



NAPPO

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

NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group:	Revision of RSPM 22 / Biological Control	
Location:	Zoom meeting – Video conference	
Date:	May 6, 2021	
Chairperson	Peter Mason (Agric. Canada)	
Participants:		
Bruno Gallant (CFIA)	Heather Cumming (CFIA)	Ronald D. Weeks (APHIS – PPQ)
Robert Pfannenstiel (APHIS – PPQ)	Kirk Martin (APHIS – PPQ)	John Goolsby (APHIS – PPQ)
Hugo Arredondo (SENASICA)	José Gustavo Torres (SENASICA)	Brian Spencer (Canada Industry)
Serena Bhardwaj (Canada Industry)	Melissa Tacolla (US Industry)	Patricia Abad (APHIS – PPQ)
Stephanie Bloem (NAPPO)	Nedelka Marín-Martínez (NAPPO)	Alonso Suazo (NAPPO)
Summary		
Project:	Revision of RSPM 22 (<i>Guidelines for the construction and operation of a containment facility for insects and mites used as biological control agents</i>)- <i>Project proposal discussions</i>	
General comments:	The chairperson and the NAPPO TD welcomed and thanked all participants for joining the call. Agenda approved as presented. The NAPPO TD agreed to take notes and prepare the conference call report.	
Item 1:	Submission of proposals to revise RSPM 26 and RSPM 39	
Consensus:	The chairperson informed and the NAPPO TD and ED confirmed that the NAPPO call for project proposals has been delayed and will be open now in mid-November.	
Item 2:	Discussion of new projects for consideration to submit to NAPPO	
Consensus:	<p>The following projects and highlights of the discussions follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Access to biological control agents.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Access and benefit-sharing of biological control agents based on the Nagoya protocol which stems from the Convention on Biodiversity. ○ The chairperson asked if there is anything the EG can contribute to help understand the process and / or share information about experiences acquiring biocontrol agents or understanding about the Nagoya protocol in general. Just a few members know about the Nagoya protocol which describe access and benefit 	

	<p>sharing of biological resources from provider countries. The Nagoya protocol establishes the benefits provider countries will get by sharing biological resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The International Organization for Biological Control through a global commission on access-benefit sharing are developing a broad questionnaire to explore how much the biological control community knows about the access / benefit sharing of biological resources. The chairperson will share the questionnaire when it becomes available for future discussions. ○ The chairperson indicated that the questionnaire and the Nagoya Protocol does not have a phytosanitary implication at this point, but it was necessary to raise awareness. ○ The chairperson asked the EG if they could generate a list of laws and processes associated with biological control conservation and possibly bring these points for discussion for the next call. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Biocontrol agents database:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The idea was to create a database of biological control agents that have been approved in all three NAPPO countries and could be made available to the public (list of biological control agents, who supply them and in which country they are available). ○ Several databases that have been developed were discussed as reference (ARS biocontrol database – Release of Biological Organisms (ROBO), CABI’s bio protection portal, and others). ○ Databases provide useful information for growers for example in determining specific biological control agents and sources that supply them. ○ EG members also indicated that useful information could include the variations in agents approved in the three NAPPO countries and, country-specific problems associated with their movement. ○ The EG discussed how these databases could be useful for regulators (Pest Risk Analysis for example). ○ EG members also indicated that one problem with databases is the maintenance. ○ Although there are many databases, they are incomplete.
Other subjects	<p>US members informed that with the current changes in the US NEPA guidelines, the potential impact of climate change will need to be included in the petition to introduce or move biological control agents. The chairperson informed that Agriculture Canada wrote a position paper on this topic. The document will be shared with the EG members.</p> <p>The chairperson suggested to continue the discussions on the</p>

	remaining topics for the next conference call.	
Next Steps		
Responsible	Action	Date
EG	Provide a list of laws and processes associated with the conservation of biological control agents. The chairperson will send an email to the group with more detailed information.	
Ronald D. Weeks	Draft a document and provide language to present to the group to justify a project on developing a database for biological control agents in the NAPPO region	To share with the group before next call
Peter Mason	Send position document drafted by Agriculture Canada on climate change to the NAPPO Secretariat for translation and to share with the EG.	Completed
Next Meeting		
Location:	Zoom meeting – Video conference	
Date:	July 29, from 1:00 to 2:00 pm EST	
Proposed Agenda Items		
1. Introductory remarks		
2. Review / amend / approve conference call agenda		
3. Submission of proposal to revise RSPM 26 and RSPM 39		
4. Follow up discussion of laws and processes associated with the conservation of biological control agents		
5. Follow up discussion of draft document to justify a project on developing a database for biological control agents in the NAPPO region		
6. Discussion of new projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • best practice for production of biological control agents • molecular techniques • climate change 		
7. Other Business		
8. Next Conference Call		
9. Conference call adjourned		