

Merit Analysis for top 45 Global Minor Use Priorities Summer 2020

Use 1 form per crop/pest priority

(To be conducted by a committee of global proponents for the priority)

Temperate					
Blueberry (field), SWD, 38 (total of 2 forms)					
Ashfaq Sial, USA, ashisial@uga.edu					
Criteria*	Points				
1. Is the crop-pest combination a situation with no available products? 2 points					no
	Solution 1	Solution 2	Solution 3	Solution 4	Solution 5
2. Are there potential solutions?	MBI-203 SC2 (Chromobacterium subtsugae)(same active ingredient as Grandevo)				
3. Company name	Marrone BioInnovations				
4. Company contact name and e-mail	Tim Johnson tjohnson@marronebio.com				
5. Level of registrant support globally – list of countries registrant is willing to supply GLP test substance, standards and pursue a label (A)	USA, Canada, EU, Australia Yes registrant support				
6. List of countries having field and analytical ability and willing to conduct trials (B)	Expects to be exempt from GLP residue data requirement				
7. <i>Insert 1 point for each match between countries that registrant supports, and countries willing (A + B)</i>	4				
8. Is efficacy already established against the target pest or can it be bridged via rationale from other labeled uses? <i>Insert 1point</i>	1 – yes Trials underway. Some data may be available by Marrone Bio Innovations. Efficacy may be bridged via Grandevo				
9. Are there any residue data already available for the crop/pest combination and if so, from where?	NA				
10. Are project champions identified?(Insert names) <i>Insert 1point</i>	1 - Michigan and Georgia blueberry growers				
11. Will a uniform GAP (rate, application pattern, PHI, formulation, premix be able to be established across all countries? <i>Yes = Insert 1point ; No = 0</i>	1				
12. Does the product replace old technology with reduced risk technology? <i>(1 point per old product replaced with reduced risk defined as a more favorable environmental or human health risk assessment)</i>	1				
13. Does the potential solution fit into IPM systems, i.e. low risk to beneficials <i>Insert 1point</i>	1 Biopesticide				

14. Does the project complement current technologies to address pesticide resistance and/or control resistant pest/disease/weed or provide an alternative mode of action? <i>Insert 1point</i>	1 Yes, it provides a rotational partner with spinosad to reduce the number of Spinosad applications which will reduce the risk of Spinosad resistance, a major issue in CA and a growing concern of organic berry growers nationally				
15. Are there any crop grouping MRL opportunities? (1 point per crop group)	1 Yes Berries (13) crop group				
16. Comments (Please use this space to make a memo of any other information that might be points of consideration such as JMPR cycle, CODEX, EPA, EU registration/MRL status, ability of a product to control multiple pest priorities, can be used across multiple crops, one formulation or premix combination used in one part of the world, regulatory needs, etc. No specific points, but useful information	There is lack of effective products for organic management of SWD that can be rotated with spinosad to control SWD in berry production systems. Grandevo has been used in some regions but prelim data indicate that this liquid formulation may be easier to apply with commonly used spray equipment and may have better efficacy than Grandevo.				
TOTAL POINTS	11				
GRAND TOTAL					11

*if not specified otherwise in the 'criteria' box, assign 1 point per solution in gray boxes only.

Temperate

Blueberry, Spotted wing drosophila and 27

Adam Doxford, UK, adam_dox@hotmail.co.uk and John Wise, USA wisejohn@msu.edu

Criteria*

5

1. Is the crop-pest combination a situation with no available products? 2 points	0				
	Solution 1	Solution 2	Solution 3	Solution 4	Solution 5
2. Are there potential solutions?	Cyrantraniliprole	Spinosad	Chromobacterium subsuugae	Bait sprays	Trapping and monitoring
3. Company name	FMC	Corteva	Marone	Andermatt	NIAB EMR
4. Company contact name and e-mail	Justine Thornton	Sheridawn Schoeman	Tim Johnson	Andrew Brown	Michelle Fountain
5. Level of registrant support globally – list of countries registrant is willing to supply GLP test substance, standards and pursue a label (A)	UK and EU USA FMC supports all soft fruit uses, but awaiting a greater level of detail on residues data available a support for generation of additional detail.	UK and EU USA Corteva supports extension of lifespan currently.	USA UK and EU uncertain Last conversation with Marrone representatives indicated they were still supporting registration of the active and product in Europe despite regulatory barriers.	UK and EU Already registered and supported in the UK, uncertain of registration status in EU and US. Registrant is keen to support expansion and collaboration.	UK and EU No commercial developments currently. Potential to develop improved lures through Bayer 'Decis Trap' system, but collaboration in early days.
6. List of countries having field and analytical ability and willing to conduct trials (B)	UK and EU USA Need to discuss with EU MUCF to establish willingness and capacity.	UK and EU USA Not relevant for this crop.	USA UK and EU Will depend on residues exemption	UK and EU	UK and EU
7. <i>Insert 1 point for each match between countries that registrant supports, and countries willing (A + B)</i>	2	2	2	1	1
8. Is efficacy already established against the target pest or can it be bridged via rationale from other labeled uses? <i>Insert 1point</i>	1	1	1	1	0
9. Are there any residue data already available for the crop/pest combination and if so, from where?	Yes USA	Yes UK and USA	Yes USA	N/A	N/A
10. Are project champions identified?(Insert	Adam Doxford	Adam Doxford	Adam Doxford	Michelle Fountain	Michelle Fountain

names) <i>Insert 1point</i>					
11. Will a uniform GAP (rate, application pattern, PHI, formulation, premix be able to be established across all countries? <i>Yes = Insert 1point ; No = 0</i>	0 Potential for great variability between countries and zones. Some may be protected/outdoor depending on climate.	0 Potential for great variability between countries and zones. Some may be protected/outdoor depending on climate.	0 Too early to tell.	1 Application via tank mix should be uniform throughout EU. Individual GAPs of co-mix may vary.	1 Species biology dependent, may vary based on climate and habitat of off-crop areas.
12. Does the product replace old technology with reduced risk technology? (1 point per old product replaced with reduced risk defined as a more favorable environmental or human health risk assessment)	0 Technically new technology, though has been use for the past 3-4 years through 'emergency authorisation'	0 Potential for resistance, though effectiveness is better than other available actives.	1	1	1
13. Does the potential solution fit into IPM systems, i.e. low risk to beneficials <i>Insert 1point</i>	0	0	1	1	1
14. Does the project complement current technologies to address pesticide resistance and/or control resistant pest/disease/weed or provide an alternative mode of action? <i>Insert 1point</i>	1	0 Addition of bait sprays could compliment use/improve effectiveness.	1	1	1 When incorporating 'attract and kill' principle, could be combined with suitable lures to improve effectiveness.
15. Are there any crop grouping MRL opportunities? (1 point per crop group)	1 (all cane/bush fruit with representatives of group)	1 Already available	1	N/A	N/A

<p>16. Comments</p> <p>(Please use this space to make a memo of any other information that might be points of consideration such as JMPR cycle, CODEX, EPA, EU registration/MRL status, ability of a product to control multiple pest priorities, can be used across multiple crops, one formulation or premix combination used in one part of the world, regulatory needs, etc.</p> <p>No specific points, but useful information</p>	<p>Gaining permanent registration for cyantraniliprole in the UK (and EU) for use on soft fruit crops is challenging due to the environmental profile of the substance. Furthermore commercial agreements have hampered the use of alternative (registered) products.</p> <p>Product is effective and broad spectrum, may have limited lifespan depending on how quickly resistance develops.</p> <p>Blueberry residues data/extrapolations may be necessary</p>	<p>Active substance provides effective control, but nearing the end of it's lifespan. Registrant agreed to extend lifespan pending registration of replacement molecule.</p> <p>Already registered but Efficacy/safety could be improved through target sprays and use of bait sprays</p>	<p>Shown to provide effective control but faced with setbacks in the EU registration process.</p> <p>Recent discussion with the company indicates that registration in Europe is still desirable, but may be another 2-3 years away.</p> <p>Residues will depend upon EU exemption.</p>	<p>UK SWD research has shown promise through attract-and-kill research for SWD.</p> <p>This method uses a registered adjuvant (Combi Protec) which is sprayed in conjunction with effective PPP active substances at half rate in tank mix.</p> <p>Flies are driven to consume residues, ingestion improves lethality.</p> <p>Still in early stages – no crop specific testing done.</p>	<p>UK SWD research has considered various trapping and monitoring methods.</p> <p>Further development of work is required to identify an effective trapping strategy for winter morphs in off-crop areas.</p> <p>In crop trapping does not give accurate forecasts due to fruit being more attractive to egg-laying females.</p> <p>Potential for research collaboration to share results and develop experimental methods.</p>
<p>TOTAL POINTS</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>5</p>
<p>GRAND TOTAL</p>					<p>27</p>