Day 1 Panel Discussion:

Plant Pest and Foreign Animal Disease Exclusion, Agricultural Stewardship, and Leveraging Resources

Trade and Industry Breakout Session

Facilitator: Jane Berkow (USDA-PPQ)
Note Taker: Day One – Osvaldo Osmundo (CBP)
Highlights: Dr. Michael Watson (USDA-PPQ)

**Topic:** Stewardship and Resources – *How can Federal, State and private organizations maintain and enhance effective plant pest and foreign animal disease exclusion efforts?*

**Goal:** To maintain effective plant pest exclusion and animal disease efforts, including hitchhiking pests, and wood packing material. To identify the common themes between agencies and organizations to develop a road map for future improvement.

**Breakout Session Purpose (Day 1):**
- Actively engage government and industry representatives.
- To discuss ways to improve our pest exclusion efforts, and identify new ways to leverage our resources to safeguard American agriculture and natural resources.

**Notes – Day One:**
Deputy Assistant Commissioner Winkowski’s opening/welcome remarks challenged the conference attendees to examine opportunities to push pest risk mitigation efforts off shore. Effectively extending our borders out in an effort to mitigate and/or eliminate the pest risk before it reaches the United States.

The trade/industry stakeholder group acknowledged Mr. Winkowski’s remarks and agreed with the need for all entities involved in the supply chain to actively seek out, address and facilitate trade that is both safe and clean.

**Comments/Discussion Threads:**
1. Develop a certification process outside the United States to aid in streamlining the process and ensuring both safe and clean trade.

2. Industry would like to see a continuation and expansion of Cargo Release Authority (CRA) being issued to agriculture specialists. The Miami Port of Entry (POE) was identified as being having a rapidly growing contingent of agriculture specialists actively
seeking CRA on regularly encountered pests. An incentive program taking place in Miami was identified as the catalyst that may be responsible for the rapid increase of CRA being gained by CBPAS in Miami. The group strongly urges CBP to examine the Miami model of providing incentives to agriculture specialists who actively gain and retain CRA.

3. The National Agriculture Release Program (NARP) was identified as a program that is working well. NARP effectively expedites those shipments considered to be of low-risk thereby expediting movement and affectively facilitating trade. Trade/industry groups would like to see an expansion of the NARP program and suggest applying/assigning unique Harmonized Tariff Codes (HTS) to specific commodities. CBP and APHIS could then expand the program to additional low-risk commodities that are being associated with high-risk commodities based on their inclusion within the same HTS.

4. Individuals within the Trade/Industry group suggest an information sharing mechanism be developed that highlights pest interception data – to include non-reportable pest information. It is suggested that the information gleaned from the data could provide opportunities for industry to identify emerging threats earlier than is currently possible. It was also suggested that pest interception data, if provided to industry, could possibly assist them in identifying emerging threats or the potential for increased risk that may be associated with specific suppliers overseas.

5. Further, it is suggested that a Task Force comprised of APHIS, CBP and industry representatives be created to coalesce all of the data being collected. The task force goal would be to then determine the data elements true value as a decision making tool. The concern stated is the information/data currently being collected by APHIS/CBP may not contain all the elements needed to make informed decisions in the determination of risk, or, further aid in developing a proper and statistically significant assessment of risk in any particular pathway or commodity.

6. Approach rate data collection is perceived by some trade/industry to be flawed. Again, this comment gets back to whether the appropriate date is being collected.
   a. Consider developing an approach rate for the cargo environment in relation to wood packaging material (WPM). Stakeholder representing the fumigation industry made the following commented that he felt the non-compliant wpm issue is out of control, and, neither USDA nor CBP has a handle on the full breadth and scope of the wpm issue at hand.
7. Question: How can the United States exert pressure on a particular government or entity for the purpose of enforcing U.S. or regional phytosanitary measures? What are the tools available USDA-APHIS to exert pressure and ultimately leverage compliance with U.S. regulations, externally, for the purpose of reducing and ultimately eliminating pest risk approaching U.S. shores? Suggested Task: Convene a group to identify those tools.

8. CA standardization nationally.

9. Stakeholder representatives with the fumigation industry request that USDA establish as a Standard Operating Procedure the following: Prior to the implementation of any changes in the treatment manual, key representatives within fumigation industry would be consulted and allowed to provide input.

10. Comments: CBP to announce finds, pests, interceptions to trade, information sharing from CBP. Industry to know if its problem with country.

11. What is the current status of CBP implementation of Centralized Examination Stations (CES)? CBP-APTL-XD, Kevin Harriger provided the following comment: It is a complex process; we do not have the full details at this point in time.

Comment: How will a centralized CES facilitate, decrease or increase inspection time – specifically, agriculture inspections? A trade/industry Broker representative expressed approval of the concept of creating centralized CES’s, one stop shops.

12. Cold treated inspections – Mr. Harriger explained quarantine requirements as a condition of entry vs. Inspect & Release procedures.
   a. Will CES comply with temperature needs of the commodity for perishable cargo to ensure cargo survives?
   b. Comment: CES should be developed for containers which require plugs-ins in order to maintain a required temperature within during the hold/I&R process.

13. Data import risk assessments reevaluate how risk assessment is done/criteria.

14. Trade/industry representative with Stericycle commented on the need for a standardization of Compliance Agreements nationally.
a. CBP-APTL XD Kevin Harriger informed the group of the standardized
Compliance Agreements developed jointly by CBP and USDA-APHIS which is
currently in the pipeline and to be released to the stakeholders in the near future.

Comment: Revisit decisions made on Pest Risk Assessments. Consider re-evaluating both the
assessments and the assessment process.

Comment: Transparency of data? Are we (CBP, APHIS, and Trade) shorting ourselves by
discarding pests based on risk assessment?

Comment: APHIS data gathering structure does not produce accurate approach rate predictions.
Approach Rate concept should be considered for implementation in the cargo environment.

We (CBP, APHIS, and Industry) lack the institutional knowledge of foreign infrastructures to
have the ability of judging how capable any particular countries processes are at complying with
U.S. regulations.

Dr. Watson voiced consideration for the possibility of using E-docs for certificates for
export/import in relation to the WPM and fraudulent IPPC markings discussion.

Comment: Nogales best port for agriculture in the nation; Tucson best Field Office. NARP is
great. Would CBP consider implementation of a Harmonized Tariff Code (HTS) specifically for
green beans? The trade/industry representative believes green beans should be categorized by
USDA as a low risk product and considered for inclusion in the NARP program.

Comment: Strongly suggest that Cargo Release Authority (CRA) program be considered for
expansion to all ports throughout the U.S.
Request: Can industry acquire access to the Offshore Pest Information System?

Industry/trade representatives made additional comments concerning access to both reportable
and non-reportable pest interception data. Representatives stated the data may provide
information on pests which are considered non-reportable in the United States. These same pests
cause quarantine action in other countries, yet we (CBP) are in fact finding these same pests on
commodities from these countries.

END