



ORGANISATION NORD AMERICAINE POUR LA PROTECTION DES PLANTES  
 NORTH AMERICAN PLANT PROTECTION ORGANIZATION  
 ORGANIZACION NORTEAMERICANA DE PROTECCION A LAS PLANTAS  
 CANADA UNITED STATES MEXICO

## NAPPO Panel Report

Panel Name:	<b>Electronic Phytosanitary Certification</b>	
Location:	Conference call	
Date:	November 17, 2009	
Panel Chair:	Nathalie Bruneau	
Participants:		
Nathalie Bruneau, Canada, CFIA	Roberto Betanzos, Mexico	Ian McDonell, NAPPO
Patrice Sinave, Canada, CFIA	Jason Dittrich, USA	Nedelka Marin, NAPPO
<b>Summary</b>		
Issue 1:	<p>Update on the work achieved by the 3 working groups established during the Electronic Phytosanitary Certification Workshop (held in Ottawa, Canada - May 19-21, 2009)</p> <p>WG1: For external validation of the New Zealand draft ISPM 12 Data Map (Jason lead)            WG2: IT/Business working group to review the business rules, and select a security transfer protocol. (Corinne IT lead/ Christian Business lead)            WG3: Master list of botanical names and working group to address it. Same group as WG1.</p>	
Consensus:	<p>For WG2: A questionnaire was circulated in the summer 2009 and completed by approx. 5-6 countries. Craig Southwick is currently compiling the information gathered and coordinating responses on business rules. For WG3: Jason informed that the US list of botanical names was ready to be shared. It was mentioned that Korea wants to join working groups but process to participate and join in a working group is unclear.</p>	
Issue 2:	Review of 2009-2010 E-Cert panel assignments.	
Consensus:	<p>Panel assignments for 2009-2010 are closely linked to work identified to be carried out by the working groups put in place at the Ottawa workshop. Nathalie to work with Ian to ensure coordination of the 3 Working groups and ensure follow up on the action items identified in the Ottawa workshop report. Need to develop a checklist of specific items that would fall under assignment #1.</p>	
Issue 3:	Update on the outcome of the September 2009 UN/CEFACT conference in Sapporo, Japan	
Consensus:	<p>Patrice reported on Japan UN/CEFACT meeting. The UN/CEFACT schema for eCert is being published on the UN/CEFACT website. The purpose of the meeting was principally to finalize the guide to the schema. During that meeting, consensus was gained that the guide should be as generic as possible and tailored by each country to meet its needs.</p> <p>Some countries are already testing and using the UN/CEFACT schema including South</p>	

	Korea-Australia in a pilot project using the UN/CEFACT schema; China, the European Union, The Netherlands-Canada pilot project using the UN/CEFACT schema.
Issue 4:	Establishment /hosting of a bulletin board on IPPC Website
Consensus:	Ian to follow up with David Nowell at IPPC on the Establishment /hosting of a bulletin board on IPPC Website for idea exchange.
Issue 5:	Discussion towards agreement on a common message to use for electronic phytosanitary certificates exchange.
Consensus:	<p>The following items were discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important that the TAG group assist the business people in validating the implementation of the business rules within the schema.</li> <li>• Don't want to have to re-map data elements contained in an electronic message with every country because this would increase systems development costs.</li> <li>• Important to get the business requirements document for NAPPO updated first ; then we could talk about schema and systems.</li> <li>• UN CEFACT – does not enforce rules- overlay rules enforced by NPPOs are necessary, e.g. what is the mandatory information in the message versus optional based on ISPM12.</li> <li>• It was also discussed that business rules need international agreement so needs international participation. The panel should review the business rules document that was prepared in 2007.</li> </ul> <p>Consensus is building internationally in plant protection to use UNCEFACT. The NAPPO Panel should make a recommendation on moving ahead with UNCEFACT schema or not.</p>
Issue 6:	Mechanism for exchange of electronic certificates
Consensus:	<p>We need to clarify the requirements for sending and receiving electronic certificates</p> <p>It was felt that this question need further discussion with the group, should be added as an item to discuss at the next meeting.</p>

### Next Steps

Responsible Person	Action	Date
Ian McDonell / Nathalie Bruneau	Discuss progress of working groups with Christian Dellis	November 20, 2009
Nathalie Bruneau / Jason Dittrich	Prepare a presentation on e-cert for non-technical people	November 20, 2009
Roberto Betanzos / Ian McDonell	Confirm details of next Panel and TAG meeting in Mexico	November 27, 2009
Ian McDonell	Propose another international workshop at meeting of Regional Plant Protection Organizations	December 1, 2009
Patrice Sinave	Circulate a copy of the NAPPO business requirements document.	November 17, 2009
Nathalie Bruneau	Develop a checklist of specific items that would fall under assignment #1 of e-cert panel for 2009-2010 and review assignments.	tbd
Ian McDonell	Follow up with Dave Nowell re: Establishment /hosting of a bulletin board on IPPC Website for idea exchange	November 20, 2009

<b>Next Meeting</b>	
Location:	Mexico City, Mexico
Date:	February 10, 11 2010
<b>Proposed Agenda Items</b>	
1. Presentation of each country's developments of electronic systems including an estimate of time before capabilities to exchange phytosanitary certificates electronically. (each country)	
2. Report on the international electronic phytosanitary certification steering committee. (Ian)	
3. Review the E-Cert for non-technicians presentation, especially terminology. Discuss using this document for education and tech. transfer. (All)	
4. Update on Ottawa working groups. Issues that need to be addressed, next steps. See issue 1 above. (Nathalie)	
5. Demo of enforcement of business rules based on ISPM12 on a message carried under UN/CEFACT SPS schema. Demo of the validation process. (Jason / Corinne?)	
6. Discuss the development of an implementation guide for electronic phytosanitary certification. References: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UNCEFACT Phyto E-cert mapping document</li> <li>• NAPPO business rules document, last update March 28, 2006.</li> <li>• UNCEFACT eCert implementation guide</li> <li>• NAPPO vision document</li> <li>• Assess the need to develop an eCert toolkit similar the toolkit recently published by CITES.</li> </ul> Identify next steps NAPPO level, International level.	
7. 7. Exchange mechanism  Discuss potential options for exchange mechanism of phytosanitary certificates. (Structure of the databases. Push or pull options; how to best structure databases for sending and receiving certificates)	