



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



International
Plant Protection
Convention

REPORT

Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)

**Virtual Meeting
21 October 2020**

IPPC Secretariat

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2020. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), 23 October 2020*. Rome. Published by FAO on behalf of the Secretariat of the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC).

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO, 2020



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (<http://www.fao.org/publications>) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the Meeting	4
1.1	Welcome	4
2.	Meeting Arrangements	4
2.1	Selection of the Chairperson	4
2.2	Selection of the Rapporteur.....	4
2.3	Adoption of the agenda	4
3.	Administrative Matters	4
4.	The TPDP Work Programme.....	4
4.1	General update on the TPDP work programme	4
4.2	Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)	4
4.3	Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Genus <i>Ceratitis</i> (2016-001).....	6
5.	Review of requests for revisions of adopted diagnostic protocols	7
5.1	DP 03: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	7
5.2	DP 09: Genus <i>Anastrepha</i>	7
5.3	DP 25: <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i>	8
5.4	DP 27: <i>Ips</i> spp.....	8
6.	Any Other Business	9
7.	Close of the Meeting.....	9
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	10
	Appendix 2: Documents list	11
	Appendix 3: Participants list	12
	Appendix 4: Action points arising from the October 2020 TPDP meeting and previous 2019 TPDP meeting	15

1. Opening of the Meeting

1.1 Welcome

- [1] The Standard Setting Officer, Ms Adriana G. MOREIRA, from the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “IPPC Secretariat”), welcomed the participants to the second virtual meeting of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP) in 2020.

2. Meeting Arrangements

2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

- [2] Mr Norman BARR (U.S. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service) was selected as Chairperson.

2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur

- [3] Mr Robert TAYLOR (New Zealand Plant Health & Environment Laboratory) was selected as Rapporteur

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

- [4] The TPDP adopted the agenda (Appendix 1).

3. Administrative Matters

- [5] The IPPC Secretariat introduced the Documents list (Appendix 2) and the Participants list (Appendix 3). The participants were reminded to update their contact information if necessary, as it is reflected in the TPDP membership list¹ on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – www.ippc.int).
- [6] It was noted that the new TPDP Steward Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE was not available to attend the meeting.

4. The TPDP Work Programme

4.1 General update on the TPDP work programme

- [7] There was no outstanding information on the current work programme from the TPDP members. The IPPC Secretariat reminded the Discipline leads of the timelines for development of diagnostic protocols (DPs) that was agreed to at the TPDP virtual meeting in September 2020². They were asked to relay these timelines and deadlines to their respective drafting groups in order to keep the work moving.

4.2 Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)

- [8] Mr Norman BARR, the discipline lead for this protocol introduced the paper which details the background information into the request to revise the scope of the topic entitled “Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)”. He mentioned that this subject has been in the work programme since 2007 and it was placed in “pending” status because drafting was determined to not be feasible when assuming the scope of the DP includes identification of species level of all pests in the family by molecular tests.
- [9] Mr BARR continued that there are three reasons why the scope is problematic that is still valid today:
- (1) The number of pests to include in the single protocol would be nearly one hundred and if scope is not defined to exclude economically important species could include hundreds; consequently the product would not fit within the expected size of a protocol as currently defined according to

¹ TPDP membership list: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/81560/>

² 2020-09 TPDP virtual meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88897/>

instruction to authors and would significantly exceed the expected workload of a co-authorship team.

- (2) The topic is not consistent with other adopted diagnostic topics. For example, test methods for molecular identification of fruit flies such as *Bactrocera dorsalis* are included in separate DPs. Inclusion in this protocol for immatures would be redundant and require both documents be revised whenever changes in test methods occur. This could be problematic for a large group such as Tephritidae.
- (3) Molecular tests that successfully diagnose tephritid pests are few and at the time these included insufficient testing of diagnostic specificity for a wide range of uses as required in [ISPM 27 \(Diagnostic protocols for regulated pests\)](#). Most publications on identification of fruit flies address the limitations of the molecular methods not how to apply the methods.

[10] To make the work more feasible, the lead authors' proposal is to limit the scope of the DP to genus-level identifications of the six major pest groups, with most economic importance). These would be identification of immature flies to *Anastrepha*, *Bactrocera*, *Dacus*, *Ceratitis*, *Rhagoletis*, and *Zeugodacus* using DNA barcoding. Mr Barr noted that this change in scope, would not resolve the issue of redundancy in DPs if that DNA barcoding method is also included in other protocols that are for these genera.

[11] In order to determine if the DP should stay in "pending status" or move to "active status", the TPDP considered if:

- (1) limiting scope to genus-level identification is appropriate
- (2) redundancy in methods across protocols is appropriate or if solutions such as referencing other protocols is appropriate, and
- (3) the lack of preexisting test methods describing procedure for completing identification precludes initiation of methods development.

[12] One member queried if changing the scope, the proposition would be to have one DP for the main species or several DPs? It was explained that the intent is to have just one DP, with identification at genus level and then going to the species level. Typically countries want to know what genus they have but for regulatory purposes, most things are done at species level.

[13] Another member asked when DNA barcoding will be able to identify all species within the genus and if it is the only methodology available? It was explained that DNA barcoding is the only reasonable methodology and it already can identify some species but not all. A follow-up question was asked on whether the six genera have the same conservative genomic regions, and it was clarified that they have the same conservative genomic regions but different primer sets are used. It was further mentioned that there is no universal primers or universal datasets for molecular identification for all species, so to fit into the format of an international DP under the ISPM 27 is quite difficult.

[14] One member mentioned the importance of the pests and so a DP for immature stages would be useful. It was also pointed out that identification issues can arise when grouping species together into one DP. One member noted a similar protocol for genus that could identify some species but not all and that according to the Specification TP1, protocols can be reviewed every five years and that more species could be added as the science becomes available. It was noted however that, if updating different adopted DPs with molecular information it may take a lot of resources from the Secretariat and that would require to go to the entire standard setting process.

[15] The feasibility and usefulness of developing a DP just for genus level was raised and in response, it was mentioned that this was a difficult question to answer because it depends on the regulatory point of view of different countries. The Secretariat recalled that when the TPDP proposed to the SC to remove this subject from the work programme a number of years ago due to the lack of molecular information, the Standards Committee (SC) wanted to retain it as they felt that a DP was important especially at the borders. The topic and its importance were for identification of species not genus-level at borders. The TPDP does not have additional information from SC on importance of a DP of genus-level scope.

- [16] One member stressed that they would prefer to have this DP moving considering that fruit flies are very important pests and queried how many species can be identified via DNA barcoding at this stage. Mr BARR replied that there is well over 50 species included in DNA barcode studies that have been reported as diagnosable to either species or species group level based on publications. Researchers are trying to get the species that they can identify into the adopted DPs e.g. for DP 09 *Anastrepha* which will be discussed further at this meeting.
- [17] The TPDP decided the development of this DP should be continued but they need to go back to the SC to see what is expected. The TPDP asked Mr BARR to update the document that was presented under this agenda item to outline options for the SC to review on how to proceed with this draft DP. The TPDP asked to review the updated document at their next meeting or via eForum before it is forwarded to the SC.
- [18] The TPDP:
- (1) *agreed* the lead author will update the document to include options on how to proceed with this draft DP by 13 November 2020, for revision by the TPDP to be presented to the SC.

4.3 Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001)

- [19] Mr Norman BARR presented agenda item 4.3 on changing the scope of draft DP: Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001). Mr BARR, the lead author of this draft protocol explained that the *Ceratitis* proposal to change the scope is similar to the previous agenda item on Tephritidae in that there is also too many species for one DP. He explained the genus is nearly 100 species and that even if they were to focus on those with international presence and the greatest documented damage (6 – 15 species) it would still result in a very lengthy DP.
- [20] The co-authors suggested to split these into smaller scope protocols and the TPDP could recommend to the SC to have a DP on sub genera on *Ceratitis*. The three major lineages of pests in the genus are *Ceratitis sensu stricto subgenus* (*C. capitata*, *malgassa*, *catoirii*), the *C. cosyra* complex (*C. cosyra*, *quinaria*, *silvestrii*), and the FAR complex (*C. rosa*, *quilicii*, *anoniae*, *fasciventris*).
- [21] Mr BARR noted his willingness to draft a justification for two changes: a change of scope for the current active DP on Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001) to focus on one of these groups and then a second request to add two DP topics for the other two. The drafting team would complete the active DP (with modified scope) while the approval is pending for the two additional topics to be added to the work programme. He noted that the same drafting team could work on the two new protocols as well and the TPDP agreed.
- [22] Mr BARR lastly requested for the TPDP to add more experts, Mr Massimiliano VIRGILIO and Mr Marc Frans Elisabeth DE MEYER, both from the Royal Museum for Central Africa, in Belgium, to the DP drafting group Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001).
- [23] The TPDP:
- (2) *requested* Mr Norman BARR to draft a justification with the scope change for Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001) for revision by the TPDP at future meeting or e-forum before being presented to the SC.
 - (3) *requested* Mr Norman BARR to draft a justification for the inclusion of new topics into the work programme, as a consequential change of scope change, for revision by the TPDP at future meeting or e-forum before being presented to the SC.
 - (4) *confirmed* the selection of new co-authors Mr Massimiliano VIRGILIO and Mr Marc Frans Elisabeth DE MEYER to the DP drafting group Genus *Ceratitis* (2016-001).

5. Review of requests for revisions of adopted diagnostic protocols

5.1 DP 03: *Trogoderma granarium*

- [24] Mr Norman BARR presented the agenda item 5.1 and summarized the justification for a revision of the adopted diagnostic protocol [\(DP\) 03 *Trogoderma granarium* Everts](#). The former lead author for the first version of this DP, Mr Andras Szito contacted the IPPC Secretariat to inform them that a reliable molecular test to differentiate Khapra beetle, *Trogoderma granarium* Everts and *Trogoderma variabile* Ballion (Coleoptera: Dermestidae) from the rest of Dermestidae beetles has been developed.
- [25] It was noted that the current method using morphology in the DP is correct for use, however, the proposed revision would add a molecular method option to the other morphological methods. This would make identification of eggs and pupae possible.
- [26] The TPDP agreed this molecular test would be a good addition to this adopted DP and asked Mr BARR to draft a paper with a recommendation to be presented to the SC for the TPDP to review it first.
- [27] One member asked about the process of this revision if it is agreed to by the SC. The Secretariat recalled that there is a procedure for revision of DPs, and that this would probably need to go for the full cycle of the standard setting process (i.e. consultation period and notification period). It was also mentioned that in the Specification TP1, the TPDP should be assessing the need to update DPs every 5 years. The Secretariat also mentioned that in 2021 there will be the IPPC call for topics and that countries are also encouraged to submit their topic proposals.
- [28] The TPDP:
- (5) *agreed* to recommend to the SC to proceed with the revision of DP 03: *Trogoderma granarium* Everts.
 - (6) *asked* Mr Norman BARR to draft a paper with the recommendation to be added to the work programme to be presented to the SC for the revision by the TPDP by 13 November 2020.
 - (7) *asked* the Secretariat to contact the former DP drafting group to see if they are willing to be part of this revision, if the SC agrees to include it in the TPDP work programme.
 - (8) *noted* that in case the SC agrees to include in the work programme, it is still valid to open a call for authors for more experts.

5.2 DP 09: Genus *Anastrepha*

- [29] Mr Norman BARR presented the agenda item 5.2 and summarized the justification for a revision of the adopted diagnostic protocol [DP09 Genus *Anastrepha* Schiner](#). The protocol focused on identification of the genus and seven species included as major economic pests: *Anastrepha fraterculus*, *A. grandis*, *A. ludens*, *A. obliqua*, *A. serpentina*, *A. striata*, and *A. suspensa*. At the time of adoption, no molecular methods had been demonstrated as successful for accurate diagnosis of the seven pests from each other or for genus.
- [30] A substantial revision to DP 09 is proposed to add the molecular test method as a new section 4.5 and to add text revision to the aforementioned background in section 4, based on new studies that have reviewed DNA barcoding of the seven pests in the protocol. Based on the publications, the DNA barcoding method can diagnose four of the seven pests and the revised protocol would provide a new ability to confirm species status of immature life stages or adults that are insufficiently preserved for morphological examination of adults.
- [31] It was noted that if the revision is not approved by the SC, the protocol would still provide reliable methods for species identification. The current adopted protocol does not result in incorrect identifications.
- [32] The necessity for these revisions was acknowledged as there are many new technologies on identifications coming out very fast. One member asked if there would be enough authors if all of these

revisions on fruit flies were added to the work programme and prioritization is important. It was mentioned that there should be enough authors and it would be possible for the TPDP to handle these updates with the current membership of discipline leads. In relation to the prioritization, it would be up to the SC to assign priority.

[33] One member queried about the need to go through the entire standard setting process for revisions as this really slows down the process. It was recalled that previously, there had been the possibility of having two consultations per year, which helped to streamline the process.

[34] It was agreed that, like the previous proposals for revision, Mr BARR would draft a paper with a recommendation to be presented to the SC for the TPDP to review first.

[35] The TPDP:

- (9) *agreed* with the assessment that substantial changes are required to align the DP 09 Genus *Anastrepha* with current methods of diagnosis.
- (10) *asked* Mr Norman BARR to draft a paper with the recommendation to be added to the work programme to be presented to the SC for revision by the TPDP by 13 November 2020.
- (11) *noted* the need to open a call for authors if the SC agrees to include this to the work programme.
- (12) *asked* the SC to consider having two consultation periods a year for DPs.

5.3 DP 25: *Xylella fastidiosa*

[36] Mr Robert TAYLOR presented this agenda item and summarized the justification for a revision of the adopted diagnostic protocol: [DP 25 *Xylella fastidiosa*](#). The protocol currently focuses on the identification of *X. fastidiosa* to species level but also provides guidance to identify to subspecies and sequence type level. It provides information on symptoms, sampling, isolation, serological and molecular techniques that are needed for robust detection and identification. This DP was also aligned with many of the methods described in the European Plant Protection Organization (EPPO) Diagnostic protocol for *X. fastidiosa*.

[37] Mr TAYLOR noted that since its adoption in 2018, there have been several advances regarding sampling and subspecies identification, and improvement of existing methods. It was noted that EPPO have revised their protocols three times in the last two years and its known there will be more advances in the next year or two.

[38] While DP 25 still provides reliable methods for species identification a revision is proposed to add new molecular tests for subspecies identification, and to update sampling guidelines and information on sequence typing based on the most recent research. If the proposed modification is approved, the revised protocol would provide new diagnostic tests for *X. fastidiosa* identification and information that improves the performance of existing procedures for the detection and identification.

[39] The TPDP:

- (13) *agreed* to recommend to the SC to proceed with the revision of DP 25: *X. fastidiosa*.
- (14) *asked* Mr Robert TAYLOR to draft a paper with the recommendation to be added to the work programme to be presented to the SC for revision by the TPDP by 13 November 2020.
- (15) *noted* the need to open a call for authors if the SC agrees to include this to the work programme.

5.4 DP 27: *Ips* spp.

[40] Mr Norman BARR presented the agenda item 5.4 and summarized the justification for a revision of the adopted diagnostic protocol: [DP 27 for *Ips* spp.](#). He explained the co-authors of the drafting team continued to investigate the taxonomic group since this DP was published in 2018 and examination of additional specimens that were not available at the time of protocol adoption revealed additional variation in the pest species *Ips hauseri* that was not reported in this DP. This constitutes a substantial

change to the protocol because without updating the DP, some pests could be incorrectly identified as non-target or non-pest species.

[41] Mr BARR continued that the drafting team also revealed through additional analysis methods that *Ips grandicollis* from *Ips lecontei* can be separated using the elytra's characters of declivital spines. These pests were not separated at couplet 13 in Key 4.1.7 of the adopted DP. This change provides a new ability to separate the species. Lastly, he noted the co-authors have additional images that could be included in the DP to enhance the DP but require renumbering of figures throughout text.

[42] The TPDP agreed that the revision of DP 27 is more urgent as it may lead to incorrect identification of pests.

[43] One member asked how frequently we should update a DP, as this DP was only adopted two years ago. It was explained that, DPs can be updated as often as needed if new information becomes available that warrants a revision.

[44] The TPDP:

(16) *agreed* with the assessment that substantial changes are required to align the DP 27 *Ips* spp. with current methods of diagnosis.

(17) *noted* the urgency for revising this adopted DP 27 as it may lead to an incorrect identification of pests.

(18) *asked* Mr Norman BARR to draft a paper with the recommendation to be added to the work programme to be presented to the SC for revision by the TPDP by 13 November 2020

(19) *noted* the need to open a call for authors if the SC agrees to include this to the work programme.

6. Any Other Business

[45] The Secretariat notified members that a Doodle poll will be sent out after this meeting to agree on a date in November 2020 for the next TPDP virtual meeting³.

[46] The Secretariat also mentioned that the proposal for the revision of DP 21: '*Candidatus Liberibacter solanacearum*' that was supposed to be presented at this meeting is pending until the next TPDP meeting.

7. Close of the Meeting

[47] The Chairperson closed the meeting and thanked the participants for their active participation.

³ For updates in the calendar, please visit the IPPC webpage: <https://www.ippc.int/en/year/calendar/>

Appendix 1: Agenda**2020 VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE
TECHNICAL PANEL ON DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOLS (TPDP)****21 October 2020****AGENDA**

Agenda Item	Document No.	Presenter
1. Opening of the Meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--	MOREIRA / CASSIN
2. Meeting Arrangements	--	
2.1 Selection of Chairperson	--	MOREIRA
2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur	--	Chairperson
2.3 Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	Chairperson
3. Administrative Matters	--	
3.1 Documents list	02_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	CASSIN
3.2 Participants list	03_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct TPDP membership list	
3.3 Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings	Short guideline for participants	
4. TPDP work programme		
4.1 General update on the TPDP work programme	(Link to TPDP 2020-09 meeting report)	Chairperson / ALL
4.2 Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)	04_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	BARR
4.3 Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Genus <i>Ceratitis</i> (2016-001)	-	BARR
4.4 DP drafting group: confirmation of authors for Genus <i>Ceratitis</i> (2016-001)	05_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	BARR / GOLDSMITH
5. Review of requests for revisions of adopted diagnostic protocols:		
5.1 DP 03: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	06_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	BARR / GOLDSMITH
5.2 DP09: Genus <i>Anastrepha</i>	07_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	BARR
5.3 DP 25: <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i>	09_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	TAYLOR
5.4 DP 27: <i>Ips</i> spp.	08_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	BARR
6. Any other business	-	Chairperson
7. Closing of the meeting - Recommendations to SC or IPPC Secretariat - Next virtual meeting date	-	MOREIRA/ Chairperson

Appendix 2: Documents list**2020 VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE
TECHNICAL PANEL ON DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOLS (TPDP)****21 October 2020***(Documents are presented in the order of the document numbers)*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGE NDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE	POSTED
01_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	2.3	Agenda	2020-10-12 2020-10-16 2020-10-19
02_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	3.1	Documents list	2020-10-16 2020-10-19
03_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	3.2	Participants list	
04_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	4.2	Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)	2020-10-12
05_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	4.4	DP drafting group: confirmation of authors for Genus Ceratitis (2016-001)	2020-10-12
06_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	5.1	Request for revision of DP 03: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	2020-10-12
07_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	5.2	Request for revision of DP09: Genus <i>Anastrepha</i>	2020-10-12
08_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	5.4	Request for revision of DP 27: <i>Ips</i> spp.	2020-10-12 2020-10-16
09_TPDP_Tel_2020_Oct	5.3	Request for revision of DP 25: <i>Xylella fastidiosa</i>	2020-10-19

Documents links (presented in the order of the agenda items)

Links	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT LINK
TPDP Membership list	3.2	TPDP membership list
Short guideline for participants	3.3	Short guideline for participants
IPPC standard setting process	4.1	Link to IPPC standard setting process
IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting	-	Link to the IPPC Procedure Manual for Standard Setting
TPDP Specification TP 1	-	TPDP specification TP 1
List of topics for IPPC Standards (LOT)	-	Link to List of topics for IPPC Standards
IPPC DPs drafting groups list	-	Link to IPPC DPs drafting groups list

Appendix 3: Participants list

2020 VIRTUAL MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL PANEL ON DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOLS (TPDP)

21 October 2020 PARTICIPANTS LIST

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting by the time this paper was posted.

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
	Steward	Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. Presidente Bulnes 140, 4 th floor, Santiago, CHILE Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl ;		
✓	Bacteriology	Mr Robert TAYLOR Plant Health & Environment Laboratory New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries 231 Morrin Road St Johns PO Box 2095 Auckland 1140 New Zealand Tel: (+64) 9 909 3548 Fax: (+64) 9 909 5739	Robert.Taylor@mpi.govt.nz	May 2011	2021 (2 nd term 2016-2021)
✓	Botany	Ms Liping YIN Plant Quarantine Laboratory Animal and Plant Inspection and Quarantine Technology Center Shanghai Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau 1208 Minsheng Road Shanghai, 200135 China Tel: (+86) 21 6854 0577 Fax: (+86) 21 6854 6481	yinlp@shciq.gov.cn ; yinlp2013@hotmail.com	April 2008	April 2023 (3 rd term)
✓	Entomology	Mr Norman B. BARR Assistant Director Mission Laboratory 22675 N. Moorefield Rd. Moore Air Base Bldg. S-6414 Edinburg, TX 78541 USA Tel. (+1) 956 205 7658 Fax: (+1) 956 205 7680	Norman.B.Barr@aphis.usda.gov	July 2012	2022 (2 nd term 2017-2022)

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
✓	Entomology	Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH Plant Health Specialist Caribbean Agricultural Health and Food Safety Agency (CAHFSA) Letitia Vriesdelaan 10 Paramaribo Suriname Tel: (+597) 422 546 Mobile: (+597) 725 2922	julietgoldsmith@gmail.com	November 2014	2019 (2 nd term 2019-2024)
✓	Nematology	Ms G�eraldine ANTHOINE Directrice adjointe / Deputy head Chef d'unit� coordination de la r�f�rence / Head of unit "coordination of reference activities" 7 rue Jean Dixm�ras 49044 ANGERS cedex 01 France Tel: (33) 241207431 Fax: (33) 240207430	geraldine.anthoine@anses.fr	April 2009	2019 3 rd term 2019- 2024)
✓	Virology, and backup for bacteriology	Mr Brendan RODONI Biosciences Research Division AgriBio Centre Ring Road La Trobe University Bundoora 3083 Australia Tel: (+61) 3 9032 7319 Fax: (+61) 3 9800 3521	brendan.rodoni@ecodev.vic.gov.au u	July 2012	2022 (2 nd term 2017-2022)
✓	Virology	Ms Vessela Assenova MAVRODIEVA Assistant Laboratory Director, USDA APHIS, PPQ, Beltsville, MD, USA Tel: (+1) 301-313-9208	vessela.a.mavrodieva@usda.gov ;	March 2020	March 2025
✓	Mycology	Ms Julie PATTEMORE Assistant Director: Plant Pathology, Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment, Melbourne, Australia Tel: (+61) 3 83186957	julie.pattemore@awe.gov.au	March 2020	March 2025
✓	Mycology	Ms Yazmin RIVERA Molecular Biologist, USDA APHIS, PPQ, Beltsville, MD, USA Tel: (+1) 301-313-9273	Yazmin.Rivera@usda.gov ;	March 2020	March 2025

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
✓	IPPC Secretariat Lead	Ms Adriana MOREIRA Standards Officer / Deputy Assistant to Unit Leader IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: (+39) 06 570 55809	Adriana.Moreira@fao.org ;		
✓	IPPC Secretariat Support	Ms Aoife Cassin Standard Setting Associate IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: (+39) 06 57052 480	Aoife.Cassin@fao.org		

Appendix 4: Action points arising from the October 2020 TPDP meeting and previous 2019 TPDP meeting

ACTION POINTS ARISING FROM THE SEPTEMBER 2020 MEETING

(by agenda item)

Action	Agenda Item	Responsible	Deadline
1. Update "document 04" to include options on how to proceed with the draft DP on Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028) to be presented to the SC for review	4.2	Mr Norman BARR	13 November 2020
2. Draft a justification with the scope change for Genus <i>Ceratitis</i> (2016-001) to present to the SC	4.3	Mr Norman BARR	13 November 2020
3. Draft a paper with a recommendation to be presented to the SC for the revision of DP 03: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i>	5.1	Mr Norman BARR	13 November 2020
4. Contact the former DP drafting group on DP 03: <i>Trogoderma granarium</i> to see if they are willing to be part of this revision	5.1	IPPC Secretariat	If the SC agrees to include it in the TPDP work programme
5. Draft a paper with a recommendation to be presented to the SC for revision of DP 09: Genus <i>Anastrepha</i>	5.2	Mr Norman BARR	13 November 2020
6. Draft a paper with a recommendation to be presented to the SC for revision of DP 25: <i>X. fastidiosa</i>	5.3	Mr Robert TAYLOR	13 November 2020
7. Draft a paper with a recommendation to be presented to the SC for revision DP 27: <i>Ips</i> spp.	5.4	Mr Norman BARR	13 November 2020
8. Open call for authors as necessary	5	IPPC Secretariat	If the SC agrees to include the DP revisions to the TPDP work programme

ACTION POINTS STILL PENDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Action (From 2019-08 TPDP meeting) ⁴	Responsible
(pending SC decision) The TPDP agreed that the TPDP gather different sources of information (manual, guides, videos) from different regions, in order to identify gaps in the existing diagnostic protocols.	Mr Robert TAYLOR supported by Ms Géraldine ANTHOINE
(pending SC decision) The TPDP recommended that a CPM recommendation on “Facilitating shipment and transport of reference material and specimens, to support diagnostic activities for regulated pests” be developed, and asked Mr Brendan RODONI and Ms Juliet GOLSMITH, supported by Ms Françoise PETER, to draft a justification for that purpose to be discussed during the next TPDP meeting.	Mr Brendan RODONI and Ms Juliet GOLDSMITH, supported by Ms Françoise PETER (invited expert – EPPO)
(pending SC decision) The TPDP is willing to take the lead in organizing the first international workshop on diagnostic laboratories in 2021, and asked Mr Norman BARR, supported by Mr Brendan RODONI, to draft a detailed proposal (justification, programme, resource mobilization) to be discussed during the next TPDP meeting.	Mr Norman BARR, supported by Mr Brendan RODONI
Action (From 2020-09 TPDP meeting) ⁵	Responsible
The TPDP asked Mr Norman BARR to review the documents for “Best practices for sequencing: Using DNA sequences to diagnose a pest” and “Interpretation of results from LAMP tests”	Mr Norman BARR

⁴ 2019-08 TPDP meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88295/>

⁵ 2020-09 TPDP meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/88897/>