



NAPPO

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

NAPPO Zoom meeting report

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Expert Group: | Revision of RSPM 26 | |
| Location: | Zoom meeting | |
| Date: | March 27, 2024 | |
| Chairperson | Bruno Gallant (CFIA) | |
| Participants: | | |
| Vicente Rosas Medina (SENASICA) | Kimberly Riley (Canada Industry) | Keith Hopper (USDA ARS) |
| Brian Spencer (Canada Industry) | Paul Abram (Canada Agriculture) | Kirk Martin (APHIS PPQ) |
| Ron Weeks (APHIS PPQ) | Hugo Arredondo (Mexico Industry) | Heather Cumming (CFIA) |
| Shelley Gray (APHIS PPQ; NAPPO AMC) | Bob Pfannenstiel (APHIS PPQ) | Carlos Lázaro Castellanos (SENASICA) |
| Ben Slager (APHIS PPQ) | Nedelka Marín Martínez (NAPPO) | Alonso Suazo (NAPPO) |
| Summary | | |
| Project: | Revision of RSPM 26 (<i>Certification of commercial arthropod biological control agents moving into NAPPO member countries</i>) | |
| General comments: | This report highlights the most important discussion point regarding the background study paper for the revision of RSPM 26. | |
| Item 1: | Welcome remarks and meeting agenda | |
| Consensus: | The NAPPO Technical Director welcomed the EG members. The agenda was approved as presented. | |
| Item 2: | Continue discussions on “Background Study Paper” – development of options | |
| Consensus: | <p>Highlights and notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EG suggested exploring the possibility of contacting a person from the Fish and Wildlife enforcement group to provide clarifications on the categories “Farm raised” and “Mass-reared” used by the agency when approving imports of BCAs. The selected person will be invited to participate in the EG discussions as an invited expert and will be provided beforehand with a list of questions for consideration (Melissa offered to draft the questions). Mrs. Courtney Stone of Fish and Wildlife was initially considered. APHIS PPQ indicated that the Fish and Wildlife Service is revising the language associated with the importation of commercially produced BCAs, especially those terms | |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| | <p>associated with “mass rearing.” The revised language will be available in the “Federal Registry” for comments, providing an opportunity for stakeholders to address the terminology of commercially produced mass-reared BCAs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EG agreed that while the topic remains important, the format, objectives and contents were much discussed. Many comments pointed to the need to reconsider the certification mechanism and format of the next iteration, including the appropriateness and value of an RSPM in the circumstances. • In that regard, considerations for options development raised through discussion included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ current climate and challenges, including the nature, scope, and source of challenges faced by industry ○ ensuring that a NAPPO product offers the most value and effective solutions in consideration of phytosanitary and trade-related concerns (i.e., what is the current “best fit”) ○ purpose, value, and effectiveness for continued guidance for harmonized requirements (in particular, as it relates to the development of an export certification program), including implications and feasibility associated with their implementation and operationalization ○ rephrasing or transforming the RSPM into a guidance document that could, for example, provide best practices and enhance transparency in order to address concerns and inform on NPPO import requirements and processes (*the following recent NAPPO guidance document was highlighted as an example that the EG may wish to consider moving forward: Standardization of responsibilities and actions for safeguarding consignments that have transited one NAPPO member country to enter another NAPPO member country) • Funding for inspection is a major problem in implementing this standard, which implies that using a harmonized form for exports/imports in the NAPPO region might be difficult. |
| Item 3: | Next steps |
| Consensus: | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue developing options and considering their feasibilities. EG members can contribute by providing a list of options. • Analyze the list of options and provide recommendations for the revision of RSPM 26. |
| Next Steps | |

| Responsible Person | Action | Date |
|------------------------------|--|-------------|
| EG members | Contribute a list of options for reframing and revising RSPM 26. | |
| Next Meeting | | |
| Location: | The Secretariat will send a poll. | |
| Date: | TBD | |
| Proposed Agenda Items | | |
| 1. Formulation of options | | |
| 2. | | |