

NAPPO Conference Call Report

Phytosanitary Alert System

Expert Group:	Phytosanitary Alert System	port			
Location:	Conference call				
Date:	22 August 2018				
Date.	22 August 2016				
Chairperson	Ignacio Baez (APHIS)				
Participants:					
Heather Cumming (CFIA)	Amanda Kaye (USDA)	Ana Lilia Montealegre (SENASICA)			
Steve Cote (CFIA)	Stephanie Bloem (NAPPO)	Alonso Suazo (NAPPO)			
Nedelka Marin-Martinez (NAPPO)					
Summary					
Agenda item 2:	Discuss processes of emerging pest alert.  Background: NAPPO PAS was approached to develop a small article for the NAPPO newsletter to explain the process PAS EG uses to post "emerging pest alerts". A draft was presented to the expert group members. Comments were received from Mexico EG member pointing out that each country may have different ways to assess pest information that may result in an Emerging Pest Alert (EPA). This is an opportunity to discuss the processes for each country and document it for the newsletter article and PAS guidelines.				
Consensus:	<ul> <li>Each country summarized their process to develop EPA. This information will be included in the newsletter article.</li> <li>NAPPO PAS guidelines will be updated to include the process that each country has to consider for the pest information to post on the PAS.</li> <li>Chair also proposed the group to review the PAS EPA posting guidelines to ensure that basic criteria are included to help EG determine what pest information is appropriate to post on PAS to be consistent among the three countries. While all members agreed, Canada AMC member suggested to still have some flexibility beyond the basic criteria to post EPA.</li> <li>All agreed that future draft alerts will be shared to all EG members for review and feedback, before posting on PAS.</li> </ul>				
Agenda item 3:	Discuss processes that each conficial pest reports (OPR)  Background: The Chair propose for each country in the newsler group to understand, it is also general NAPPO region public a) Discuss and document	sed also including the OPR process tter article. While relevant for the an opportunity to explain to the how OPRs are developed.			

		c) Confirm the current points of contact for OPRs and EPA if different from EG contact.			
Consensus:	<ul> <li>All agree article.</li> <li>Process included</li> <li>All membroortal.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Each country summarized their process to develop OPR.</li> <li>All agree to include the OPR process per country in the Newsletter article.</li> <li>Process details of the OPR development for each country will be included in the NAPPO PAS guidelines.</li> <li>All members confirmed they are linking the OPR in PAS to the IPPO</li> </ul>			
	T OING OF	OPR Point of Contact Linking in IPPC portal			
	Canada	Rajesh Ramarathnam, Heather Cumming (CFIA/ACIA)	Rajesh Ramarathnam		
	U.S.A.	Ignacio Baez, Amanda Kaye (USDA APHIS PPQ)	Ignacio Baez, Amanda Kaye		
	Mexico	Ana Lilia Montealegre (SAGARPA SENASICA)	Ana Lilia Montealegre		
Consensus:	Background a) Scenario membrication been in this in this in the scenario been in this document of a possible scenario beaction of a pos	iscuss process to communicate to NAPPO country member(s) becial cases of pest information  Background:  a) Scenario 1: New pest reports specific to NAPPO country member. U.S. EG members have found information in the literature of new pest reports in a NAPPO country. What has been the experience with the other EG members? How should this information be shared?  b) Scenario 2: New pest information of potential interest to a NAPPO country member. When evaluating pest information, there are times U.S. EG members come across information that may be relevant to one NAPPO country but not necessarily relevant to the region or appropriate for PAS. The pest is not known to be in the NAPPO region. For example, a new pest reported on banana may be relevant for Mexico, but not the other NAPPO countries. Are EG members interested in sharing this type of information? How should this information be shared?  It is important to make clear, that ISPM 8 provides guidance to describe the contents of a pest record and the guidance for evaluating the reliability of a pest record to determine the status of a pest in an area but independent of the these two scenarios, this does not exclude the sovereignty or prerogative of an NPPO to do or not an official pest record as a result of this type of information.			
Consensus:	<ul> <li>Can</li> <li>Cou</li> <li>NAF</li> <li>app</li> <li>Proc</li> <li>NAF</li> <li>For Scenar</li> <li>Cou</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>For Scenario 1:</li> <li>Canada and Mexico also find this type of information.</li> <li>Countries agreed that information should be sent to the NAPPO Secretariat, and the Secretariat can then forward to the appropriate points of contact.</li> <li>Process to share this type of information will be included in the NAPPO PAS guidelines.</li> <li>For Scenario 2:</li> <li>Countries agree to share this type of information.</li> <li>Process to share information based on both scenarios will be</li> </ul>			

<ul> <li>included in the NAPPO PAS guidelines.</li> <li>NAPPO Secretariat suggested the use of the Secretariat</li> </ul>				
intranet as way to share information. We were not able to				
	discuss this idea further due to time limitations.			
Agenda item 5:	the management and ownership of the PAS to NAPPortular control. In late 2017, the Secretariat initiated conversate University to establish a contract to conduct the maintenance of the system, resulting in a signed coop agreement in July 2018. The upgrades include: updat and content to make it more visually similar to the NA and connecting the PAS system to the IPPC portal, so	Background: In June 2017, U.S. Department of Agriculture transferred the management and ownership of the PAS to NAPPO Secretariat for full control. In late 2017, the Secretariat initiated conversation with NC State University to establish a contract to conduct the upgrades and maintenance of the system, resulting in a signed cooperative agreement in July 2018. The upgrades include: updating the website and content to make it more visually similar to the NAPPO website, and connecting the PAS system to the IPPC portal, so that when		
		Official Pest Reports are posted in in the NAPPO Site, the reports are automatically posted in the IPPC portal. There is an opportunity for the		
		EG to evaluate the current system and provide input to the Secretariat		
	to update and improve the PAS.			
Consensus:	Agreed to review the site and provide feedback to Chair.			
Agenda item 6:	Preparation of EG activity report for upcoming annual meeting			
Consensus:	annual NAPPO meeting.	grider to brokering the grider brokering the grider me		
	Presentation will be sent to all EG members for refeedback.  Chair will present final report at the NARRO meet.			
	Chair will present final report at the NAPPO meet  Next Steps	ting.		
	Т			
Responsible Person	Action	Date		
Ignacio Baez	Prepare the annual report presentation for the upcoming annual meeting, and share with EG for review.	19 September 2018		
All	Review the NAPPO PAS site and provide suggestions for improvement to Chair.  30 September 2018			
Ignacio Baez	Incorporate emerging pest alerts (EPA) and official pest reports (OPR) processes from each country in the			
	newsletter article, and share with EG for review.			
Ignacio Baez	Based on agenda item 4, share with EG proposed process to communicate NAPPO country member(s) special cases of pest information.			
Ignacio Baez	Incorporate into PAS guidelines the process of each country for developing EAP and OPR, and share with EG for review.			
Ignacio Baez	Share with EG criteria to develop EPA for the NAPPO PAS. 5 October 2018			
Location:	Teleconference			
Date:	To be determined.			
Proposed Agenda Items				