

Main Topic	Export Certification Workgroup – Meeting
Date:	February 21, 2013
Time	2:30pm EST
Facilitator:	Marcus McElvaine
Scribe	Julie Clapp
Location:	Conference Call: 888-858-2144, code: 5268033

MEMBERS:

Name	Contact Information	Meeting Participant
Mike Bryan, Central Plant Board Representative	bryanm@michigan.gov	X
Laney Campbell, Eastern Region Program Manager	laney.e.campbell@aphis.usda.gov	-
Julie Clapp, Export Specialist, Export Database	julie.l.clapp@aphis.usda.gov	X
Mike Cooper, National and Western Plant Board Representative	mike.cooper@agri.idaho.gov	X
Emilee Douglas, Idaho Dept of Agriculture	EDouglas@agri.idaho.gov	-
Christian Dellis, Deputy Director PIM	christian.b.dellis@aphis.usda.gov	X
Carl Harper, Southern Plant Board Representative	carl.harper@uky.edu	X
Marilyn Kinoshita, Tulare County Agricultural Commissioner, CACASA Representative	giacono@co.tulare.ca.us mkinoshi@co.tulare.ca.us	-
Dennis Martin, Export Specialist	dennis.w.martin@aphis.usda.gov	-
Marcus McElvaine, Senior Export Specialist,	marcus.mcelvaine@aphis.usda.gov	X
Michon Oubichon, Senior Export Specialist,	michon.m.oubichon@aphis.usda.gov	-
Michael Perry, Export Specialist, PCIT,	michael.j.perry@aphis.usda.gov	-
Sarah Scally, Eastern Plant Board Representative	sarah.h.scally@maine.gov	X
Craig Southwick, Western Region Program Manager,	craig.southwick@aphis.usda.gov	X
Terrance Wells, Export Specialist,	terrance.d.wells@aphis.usda.gov	X
Maggie Smither, Export Specialist	margaret.r.smither@aphis.usda.gov	X

Agenda:

No.	Topic	Responsible
1.	<p>PCIT/PExD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCIT/PExD General Information <p><i>Carl was not on the line yet and we weren't sure what this bullet was about. Topic tabled.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCIT/PExD Industry Webinars begin on 2/26 <p><i>There was concern that not enough industry groups were aware of these webinars. Could ES post this information online somewhere?</i></p> <p><i>ES will resend the webinar invites to the ECW and members can forward the invites to their contacts.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPQ ACO PExD Webinars are ongoing, we have received positive feedback. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Training – When will it be based on PCIT & PExD? <p><i>ES is working with the PDC developing initial training material and reviewing what has been done. As lessons are finished, they will be forwarded to the ECW for review/input.</i></p> <p><i>The revised training will be mostly web based training through PCIT. It will be based on the most current version of the XPM, will include a navigating PCIT module and a navigating PExD module. Paper certificate issuance will not be included. It is expected that the new training will be available in July. ES is advising people to hold off on training new ACOs until July, when they can be trained on the new material.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ACO Training for new inspectors can be delayed and not 	<p>Export Services</p> <p>Carl Harper</p>

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p>delivered timely; excessive costs associated with 5 days of training to the state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When PCIT user accounts (industry) are deactivated, users and state offices are not notified as to who has been deactivated. Accounts can be deactivated regardless of whether or not there is money in their account through lack of use and/or failure to login within a time interval. <p><i>ES believes that this is an eAuth condition (180 days of inactivity). Deactivated users can be reactivated by calling the PCIT helpdesk. ES will speak to the developer to see if they can expand the window.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In respect to the PExD, Phytosanitary Export Database, we receive minimal notification that country requirements have changed. This is particularly difficult with European Union when specifics of an additional declaration have changed. With the large number of additional declarations for the EU (18 pages), it would be very helpful for revision dates or some other indicator to be included in the AD glossary or a notification that there have been changes. The previous system (EXCERPT) did include this information. The rationale for this is that the person providing the update would be best suited to add a revision date for the change. <p><i>The date of the revision is in the file description of the document. (Additional Declaration Glossary version 02-04-2013.) It is also in the document footer, so it is on every page.</i></p>	
2.	<p>Policy - Treatments/ Certification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Certifying 'Area Freedom' <p><i>What does APHIS mean by area freedom? (Mike</i></p>	<p>Export Services</p> <p>Mike Cooper</p>

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p><i>understands that countries may apply the term differently)</i></p> <p><i>As long as you have the information/documentation to back up your decision, you can put it on the PC. It should be based on the ISPM standard and should NOT be based on just field inspection.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KD/HT Lumber – Update on draft policy <p><i>We received comments from the field and met with Tyrone. Michon is editing. She will send it to the ECW so that they can distribute it to their stakeholders for their input.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil Tolerances <p><i>Craig has not had a chance to look at it. Request that ES take a look at it and see if it can be made policy. (why or why not). Discussion was tabled until the next ECW call.</i></p>	
3.	<p>Growing Season Field Inspections vs Lab Test Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the growing season field inspection results are positive and that information has been presented to the certifying official the shipment will not be certified even if the lab test results are negative. – Update <p><i>Growing season inspection vs. lab tests (re: Stewart’s wilt)</i></p> <p><i>Field inspection showed symptoms of the pathogen so samples were sent for lab tests. Even though the field showed symptoms, the lab test was negative and ACOs are superseding the field inspection with the lab test. ES told the field that this practice needs to stop. Once you have a “+”, you can’t manipulate it to make “-“.</i></p> <p><i>Whatever we do has to be supported by the importing country. If we need PIM to renegotiate requirements with a country, we need to assemble the information for them</i></p>	All

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<i>to present to the trading partner</i>	
4.	<p>Canada</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FYI - Canada is now enforcing the Directive D-02-12. The bottom line is that bamboo products that are from outside the US are required to be fumigated with the treatment listed on the PC. Since the USGCP and USNCP doesn't have a mechanism in place to add a treatment, an additional PC would have to be issued for the bamboo products associated with the shipments. If the exporters insist on shipping plants with foreign bamboo products, they should not ship under the USGCP or USNCP. They should just have the plants and stakes both certified under a PC. <p><i>Bamboo stakes were regulated separately from the other shipments. As per D-02-12, bamboo needs to be treated.</i></p> <p><i>Advising exporters that if bamboo is from the US, put that somewhere on the commercial documents. As soon as we get confirmation from Canada that this is acceptable, we will put something in PExD.</i></p> <p><i>There are exemptions in the directive.</i></p> <p><i>Stakes were never addressed in USGCP or USNCP → supposed to be low risk commodities. If shipping under these programs, you should get a separate PC.</i></p>	<p>Terrance Wells</p> <p>Carl Harper</p>
5.	<p>Open Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peas and pulses to India <p><i>Field inspections and freedom from nematodes</i></p> <p><i>Now Brazil wants certification from viruses</i></p> <p><i>ES is considering pulling peas/pulses from grain plant part so they can be treated differently depending on how they're handled, so they can be tested for</i></p>	<p>All</p>

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p><i>nematodes/viruses.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCIT Outage <p><i>PCIT was down for about ½ hour yesterday. A CPU failed at NITC. It was a quick fix, so we did not rollover to backup. The CPU will be replaced.</i></p> <p><i>Currently, if PCIT goes down, we give them an hour to fix it. If after 1 hour it is not fixed, we tell them to fallover which takes another hour to do.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting April 24, 2013 – Starting in April our meetings will be on Wednesday. <p><i>It was pointed out that the week of April 21-24 is the Southern Plant Board meeting</i></p>	