

Main Topic	Export Certification Workgroup – Meeting
Date:	May 15, 2013
Time	2:30pm EST
Facilitator:	Maggie Smither
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	
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	X
Marcus McElvaine, Senior Export Specialist,	marcus.mcelvaine@aphis.usda.gov	X
Michael Perry, Export Specialist, PCIT,	michael.j.perry@aphis.usda.gov	X
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

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p>multiple quantities are listed (i.e. board feet AND cubic meters)?</p> <p>Is it just currently not technologically possible or not a priority for completion?</p> <p>At this point if more than one quantity is listed in PCIT then PCIT is unable to offer that option to the exporter; the ACO must be contacted to do that.</p> <p><i>CH: Is there a timeline when this is potentially going to be an option in PCIT?</i></p> <p><i>CD: This option is not coming any time soon. With such a variety of ways to capture measurement (lbs., kgs., boxes, etc.), there's no conversion tool available between all the possible measurement variations.</i></p> <p><i>ALSO, from CH: when exporter submits a replace request, PCIT will not allow certificate to split a measurement (10,000 board feet and "x" cubic meters) because there's not enough room in the reason for the split request to list all the measurements needed.</i></p> <p><i>CD: was able to fit 4000 characters in the reason block as both a gov't user and an industry user. This limit went into effect a few months ago, so maybe the exporter needs to try again.</i></p> <p><i>MP: suggested that the applicant could be copying and pasting and the HTML coding is adding to the character #?</i></p> <p><i>ACTION: Carl will make sure that the cutting and pasting isn't happening. He will ask the applicant to try again.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPQ ACO PExD Webinars <p>The webinar series is complete, we have received positive feedback.</p> <p><i>Kudos to Mike Perry for conducting the webinars.</i></p>	

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="326 289 1105 321">• Initial Training – When will it be based on PCIT & PExD? <p data-bbox="326 380 1130 768">The Export Certification training for ACOs is entirely paper based, which is obsolete. All states and USDA use the web-based PCIT system, which is not taught at all in the current Export Certification training. The training needs to be updated so that it reflects the way that export certification is actually done currently, through PCIT, rather than an obsolete method no longer in use that has to be followed up with additional PCIT training to bring these “newly-trained” ACOs up to speed.</p> <p data-bbox="326 827 1117 1346">(This activity is ongoing, notes from last ECW: “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. 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”).</p> <p data-bbox="326 1404 1089 1524"><i>MM: ES continues working with the PDC on storyboards. We’re still on track for July. Will be based on current policy and procedures.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="326 1583 967 1614">• PCIT Certificate Printing Option for Exporters <p data-bbox="326 1673 1130 1854">For example- An exporter has plants located in multiple states. One state is fine with the exporter printing out his/her certificates, but another state is not in favor of allowing this option. The exporter would like to be able to print at his/her office as many as are allowed via the digital signature image.</p>	<p data-bbox="1157 312 1409 432">Submitted by C. Harden of Clemson Univ.</p>

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p>What is being done (or can be done) to alleviate the ‘fear’ that some states (USDA or State Cooperator) have with exporters printing his/her own certificates.</p> <p>Isn’t that why the certificate paper which is distributed to the exporters is recorded so that they can keep track of it and if database audits or an ACO has concerns then that is what audits are for (trust but verify?). A report could be run when an exporter requests more certificate paper to see whether they are asking for more paper than what has been issued.</p> <p>Discussion → How can we distribute the information in a manner which will ease fear and identify auditing ability? How would an ACO/ECS inquire about certificate paper usage?</p> <p><i>MP: Maybe local office doesn’t have signature images on file and we can’t force officers to submit images. Exporter should find out if that is the case at the office refusing to do electronic signature. Maybe Laney or Craig can contact the ECS and follow up.</i></p> <p><i>CH: Why will an ACO physically sign a PC for a company, but refuse to let them print their own phyto with an e-signature? (They’re willing to certify the product so what’s the difference)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Data Sharing <p>Right now access to PCIT data is restricted to within your organization. Specifically, employees of a state have access to their state’s PCIT data but not to that of other states. Discussion → See if there is interest in greater data sharing. There are obstacles to such sharing so the discussion is merely to gauge interest in the idea.</p> <p><i>CS: PCIT Privacy Impact statement would be violated if we shared this information. Before we would look into data sharing, we would need the NPB to make an official request for this to happen.</i></p>	<p>Submitted by M. Cooper; C. Southwick</p>

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p><i>MC: has reported this issue to the ECS, but nothing has been done. He needs a way to find out that a company is lying about certifications from other duty stations. What company is telling you may not be the whole truth.</i></p> <p><i>General consensus is that States/offices should have no problem sharing information with each other without ES just providing info and violating PIS. The problem is knowing who to contact to ask questions. MM asked that Mike C send this information to Craig and Marcus for follow up. MC has sent it all to Curt Thornburg weeks ago. Craig will contact Curt and follow up. MC has a feeling that this is more widespread, but doesn't have access to the information.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next PCIT Release <p><i>PCIT 6.3 is scheduled for release in June. Proposed items for this release include the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Enable PCIT to pull AD data directly from PExD.</i> <p><i>If people are using the "other" option, this interface won't work as they won't find the correct info in PExD. ES will probably schedule webinars on how the interface works. Pulling over treatment data will not be part of this release.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Allow an applicant to duplicate an application 20 times.</i> <p><i>Applicant will have the ability to edit individual PCs (container #, etc)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Implement the electronic exchange of certificate data.</i> <p><i>Implementation of this program will be done with the Netherlands. PCIT will automatically send an xml message (PC data) to the Netherlands. They will not</i></p>	

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p><i>get an image of the phyto. The ACO will get a message on the screen that a message was sent to the Netherlands.</i></p>	
2.	<p>Policy - Treatments/ Certification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KD/HT Lumber – Update on draft policy if available <p><i>Policy has been revised and is being reviewed by the trade director. ES hopes to have something out before the next ECW call.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soil Tolerances – Update if available <p><i>Background: WA State and OR put together a soil tolerance guidance document for seed for countries that do not have a zero tolerance for soil and seeds</i></p> <p><i>MM: most countries prohibit soil (without specifying zero tolerance), so we can't make a general tolerance without negotiating with the trading partner. ES can't support the document.</i></p>	
3.	<p>PPQ Export Certification Policy for Grain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy was reviewed; there is no change. <p><i>MS: Peas and pulses are still considered grain. Policy will NOT be changed. If you get an IP for grain that asks for bacteria/disease/fungus freedom AD, please send up the chain to ECS and it'll get to ES and we'll follow up with appropriate Trade Director.</i></p>	M. Smither
4.	<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. • Certification process was discussed through export certification and trade management meetings. There 	ES/All

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p>should be less inconsistency and an improved understanding of processes.</p> <p><i>Issue has been reviewed several times. A policy doc will be coming up from ES soon. A draft has been distributed to ECS for comment. ACTION: MM will send a draft out to ECW for comment today or tomorrow.</i></p>	
5.	<p>Open Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seeds to Jordan <p>PC and “no import permit presented” AD concern (need non-compliance document for reference/support)</p> <p><i>Onion seed shipment rejected because of no IP. MM is still working on the issue. He received some information, but it’s in Arabic.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Alfalfa seed to ARG issue: <p><i>Background: SENASA offers an option of pest freedom based on production area freedom and other state has field walk inspection option. Two states on same phyto had different ADs for same pest. ARG won’t accept the PC because the same pest is listed twice in the ADs.</i></p> <p><i>MS: no immediate solution to this problem. Issue has been forwarded to the Trade director, but is not a priority. Suggests getting a different PC for each state. Not sure how this would be done when the shipment is blended.</i></p> <p><i>CS: Would ARG be willing to accept a modified AD that includes production area and field inspection.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● OR and frozen berries <p><i>There have been problems getting frozen berries to CHN</i></p>	<p>All</p> <p>Submitted by M. Cooper</p>

No.	Topic	Responsible
	<p><i>because CHN is requiring a phyto. States used to be to issue State phytos but can't anymore since all int'l shipments must have a FPC.</i></p> <p><i>MM: As per ISPM 32, a PC shouldn't be required for frozen fruits and vegetables as the pest risk associated with such products is considered very low. Suggest that prior to freezing commodity, the shipment should be inspected so a PC can be issued. (they also want PCs for frozen peas)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IT security training <p><i>CD: Received word today that All users touching AgLearn (ie. all ACOs taking reaccreditation and initial training) must take the security training. Currently, there are 650 people that still haven't taken IT training. If they don't do it by June 6, they'll be shut out of AgLearn. Next step may be locked out of PCIT.</i></p> <p>ACTION: <i>ES will sort the list of names and send it out to the field so they can follow up. ES will send out a message to ECS about this topic and will post a message in PCIT. Craig also has a message drafted and he will distribute as widely as he can.</i></p> <p><i>As more problems are identified in the field with State/City people doing the training, please let ES know so that we can continue challenging this decision.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Meeting July 10, 2013 –Wednesday. 	

1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance on Pest Free Areas (PFA) and Pest Free Place of Productions (PFPP). The document also provides information regarding phytosanitary certification.

2. BACKGROUND

PPQ is obligated to comply with the phytosanitary requirements established by foreign countries. There may be circumstances where scientific evidence would negate the requirements, however, PPQ cannot ignore or change the foreign requirements to enable certification, without first negotiating with the importing (receiving) country.

It was recently discovered that phytosanitary certificates attesting to PFA and PFPP were based solely on field inspection results. This practice is not consistent with international standards or APHIS policy. It was also discovered that laboratory tests were being conducted after positive finds were made from field inspections, and that not all shipments were receiving an official phytosanitary inspection.

3. POLICY

Pest Free Area (PFA), Pest Free Place of Production (PFPP) and Field Inspections

A country may require that a commodity originate from a PFA or a PFPP. In order to qualify for this requirement, PFAs and PFPPs must be demonstrated by scientific evidence as described below.

Establishing a PFA

1. A written plan outlining how the proposed PFA would satisfy the requirements found in [ISPM 4](#) and [ISPM 8](#) must be developed. The requirements for establishing and maintaining the PFA will vary according to the biology of the pest, the size and nature of the area, and the available information pertaining to the pest. The methods used to achieve the PFA may include:

- A. General surveillance supported by data (historical records)
- B. Surveys (include survey type and proposed methods)—all survey data must be entered into an appropriate record keeping system (e.g. [National Agricultural Pest information System \(NAPIS\)](#), Integrated Plant Health Information System (IPHIS), etc.)
- C. Regulatory controls (buffer zones, restrictions on movement of regulated articles, routine monitoring, etc.)
- D. Auditing of records (review and evaluation)
- E. Documentation (reports and work plans)

2. If a survey was conducted, the negative survey data **must** be entered into the appropriate record keeping system.

3. Periodic checks to verify that pest freedom has been maintained **must** be carried out and entered into the record keeping system as outlined in the accepted PFA plan.

Establishing a PFPP

1. A written plan outlining how the proposed PFPP would satisfy the requirements found in [ISPM 10](#) and [ISPM 8](#) **must** be developed. The requirements for establishing and maintaining the PFPP will vary according to the biology of the pest, the size and nature of the area, and the available information pertaining to the pest. The methods used to achieve the PFPP may include:

- A. A system to establish pest freedom including official surveys for one or more years as appropriate
- B. A system to maintain pest freedom
 - i. Preventive measures (e.g. elimination of other host material)
 - ii. Exclusion measures (e.g. physical barriers, screens, controls)
 - iii. Pest control measures (e.g. cultural methods, treatments and resistant cultivars)
- C. Verification that pest freedom has been attained or maintained (e.g. growing season inspections, compliance agreements, sampling, etc.)
- D. A system to maintain product identity, consignment integrity and phytosanitary security
- E. The establishment and maintenance of an appropriate buffer zone

2. Surveys (include survey type and proposed methods) and/or growing season inspections can be conducted. All survey data must be entered into an appropriate record keeping system (e.g. [National Agricultural Pest information System \(NAPIS\)](#), Integrated Plant Health Information System (IPHIS), etc.)

3. Periodic checks to verify that pest freedom has been maintained **must** be carried out and entered into the record keeping system as outlined in the accepted PFPP plan.

Field Inspections

Many states and counties conduct field inspections to meet foreign import requirements for various United States commodities. Often, foreign countries require a growing season inspection by an official certifying agency in the country of origin and the results of the inspection may be recorded on a phytosanitary certificate. USDA-APHIS-PPQ recognizes all States and Counties field inspection reports for phytosanitary certification purposes. Any State or County issuing certificates with a question pertaining to a field inspection report should contact the issuing State or County for clarification.

4. CLARIFICATION

- 1. All consignments must have a visual phytosanitary inspection by an ACO regardless if a laboratory test or field inspections were conducted (except commodities inspected by approved third parties (i.e. FGIS, AMS, entities under the National Cotton Compliance Agreement).
 - 2. If a country requires a commodity be from a PFA or PFPP, then it must follow the guidance in the XPM for establishment. Field inspections alone are not enough to meet these conditions.
-

3. If a country allows for field inspection or laboratory testing, as the basis for certification, then a positive result of either can't be replaced with a negative result.

Please note: When given an option of either a field inspection or laboratory testing the exporter can choose one or the other of those options. Freedom from can be met by field inspections during active growth of the mother plants **or** by laboratory analysis. However, if the field inspection is conducted and found positive then the seed is considered positive and a negative laboratory test cannot be used in lieu of the positive field inspection.

4. If a country requires an Additional Declaration (AD) relating to a field inspection for a pest which does not occur in the U.S. or a political subdivision thereof, such as a State and the requested AD asks for freedom from the pest of pathogen, the AD must be changed to read, "Pest X" does not occur in the United States or identified State(s)."

5. FURTHER INFORMATION

Additional guidance is provided below for your reference. Follow up questions or concerns can be addressed to Export Services at ppqexportservices@aphis.usda.gov or (301) 851- 2319.

6. RESOURCES

Use the following resources for additional information:

- Area identifiers, PPQ
- Biological and Technical Services, PPQ, Riverdale through your Export Certification Specialist (ECS)
- Cooperative extension services
- Crop Protection Compendium (CABI)
- Plant Pest Home Page
- State or County officials
- Universities

7. GLOSSARY

Area

An officially defined country, part of a country or all or parts of several countries [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999; based on the World Trade Organization Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (WTO, 1994)]

Detection survey

Survey conducted in an area to determine if pests are present [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995]

Field

A plot of land with defined boundaries within a place of production on which a commodity is grown [FAO, 1990]

Find free

To inspect a consignment, field or place of production and consider it to be free from a specific pest [FAO, 1990]

Free from (of a consignment, field or place of production)

Without pests (or a specific pest) in numbers or quantities that can be detected by the application of phytosanitary procedures [FAO, 1990; revised FAO, 1995; CEPM, 1999]

Monitoring

An official ongoing process to verify phytosanitary situations [CEPM, 1996]

Monitoring survey

Ongoing survey to verify the characteristics of a pest population [FAO, 1995]

Pest free area

An area in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained [FAO, 1995]

Pest free place of production

Place of production in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period [ISPM 10:1999]

Pest free production site

A defined portion of a place of production in which a specific pest does not occur as demonstrated by scientific evidence and in which, where appropriate, this condition is being officially maintained for a defined period and that is managed as a separate unit in the same way as a pest free place of production [ISPM 10:1999]

Phytosanitary import requirements

Specific phytosanitary measures established by an importing country concerning consignments moving into that country [ICPM, 2005]

Place of production

Any premises or collection of fields operated as a single production or farming unit. This may include production sites which are separately managed for phytosanitary purposes [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1999]

Surveillance

An official process which collects and records data on pest occurrence or absence by survey, monitoring or other procedures [CEPM, 1996]

Survey

An official procedure conducted over a defined period of time to determine the characteristics of a pest population or to determine which species occur in an area [FAO, 1990; revised CEPM, 1996]

Sources:

NAPPO RSPM 36 - Phytosanitary Guidelines for the Movement of Seed
FAO ISPM 4 - Requirements for the establishment of pest free areas
FAO ISPM 5 - Glossary of phytosanitary terms
FAO ISPM 8 - Determination of pest status in an area
FAO ISPM 10 - Requirements for the establishment of pest free places of production and pest free production sites
USDA APHIS PPQ Phytosanitary Export Database
USDA APHIS PPQ Export Program Manual

8. ADDENDUM

Specific Additional Declarations (AD) that may be required for certifying commodities as free from regulated pests by importing countries:

“Shipment is free of” –

Certification can be based on either a growing season inspection of the parent plants, a laboratory test (if available) or a visual inspection (if applicable).

“Plants were inspected in the field during the most active growing season and found to be free from” –

Certification has to be based on a growing season inspection of the parent plants during the active growing season.

“Produced in a PFA or PFPP” –

Certification has to be based on the policy for establishment of a PFA/PFPP.

“Tested and found free from” –

Certification has to be based on a laboratory testing.
