



Australian Government
Department of Agriculture

APPPC ePhyto workshop

Session 4
Successes, challenges and
emerging issues



Peter Neimanis, Plant Export Operations

October 2014

Australian experiences

This presentation will look at

- Background to eCert/ePhyto in Australia
- Experience and challenges
- Opportunities

Background

Successes

Australia - background

Australia has two systems for sending and receiving electronic certificates.

- eCert (for exports) – linked to EXDOC
 - eCert website
 - eCert SOAP interface
 - eCert SMTP interface
- eCert for iMports – linked to AIMS
 - eCert SOAP interface

The systems were established separately to align with existing export and import systems.

Australia - background

eCert (for exports) – currently sends certificate data to

- China - all commodities (inc phyto)
- USA – phytos and meat
- Japan - meat
- Canada - meat
- Hong Kong – meat, fish and dairy
- Netherlands - meat
- Philippines - meat (in trial)

The eCert system began as trial between Australia and Japan in 2008 before moving to a full eCert exchange in May 2011.

Australia - background

eCert for iMports – currently receives certificate data from

- New Zealand - phytos
- Netherlands - all commodities (in trial)

The eCert for iMports system commenced operation in 2012 with receiving Phytos from New Zealand as a proof of concept.

Approval received to expand system to receive two more countries in 2014/15 and five more countries in 2015/16.

Australia - background

Business impact

- To support implementation of ePhyto (for exports or imports) requires alignment of other 'domestic' processes and systems.
- Consideration of aligning with Customs processes.
- How does it align with import clearance process?
- What role does industry play in providing information and does that need to change with ePhyto?
- Departmental IT capacity and capital bid/funding process

Challenges

Challenges – areas of difficulty

In developing government to government exchange of certificate data, there are a number of areas that have to be harmonised to allow efficient communication between two system.

- Transmission Control Protocols
- Technical support
- UNCEFACT version
- Standards WSDLs
- Reliance on paper certification

Challenges – Transmission Control Protocol

Transmission Control Protocols (TCP) provide the interface between an application program (eg. Domestic system) and the internet (for exchange)

For example, TCPs provide a structure for how data is placed into ‘packets’ and arranges them in a sequential order. This occurs to manage network congestion.

The TCP defines how the exporting and importing system are going to exchange ePhyto data.

Challenges – Transmission Control Protocol

There are a number of Transmission Control Protocols (TCPs) mechanisms that sending/receiving countries can opt for

- SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol) – one option for ‘system to system’ exchange of certificate data via secure web services.
- SMTP (Simple Mail Transfer Protocol) – a direct e-mail exchange between export and import authorities allowing automated transfer of certificate information. Requires digital certificates.
- Web view - where by the receiving country can view the certificate on a secure web site hosted by the sending country. Not complete exchange.

Countries currently negotiate which is the best option for exchange.

Challenges – technical support

In managing the exchange of certificate data between two systems, there is a level of technical and systems support that must be established.

This can include internal (domestic system) service level agreements to manage outages or systems issues within an agreed timeframe – critical if another country is ‘calling’ to receive certificates.

System support staff are also required to update and manage systems to ensure that required enhancements/fixes occur in a timely manner.

Critical to identify a technical contact for both importing and exporting countries. Key during trial phase as it makes problem solving and progressing easier – important to ensure on-going support.

Challenges – UNCEFACT version

United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) . UN/CEFACT is an organisation that makes international Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) standards for electronic trade documents in XML format.

There are 94 forms developed by UN/CEFACT, as at May 2014 (version D13B) – of interest to us are

- SPSCertificate
- SPSAcknowledgement

XML schema to standardise transmitted message data. There are numerous versions and it is important that both exchanging countries support the common version.

Challenges – standard WSDLs

WSDLs are the Web Services Description Language.

WSDLs are XML based and serves as the communication language between the two systems. It is how the two systems ‘talk’ with each other.

Generally the sending authority sets the WSDL and these can vary greatly in length and complexity.

There is no standard for eCert (ePhyto) WSDLs and, as such, there is a lot of communication between authorities to get WSDL working for both parties.

Challenges – reliance on paper

In the move to electronic certification, there has to be a commitment to paper-less trading.

Some countries have difficulty in moving to paper-less trading

- paper based certification embedded in legislation
- other import/export processes remaining paper based

Electronic and paper may run together during the initial 'validation' period but the receiving country has to commit to an end date for paper.

Emerging issues

Opportunities

Opportunities – IPPC ePhyto Steering Group

The IPPC has established the ePhyto Steering Group to oversee the progress of ePhyto matters.

The IPPC ePhyto Steering Group was established by the 8th session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) to commence work on key components to assist countries with their implementation of ePhyto.

The ePhyto Steering Group is comprised of

- +Walter Fabian Alessandrini (Latin America, Argentina)
- +Christian B. Dellis (North America region, United States of America)
- +Chen Maoyu (Asia region, China)
- +Peter Neimanis (Southwest Pacific region, Australia)
- +Nico Horn – chair (Europe region, The Netherlands)
- +Peter Thomson (Bureau member, New Zealand)
- +Craig Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat)
- +Josiah M. Syanda (Africa region, Kenya)

Opportunities – IPPC ePhyto Steering Group

The IPPC has established the ePhyto Steering Group to oversee the progress of ePhyto matters.

The work streams are aligned with CPM direction

1. Harmonisation of terms (Appendix 1 to ISPM 12)
2. The Hub concept - single point of exchange
 - i. Single WSDL
3. Awareness raising
4. Capacity development

Opportunities – IPPC ePhyto Steering Group

Importantly, the CPM-9

1) noted the activities of the ePhyto Steering Group

2) noted the summary of the ePhyto Hub Feasibility Study provided in CPM 2014/INF/13

3) noted the recommendations in the summary of the ePhyto Hub Feasibility Study provided in CPM 2014/INF/13

4) supported the continued work of the ePhyto Steering Group under the oversight of the CPM Bureau

Opportunities – IPPC ePhyto Steering Group

The CPM-9

5) encouraged the ePhyto Steering Group urgently to continue its work including:

- **increasing awareness**
- facilitating **capacity development** opportunities (with the Capacity Development Committee)
- finalising procedures for maintenance of **harmonised terms, codes and transmission protocols**
- updating **transmission protocols** and the databases of harmonised terms and codes
- continuing with the analysis of a possible **ePhyto hub** taking into account the recommendations in the summary of the ePhyto Hub Feasibility Study provided in CPM 2014/INF/13; and,

Opportunities – IPPC ePhyto Steering Group

The CPM-9

6) requested the CPM Bureau to report back to CPM-10 (2015) on the progress made on ePhyto, including the issues raised by contracting parties referred to above, and providing adequate information to the CPM to make decisions on how to proceed with ePhyto.

Opportunities – IPPC ePhyto Steering Group

ePhyto discussion at CPM-10 (2015)

The CPM has requested that the ePhyto Steering Group, through the CPM Bureau, report back to CPM-10 specifically on a detailed costing of a potential Hub.

The ePhyto Steering Group will also report on all ePhyto developments and will facilitate a side session on ePhyto at CPM10.

The ePhyto Steering Group also provided an update of progress to the IPPC Strategic Planning Group (SPG) Meeting in Rome in October 2014.

Opportunities for ePhyto within the APPPC

Ensure ePhyto implementation within the APPPC is IPPC consistent

- Commitment from APPPC to work towards single point exchange rather than continue with commodity based country-to-country arrangements
- APPPC contributes support for ePhyto approach in IPPC CPM
- APPPC develops information sharing 'portal' on website
- APPPC develops action plan with
 - Detail on 'next steps'
 - Who is responsible
 - Associated timeframes.
- APPPC is leading region for ePhyto development and implementation

Questions