSANITARY ALERT SYSTEM PANEL 2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Heather Hartzog, Chairperson, USA
Christie Hurt, USA
Rob Favrin, Canada
Ian MacLatchy, Canada
Francisco Ramirez, Mexico
Rene Hernandez, Mexico

Assignment 1

Continue to post timely alerts on the NAPPO website

Results

Over the past year, the Phytosanitary Alert System (PAS) panel posted over 20 News Stories/Alerts and 45 Official Pest Reports to the PAS website (www.pestalert.org). We now have over 2000 subscribers to the PAS email notification system with users from 112 different countries around the globe. Approximately thirty percent of the visitors that visited the site more than once utilize the Spanish version of the website at www.pestalert.org/espanol.

Assignment 2

Continue to review automated data surveillance technologies to streamline data mining processes

Results

For the United States:

In January of 2006, a collaborative effort between North Carolina State University and the USDA Plant Protection Quarantine division formed the U.S. Biosecurity Surveillance Team that started the Exotic Pest Information, Collection and Analysis (EPICA) project. The new team is focused on developing novel technology for automated real-time data retrieval and cataloguing of open source exotic pest information. As of August 2007, the team is delivering useful reports to the U.S. panel members on a bi-monthly basis. These reports include brief summaries of the pest situations and their supporting references. The U.S. panel members provided input early on, which has guided the Biosecurity Surveillance Team to query for pest situations not only of U.S. concern, but also of NAPPO concern due to the shared land border pathways. The PAS panel directly benefits from this service by receiving up-to-date information on exotic pests of concern without having to manually search individual websites and journals. Also, the EPICA project is able to process news articles in various languages, which greatly expands the pool of potential news stories. The U.S. panel members will continue to work with the Biosecurity Surveillance Team to refine the searches and output as new resources and concepts emerge.

For Canada:

The Canadian panel members continue to work with the Public Health Agency of Canada to determine the feasibility of using the Global Public Health Intelligence Network (GPHIN) to monitor worldwide media sources. The GPHIN is a secure internet-based automated "early

warning" system developed to gather and disseminate reports of public health significance on a real-time basis, in seven languages (Arabic, English, French, Russian, simplified and traditional Chinese, and Spanish) (http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/media/nr-rp/2004/2004_gphin-rmispbk_e.html).

To test the utility of the GPHIN system relative to plant health data mining, the Canadian panel members provided the GPHIN coordinator with plant health related search terms and parameters. These terms are still being tested and modified by the GPHIN staff to determine the overall feasibility of using the system to find and report on significant plant health threats occurring around the globe. It is hoped that in the near future the GPHIN will become another resource that facilitates the work of the PAS panel members.

Assignment 3

Determine ways to improve Official Pest Reporting through the PAS

Results

Both Canada and the United States made progress in obtaining status declarations for Official Pest Reports. Status declarations are a required component of Official Pest Reports under ISPM No. 17. Status options are listed in ISPM No. 8. Until last year, Official Pest Reports were posted on the PAS without the official status declarations. Both countries are still refining the process for obtaining status declarations, but feel the process will get easier over time. Status declarations, using options provided under ISPM No. 8, provide a concise, consistent and transparent message about the pest situation in the country of origin. On the PAS website, the status declaration, if available, is listed at the end of the Official Pest Report. In the upcoming year, the panel will continue to work on this issue for all NAPPO countries.

Assignment 4

Continue outreach efforts

Results

Outreach efforts in 2006-2007 were limited for various reasons; however both usage of the website and the subscriber base increased. The panel hopes to find new avenues for outreach in 2007-2008.

PLANTS FOR PLANTING PANEL 2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Michael Word, Canada
Barbara Peterson, Canada
Ray Jonson, Canada
Shane Sela, Canada
Trent Herman, Canada
Arnold Tschanz, USA
Debora Golino, USA
Dorthea Zadig, USA
Ed Podleckis, USA
Kerry Britton, USA
Ricardo Perez Zubiri, Mexico
Juan Jose Ornelas, Mexico

Assignments

1. Report on progress in achieving the implementation plan for RSPM No. 24, *Integrated Pest Risk Management measures for the importation of Plants for Planting in NAPPO countries*.
2. Coordinate country comments on the draft ISPM on Plants for Planting.
3. Clarify the meaning of the term 'origin' in ISPM No. 12, *Guidelines for Phytosanitary Certificates*, in particular for re-exports of seed.

Introduction

The panel did not have an opportunity to meet face to face this year but members were involved in development of the ISPM on Plants for Planting and held teleconferences.

Item 1

Member countries have begun implementation of individual plans and revisions to legal instruments allowing this significant change to traditional end-point inspection to be made. Further and more detailed discussions are required as the panel believes that a more harmonized approach to implementation is required in all three member states. Lessons learned from implementation of the wood packaging standard suggest that to avoid port shopping and ensure a North American approach, present proposed implementation dates should be reviewed and revised for a common target for implementation.

Item 2

The panel has not yet had the opportunity to comment on the international standard as the document is still in the drafting stage. As mentioned above, the IPPC panel has had excellent participation from NAPPO member states, with two permanent members and due to NAPPO's role as host to both meetings of the panel last year, NAPPO was able to provide a Rapporteur and host.

The ISPM is presently editing the draft document on-line using internet document sharing.

The document focuses on critical control points and is very reflective of RSPM 24 as well as the Canadian and US nursery certification programs. The standard should be out for country comments and consultation early in 2008.

Item 3

There are differences of opinion amongst member countries on this terminology. The IPPC is the process of re-evaluating this term and we would propose we await the results of this review before further consideration by the panel.

Changes to Panel Membership

Dr Arnold T. Tschanz, USDA as accepted chair of the panel as Michael Wood is stepping down from the panel and will be replaced by two new Canadian members, Trent Herman and Barbara Peterson, both of whom are working on the implementation of RSPM 24 in Canada.

POTATO PANEL 2006 - 2007

Panel Members: Richard Zink, Chairperson, USA
 William Wise, USA
 Gustavo Frias Trevino, Mexico
 Rene Hernandez, Mexico
 Solke De Boer, Canada
 Nathalie Bruneau, Canada

Industry Contacts: Daniel Moss, USA
 Hugo Gómez Arroyo, Mexico
 Larry Buba, Canada

The Potato Panel met in Toluca, Mexico on February 20, 21 & 22, 2007.

Assignment 1

Finalize protocols for the detection and identification of *Clavibacter michiganensis* subsp. *sepedonicus* as Appendix 6 to the NAPPO Potato Standard, RSPM No. 3.

Results

The Panel discussed the comments received during country consultation and decided to make no substantive changes to the draft appendix. The Potato Panel concurred to add Appendix 6 to the NAPPO Potato Standard.

Assignment 2

Finalize protocols for the isolation and identification of regulated nematodes of potato as Appendix 7 to the NAPPO Potato Standard, RSPM No. 3.

Results

No comments were received during country consultation on the draft appendix. The Potato Panel concurred to add Appendix 7 to the NAPPO Potato Standard.

Assignment 3

Determine the accuracy of Appendix 5, Per-Shipment Testing for PVYn, based on the current knowledge of the North American PVY complex.

Results

The panel agreed to delay revisions to Appendix 5 of the NAPPO Potato Standard until the ongoing Canada/US PVY survey is complete. In the interim, the Panel will request a status report on the Canada/US PVY survey. In addition, the US will provide Mexico with the protocol being used in the survey and Mexico will consider the protocol and determine whether to conduct a national survey for PVY. At the next panel meeting, there will be an invited presentation on the PVY complex and what is known about it in Europe and North America.

Assignment 4

Identify the requirements for recognition of Pest Free Areas, Pest Free Places of Production and Pest Free Production Sites, to facilitate potato trade among NAPPO member countries.

Results

The panel reviewed and revised an internal working document addressing the terms of reference for pest freedom and their application to potatoes. The panel agreed to proceed with the working document in the development of specific requirements for the recognition of pest freedom for *Globodera pallida* and *G. rostochiensis*.

Canada and the US will provide to Mexico, respectively, relevant country information on the biology and management these two nematodes. Mexico, in turn will draft a pest specific document taking into account information from the three countries. A further revision of the working document on pest freedom will be distributed to panel members for review.

**STANDARDS PANEL
2006 - 2007**

Panel Members: Greg Wolf, Chairperson, Canada
 Steve Cote, Canada
 Julie Aliaga, USA
 Mario Puente, Mexico

1. Coordinate the review of new and amended NAPPO standards and implementation plans.

Some concerns have been raised regarding implementation plans that have different timelines between NAPPO member countries e.g., for RSPM 24, *Integrated Pest Risk Management Measures for the Importation of Plants for Planting into NAPPO Member Countries*. Following discussions, adjustments will be made to the implementation plans for RSPM 24. The standards panel will continue to review all existing implementation plans to determine whether their targets are being met. The standards panel will ensure that the implementation plan for RSPM 27- Guidelines for Importation and Confined Release into the Environment of Transgenic Arthropods in NAPPO Member countries is available when this standard is presented for adoption by the Executive committee.

2. Exchange and discuss comments on draft International Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPMs), within NAPPO and with other Regional Plant Protection Organizations, to build consensus on draft ISPMs and other issues related to the IPPC.

Copies of country comments on draft standards and draft specifications were shared between NAPPO member countries. The draft ISPMs will be further reviewed in January 2008 in conjunction with the NAPPO-EPPO meeting (following Standards Committee review and prior to their presentation for adoption at CPM 3).

3. Provide updates on NAPPO Standards and ISPMs for the NAPPO Newsletter.

A summary of all newly adopted standards at CPM 2 was provided in the June 2007 NAPPO newsletter.

4. Organize conference calls and prepare NAPPO discussion documents where possible, to confirm positions on key issues for North American representatives to FAO expert working groups.

Given that NAPPO's Technical Director position is now staffed, consideration of the need for, and taking the lead on drafting of, discussion documents for all EWGs could form a core task of that role. Members of the standards panel developed country-based discussion papers for the Technical Consultation of Regional Plant Protection Organizations (TC of RPPOs) for the revision of ISPM 7, *Export certification system* and ISPM 12, *Guidelines for phytosanitary certificates*. Given lack of time, these papers were presented as individual country discussion papers rather than NAPPO papers for the revision of ISPM 7 and 12.

5. Update the NAPPO Glossary taking into account new definitions and standards.

The Standards Panel initiated the review of the NAPPO Glossary of Phytosanitary terms in 2007. Revisions to the NAPPO Glossary take into consideration definitions in RSPMs adopted since 2004 and new IPPC definitions. One outstanding issue that needs to be addressed by the Standards panel is the existence of two different definitions for the terms propagative material and citrus propagative material. The standards panel will discuss this issue in January 2008 with a target date for finalising the revision to the NAPPO glossary in early 2008.

6. Review NAPPO position papers and policy documents to verify current relevance.

Work which may result in changes to some policy papers and decision documents commenced, e.g., the NAPPO Annual Meetings Procedures Manual. The standards panel will pursue opportunities to review other position and policy documents as necessary.

7. Review standards which have reached their 5 year review period and recommend actions to revise them, as necessary.

The Standards Panel identified a number of standards that require review:

- RSPM No. 2, *Preclearance*, - The Standards Panel will initiate the revision of this RSPM in the upcoming months.
- RSPM No. 7, *Guidelines for Petition for Release of Exotic Phytophagous Agents for the Biological Control of Weeds*- the Biocontrol panel initiated the revision of RSPM 7 with an objective of completing the revision of this standard by the end of 2008 if possible.
- RSPM No. 13, *Guidelines to Establish, Maintain and Verify Karnal Bunt Pest Free Areas in North America*, and RSPM No. 21, *Harmonized Procedure for Morphologically Distinguishing Teliospores of Karnal Bunt, Ryegrass Bunt and Rice Bunt* will be reviewed by the Grains Panel. Revision of RSPM 13 and 21 should be initiated in 2007-2008 with the objective of completing the revision by the end of 2008.

8. Update the NAPPO Standard for standards with a flowchart to explain the standard setting process.

A flowchart and accompanying summary explanation was prepared by the Standards Panel. The modifications should be included as an appendix to RSPM 6 very shortly.