



NAPPO

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

NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group:	Forestry Systems Approach	
Location:	Conference Call	
Date:	November 21, 2017	
Chairperson	Eric Allen (NRCAN)	
Participants:		
Tyrone Jones (APHIS PPQ)	Steve Côté (CFIA)	Nancy Furness (CFIA)
Meghan Noseworthy (NRCAN)	Gustavo Gonzales (SEMARNAT)	Scott Myers (APHIS PPQ)
Paul Chaloux (APHIS PPQ)	Chuck Dentelbeck (Canadian industry)	Russell Reck (US industry)
Dave Kretschmann (US industry)	Brad Gething (US industry)	Faith Campbell (NGO)
Ana Lilia Montealegre (SENASICA)	Patricia Abad (APHIS PPQ)	Rajesh Ramarathnam (CFIA)
Dominique Pelletier (CFIA)	Stephanie Bloem (NAPPO)	Alonso Suazo (NAPPO)

Summary

Project:	Develop an RSPM on the use of systems approaches to manage pest risks associated with the movement of wood.
General comments:	Debrief EG members concerning the discussion and suggested decisions made by the AMC and EC regarding RSPM 41 during the NAPPO AM in Merida, Mexico in October 2017.
Item 1:	Welcome
Consensus:	The NAPPO ED welcomed everybody and congratulated the EG for the recognition award received at the 41 st NAPPO AM. The ED indicated the nomination was submitted by one of the NAPPO member countries.
Item 2:	Agenda approval
Consensus:	All call participants in agreement with proposed agenda.
Item 3:	Debrief EG on discussions/suggested decisions on RSPM 41.
Consensus:	Debrief on discussions and decisions regarding next steps for RSPM 41, resulting from two AMC and two EC meetings on the margins of the NAPPO AM. The ED asked AMC members to actively participate and provide information to the EG and encouraged the EG members to ask questions. ED indicated that the main points of discussion regarding RSPM 41 were as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMC and EC members agreed RSPM 41 provided a good

framework for the RSPM but were concerned that it was too general and lacked specific requirements. This concern came because the trend for new ISPMs is to be more specific about the requirements in a standard.

- All expected that the necessary details would be contained in the Explanatory Document (ExD). They wondered if the specific requirements found in the ExD might be incorporated into the body of the RSPM or alternatively, include the ExD as an Annex to the RSPM.
- There were concerns that many had not read the ExD.
- Concerns were also expressed about how NAPPO should handle these types of documents (an RSPM with an Explanatory Document) since no ExD have ever been used in NAPPO. NAPPO lacks a foundational document or policy to deal with this new situation.
- Because of the above, there was uncertainty as to how to proceed with respect to country consultation - should both documents together or should the new version of the RSPM with an Annex go back out for country consultation?
- AMC and EC members also expressed concern about the usefulness of ExDs at the IPPC level. The ED indicated there are a few cases of ISPMs with ExDs but that in many cases, the ExDs are not closely associated with the ISPM and are difficult to find. It is for this reason that AMC and EC members suggested to take the specific requirements from the ExD and either include them in the main document or use the content as an Annex to the RSPM.
- The document also needs careful editorial revision.

Following updates from the ED, the AMC member from MX indicated the main document made reference to an "*Implementation Plan*". The ED indicated that a broader discussion at the AMC and EC level was needed to discuss implementation plans. The ED indicated the group should focus on the previous points and not on the implementation plan at this time.

EG members comments:

- The Chairperson acknowledged that it was difficult to see how the two documents complemented each other before seeing the ExD, but also indicated that a link was shared with the group for people to read the ExD and asked members of the AMC whether they had had an opportunity to read and provide comments on the ExD now that it had been made available to everybody. The ED indicated that she had read the ExD and was quite impressed with the details included and how they might fit within the RSPM or as an annex to the standard.
- One industry members indicated that putting the documents together would make the RSPM stronger; another indicated

he did not see any problems keeping the documents separated. The ED indicated that including the ExD as an annex to the main document might facilitate the implementation of the standard. It was noted that the ExD has many examples and this might be an issue if the two documents are put together. The changing nature of the forest industry will make changes to the standard very difficult, if the documents are joined.

- An EG member expressed concerns with including the ExD as an annex because it will make the RSPM too long to read.
- An EG member inquired with the AMC if they had the opportunity to read the ExD indicating the link to access the document was sent to all AMC members. Several did not have a chance to read the ExD and it was suggested to allow more time for all to read the ExD and reschedule a conference call in January to further discuss next steps for RSPM 41.
- Some members of the AMC commented that the ExD could be the standard because of the level of details found in it.
- With respect to having an ExD separated from the standard EG members indicated that:
 - The forest industry has too many products to make a “prescriptive” standard, doing so is simply not practical.
 - Having a standard adapted to very specific forest products is very challenging.
 - The rapidly evolving nature of the industry makes it difficult to develop a standard that is too “prescriptive”. Merging the standard with the ExD or adding sections of the ExD into the standard is simply not going to accommodate the future needs to modify the standard.
 - The Chairperson indicated that ISPM 15 has documents linked and some industry members indicated that it was useful and practical for them to have the documents separated (for ISPM15).
 - The Chairperson also indicated that a justification to have two documents was also because of the implementation of regulations by NAPPO member countries. Having the documents separated gives value to the implementation of the standard by different countries as it is the case with ISPM 15.

The ED proposed the following plan:

- Agreed we all need to read the ExD.
- Have another discussion after the group has read the ExD.
- Decide which way we move forward including having NAPPO develop terms of reference for ExDs.
- Keep in mind that AMC and EC will get together in February 2018.

Next Steps		
Responsible Person	Action	Date
All member including AMC	Read the Explanatory Document	Before Jan. 18, 2018
Next Meeting		
Location:	Conference call	
Date:	January 18, 2018 from 2:30 to 4:00 pm.	
Proposed Agenda Items		
1.		