

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)

Tropical							
Coffee, <i>Hypothenemus hampei</i> 12							
Adriana Castañeda, Colombia, 2018 adrianacolombia@gmail.com							
Criteria*	Points						
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	Solution 6	Solution 7
2. Are there potential solutions?	Bifenthrin	Indoxacarb	Cyantranilprole	Spinetoram	Guarda	Tetranilprole	Broflanilide
3. Company name	FMC	FMC	FMC	Corteva	Biosafe	Bayer	BASF
4. Company contact name and e-mail	Sheldon Sumpter sheldon.sumpter@fmc.com	Geoff Cornwell Geoff.cornwell@fmc.com	Geoff Cornwell Geoff.cornwell@fmc.com	Brian Brett brian.bret@corteva.com	Gretchen Pettis gpettis@biosafesystems.com	Shane Trainer shane.trainer@bayer.com	Sergio Ruvalcaba sergio.ruvalcaba@basf.com
5. Level of registrant support globally – list of countries registrant is willing to supply GLP test substance, standards and pursue a label (A)	0	Australia	Australia	0	0	Australia	0
6. List of countries having field and analytical ability and willing to conduct trials (B)		Panama Costa Rica Colombia Australia	Australia			Australia	
7. Insert 1 point for each match between countries that registrant supports, and countries willing (A + B)	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
8. Is efficacy already established against the target pest or can it be bridged via rationale from other labeled uses? Insert 1point	1	1	1	1	0	0 No	1
9. Are there any residue data already	Yes, IR-4	Yes, IR-4	Yes, IR-4	Yes, IR-4		No	

available for the crop/pest combination and if so, from where?		1	1		Exempt from tolerance		
10. Are project champions identified?(Insert names) <i>Insert 1point</i>		Peter Dal Santo pds@agaware.com. <u>au</u> 1	Peter Dal Santo pds@agaware.com. <u>au</u> 1			Peter Dal Santo pds@agaware.com. <u>au</u>	
11. Will a uniform GAP (rate, application pattern, PHI, formulation, premix be able to be established across all countries? Yes = <i>Insert 1point</i> ; No = 0		NA	NA			NA	
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	0	0	1	1	0 No	
13. Does the potential solution fit into IPM systems, i.e. low risk to beneficials <i>Insert 1point</i>	1 Fair to good IPM fit. Will need to rotate with other products	1	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>	0 IRAC Group 3 pyrethrins + PBO (IRAC 3) already available and being used	1 IRAC Group 22	1 IRAC Group 28	1 IRAC Group 5	1 Thyme Oil, not classified	0 No	

15. Are there any crop grouping MRL opportunities? (1 point per crop group)	0	0	0	0	0	0 No	
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	No Codex MRL EU MRL 0.05 ppm EPA: IR-4 residue project in progress—lab phase	Chosen as the highest priority by the expert team No EPA Tolerance No Codex MRL	Australia would need only efficacy data EPA Tolerance 0.05 ppm Codex MRL 0.05 ppm EU MRL 0.05 ppm Japan MRL 0.05 ppm Mexico MRL 0.05 ppm	In Costa Rica studies shows is no efficacious against CBB EPA Tolerance 0.04 ppm No Codex MRL EU MRL 0.1 ppm	The Company showed interest initially. Exempt from tolerance	No Codex MRL	No Codex MRL Registered in Colombia
TOTAL POINTS	0	6	6	0	0	0	0
GRAND TOTAL							12

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