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**Summary**

**Project:** Develop a NAPPO Science and Technology paper on the risks associated with Lymantriids of potential concern to the NAPPO region, identifying potential species and pathways of concern.

**General comments:** The main purpose of this conference call was to provide an update from EG members on the risk analyses of Lymantriid species assigned to each country.

**Item 1:** Group progress report.

**Consensus:** The Chairperson indicated that the main objective of the conference call was to provide an update on the work being done by the expert group and discuss the problems experienced.

**Updates:**
- **Mexico.**
  - Due to the current workload, MX has not finished filling the data sheets on all the Lymantriid species assigned to Mexico.
  - EG members from Mexico also looked at the data from the species that were previously analyzed and are currently found in the Group’s folder in Google Drive (about 20 species with their data sheet).
  - Members have not been able to complete the work assigned but committed to work on the data sheets as soon as possible.
  - In general terms MX had difficulties finding information on the biology and behavior of the species assigned. Most of the data they have collected is for hosts and distribution.
  - The score of most species analyzed is “0”
US.
- Have identified a total of 13 species based on data availability.
- Completed two assessments, one for *Lymantria ampla* and the other for *L. lunata* and, working on a third species (*O. mendoza*).
- Spatially broken the Köppen-Geiger classes by NAPPO countries to determine the areas in each country that have a risk for establishment of Lymantriid species. The US EG member asked if the information should be uploaded into the group’s folder in Google Drive. The Chairperson indicated that it is good information to have and encouraged to upload the information into the Google Drive. The US EG member indicated the information is in the same format as in previous analyses done by the group. The Chairperson asked the US member if he could run the analyses for other species from which data is being collected by other members. The US member agreed to help but expressed his concerns about time availability to do this. The Chairperson indicated that this will be good information but only for those species that have a complete datasheet and emphasized that including this type of data is part of the analysis and provides a more objective picture. The Chairperson indicated the analysis should be done in two steps:
  - Evaluate based on the host(s)
  - Evaluate whether there is enough biological information associated with the species selected based on the host(s) availability. If there is not enough biological information the species should be removed from the analysis. GIS analyses will be done only if there is enough biological information. The Chairperson also indicated the importance of having additional parameters, as it was done previously, for example the "percentage overlap" that will facilitate the extrapolation of information like the distribution of lymantriids species in the world and the possibility of establishment in the NAPPO region. This information should be included in the analysis for those species where complete data sheets are available.

Canada.
- The Chairperson indicated that he had completed collecting the biological information for 10 species.
- The process of collecting the biological information
will continue for the remaining species assigned to Canada and, upon completion, the most pestiferous species will be selected to complete the analysis.

- The Chairperson explained all the problems associated with the search engines used (Google and Google Scholar) and the difficulties in accessing certain information databases like “Zoological Records”. He also explained the challenges in accessing the records in spite of being able to run a search and getting a good number of hits (i.e. with the AGRIS database). Other members are also using Google and Google Scholars (MX). The EG member from Mexico indicated they have been able to get partial information (abstracts) and most of the information obtained is restricted to the host and distributions. US members have been using Google, Google Scholar, CAB compendium and CAB abstracts. The Chairperson also suggested and encouraged EG members to place special requests to get information for those species where information is difficult to obtain. This could be as a written request to researchers of organizations in other countries of the world. Mexico will follow this approach with the scientific community with expertise in Lymantriids in MX.

### Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG members</td>
<td>Continue working of the species assigned to their respective countries.</td>
<td>As needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPPO Secretariat</td>
<td>Send Doodle poll to schedule the next conference call for the last week of January.</td>
<td>As soon as possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Next Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Conference call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Last week of January. To be determined after Doodle poll results.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Proposed Agenda Items

1. Determine Status of datasheets and whether more time needed

2. Discuss methods to capture missing data

3. Discuss timelines for draft paper and its format