NAPPO Symposium Section 1 - Group Reports

Questions Development Agenda Items or DAIs	Are there existing models in NAPPO member countries (government, industry, or academia) that can be used as these DAIs are rolled out or further refined?	Will implementation of these DAIs benefit the NAPPO region? If yes, how specifically do you think they will improve phytosanitary protection in North America?	disadvantages of each approach?		Do you have specific suggestions on how to approach implementation or further refinement of these DAIs?	
Pest Outbreak, Alert and Response Systems – managed by S. Dubon	 NAPPO Phytosanitary Alert System U.S. PPA 7721 – Plant Protection Act Plant Pest and disease management and disaster prevention Stakeholder Registry Notice U.S. PestLens U.S. National Priority Pest List U.S. Mexico Surveillance System – SINAVEF? AQW Pest Reports California CFIA ListServe Canada WTO Notifications First reports in ESA and APS publications CABI NPDN iNaturalist - Edd maps Hotlines 	 Inform import policy to prevent introduction and spread of new pests Improve early communication Centralize location for information Improve preparedness and response 	Advantages	 Regional Fewer language barriers Fewer pests More relevant pests Easier logistics Framework in place already set- up for NA region Delay in hearing about emerging global issues Globalization of trade means global pathways that may not be captured in a regional approach 	 Global Framework would provide starting point for other countries/regions that don't have a system in place May facilitate hearing about new pests earlier Facilitate trade Overaction on pests that may not be an issue regionally Difficult to implement – many systems Difficult to harmonize technology Regulations all different – hard to harmonize Growing seasons not synchronous Might be 	 Official confirmations only How will it be funded? Clarify funding vs. information sharing Harmonized tool to feed information from various systems – think through/plan how this would happen Data quality control – who is responsible? How data nuances are communicated to ensure information is interpreted correctly – interception may not mean establishment

Climate Change - managed by A. Suazo	 Yes, MEX has its own models adjusted to its particular needs; they also use global models like MaxEnt 	 improve pest monitoring more efficient use of resources earlier (more opportune) pest detection early response 	 reluctance to share information because of potential trade consequences + highly specific for a country - cannot be replicated regionally 	 Integrate academia in a meaningful way – including cooperative extension Leverage the NPDN Incentivized buy-in Collaboration Training/capacity building Joint financing
Global Research Coordination - managed by S. Cote	 EUPHRESCO has value for NAPPO Research clusters (e.g., Canada) Need a way to know who is working on what Need to avoid duplication and create synergies NPPO research priorities feeding into regional and global plans Research by international societies 	 early response Yes – build on others experiences A searchable global database is needed Sharable and agreed upon data (acceptance) 	 First regional then global where appropriate Depends on issue Scale of issue 	 Relevance of projects to global network Funding access Agriculture, forestry and environment Align with other international research priorities
Diagnostic Laboratory Network - managed by A.L. Montealegre	 Several NA regional examples of both official and private networks already in operation 	 Standardize diagnostic protocols Fully characterize Laboratory Infrastructure 	Acceptance and Validation of Protocols for specific pests	 Signed agreement between regulatory agency and university research centers at or with approved laboratories