The meeting of the National Clean Plant Network (NCPN) – Grape Section was convened at 9:00 a.m. on July 8, 2008, in the AGR Room of the Buehler Alumni Center on the U.C. Davis campus. Deborah Golino, Director of Foundation Plant Services (FPS), acted as moderator.

The following were present: Maher Al Rwahnih (FPS), Mike Anderson (Napa County), Gary Ballard (Wash.State Univ./NWGFS), Murali Bandla (USDA-APHIS, PPQ), Rebecca Bech (USDA-PPQ), Mark Black (Texas A&M), Mike Colvin (Calif.Dept. Food & Agr.- CDFA), Peter Cousins (USDA/Cornell), Cheryl Covert (FPS), Mike Cunningham (FPS), John Duarte (Duarte Nursery, CA), Ken Eastwell (WSU), Bev Ferguson (FPS), Marc Fuchs (Cornell), John Griesbach (Ascent Agr.Services, OR), Jan Hedberg (Ore. Dept. Agr.- ODA), Justin Jacobs (FPS), Jay Jensen (Novavine Grapevine Nursery, CA), Ray Johnson (CFIA, Canada), Umesh Kodira (CDFA), Bob Martin (USDA/ARS-Ore.), Dan Martinez (Martinez Orchards, CA), Susan McCarthy (CDFA), Kathy McGahan (FPS), Judit Monis (STA Laboratories, Inc.), Cliff Ohmart (Lodi Winegrape Commission, CA), Waclawa Pudlo (FPS), Wenping Qiu (Missouri State Fruit Experiment Station), Ken Rauscher (Michigan Dept. of Agr.), Adib Rowhani (FPS), Erich Rudyj (USDA-APHIS, PPQ), Sue Sim (FPS), Keith Striegler (Univ. of Missouri), Mysore Sudarshana (USDA/ARS-Calif.), Padma Sudarshana, Nancy Sweet (FPS), Athar Tariq (CDFA), Andy Walker (UC Davis), Ruth Welliver (Penn. Dept. of Agr.), Thomas Wessels (Wash.State Dept. Agr.), Robert Woolley (Dave Wilson Nursery, CA).

**USDA Perspectives**

Rebecca Bech, Deputy Administrator for Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ) at APHIS (USDA), opened the meeting with introductory comments about the NCPN. Primary objectives of the program include harmonization of regional certification standards and outreach to the grape industry. Three USDA agencies (ARS, APHIS, CSREES) have collaborated on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) covering federal cooperative participation in activities related to the National Clean Plant Network (NCPN). The MOU agreed upon by the three USDA agencies presents a single USDA voice to the NCPN. The primary substantive articles in the MOU are 1, 2, and 6, which contains the 12 guiding principles of the MOU. The three signatory agencies will pool their resources and energies and sponsor the administrative costs of NCPN governance.
A copy of the MOU was distributed at the meeting, and Ms. Bech asked for feedback on the document. The MOU should be finalized and signed in August, 2008.

Dr. Murali Bandla and Erich Rudyj (USDA-APHIS, PPQ) presented the USDA vision of NCPN Governance and a summary of ongoing and future funding, including alternatives. The USDA proposed a three-tier NCPN structure as follows:

1. **NCPN Governing Body (Tier 1)**
   The top tier of the NCPN structure is the NCPN Governing Body, composed of a Core Working Group and 7 appointed (“invited”) members. The Core Working Group (CWG) consists of one representative appointed by the USDA from each of the three MOU agencies (APHIS/ARS/CSREES). The 3 CWG members will have no voting rights but can veto recommendations of the Governing Body. The APHIS representative will act as the CWG Chair for the first year, and the Chair shall rotate in subsequent periods among the federal members.

   The CWG will appoint the 7 voting members of the Governing Body (including one Fruit Tree Network member, one Grape Network member, one state department of agriculture employee, one CGC employee, and three other invited members). The primary function of the Tier 1 body will be to set NCPN program policy and provide/allocate the NCPN funds to the various commodity networks. The Federal Advisory Council Act (FACA) provides that only federal or state employees can participate in the distribution decisions for federal money. The CWG is required to appoint state or federal employees to act as voting members on the NCPN Governing Body. The question of whether university employees are state employees is under examination. Non-voting subject matter experts will be invited to meetings as observers.

   Dr. Bandla explained that the NCPN will be a commodity-based network. At the present time, grapes and fruit trees are the only identified commodities for purposes of fund allocation.

   The CWG intends to recruit and hire a full-time coordinator for the NCPN program. The Plant Health Program division of PPQ will provide the funding for this permanent position.

2. **National Grape Clean Plant Network (Tier 2)**
   Tier 2 for grapes is the national level of the Grape Clean Plant Network (GCPN) and includes 4 representatives from each of the Western and Eastern regions. Members shall include representatives from industry, academia and government regulatory bodies. Subject matter experts should also be included as observers. The function of the GCPN will be to identify priorities and provide/allocate funding

---

1 Post-meeting note: APHIS is seeking a legal opinion as to whether the Tier 2 body can “allocate funds” or must recommend funding options to the Tier 1 body.
received from the NCPN Governing Body (Tier 1) – see footnote 1. A major goal of the national grape network is to harmonize/coordinate state certification programs. Dr. Bandla proposed that Foundation Plant Services (UC Davis) be designated the headquarters for the GCPN and that one full-time administrative position be provided using NCPN funds to support grape NCPN activities.

3. **Regional Grape Clean Plant Networks (Tier 3)**

The Tier 3-level entities are the regional networks for grapes. The proposal is to establish a Western Grape Clean Plant Network (Foundation Plant Services-UC Davis; Northwest Grape Foundation Services-Prosser, WA) and an Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network (Cornell University-NY; Missouri State University; and, potentially, other cooperators including the Mid-Atlantic Grape Foundation). The issue of the affiliation of Texas A&M was left open for later discussion at the meeting. Each regional governing body would be composed of industry, academic and governmental voting representatives, along with non-voting subject matter and other designated observers. Each regional body would have authority to regulate regional issues and review and fund proposals within the region.

Erich Rudyj reviewed funding provisions related to the NCPN.

Mr. Rudyj stated that in 2008 APHIS has allocated money from internal discretionary funds for NCPN start-up money. $750,000 is promised to various existing grape and stone fruit programs to be used for quarantine activities associated with Partnership programs. A cooperative agreement between APHIS and UC Davis (which was signed later that day) provided $345,000 to Foundation Plant Services for grape quarantine activities. Cornell University (NY) will receive $111,150 for importation and related services for cold-weather grape cultivars and rootstocks. Washington State ($225,000) and Clemson University ($49,980) will receive funds for stone/ pome fruit activities.

The recent Farm Bill appropriated $20 million ($5 million annually for 4 years) for clean plant programs. Congress provided general guidance to the USDA for allocation of Farm Bill resources by way of language in the Food, Conservation and Energy Act of 2008. Congress directed the USDA Secretary to establish a National Clean Plant Network to produce and maintain clean material throughout the United States and, where practicable, to use existing state and federal facilities for the clean plant centers. Crops such as “grapes, apples, peaches and other fruits” were mentioned as being particularly vulnerable to viruses.

The U.S. Congress established a Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) within the USDA to handle special funding initiatives. The CCC will fund the NCPN Farm Bill Initiative. The $5 million Farm Bill funds are anticipated to be obligated by the federal government within each fiscal year but the funding is “no year money” and as such need not be completely obligated during that year; the bill specifically states that the money will be “available until expended”. Any
unobligated money remains available in subsequent years for continued obligation. There is no legal limitation on the time within which the money must be spent by any recipient, and the biological cycle(s) inherent in clean plant work will be considered in assessing the appropriate length for a project. The money for federal fiscal year 2009 will be available after October, 2008. It is expected that NCPN projects will result from cooperative agreements incorporating cost sharing and matching funds for maximum leveraging of Farm Bill funds. Work plans, expenditure reports, and progress reports on performance benchmarks are required for projects funded by Farm Bill money.

Mr. Rudyj indicated that NCPN activities are not limited to Farm Bill funding. Federal agencies with available resources (such as APHIS and CSREES), state agencies and cooperators may be tapped for support of the NCPN. Specialty crops funds are also available. Beyond 2012, there is the option of renewed funding under the next Farm Bill. A permanent NCPN funding line could evolve in the budget of one of the three USDA Core Working Group agencies.

**Proposed Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network**

The central and eastern states have agreed to merge into one regional (Tier 3) clean plant network under the name Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network.

Dr. Keith Striegler, Director and Viticulture Program Leader at the University of Missouri (UM), reported on the central states’ meetings of the Grape Clean Plant Network. Dr. Wenping Qiu, Director of the Center for Grapevine Biotechnology at Missouri State University (MSU), was the co-author of the report.

The active participants in the central states have been Missouri (UM, MSU), Texas (Texas A&M), and Michigan (Michigan State University). Dr. Striegler described the available resources, importation and virus treatment program and foundation vineyard maintained at the Missouri Grapevine Importation and Certification Program at MSU. UM focuses on extension work and research. Texas A&M and Michigan State plan to contribute grape disease diagnostics, tissue culture work, extension activities (Texas A&M) and propagation of crown-gall free grapevines (MSU).

The central states elected to merge with the eastern states for several reasons. The diseases, viruses and grape cultivars are similar in both regions. The existing programs in the two regions are complimentary. Merger was thought to be an efficient method for delivery of clean plant material to growers within the constraints of limited NCPN resources.

Dr. Bandla inquired of Mark Black whether Texas A&M had decided to align with the Western Grape Network or the Eastern Grape Network. Dr. Black stated that Texas has issues with both the West and the East. Pierce’s Disease has been discovered in Texas, which will ultimately rely more heavily on Dr. Andy Walker’s resistant rootstocks. Texas is physically closer to Missouri. However, many
Texas growers purchase grapevine material from California. Texas expects that
grower purchase of Gulf Coast grape material will increase in the future. Dr.
Black indicated that Texas is a better fit with the Eastern Grape Clean Plant
Network at this time, but circumstances could change in the future.

Marc Fuchs (Cornell University) gave a status report from the Eastern States
Grape Network. The core states from that region have been Maryland, New
York, Pennsylvania and Virginia; recent attendees include Michigan, Missouri,
and Texas. Dr. Bandla and Erich Rudyj attended a meeting at Harrisburg,
Pennsylvania, on November 5, 2007, to discuss the NCPN concept. Several
group meetings were held to discuss national and regional standards and
regional assets.

The Working Committee on Diseases/ Diagnostics/ Standards decided that Joe
Foster’s USDA “National Standards” would be adopted for the Eastern Network.
Crown gall disease is an important issue for the eastern states, who have been
reluctant to purchase material from California nurseries (where crown gall is not
an issue). Crown gall testing is not yet included in the Eastern Network regional
testing standards because there are no safe, reliable tests available at this time.
The Eastern Network has established a research project on Crown gall disease
in search of effective tests.

The Eastern Network does not have a nuclear block of virus-tested material
except for the small foundation block available in Missouri. Tony Wolf (Virginia
Tech) and Mark Chien (Penn State) have drafted a plan for extension/outreach
containing provisions for resource development, communication and personnel
needs. The central and eastern states are currently undergoing a detailed
inventory audit of resources within the regions, including identification of permit
holders, existing personnel and facilities, and available plant material. The
center(s) for maintaining the mother blocks(s) for the Eastern Network region
need to be finalized. Extension and outreach will also be key issues for the
Eastern region.

Cliff Ohmart (Lodi Winegrape Commission) inquired as to the potential for
including other states such as Ohio in the Eastern Network meetings. Ohio has
expressed interest and will be included.

Deborah Golino commented on the benefits inherent in linking to existing
programs that are currently addressing issues of common interest. The NE1020
group is currently in the process of identifying high priority grape varieties for
virus testing and subsequent distribution to all regions in the country. Although
crown gall disease is not a disease that impacts grapevines in California, FPS
has recognized the concern of Eastern grape growers and has established a
“next generation” vineyard that has tested free of crown gall under the guidance
of Tom Burr. The next generation vineyard contains plants made with shoot tip
tissue culture propagation of all rootstocks and at least one clone of some
popular grape varieties. Grape plant material from Cornell and clean grape material from Missouri State University will be added to that block. California nurseries have expressed a desire for crown gall free grape material. Recent progress in testing for crown gall disease will make that possible.

Marc Fuchs noted that even shoot tip tissue culture plants at Cornell showed some negative signs for crown gall after a few years in the vineyard.

**Western Grape Clean Plant Network**

Dr. Golino spoke as the representative of the Western Grape Clean Plant Network. She began by mentioning two handouts on display at the registration desk. The brochure entitled National Grapevine Importation Program at Foundation Plant Services explains the clean plant program at UC Davis. The 2007 FPS Grape Program Newsletter contains current information of interest to grape nurseries.

The Western Grape Clean Plant Network has met several times and has agreed upon a set of standards for pathogen testing. The group created a two-page Excel spreadsheet memorializing its decisions. The participants in the meetings separately addressed each pathogen on the spreadsheet and discussed all valid tests before deciding whether the pathogen or test would be included in the Western Standards.

The first column on the spreadsheet is labelled National Grape [Clean Plant] Standards, which is the minimum consensus standard for screening of material that moves around within the United States. 2

The second column on the spreadsheet shows the pathogens and tests that are included in the Western Regional Standards. Globalization has had a major effect on phytosanitary standards in the grape industry. The mix of experts attending the Western regional meeting (USDA/ARS scientists and extension specialists, state regulators, academic scientists, Ray Johnson from CFIA in Canada) attempted to conform the regulations to global phytosanitary standards where possible. There was agreement to include the nepoviruses, leafroll associated viruses and fleck viruses and valid tests in the Western standards.

There was not unanimous agreement on the pathogens on page two of the spreadsheet. Agrobacterium testing was not included in the Western Standards. The group decided that it was premature to include that pathogen on the list because there is no available routine test for screening and the mechanism for reinfection is unknown. Yellows phytoplasmas were not included in the Western Standards because there is no evidence (symptoms) of the pathogen(s) in grapes in the western United States. The group recognized that the eastern states might decide otherwise. Peach rosette mosaic virus (PRMV) was included in the Western Standards even though not included in the National Grape

---

2 *This set of standards is sometimes referred to as the “Joe Foster list”.*
Standards. Herbaceous testing picks up PRMV. Testing for *Xylella fastidiosa* was included in the Western Standards because Oregon and Washington wanted it to be included. It was agreed that visual inspection with backup ELISA/PCR testing in case of suspicious symptoms would be adequate. Dr. Golino opposed requiring lab tests due to the expense associated with bacterial PCR testing and the fact that it would be extremely difficult to manage such an abundant pathogen in a certification program. *Rupesstris* stem pitting was excluded from the Western standards because there is yet no tool kit to manage the virus. FPS will over time use shoot tip tissue culture treatment on all RSP+ vines to eliminate it from the important wine varieties.

Dr. Fuchs indicated that the Eastern Network is in substantial agreement with the pathogen testing list proposed by the Western Network. He stated that *Xylella* is an important pathogen to the East and South but acknowledged that routine diagnostics for that pathogen are not good.

Scientists in the Eastern Network (e.g., Tony Wolf – Va.Tech) recommend against routine testing at the foundation level for phytoplasmas. Dr. Golino commented that, even in Europe, phytoplasmic-infected wood is rogued out during propagation and does not survive the process. Ray Johnson (CFIA) stated that recent testing (visual inspection and PCR) of imported vines from France and Germany revealed *Bois noir* (yellows) in material coming from Europe into Canada and a second visual/PCR testing showed X disease (aster yellows). Canada now mandates hot water treatment for all vines imported from Europe. The effectiveness of hot water treatment was debated.

Ruth Welliver commented relative to phytoplasmas that if the United States does not monitor the pathogen at the foundation level, we could open ourselves to international challenge. Dr. Golino said that, in regard to non-quarantine regulated pests, we should not establish a higher standard for European imports than we set for ourselves and must be realistic in regulating against specific threats. Ray Johnson commented that Canadian regulations include testing for phytoplasmas (yellows, *Bois noir*). Dr. Golino concluded that the Eastern Network might wish to consider including phytoplasmas in the Eastern Standards but the Western Network will continue to exclude that pathogen. She suggested that it be determined whether the European countries will agree to visual inspection only.

Dr. Bandla stated that the United States is trying to harmonize its regulations with NAPPO. Phytoplasmas are currently not in the National Standards but may eventually have to be included because testing for phytoplasmas is now under review for the NAPPO standards. Dr. Golino suggested that it would be necessary to identify for which phytoplasmas to require testing if phytoplasm testing is added to the National Standards and noted that such testing could be expensive. Dr. Bandla asked whether a combination of hot water treatment and visual inspections would suffice for a National Standard for phytoplasm testing.
Dr. Golino replied that it would be adequate for the Eastern region if it chooses to require such testing. Ken Eastwell mentioned that he uses PCR testing for \textit{Xylella}, \textit{Agrobacterium} and phytoplasmas. Dr. Bandla commented that perhaps a similar method could be adopted for the Eastern region.

**Open Discussion on NCPN Resources**

Dr. Golino raised the issue of the appropriate focus for NCPN money. She stated that the resources should be concentrated on the stages prior to “making plants for planting”. The focus should be on elite germplasm material in the following areas: (1) maintaining importation and quarantine standards; (2) establishing appropriate regulatory standards for and screening foundation level grape material; and (3) assistance to nurseries in monitoring plant material from which they take wood. State regulatory programs are more appropriately served through block grants to the states.

Ruth Welliver agreed with Dr. Golino. Dr. Welliver stated that growers should be included in resolving NCPN problems to the extent that growers must maintain clean plant material moving through the system. Dr. Golino added that NCPN funds should also be used for outreach to all interested parties, including the growers.

**Shared Resources Available to the NCPN**

Dr. Golino offered to share resources with the Clean Plant Network participants. FPS has in the past few years developed a viticulture website using software from UCD’s ANR (Agriculture & Natural Resources) Communications Services. The Integrated Viticulture On-Line site (http://iv.ucdavis.edu) was created using a program called Site Builder. Another key feature of ANR technology (Breeze) allows for display of lectures by a simultaneous display of both the speaker and Power Point slides. ANR personnel assisted with development of a second FPS website, the National Grape Registry (http://ngr.ucdavis.edu). Both sites are used in outreach and extension activities. Dr. Golino offered to develop a website for the National Clean Plant Network using the Site Builder and Breeze technologies. Content on the NCPN site would include such things as Power Point presentations, handouts and minutes and webcam recordings from the Network meetings and working lectures on virus and other diseases for outreach programs.

FPS is currently reprogramming its internal database with web-based technology to make it more user friendly. Dr. Golino offered to share the programming code with the Fruit Tree and Grape Clean Plant Network participants.

Dr. Golino offered to take the lead on creation of a Clean Plant Network logo. She and Dr. Bandla will consult with their artists and recommend a logo design to the Clean Plant Network members.
**Signing of Cooperative Agreement**

Following lunch, there was a signing ceremony for a Cooperative Agreement between the USDA (represented by Rebecca Bech, Deputy Administrator, PPQ) and UC Davis-FPS (represented by James McDonald, Executive Associate Dean, College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences). Remarks were made by the signatories and the agreement was signed. The agreement relates to the 2008 NCPN start-up funds ($345,000) allocated by APHIS to FPS for importation and quarantine activities.

**Inventory and Analysis Discussion: Assets, Capacities, and Efficiencies**

Keith Striegler reported on the progress of the asset inventory then being conducted in the Eastern and Central regions. The purpose of the inventory is to identify assets (e.g., personnel, staff, laboratories) available to NCPN participants in order to avoid duplication. The report was due July 8. Dr. Striegler indicated that he would e-mail the completed document to the group once it is available. Tony Wolfe is currently compiling the information received from Eastern network members.

**Single v. Split Network for the Grape Clean Plant Network**

Bob Martin raised the issue of whether the Grape Clean Plant Network should consist of two separate regions or one single national network, given the common pathogens and need for sharing assets among the network(s). He suggested that separate East and West Networks could give the impression to Congress (the funding entity) that the grape industry cannot work together effectively.

Deborah Golino explained that the rationale for the split network is in part attributable to the fact that some viticulturalists on the East Coast are suspicious of California. She noted that the scientists at Davis, Missouri, Cornell, and Prosser have been able to work together quite closely on importation and quarantine issues, but some industry stakeholders feel neglected and abused by California (FPS). East Coast hybrids go to FPS for clean up and certification; the first clean Eastern hybrid material will be released through FPS. Keith Striegler added that there is also the issue of the different varieties that thrive in each region. Ruth Welliver noted that the Fruit Tree Clean Plant Network, who initially decided to form a single network, have been struggling with accommodation of regional differences. Drs. Golino and Welliver acknowledged the need of the NCPN to protect specialized niche interests in the smaller states given that California drives the grape work by producing 95% of the commercial grapes in the country.

Mark Black (Texas) asked how the grape industry in the states of the Pacific Northwest interrelate with California. Oregon and Washington have established a Clean Plant Program at Prosser, Washington – the Northwest Grape Foundation Service (NWGFS). Although there are some minor differences in the standards for the Northwest Clean Plant Program, NWGFS sources most of its
plant material from FPS. Gary Ballard, manager of the NWGFS, indicated that growers in Oregon and Washington have turned to his program more often to avoid quarantine impediments associated with taking plants out of California. Deborah Golino stated that Oregon growers acknowledge that California certified stock is pretty good. Oregon started its industry with clean plant material from FPS and most of its subsequent virus problems occurred as a result of smuggling plants into the state. Additionally, after Oregon imposed additional testing in response to vine mealybug and Pierce’s Disease reports from California, it became easier for Oregon to obtain its plant material through the Prosser facility. Dr. Golino explained that FPS and NWGFS are in the same network and are effective duplicate programs.

Marc Fuchs stated that the different varieties in the two regions and the lack of a nuclear block for hybrids in the eastern region justify the split network configuration proposed for the National Grape Clean Plant Network. Dr. Bandla indicated that there is not much difference in terms of funding between having a single grape network or a split network at the Tier 3 level. Deborah Golino was of the opinion that there were not enough industry representatives from the Eastern Network present at the meeting to resolve the issue.

The consensus opinion was to leave the network as a split network (West and East) for the time being.

**NCPN-Grapes National and Regional Governance Discussions**

The subject of the Tier 2 and Tier 3 governance structure was then discussed. The structure for each tier was established and roles were defined.

**Tier 2 (National Grape Clean Plant Network)**

The Tier 2 NCPN body contains designated representatives from throughout the nation and receives funding from the NCPN Governing Body (Tier 1). The Tier 2 group will identify priorities and provide/allocate funds to the Western and Eastern Grape Networks (Tier 3). It was agreed that the headquarters of the National Grape Clean Plant Network would be at Foundation Plant Services at UC Davis (California). A full-time administrative position was approved to support the network.

Each Tier 3 body (West and East) shall select 4 representatives to send as voting members to the Tier 2 (national) body. Those 4 representatives must include: one grower, one nurseryman, one university and one state regulatory representative. The Chair and Vice Chair may be selected but must be representative of one of the 4 categories.

The Tier 2 body shall be composed of the following 8 voting members:
1. four representatives from the regional grape centers – two each from the Western and Eastern regions - including one grower and one nurseryman representative from the West and East.
2. two representatives from university employment, one each from the Western and Eastern regions. Each Tier 3 body shall select its representative.
3. two representatives from state government, to be selected one each by the Western and Eastern Networks.

The Tier 2 body shall include the following non-voting members:
1. an observer from the NCPN Governing Body (Tier 1)
2. an observer from APHIS
3. subject matter experts to give input on technical issues

There shall be a Chair and Vice-Chair elected for the Tier 2 body. The Chair and Vice-Chair shall have two-year terms. The Chair shall not be a voting member of the Tier 2 body except that the Chair (or Vice-Chair in the absence of the Chair) may vote if there is a tie vote among the 8 voting members. The Vice-Chair shall automatically succeed the Chair when the Chair’s two-year term has expired. The Chair shall alternate between the Western and Eastern Networks. The term for the board members shall be two years. Elections for the two-year terms for board members shall be staggered so as to avoid all terms becoming due simultaneously.

The National Grape Clean Plant Network (Tier 2) shall have meetings twice per year. Tiers 2 and 3 should schedule meetings simultaneously where possible. The meetings shall be open to the public.

Mike Cunningham (FPS) inquired as to the reason for equal representation for the Eastern and Western Networks given the disparity of production of grape plant material in favor of the West. The answer is found in political considerations. There is no requirement in the NCPN funding provisions that there be an equal distribution of funds to West and East. Keith Striegler opined that the nominees for positions on the National Grape Clean Plant Network should possess an understanding of the issues based on a national perspective and not be limited by partisan regional attitudes.

**Tier 3 (Regional NCPN Bodies)**
The Tier 3 bodies (Western and Eastern Grape Clean Plant Networks) are the regional networks with separate governance structures. Each regional body will call for proposals and distribute the funds received from the National Grape Clean Plant Network, after receiving advice and input from subject matter experts and other interested parties. It was agreed that the regional networks should be...
populated first, after which each regional body could select its representatives to the National Grape Network (Tier 2).

Each Tier 3 body shall be composed of the following 8 voting members:

1. four representatives from the grape “industry”, consisting of two nurserymen and two growers from each region (one nurseryman and grower from the North West U.S. and one each from California for the Western Grape Clean Plant Network)

The issue of selection of industry representatives was discussed. The term “industry” could include growers, nurseries and other special interests in the grape and wine field. Growers and nurseries have diverse interests and differing levels of practical knowledge. Deborah Golino proposed that NGWI would be an appropriate entity to recommend industry stakeholders because NGWI is closest to a broad representation of diverse interests within the grape industry. Bob Martin suggested that the industry representatives be selected on the basis of being a major player within the region, e.g. industry representatives from California and the Northwest within the Western Grape Clean Plant Network and industry representatives from the Northeast and Midwest within the Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network.

2. two representatives from university employment, consisting of one extension specialist and one research specialist

3. two representatives from state government

Ken Rauscher shall insure that the Plant Board nominates a pool of candidates from each region from which each region shall choose two for the Tier 3 board\(^3\). Only one state regulatory representative will be sent to represent each Tier 3 body on the Tier 2 board.

Each Tier 3 body shall include the following non-voting members:

1. an observer from the NCPN Governing Body (Tier 1)

2. an observer from APHIS

3. the curators (Crop Germplasm Committee - CGC) of the USDA Grape Repositories at Davis and Cornell for the West and East regions, respectively

4. subject matter experts to give input on technical issues

The Tier 3 Board shall elect a Chair and Vice-Chair. The Chair shall be rotated every 2 years (2-year term). The Chair shall not be a voting member of the Tier 3

\(^3\) Subsequent to the July 8 meeting, it was decided that there should be three state regulatory representatives for the Western Clean Plant Network, one each from California, Oregon and Washington.
body except that the Chair (or Vice-Chair in the absence of the Chair) may vote if there is a tie vote among the 8 voting members. The Vice-Chair shall automatically succeed the Chair when the Chair’s two-year term has expired. The board members shall also serve two-year terms, except that alternate staggered terms shall be assigned to board members at the outset (2 years and 3 years) to avoid simultaneous expiration of all terms.

Nominations for candidates to fill the Tier 3 positions should be sent to Deborah Golino (Western Grape Network) and Marc Fuchs/ Peter Cousins (Eastern Grape Network) by the end of July, 2008. Drs. Golino, Fuchs and Cousins shall contact each nominee and verify that he/she would be able and willing to serve. The voting and selection process should be completed by e-mail ballot by August/September.

**Harmonization of Terminologies**

Dr. Bandla spoke on the need for harmonization of terminologies within the National Clean Plant Network. The European Union is currently undergoing a process of harmonizing its various certification programs. Dr. Bandla expressed his desire that the Clean Plant Network for Grapes and Trees use a single terminology for plant material when addressing certification standards.

Ray Johnson (CFIA – Canada) explained that NAPPO attempted to use common terms when creating its regulations, e.g., Generation 1 (G1), Generation 2 (G2) etc. The goal within the North American community is to harmonize the standards within the North American perimeter relative to movement of plants within the continent. The Canadian Food Inspection Agency has used the NAPPO terminology in rewriting its fruit and grape regulations.

Ruth Welliver has been appointed Chair of a committee in the National Fruit Tree Clean Plant Network to draft model regulations including standard terminology related to pathogens and plant category standards.

Dr. Golino proposed that a white paper be prepared at the Tier 1 level containing guidelines and a philosophical approach for the Clean Plant Network regarding a single terminology for the grape and tree standards. Dr. Bandla requested a draft report within one year on a single terminology for grape and fruit standards. The following were appointed to serve on the committee to prepare the draft report: Deborah Golino, Ray Johnson, Susan McCarthy, Nancy Sweet, Ruth Welliver.

**Certification Programs and Interstate Cooperation**

Ruth Welliver (Penn. Dept. Agr.) described the specialized certification programs at the state level and the reasons for a single national certification program.

She stated that specialized certification has developed at the state level in response to industry requests. In such programs, the state publishes regulations
to define a system of production and auditing that begins with approved foundation sources and moves toward a “certified” nursery product. The specialized character of the program usually signifies virus testing in excess of the standard levels. Various terms are used in reference to plant material in the process, including foundation stock, nuclear block, elite stock, increase block, registered stock and certified stock. Common elements of the state programs include: a voluntary program commenced by nursery applications; foundation stock as the initial source of plant material; maintenance and isolation of the material in the cleanest possible environment; documentation; audits of records and inspection and testing of plant material by the state; fees and penalties. States with active specialized programs for certification of grape stock include: California, Missouri, Oregon and Washington. Maryland, New York, and Virginia have inactive or former programs.

Dr. Welliver explained that the interest in a national clean plant program arises from grape industry need that is not being met in all cases by state programs. Growers desiring clean plant material may be located in states without adequate nursery production. Nurseries desirous of producing certified material may be located in states that do not have regulations or resources to support a clean plant program. A state with regulations in place may lack the expertise for evaluation of new scientific information. Differences among state programs pose obstacles to equitable interstate commerce and transparent international commerce.

She posed three alternatives for the future of certification programs:

1. The states could operate under the status quo, i.e., separate programs.

2. A model standard for certification regulations could be developed. Each state would make the decision to adopt or adapt the model standards given its own industry needs. A state could enter into agreements or MOUs with other states to share resources.

3. The NCPN and APHIS could cooperate in developing a national standard for certification that would be voluntary for the states. APHIS could delegate the structure and audit function to the NCPN.

Identification of Teams, Tasks and Time Frames
Erich Rudyj (USDA, PPQ) led a discussion of 18 items identified during the meeting as items possibly needing clarification or review.

1. The eastern and central states have elected to merge into a single Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network (Tier 3). The next meeting of the group will be in October in Geneva, New York. Marc Fuchs (Cornell University) will assume responsibility for organizing the meeting. The next step for the Eastern Network is election of the board members for that Tier 3 body. The issue of eligibility to
vote for board members is not clear. The quality of the nominations for the board may dispense of the need for a formal election (vote) for board members at the Tier 3 level. Deborah Golino (Western Network) and Marc Fuchs (Eastern Network) can properly nominate board members so as to avoid the need for an election at this initial stage of the process, before formal rules for governance have been created.

2. Texas (Texas A&M) will be associated with the Eastern Grape Network (Tier 3) at this time.

3. The “Combined Eastern Region Draft Plan for Extension/Outreach” will be addressed no later than October, 2008, at the Eastern Grape Network meeting. Tony Wolf (Va. Tech.) and Mark Chien (PSU) have drafted a preliminary proposal for distribution of funds for extension/outreach activities. The outreach issue is a big issue in both the Western and Eastern regions. The draft proposal should be forwarded to the National Grape Clean Plant Network (Tier 2) body for a national coordinated effort on outreach issues. Tom Bewick is aware of grant programs other than NCPN money that may be used to supplement outreach efforts. Keith Striegler (Missouri) and Ed Hellman (Texas) are considering an approach that goes through NGWI.

4. Marc Fuchs, Mark Black, and Wenping Qiu will take the lead on a recommendation for pathogen and testing standards for the Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network. Their proposal should be completed by early to mid-August.

5. Marc Fuchs and Tom Burr will arrange for the October, 2008, meeting of the Eastern Clean Plant Network in Geneva, NY. It is important that representatives of the Eastern and Central states attend the meeting, but all NCPN members are invited.

The date for the next NCPN national (Tier 2) meeting was left open. *(The tentative date and time for the meeting is October 8, at Geneva, New York).*

6. The NE1020 group is composed of extension grape researchers from throughout the nation that convene annually every November. They are interested in research and trials on grape varieties of interest in various locations throughout the country. They have asked FPS to acquire and clean up many new varieties. Deborah Golino will make a presentation at the next NE1020 meeting (November, Colorado) to discuss the NCPN and let NE1020 participants know they will be involved in choosing new plant materials.

7. Deborah Golino will collect nominations for board positions for the Western Grape Clean Plant Network. Nominations should be made to her by the end of July. The board members will be selected by late August. It was agreed that members from the Western group only would assist with selection of the Western board and Eastern members shall assist with the Eastern board.
8. The procedure for adding or removing pathogens from the National Standards was discussed. APHIS would not be an appropriate entity to petition if the matter is not a quarantine issue. Not every pathogen on the “National Standards” (Joe Foster) is a quarantine issue. There seems to be a strong consensus among pathologists about which pathogens should be on a National Standards list, which may someday serve as the basis for a national clean plant certification program. A process should be created for each NCPN body to allow for additions or challenges to the pathogen list. This item will be revisited regularly. The regional groups will have ongoing discussions about the appropriate pathogens for the respective regional standards.

9. The question was raised as to what the focus should be on best use of Farm Bill resources. There are a limited number of resources available and no firm parameters. The function of the NCPN Governing Body (Tier 1) is to set priorities for funding, including specification of the commodities to receive money as well as the amount to be allocated to each commodity. Dr. Bandla indicated that priorities were set at a national stakeholders’ meeting in 2007, where the group agreed that resources should be allocated in the following order: grape; fruit tree; small fruit; citrus (see article 6 of the MOU). Deborah Golino commented that funds should be spent on clean plant activities occurring in existing public sector programs prior to the “Plants for Planting” phase. State certification programs present a lower regulatory priority.

10. Deborah Golino will organize the creation of an NCPN website and logo. A team composed of UC Davis and APHIS artists and IT people will collaborate on the logo and website. The Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network was asked to forward any documentation (agenda/ minutes) from prior meetings to Nancy Sweet to post on the website. The National Clean Plant Network website (including all commodities) should be on line by August, 2008. Dr. Golino indicated that she would be formally turning over administrative responsibilities for the Fruit Tree Clean Plant Network to Ken Eastwell at this point.

11. Erich Rudyj discussed the logistics involved in moving the Farm bill funds to the networks. The NCPN Governing Body (Tier 1) is responsible for the initial distribution to the Tier 2 national commodity networks. There are several options for transfer of the money once it is in the account at the USDA, to wit, institutionalizing the Tier 2 bodies so that the money can be transferred to them; or transfer to a university or other cooperator associated with the commodity network (such as UCD or WSU). Funds could be diverted for overhead expenses if the second alternative (transfer to a university or other cooperator) is adopted, although this could also be the case, regardless, if funds pass through other bodies. The cooperative agreement mechanism to provide NCPN funds to cooperators would require separate paperwork for each institution. The group agreed that the goal is to minimize the number of transfers that are required and avoid diversion of funds for overhead expenses.
Erich Rudyj will by mid-August prepare a paper with pros and cons on money transfer mechanisms and an explanation on the procedure for “institutionalizing” or legally chartering a network, so that it could receive funds directly from the USDA (i.e., creating a charter similar to the Plant Board). Deborah Golino suggested that funds be pooled through one of the universities for common expense issues such as travel, importation services and moving grape cuttings to regional foundation blocks.

12. Erich Rudyj requested feedback from the NCPN participants on the USDA 3-agency MOU. Comments should be sent to Erich by August 15, 2008. The final (post-signature) version of the MOU will be posted on the NCPN site.

13. Nancy Sweet will produce minutes of the July 8, 2008, meeting and circulate the draft for comments. She will post the minutes, agenda, handouts, Power Point presentations and webcam recording (if available) on the NCPN website by September 1, 2008.

14. A national NCPN asset inventory analysis is not needed at this time. The Eastern Grape Clean Plant Network is close to completion of its asset inventory, which should be ready by the end of July. Dr. Bandla indicated that the Eastern region performed the inventory as a result of a need to define expertise and assets available to the network. Deborah Golino indicated that the Western region will rely on statements within proposals for funding where applicants list resources available to them.

15. The necessity for a position paper on single v. multiple networks (grapes) was tabled for the present time. Deborah Golino indicated that the East/West Tier 3 Network structure is a good start. More will be learned within the next two years of operation as a bifurcated network.

16. The governance decisions were summarized (see previous discussion in minutes).

17. Harmonization of terminology is a Tier 1 issue. The white paper discussed previously in the minutes will be prepared by Deborah Golino and the rest of the committee within the next year.

18. It was agreed that the appropriate method for establishing a national certification program is a topic that is not ripe for decision at this time but should be regularly revisited at all network meetings. Foundation level material is the primary focus of any such certification effort.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

_________________________________

Nancy Sweet
Foundation Plant Services, UC Davis