



## **NAPPO Regional Standards for Phytosanitary Measures (RSPM)**

### **RSPM N° 12**

### **Guidelines for Petition for First Release of Non-indigenous Entomophagous Biological Control Agents**

The Secretariat of the North American Plant Protection Organization  
1431 Merivale Road, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Room 309  
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0Y9  
October 20, 2008

## Contents

	Page
Review .....	3
Amendment Record.....	3
Distribution .....	3
Introduction .....	4
Scope .....	4
References.....	4
Definitions, Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	6
Outline of Requirements .....	7
General Requirements .....	7
1. Proposed Action .....	7
2. Target Pest Information .....	8
3. Biological Control Agent Information .....	8
4. Environmental & Economic Impacts of the Proposed Release.....	9
5. Post-Release Monitoring .....	9

## Review


NAPPO Standards for Phytosanitary Measures are subject to periodic review and amendment. The next review for this Standard is October 2013. This standard was last reviewed in 2008. A review of any NAPPO Standard may be initiated at any time upon the request of a NAPPO member country.

## Approval

This Standard was updated and approved by the North American Plant Protection Organization (NAPPO) Executive Committee on October 20, 2008 and is effective from this date.

Approved by:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Greg Stubbings  
Executive Committee Member  
Canada

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Paul R. Eggert  
Executive Committee Member  
United States

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Javier Trujillo Arriaga  
Executive Committee Member  
Mexico

## Implementation

No implementation plans are required for this standard.

## Amendment Record

Amendments to this Standard will be dated and filed with the NAPPO Secretariat.

## Distribution

This standard is distributed by the NAPPO Secretariat, to the Industry Advisory Group and Sustaining Associate Members, the International Plant Protection Convention (IPCC) Secretariat, and to other Regional Plant Protection Organizations (RPPOs).

## Introduction

### Scope

These guidelines are intended to assist in drafting a petition for release of Non-indigenous entomophagous biological control agents of insect pests. A standardized petition will also assist the reviewers and regulators in assessing the risk of Non-indigenous introductions intended for biological control of insect pests. These guidelines could be used for biological control agents for other target pests (e.g. mites, nematodes, and molluscs) at the discretion of the NPPO.

### References

Babendreier D, F. Bigler, U. Kuhlmann. 2005. Methods used to assess non-target effects of invertebrate biological control agents of insect pests. *BioControl* 50: 821-870.

Bennett, F.D.1990. Introduction. *In*: Habeck, D.H., F.D. Bennett and J.H. Frank (eds.). Classical Biological Control in the Southern United States. *Southern Coop. Series Bulletin* No. 355: 1-6.

Bigler, F., D. Babendreier, and U. Kuhlmann (eds.). 2006. *Environmental Impact of Invertebrates for Biological Control of Arthropods: Methods and Risk Assessment*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, Oxon, UK, 288p.

Charudattan, R. and H.W. Browning. 1992. *Regulations and Guidelines: Critical Issues in Biological Control*. Proceedings of the USDA/CSRS National Workshop, 10-12 June 1991. Vienna, VA, USA, 203p.

DeClerck-Floate, R.A., P.G. Mason, D.J. Parker, D.R. Gillespie, A.B. Broadbent and G. Boivin. 2006. *Guide for the Importation and Release of Arthropod Biological Control Agents in Canada*. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada Miscellaneous Publications, Ottawa, ON, Canada, 53p.

Follett, P.A. and J.J. Duan (eds.). 2000. *Nontarget Effects of Biological Control*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 316p.

*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*, 2008. ISPM No. 5, FAO, Rome.

*Glossary of Phytosanitary Terms*, 2008. RSPM No. 5, NAPPO, Ottawa.

*Guidelines for Petition for First Release of Non-indigenous Phytophagous Biological Control Agents*, 2008. RSPM No. 7, NAPPO, Ottawa.

*Guidelines for the export, shipment, import and release of biological control agents and other beneficial organisms*, 2005. ISPM No. 3. FAO, Rome.

Hokkanenn, H.M.T. and J.L. Lynch. 1995. *Biological Control: Benefits and Risks*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 326p.

Huber, J.T. 1998. The importance of voucher specimens, with practical guidelines for preserving specimens of the major invertebrate phyla for identification. *Journal of Natural History* 32: 376-385.

Kauffman, W.C. and J. E. Nechols (eds.). 1992. *Selection criteria and ecological consequences of importing natural enemies*. Proceedings Thomas Say Publications in Entomology, Entomological Society of America, Lanham, MD, USA, 117p.

Kidd, N.A.C. and M.A. Jervis. 1996. Population dynamics. Pp. 293-374, *In* Jervis, M.A. and N.A.C. Kidd (eds.) *Insect Natural Enemies: Practical approaches to their study and evaluation*. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY, USA.

Leppla, N.C., E.S. Delfosse and R.S. Soper. 1995. Technical and regulatory constraints to international cooperation in biological control. Pp. 385-395, *In* Gerling, D. and R.T. Mayer (eds.) *Bemisia: Taxonomy, Biology, Damage, Control and Management*. Intercept. Andover, UK.

Mackauer, M., L.E. Ehler and J. Roland (eds.). 1990. *Critical Issues in Biological Control*. Intercept, Andover, UK, 330p.

Mason, P.G., R.G. Flanders and H.A. Arrendondo-Bernal. 2005. How can legislation facilitate the use of biological control of arthropods in North America? Pp. 701-714. *In* Hoddle, R.G. (Compiler) *Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Symposium on Biological control of Arthropods, Davos, Switzerland, 12-16 September 2005*. United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Morgantown, WV, FHTET-2005-08, Vol II.

National Research Council (U.S.). 1996. *Ecologically Based Pest Management*. Board on Agriculture. National Research Council. National Academy Press. Washington, DC, USA, 144p.

Noyes, J.S. 1994. The reliability of published host-parasitoid records: a taxonomists view. *Norwegian Journal of Agricultural Sciences, Supplement* 16: 59-69.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. 1993. *Harmful Non-Indigenous Species in the United States*. OTA-F-565. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC, USA, 391p.

U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment 1995. *Biologically Based Technologies for Pest Control*. OTA-ENV-636. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, D.C., 204p.

Van Driesche, R. G and T. S. Bellows Jr (eds.) 1993. *Steps in classical arthropod biological control*. Proceedings Thomas Say Publications in Entomology, Entomological Society of America, Lanham, MD, USA, 88p.

Van Driesche, R. G. and Reardon, R. (eds.). 2004. Assessing Host Ranges for Parasitoids and Predators Used For Classical Biological Control: A Guide to Best Practice. USDA, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team, FHTET-2004-03, Morgantown, West Virginia, USA.

van Klinken, R.D. 2000. Host-specificity testing: why do we do it and how we can do it better. Pp. 54-68, *In* Van Driesche, R.G., T. Heard, A.S. McClay and R. Reardon (eds.) *Host-Specificity Testing of Exotic Arthropod Biological Control Agents: the Biological Basis for Improvement in Safety*. USDA Forest Service, Forest Health Technology Enterprise Team. Report FHTET-99-1, August, 2000. Morgantown, West Virginia, USA.

Van Lenteren JC, Babendreier D, Bigler F, Bungio G, Hokkanen HMT, Kuske S, Loomans AJM, Menzler-Hokkanen I, van Rija PCJ, Thomas MB, Tommasini MG, Zeng QQ, 2003. Environmental risk assessment of exotic natural enemies used in inundative biological control. *BioControl* 48: 3-38.

Waage, J.K. 1990. Ecological theory and the selection of biological control agents. Pp. 135-157, *In* Mackauer, M., L.E. Ehler and J. Roland (eds.). 1990. *Critical Issues in Biological Control*. Intercept, Andover, UK.

Wajnberg, E., Scott, J.C. and Quimby, P.C. (eds.). 2000. *Evaluating Indirect Ecological Effects of Biological Control*. CABI Publishing, Wallingford, Oxon, UK, 261p.

Withers, T.M., L. Barton Browne, J. Stanley. 1999. *Host specificity testing in Australasia: towards improved assays for biological control*. Department of Natural Resources. Cooparoo, Queensland, Australia, 98p.

## Definitions, Abbreviations and Acronyms

biological control agent	A natural enemy, antagonist, competitor, or other organism used for pest control (FAO)
biological control (biocontrol)	Pest control strategy making use of living natural enemies, antagonists, competitors or other biological control agent (FAO)
containment facility	A structure whose purpose is to prevent escape of material held within it, into the environment (NAPPO)
entomophagous	Organisms that eat insects (NAPPO)
non-indigenous	Not native to a particular country or ecosystem (applied to organisms intentionally or accidentally introduced as a result of human activities) (FAO)
host material (for production of commercial arthropod biological control agents)	The prey, host, plant material and substrate that the commercial arthropod biological control agents was produced with, some or all of which may be included in the final product (NAPPO)

import permit	Official document authorizing importation of a commodity in accordance with specified phytosanitary requirements (FAO)
NPPO	National Plant Protection Organization (FAO)
petition	A formal, written application to a regulatory agency seeking approval to release a non-indigenous biological control agent (NAPPO)
release (into the environment)	Intentional liberation of an organism into the environment (FAO)
standard operating procedure (SOP)	Codified best laboratory practices for handling biological control agents in quarantine or containment (NAPPO)
voucher specimens	A series of individuals from a specific population deposited in the National Collection(s) of the country (NAPPO)

## Outline of Requirements

Information is requested on the proposed action: aspects of the biology, regulatory status, distribution and economic impact of the target pest; biology, source, known host organism, related species in the proposed area of introduction, and quarantine procedures for the biological control agent; and expected impacts after release; and key published and unpublished scientific records of both the intended target and the organism to be released.

## General Requirements

Each petition should be preceded by a title page, a table of contents and a summary or abstract. A petition to request the first release of Non-indigenous entomophagous biological control agents in NAPPO member countries should include the following information:

Title page - '**Petition for the Release of XXX for the Biological Control of YYY**'  
Name(s) and address of Petitioner(s)

### Summary or Abstract

#### 1. Proposed Action

- 1.1 Purpose of the release.
- 1.2 Need for the release.
- 1.3 Reasons for choice of the entomophagous biological control agent.
- 1.4 Specific location of rearing/containment facility and name(s) of qualified personnel operating the facility.
- 1.5 Timing of the release (approximate date of release) and factors affecting the timing (e.g. life stage of target pest, season)
- 1.6 Location of initial release (including geographic coordinates).
- 1.7 Methods to be used (e.g., rearing, multiplication, release).

- 1.8 Methods to be used for disposing of any host material, pathogens, parasites, parasitoids, and hyperparasitoids accompanying an import.
- 1.9 Agencies and/or individuals that will be involved in the release and monitoring.

## **2. Target Pest Information**

- 2.1 Taxonomy: scientific name, full classification, synonymy, common names (if any), and sufficient characterization to allow unambiguous recognition.
- 2.2 Economic impact and benefits (if any) of the target pest.
- 2.3 Life history of the target pest.
- 2.4 Distribution of the target pest.
- 2.5 Economically and ecologically important species in North America (introduced and native) related (phylogenetically and/or ecologically) to the target pest.
- 2.6 Regulatory and/or pest status of the target pest in state, provincial or federal law.
- 2.7 Knowledge of status of other biological control agents (indigenous and introduced) that attack the target pest.
- 2.8 Life stage(s) of target pest that are vulnerable to the biological control agent.

## **3. Biological Control Agent Information**

- 3.1 Taxonomy: scientific name, synonymy, common names and name of the taxonomic authority making the identification of the biological control agent.
- 3.2 Methods used to identify the biological control agent (e.g., morphological, molecular).
- 3.3 Location of voucher specimens.
- 3.4 Natural geographic range, other areas where introduced, and expected attainable range in North America (also habitat preference and climatic requirements of the biological control agent).
- 3.5 Source of the biological control agent (laboratory/rearing facility/containment facility, original collection locality, name of collector, and name of identifier).
- 3.6 Host/Biological control agent interactions (e.g., parasitoid, pathogen, parasite, competitor, and antagonist)
- 3.7 Life history (including dispersal capability and damage inflicted on target pest).
- 3.8 Known host range based on valid literature records, host data from museum specimens, and unpublished records.
- 3.9 History of past use of the biological control agent.
- 3.10 Pathogens, parasites, parasitoids, and hyperparasitoids of the biological control agent and how to eliminate them from a culture of the biological control agent.
- 3.11 Standard Operating Procedure stating how the biological control agent will be handled in containment.
- 3.12 Other closely related genera, sibling species, or similar species of the biological control agent in North America.

## 4. Environmental & Economic Impacts of the Proposed Release

- 4.1 Known impact on vertebrates including humans.
- 4.2 Implications of not releasing this biological control agent (e.g., pesticide use, physical controls).
- 4.3 Direct impact of the biological control agent on target pest and non-target species.
- 4.4 Effects on physical environment (e.g., water, soil and air resources).
- 4.5 Indirect effects (e.g., potential impacts on organisms that depend on the target pest and non-target species, including potential competition with resident biological control agents).
- 4.6 Possible direct, or indirect effects on threatened and endangered species in North America.

## 5. Post-Release Monitoring

Researchers and practitioners should publish details on the economic and environmental impacts of programs, as soon as practical, after release of the biological control agent. Comparing predicted and observed behavior and performance of biological control agents is necessary to validate and improve regulatory systems. Further, monitoring can provide useful information for current programs. For example, additional releases may be suspended if proven ineffective, when control/balance is achieved, or if unintended impacts are observed. Therefore, to assist in assessing program impacts, information is requested on plans for post-release monitoring.

In designing monitoring plans please note that pre-release baseline measurements of target pests and non-target species provide for better monitoring data and documentation of effects. Also, some effects may take years or decades to manifest while others may not be long lasting.

The key elements to monitor are:

- 5.1 Biological control agent establishment and spread.
- 5.2 Biological control agent and target pest densities over time.
- 5.3 Host specificity/attack rates on the target pest and selected non-target species for which potential impacts are identified (e.g., threatened or endangered species, and taxonomically related or beneficial species). Methods should measure both biological control agent host preference and development.
- 5.4 Changes in the target pest and in the growth, survival, and reproduction of selected non-target species.
- 5.5 Changes in species diversity and community structure. Monitor the displacement or exclusion of native natural enemies, local extinctions, replacement of the target pest as the main host, and other direct and indirect effects.

**NOTE:** Voucher specimens must be deposited in a National Collection in advance of approval for release. The specimens must be clearly labeled, indicating collection locality, latitude and longitude, date of collection, name of collector and any other pertinent information. Researchers must also provide exact location and timing of release(s) to regulatory officials.