



Food and Agriculture  
Organization of the  
United Nations



International  
Plant Protection  
Convention

## **REPORT**

# **Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP)**

**Virtual Meeting  
22 July 2021**

**IPPC Secretariat**

Required citation:

IPPC Secretariat. 2021. *Report of the meeting of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP), 22 July 2021*. 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, 2021



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](mailto:publications-sales@fao.org). Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: [www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request](http://www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request). Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: [copyright@fao.org](mailto: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.	Recommendations to the SC.....	4
4.1	Discussion on the scope of draft DPs: Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028) .....	4
5.	TPDP work programme.....	6
5.1	Review of the TPDP work programme .....	6
6.	IPPC Secretariat and SC updates .....	7
7.	Any Other Business .....	8
8.	Close of the Meeting.....	8
	Appendix 1: Agenda.....	9
	Appendix 2: Participants list .....	10
	Appendix 3: Action points .....	13

## 1. Opening of the Meeting

### 1.1 Welcome

- [1] The Standard Setting Specialist, Ms Aoife CASSIN, from the International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat (hereafter referred to as the “IPPC Secretariat”), welcomed the participants to the virtual meeting of the Technical Panel on Diagnostic Protocols (TPDP).

## 2. Meeting Arrangements

### 2.1 Selection of the Chairperson

- [2] Mr Robert TAYLOR (New Zealand Plant Health & Environment Laboratory) was selected as Chairperson.

### 2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur

- [3] Ms Vessela Assenova MAVRODIEVA (U.S. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service) 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 noted that the TPDP Steward Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE, Mr Brendan RODONI, Ms Yazmin RIVERA and Geraldine ANTHOINE were not available to attend the meeting and the Participants list is available in Appendix 2. The participants were reminded to update their contact information if necessary, as it is reflected in the TPDP membership list<sup>1</sup> on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP – [www.ippc.int](http://www.ippc.int)).

## 4. Recommendations to the SC

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

- [6] Mr Norman BARR, the lead author 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)”.
- [7] 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.
- [8] The TPDP had discussed this topic already on a number of occasions and at their October 2020 meeting<sup>2</sup>, the TPDP agreed for Mr BARR to update the document to include options on how to proceed with this draft DP for revision by the TPDP to be presented to the SC.
- [9] Therefore, Mr BARR continued to present the revised paper for review and discussion of the TPDP at this meeting.
- [10] Mr BARR elaborated further on the three reasons why the scope is problematic:
- (1) The number of pests to include in the single protocol would be nearly one hundred and if scope is not defined to exclude other economically important species it could include hundreds; consequently the product would not fit within the expected size of a protocol as currently defined according to instruction to authors and would significantly exceed the expected workload of a co-

---

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

<sup>2</sup> TPDP October 2020 meeting report: <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/89085/>

authorship team. In addition to biological and taxonomic sections that would be greatly expanded, and molecular test methods would require significant review given the large number and diversity of pests. Tephritid diagnostic specialists usually focus on a particular genus or species group. Many molecular tests have been reported for Tephritid fruit flies but few have been demonstrated as reliable diagnostic procedures and will require review by the drafting team.

- (2) The topic is not consistent with other adopted diagnostic topics. 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) There is insufficient stability in molecular methods for identification because of taxonomic instability. Publications on identification methods such as DNA barcoding address the limitations of the technology and only rarely how to apply the methods for accurate identification. Many of the major pests in the family are members of species complexes that are under active systematic investigation. This will cause both difficulty in adopting a protocol and result in a high likelihood of frequent revisions to the protocol. If taxonomy of any one of the included species is revised after adoption, the protocol could require substantial revision and member consultation.

[11] Mr BARR noted that additional details were provided in a 2015 TPDP proposal to modify the topic of the DP and were presented to TPDP at the Virtual TPDP Meeting in March 2016. The recommendation that was approved by the TPDP was the following:

“To be consistent with existing methods for *Anastrepha* and *Bactrocera*, the new scope should not be limited to one method of identification. Revising the protocol to address pests in the genus *Ceratitis* would provide a DP that is consistent with other DP topics”

[12] The Standards Committee (SC) accepted the recommendation that a new topic be generated. The DP entitled “Genus *Ceratitis*” (2016-001) and rated as priority 1 was added to the work plan. The SC did not remove the “Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)” topic. The arguments for not developing this DP based on feasibility are still applicable. If not resolved, the 2006-028 topic will remain in pending status. An alternative would be to remove the topic from the work program.

[13] A third option presented by Mr BARR would be to change the scope of the protocol. The lead author proposed to limit the scope of the DP to genus-level identifications of the six major pest genera would make the work load more feasible. These would be identification of immature flies to *Anastrepha*, *Bactrocera*, *Dacus*, *Ceratitis*, *Rhagoletis*, and *Zeugodacus* using DNA barcoding.

[14] This change in scope reduces the number of taxa to be consistent with other protocols. The change in scope, however, would not completely resolve the issue of redundancy in DPs if genus-level diagnosis methods (such as the DNA barcoding) are included in other protocols. It is possible that other tephritid protocols focus on species-level diagnostics. DNA barcoding methods are included in a draft DP for Genus *Ceratitis* (2006-001) and expected to be included in revision of DP9 Genus *Anastrepha* (2021-002). An additional challenge of this scope change is that there are no publications that describe how DNA barcodes can be used to complete a genus-level identification. Therefore, scope change could require reliance on information not yet available to authors in the literature. The taxonomic compositions and placement of fruit fly genera is currently under investigation. In 2018 this approach to identification of fly genera was not possible for most fruit fly genera because the classification of these genera did not represent true phylogenetic relationships. The drafting team would need to invest in defining methods for inclusion in a protocol. A third challenge with this scope change is to ensure a genus-level identification protocol addresses a need from contracting parties as a topic. The initial request was intended for species identifications. The resources needed to draft and approve a genus-level protocol should be documented if it is to be a viable replacement of the initial topic.

[15] The TPDP were asked to consider if the described information provided in this document was enough to make a recommendation to the SC to either:

- (a) *Remove* the DP from the work plan

- (b) *Maintain* the DP in pending status with no scope change
- (c) *Maintain* the DP in pending status with scope change to genus-level identification
- (d) *Reactivate* the DP with no scope change
- (e) *Reactivate* the DP with scope change to genus-level identification

- [16] One TPDP member asked that if the protocol were reactivated with the scope change to genus-level identification would this push it through and does that leave the door open for future DPs to do a genus-level identification? The lead author responded that a genus -level DP for the family is more feasible than a species-level for the entire insect family and the DP topics can be at genus level. We have *Anastrepha* DP being revised that deals with a handful of species and has morphological methods for genus-level identification, that are currently under revision to include molecular identification methods. If the genus-level DP is selected, then we would not want that *Anastrepha* DP to include a genus-level molecular method. We would need to avoid redundancy.
- [17] Another member expressed the opinion that the rational for its removal from the work programme is clear and they don't feel the protocol is technically feasible.
- [18] Another member strongly agreed that it is unreasonable with no scientific basis and they expressed that the TPDP has an obligation to maintain the request to remove this subject from their work programme as it cannot be achieved in the near future.
- [19] The lead author noted that this was already presented to the SC for removal but it was put into "pending" status. One member asked if the other authors could draft a response to have more expert input into why the draft protocol is not feasible and should be removed. Mr Barr replied that he would be happy to reach out to other experts to get their inputs but the DP drafting group is not working at this point. He also noted that he agreed with what the TPDP were saying so far and thinks it should be removed from the work programme. He noted the development of a species-level protocol for all the pests in the family is desirable but not feasible at this point from a scientific perspective or from a management perspective because of the logistical problems with drafting, reviewing, and revising a protocol with a taxonomically large scope. Therefore, removal from programme is a realistic and productive option. Subsequent calls for new topics focused on tephritid groups with more limited scope would better fulfil the needs of contracting parties while assigning work feasible for authors.
- [20] Mr Barr also continued that if the scope changed to focus on genus level and not worry about the species or any overlap in other protocols does it still fulfil the criteria for when it was submitted and approved to be included on the work programme?
- [21] All TPDP members strongly agreed to the removal of this topic from their work programme as it is not technically feasible at this time.
- [22] The TPDP:
- (1) *Agreed* to recommend to the SC to remove the subject "Tephritidae: Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)" from their work programme

## 5. TPDP work programme

### 5.1 Review of the TPDP work programme

- [23] The TPDP went through the list of subjects that are currently on their work programme and the Discipline leads gave a brief status update. The IPPC Secretariat reminded the Discipline leads of the timelines for development of diagnostic protocols (DPs) that was agreed and they were asked to follow-up and relay these timelines and deadlines to their respective drafting groups in order to keep the work moving.
- [24] In relation to the following subjects from the latest call for authors (closed 17 May 2021) the IPPC Secretariat gave an update:

- *Amaranthus palmeri* (2019-006) – one expert nomination received
- *Solanum rostratum* (2019-007) – one expert nomination received
- *Moniliophthora roreri* (2019-005) – one expert nomination received
- *Meloidogyne mali* (2018-019) – one expert nomination received
- *Cronartium comandrae* (2018-015) – one expert nomination received
- *Microcyclus ulei* (2019-003) – zero expert nominations received
- Revision of DP 03: *Trogoderma granarium* Everts (2021-001) – one expert nomination received
- Revision of DP 05: (*Phyllosticta citricarpa* (McAlpine)) Aa (2019-011) – seven expert nominations received
- Revision of DP 09: *Genus Anastrepha* (2021-002) – four expert nominations received
- Revision of DP 25: *Xylella fastidiosa* (2021-003) – five expert nominations received
- Revision of DP 27: *Ips* spp. (2021-004) – three expert nomination received

[25] The Secretariat noted that by the closing deadline, 25 complete nominations were received for experts with the necessary expertise for all listed DPs. However, for six of the eleven DPs only one nomination of an expert author was received and for *Microcyclus ulei* (2019-003) no nominations were received.

[26] Therefore, the Secretariat will open a TPDP eDecision to select the authors for the Revisions of DPs 05, 09, 25 and 27.

[27] The TPDP discussed what should happen in the case authors cannot be identified and they agreed for Mr Norman BARR, Mr Robert TAYLOR and Ms Julie PATTEMORE to draft a procedure in the event that there is no authors nominated to work on TPDP subjects. The paper will be presented to the TPDP for review before forwarding it to the SC for consideration.

### **The TPDP:**

- (2) *agreed* for Mr Norman BARR, Mr Robert TAYLOR and Ms Julie PATTEMORE to draft a discussion paper for a procedure in the event that authors cannot be found to develop a DP in the TPDP work programme

## **6. IPPC Secretariat and SC updates**

### ***Recent activities***

[28] The Secretariat updated the group on the recent activities of the SC including they met virtually for their annual May and again in June and July 2021 for focused meetings.

[29] At their May meeting, the Secretariat noted that the SC approved four draft ISPMs for first consultation<sup>3</sup> and they also approved (via eDecision) the draft DP *Candidatus Liberibacter* spp. on *Citrus* spp. (2004-010) for first consultation. It was highlighted that in 2021 there is a total of 16 draft ISPMs for first and second consultation as well as one draft specification, and one draft CPM recommendation for the consultation period. The draft ISPMs (including the draft DP) are now available for commenting via the [Online Commenting System \(OCS\)](#) until **30 September 2021**. Additionally in June, the SC discussed and approved via eDecision the draft DP *Striga* spp. (2008-009) to be sent to the DP Notification Period<sup>4</sup> that is currently ongoing until **15 August 2021**.

[30] Relative to the TPDP, the SC agreed to renew the membership of Mr Robert Taylor, expert for bacteriology and backup for mycology from New Zealand, to a third term on the TPDP.

<sup>3</sup> Current consultation for draft ISPMs: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/member-consultation-draft-ispms/>

<sup>4</sup> DP Notification Period: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/notification-period-dps/>

- [31] Lastly the TPDP were updated that at the SC focused meeting in July, they discussed the development agenda items of the IPPC Strategic Framework 2020-2030. The SC decided to create small groups to advance ideas on each development agenda item assigned to the Standard Setting Unit (Commodity- and pathway-specific ISPMs; Developing guidance on the use of third-party entities; Diagnostic laboratory networking), and present the results at the next SC virtual focused meeting in September.
- [32] The SC meeting reports are available to download and review here: <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/standards-setting/standards-committee/>.

### ***Developmental agenda item: Diagnostic laboratory networking***

- [33] The IPPC Secretariat updated the group on the developmental agenda item for diagnostic laboratory networking and specifically wanted the TPDP to discuss the draft Terms of Reference (ToR) for the hiring of a consultant to initiate the work on this agenda item for the TPDP to provide their inputs and comments. It is intended that this consultant will be an expert in the subject matter to gather data on the topic, do a literature search, make a project proposal and provide suggestions, actions, or indicators to help with the implementation of this development agenda.
- [34] The general comments from the TPDP included the number of days proposed in the draft ToR (50 days) would not be enough considering the amount of work that will be involved.
- [35] One member mentioned that it would be good to gather information on these labs including a report of best practices such as their standard operating procedures (SOPs) but that they are also interested in what these other labs do for the identification of certain pests or pathogens but this could be outside of the scope here. Other members agreed that this kind of information would be a huge benefit to the IPPC community.
- [36] Another member mentioned that if this were to be done in just 50 days then the most important factor is the person who is doing the work needs to be someone who is part of a diagnostic network that has experience working in a national level laboratory.
- [37] The TPDP agreed and one of the members added that the expert should contact the NPPOs and have them do a sub-search so as to throw larger net out to their lab networks. They also expressed that they didn't think analyzing the best practices would be successful and questioned the usefulness of doing a literature review as many labs do not publish their data. Other members agreed.
- [38] When asked how the TPDP could be part of the process they responded that they could review the report produced by the consultant and provide feedback. They added that a lot of these labs have their own protocols so it could be good long-term to know what protocols are in place across different labs.

## **7. Any Other Business**

- [39] There was no other business.

## **8. Close of the Meeting**

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

**Appendix 1: Agenda**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Document No.</b>	<b>Presenter</b>
<b>1. Opening of the Meeting</b>		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat	--	CASSIN
<b>2. Meeting Arrangements</b>		
2.1 Selection of Chairperson	--	CASSIN
2.2 Selection of the Rapporteur	--	Chairperson
2.3 Adoption of the Agenda	01_TPDP_Tel_2021_July	Chairperson
<b>3. Administrative Matters</b>		
3.1 Participants / membership	<a href="#">TPDP membership list</a>	MANGILI
3.2 Connections to Zoom and virtual meetings	<a href="#">Short guideline for participants</a>	
<b>4. Recommendation to the SC</b>		
4.1 Scope adjustment for draft DP <i>Tephritidae</i> : Identification of immature stages of fruit flies of economic importance by molecular techniques (2006-028)	02_TPDP_Tel_2021_July	BARR
<b>5. TPDP work programme</b>		
5.1 Updates and review of work programme: - Updates from DP drafting groups and indications of authors	--	CASSIN / LEADS
<b>6. Updates</b>		
6.1 Draft DPs under IPPC consultation period: - First consultation for draft DP <i>Candidatus Liberibacter</i> spp. on <i>Citrus</i> spp. (2004-010) - DP Notification Period for <i>Striga</i> spp. (2008-009)	--  <a href="#">Link to consultation page</a>  <a href="#">Link to DP Notification Page</a>	CASSIN
6.2 IPPC Secretariat and Standards Committee (SC) updates - Recent activities - Developmental agenda item: Diagnostic laboratory networking	03_TPDP_Tel_2021_July	MANGILI
<b>7. Any other business</b>	-	Chairperson
<b>8. Closing of the meeting</b> - Recommendations to SC or IPPC Secretariat	-	CASSIN / Chairperson

## Appendix 2: 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	<b>Mr Álvaro SEPÚLVEDA LUQUE</b> Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero División de Protección Agrícola y Forestal Av. PresidenteBulnes 140, 4 <sup>th</sup> floor, Santiago, <b>CHILE</b> Tel: + 56-2 234 5120	<a href="mailto:alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl">alvaro.sepulveda@sag.gob.cl</a> ;		
✓	Bacteriology	<b>Mr Robert TAYLOR</b> Plant Health & Environment Laboratory New Zealand Ministry for Primary Industries 231 Morrin Road St Johns PO Box 2095 Auckland 1140 <b>New Zealand</b> Tel: (+64) 9 909 3548 Fax: (+64) 9 909 5739	<a href="mailto:Robert.Taylor@mpi.govt.nz">Robert.Taylor@mpi.govt.nz</a>	May 2011	May 2026 (3 <sup>rd</sup> term)
✓	Botany	<b>Ms Liping YIN</b> Plant Quarantine Laboratory Animal and Plant Inspection and Quarantine Technology Center Shanghai Entry-Exit Inspection and Quarantine Bureau 1208 Minsheng Road Shanghai, 200135 <b>China</b> Tel: (+86) 21 6854 0577 Fax: (+86) 21 6854 6481	<a href="mailto:yinlp@shciq.gov.cn">yinlp@shciq.gov.cn</a> ; <a href="mailto:yinlp2013@hotmail.com">yinlp2013@hotmail.com</a>	April 2008	April 2023 (3 <sup>rd</sup> term)
✓	Botany	<b>Ms Colette C. JACONO</b> USA / USDA-APHIS-PPQ National Identification Services National Taxonomist - Botany Address: 10300 Baltimore Ave., BARC-W Bldg 12, Rm 10., Beltsville, MD 20705-2350 <b>USA</b> Tel. (+1) 240 428 9658	<a href="mailto:Colette.Jacono@usda.gov">Colette.Jacono@usda.gov</a> ;	October 2020	October 2025
✓	Entomology	<b>Mr Norman B. BARR</b> Assistant Director Mission Laboratory 22675 N. Moorefiled Rd. Moore Air Base Bldg. S-6414 Edinburg, TX 78541 <b>USA</b> Tel. (+1) 956 205 7658 Fax: (+1) 956 205 7680	<a href="mailto:Norman.B.Barr@aphis.usda.gov">Norman.B.Barr@aphis.usda.gov</a>	July 2012	2022 (2 <sup>nd</sup> term 2017-2022)

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

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address	Term begins	Term ends
ü	IPPC Secretariat Support	<b>Ms Aoife Cassin</b> Standard Setting Specialist IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy	<a href="mailto:Aoife.Cassin@fao.org">Aoife.Cassin@fao.org</a>		
✓	IPPC Secretariat Support	<b>Ms Erika Mangili Andre</b> Standard Setting Specialist IPPC Secretariat / FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 Rome, Italy Tel: (+39) 06 57052 480			

**Appendix 3: Action points****ACTION POINTS ARISING FROM THIS MEETING**

(by agenda item)

	<b>Action</b>	<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
1.	Update the document on 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 removal	4.2	Mr Norman BARR	October 2021
2.	Open TPDP eDecision to select authors for the Revision of DPs 5, 9, 25 and 27	5.1	IPPC Secretariat	August 2021
3.	Draft a paper with a recommendation for a procedure on how to address subjects that do not receive authors nominations	5.1	Mr Norman BARR, Mr Robert TAYLOR and Ms Julie PATTEMORE	September 2021