



# NAPPO

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

## NAPPO Conference Call Report

Expert Group:	Seeds-ToBRFV	
Location:	Zoom meeting	
Date:	June 10, 2020	
Chairperson	Edward Podleckis (APHIS-PPQ)	
Co-Chair	Marlene Ortiz (AMSAC)	
Participants:		
Nancy Osterbauer (APHIS-PPQ)	Patricia McAllister (CFIA)	Pamela Ross (CFIA)
Vessela Mavrodieva (APHIS-PPQ)	Geoffrey Dennis (APHIS-PPQ)	Kevin Ong (TAMU)
José Manuel Cambrón Crisantos (SENASICA)	Jessica Berenice Valencia Luna (SENASICA)	Daniela Alejandra Bocanegra Flores (SENASICA)
Eduardo Garrido (INIFAP)	Claudio Feulner (Canada Industry)	Ric Dunkle (US industry)
Samantha Thomas (US industry)	Patricia Abad (APHIS PPQ)	Stephanie Bloem (NAPPO)
	Nedelka Marín-Martínez (NAPPO)	Alonso Suazo (NAPPO)
<b>Summary</b>		
Project:	A pilot for harmonization of diagnostic protocols for seed pests focused on ToBRFV.	
Item 1:	Summary of discussions from the previous conference call	
Consensus:	<p>The Chairperson summarized the main points discussed during the May 27 conference call. He indicated that consensus was not reached on whether the group will work on one protocol harmonized for the NAPPO region or the characteristics that will make one or several protocols acceptable and indicated a consensus should be reached during this call.</p> <p>The Chairperson also proposed to discuss the steps outlined in the “<i>Harmonization workflow diagram</i>” modified from the original diagram sent by Mexico.</p>	
Item 2:	One harmonized protocol or defining the characteristics for acceptable protocols in the NAPPO region.	
Consensus:	<p>Points considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate protocols used by all three NAPPO countries and establish if they are comparable.</li> <li>• Examination of different protocols will not be a problem but a consensus to have a harmonized protocol for testing in all three NAPPO countries will be difficult to reach.</li> <li>• The option of considering several protocols is more</li> </ul>	

	<p>realistic because of the variability in testing conditions and the different needs in each country.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider using protocols approved in other countries of the world and use the protocols being used by all three NAPPO countries as a baseline.</li> <li>• The group should consider       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Developing a process/procedure for a comparative analysis of protocols (product 1).</li> <li>2. Evaluate methods/protocols using the comparative analysis approach (product 2).</li> <li>3. Emerging new protocols can be evaluated and possibly adopted using the comparative analysis protocol.</li> </ol> </li> <li>• One objective and one of the first steps of the pilot project is comparing the actual protocols.</li> <li>• The main objective of the project is to agree on one or more accepted/harmonized protocols for ToBRFV.</li> <li>• Final report will include the recommendation of acceptable protocols used by NAPPO countries.</li> <li>• Evaluate the data and decide next steps after agreeing on the ToR and the selection of protocols.</li> <li>• The chairperson proposed the following actions for the group:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop a <u>process for <b>selecting</b></u> what diagnostic protocols will be compared.</li> <li>2. Develop a <u>process for <b>comparing</b></u> protocols.</li> <li>3. Develop Terms of Reference after consensus on step 1 and 2 is reached.</li> <li>4. Determine what the criteria are for an acceptable protocol.</li> <li>5. The decision of whether to use one protocol or various acceptable protocols can be reached after analyzing the data obtained from the pilot project as describe above.</li> <li><b>6. Consensus of the above proposal was reached by the group.</b></li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Item 3:	Workflow harmonization diagram.
Consensus:	<p>The Chairperson explained the general layout of the harmonization diagram and indicated that the diagram provides steps on how to select a protocol. Color-coded boxes provide a general description of the steps/tasks they represent with blue boxes showing the tasks necessary to <u>decide what protocols to compare</u> and the green boxes describe <u>the processes used to compare the selected protocols</u> including the methodologies, the specifics to compare the protocols, the criteria used to determine protocols acceptability and the documentation to evaluate the performance of protocols. Columns in the diagram represents sub-tasks. The Chairperson proposed to use this information to create sub-groups and assign tasks to each sub-group.</p>

	<p>The ToR starts by selecting the different protocols to compare and develop the processes that will be used to compare them. The outcome will be a proposed workplan for consideration and approval by the NAPPO Executive Committee. Work on the pilot program will start pending EC approval of the proposed workplan.</p> <p>Additional notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The industry indicated that protocols are available from the industry.</li> <li>• ISHI is comparing protocols from other countries. The industry will share the results from those protocol comparisons with the EG as they become available.</li> <li>• A problem comparing protocols from other countries is that validation processes used in the different protocols have differences that will need to be addressed.</li> <li>• Useful for the EG to know the specific of the processes used by ISHI to validate the protocols. Industry members will share that information with the EG.</li> <li>• Participation of a “third party” was suggested to serve as a “judge/impartial evaluator” in this process. The ED indicated that this is not a procedure that has been used by NAPPO.</li> <li>• A list of PCR-based assays can be put together for the group to evaluate. Some of those protocols have been validated in the US. Canada and Mexico have also evaluated protocols.</li> <li>• The Chairperson proposed to each country to make a list of the protocols they have available. The list will be compiled for all three countries. Vesella Mavrodieva volunteered to start the list of protocols (Conventional PCR, Real-Time PCR and RT-PCR) and share with members of the sub-group that will be assigned with the task of generating the list of protocols in the NAPPO region. Sub-group members will provide additional input to complete the list. The proposal was agreed by the group: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Provide a list of protocols</li> <li>○ Protocols should be PCR-based</li> <li>○ List will be discussed by the sub-group assigned with the above task.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Item 4:	Sub-groups:
Consensus:	<p><b><u>Sub-group 1</u></b></p> <p><b>Members:</b>  Vessela Mavrodieva (APHIS-PPQ)  Pamela Ross (CFIA)  Samantha Thomas (Industry)  Eduardo Garrido (INIFAP-Mexico)</p>

José Cambrón (SENASICA)

**Task:** Generate list of protocols used in all three NAPPO countries to provide input. Selected protocols will be subjected to further discussions by the sub-group during a conference call. The NAPPO Secretariat can assist the sub-group with the logistics including translating and sharing the information and scheduling the conference calls.

**Communication strategy:** Vessela Mavrodieva volunteered to collect the information from all three NAPPO countries and send it to Ed Podleckis. Ed Podleckis will send it to the Secretariat for translation and to share with the sub-group members to provide input and discussions during a conference call.

**Timeframe:** Send initial list prepared by V. Mavrodieva to Ed by June 17.

**Sub-group 2**

Members of the sub-group 2 will be assigned the tasks associated with the second column in the harmonization diagram including:

- Describing the methods used to compare protocols.
- Determine the specifics used to compare protocols.
- Describe criteria used to determine acceptability of protocols.

**Members:**  
 Geoffrey Dennis (APHIS-PPQ)  
 Jessica Berenice (SENASICA)  
 Samantha Thomas (US Industry)

**Timeframe:** June 19 to gather the information detailed below.

Geoffrey Dennis will put together a list of international standards validation protocols and processes relevant to the ring tests (US National Seed Health system etc.) and suggested to evaluate what they already have.  
 Samantha Thomas will provide a copy of the ISHI process and will add information from the National Seed Health Standard System.  
 Vessela Mavrodieva and Pamela Ross will review the material.

**Next Steps**

Responsible Person	Action	Date

<b>Next Meeting</b>		
Location:	The Secretariat has sent a poll but need more information from the EG members to determine a date. Members that did not respond to the poll were asked to respond to the initial poll to determine the date and time for the next call.	
Date:		
<b>Proposed Agenda Items</b>		
1.		
2.		