# Report of the Meetings of the IPPC ePhyto Project Technical Committee & IPPC ePhyto Steering Group
## 2-6 May 2016
## Geneva, CH

**Participants**:

| | |
|---|---|
| Walter Alessandrini (AR) | Peter Neimanis (AU) |
| Maoyu Chen (CN) | Josiah Syanda (KE) |
| Christian Dellis (US) | Shane Sela (IPPC Secretariat) |
| Craig Fedchock (IPPC Secretariat) | Venkat Venkateswaran (UNICC) |
| Nico Horn (NL, Chair) | Shashank Rai (UNICC) |

**Observer:**
Kenza Le Mentec (STDF)

**Members unable to attend:**
Kyu-Ock Yim (CPM Bureau), Mostafa Abdelaziz (EG)


## 1.      Welcome and opening of the meeting

The IPPC Coordinator welcomed the Project Technical Committee (PTC) members. He emphasized importance of having the meeting at UNICC given the important role of UNICC in the development and operation of the solution.

Members welcomed Ms. Kyu-Ock Yim and Mr. Mostafa Abdelaziz to the PTC and the ePhyto Steering Group (ESG). The members noted that it was unfortunate that Ms. Yim and Mr. Abdelaziz could not attend.

## 2.      Local information

Members thanked Mr. Venkat Venkateswaran for offering United Nations International Computing Centre (UNICC) as the host location for the meeting. Mr. Venkateswaran described the key logistics associated with meeting at UNICC.

## 3.      Introductions

The members introduced themselves. The members come from differing expertise in relation to ePhyto systems including expertise plant health certification, IT operations, management of IT systems, etc.

## 4.       Review and adoption of agenda

The participants reviewed the agendas of the meetings and proposed no changes.

## 5.                   Operation of the committee

The participants noted the structure of the PTC in relation to the ESG and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC).  They noted that there was some confusion in relation to the role of the ESG with respect to the role of the PTC. The Secretariat pointed out that the PTC had a specific mandate in relation to the project and that the ESG had a much broader role in relation to supporting ePhyto within the IPPC.

The members concluded that for logistical purposes the PTC and ESG would operate as one although the Terms of Reference of each would remain separate including the reporting structure. Should a conflict arise during a joint meeting, the members agreed to defer discussion on the item until appropriate members of the specific committee or group are present.

## 6.       Selection of the PTC Chair and rapporteur

The members of the PTC acclaimed Mr. Nico Horn as the Chair of the PTC. The members acclaimed Mr. Christian Dellis and Mr. Josiah Syanda as rapporteur for the PTC and the ESG meeting.

## 7.       Updates from Standard and Trade Development Facility (STDF), Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) Bureau and CPM 11 meetings

Ms. Le Mentec noted that the project plan was in final stages of approval. An implementation assignment which transfers funding to the IPPC Secretariat through Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) will only be signed following the finalization of the plan. Most of the plan components would be reviewed by the PTCmembers this week and a finalized document re-submitted to the STDF Secretariat.  Ms. Le Mentec also reported that the STDF Secretariat planned to host an e-cert seminar at WTO at June 28th, with the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting planned for June 29th . PTC members were encouraged to attend both events.

Members noted that a workshop between PTC and PAC would be very fruitful in managing expectations of each of the groups and the end products. There are challenges in meeting too many expectations.

The IPPC Secretariat noted that the CPM and CPM Bureau were very positive on the progress made in advancing the STDF Project for an ePhyto Solution. Mr. Horn reported that the CPM had expressed a concern regarding the transparency of the criteria used for country selection for participation on the ePhyto pilot. This had been addressed during

CPM and that a fact sheet was to be published within a few weeks that should clarify the pilot process. The members also noted that there is increasing interest in participation.

## 8.     The project plan

The Secretariat provided an overview of the project plan. The plan is comprised of seven principle components to achieve the goal of establishing a self-sustaining global framework for electronic phytosanitary certification. These components are:

- Establishing a project and service arrangement with UNICC;
- Establishing a generic national system for the production, sending and receipt of ePhytos;
- Establishing a hub to transfer ePhytos between NPPOs;
- Piloting the generic national system and hub;
- Establishing and delivering capacity building to developing countries to support their adoption of the ePhyto Solution;
- Analysing and developing a business model to ensure the long term operation of the ePhyto Solution
- Establishing an governance framework for the project that ensures the integration of other key international initiatives in e-certification and effective project reporting

The members discussed the structure of the agreements with UNICC. The Secretariat reported that a project agreement would be developed to undertake the work of evaluating software and infrastructure required for the generic national system and hub. A second agreement would be developed to support the ongoing operation of the ePhyto Solution.

The members suggested that the requirements for a system vary by region or capacity (e.g. some countries may have differing certificate retention periods, differing requirements for non-phytosanitary information, the types of documents that could be included with a certificates, etc.) and that countries ability to implement a system also vary. The members suggested that a needs evaluation should be conducted prior to countries participating in the ePhyto Solution.

UNICC provided a presentation on the proposed plan for the development and implementation of the ePhyto Solution. UNICC noted that a project agreement between UNICC and IPPC would be used to undertake an assessment of software/hardware available for developing the solution. A seperate service agreement between UNICC and IPPC would be used for establishing the pilot and long term operation of the Solution. UNICC would develop specifications of both the hub and generic national system which would address functional technical requirements, non-functional requirements and

information security requirements. These would be used to assess IT available for use as the generic national system and hub.

UNICC agreed to provide these specifications for review by the PTC for its completeness and alignment with existing standards (e.g. the Global Solutions document). Once the specifications were agreed upon, the UNICC would evaluate existing software and hardware for use in the Solution. The UNICC would evaluate initially the ASYCER system for use as the generic national system and then if necessary undertake a tendering process to obtain suitable commercial software.

Some members expressed strong concerns regarding the gap in information required for developing the generic system and the incomplete harmonized codes and mapping. The group agreed that finalizing a path to address the gap should be a priority. The members agreed that Mr. Dellis and Mr. Alessandrini would review the remaining work and provide a proposal for addressing the majority of issues (See additional information in item 13 below).

## 9.      Review of potential generic system options

The PTC reviewed the specifications included in the Global Solutions document. The PTC discussed what documents should be stored (e.g. incoming certificates, outgoing certificates or both) and the retention period of these documents. It was also stated that some industries require retention of certificates for longer periods than is usually required by countries to support re-export certification of commodities; while some countries require records to be maintained in a specific manner that does not allow the data to be changed over time (e.g. secure pdf). The UNICC indicated that they would provide a list of questions that require clarification with respect to the specifications so that these issues could be addressed completely by the Committee prior to commencing to establish a Solution.

Members also indicated that the description of users (roles) of the generic national system described in the Global Solutions Document should be better aligned with ISPM 12 and ISPM 5 (e.g. inspector, officer, etc.). The members also stated that the description of who should be eligible to issue and cancel certificates as described in the document should be further clarified in the Global Solutions document.

The members discussed the availability of ePhyto documents in FAO languages. They reported that many of the codes and lists are only in English and these may take time to translate into additional languages. The members suggested that since the countries proposed for the pilot of the Solution operate in Spanish and English only, translation from English to Spanish should be a priority initially. UNICC noted that the Solutions operation was independent of languages, only the user interface requires translation.

With each certificate issued there may be a need to attach supporting documentation including documents which support an application for inspection, documents which support the certificate, etc. Therefore all users of the system should be able to attach documents, but only the authorized official should have the capacity to issue and authorize the transmission of a certificate with appropriate attachments. This information is currently not included in the Global Solutions document.

The members pointed out over time countries will request changes to the generic national system or changes will be required to address updates or system based requirements. To address the need a formal change management process with a method for the prioritization is required. The members also agreed that to facilitate entries, the system could be built in a manner that would allow industry to populate the information required for generation of certificates.  To address these suggestions the UNICC agreed to include these components within the draft a specifications document outlining the functional, non-functional and security specifications.

## 10.    ASYCER

Mr. Dmitry Gudanov, United Nations Centre for Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and Ms. Salma Ben Haji, UNCTAD were invited to provide an update on the UNCTAD ASYCUDA program. Mr. Gudanov provided a presentation on the overall role and functions of UNCTAD ASYCUDA.  UNCTAD provides a capacity development role in IT systems for developing countries by providing the software, while project implementation is charged to the country at UN standard rates. He noted that a number of countries are moving toward greater border integration, which resulted in UNCTAD developing the ASYCER phytosanitary component. ASYCUDA has a full integration from export to import to financial elements, etc. Ms. Haji provided a demonstration of the export component of the ASYCER, including ePhyto according to ISPM 12.

The members noted that ASYCER is used in a number of developing countries. The group was advised that the integration of ASYCER into the Solution could bring a number of benefits including simplicity given that it is owned by a U.N. organization; that UNCTAD has significant development and outreach experience; that the ASYCER system is currently being deployed in Africa and as such is starting to form the basis of electronic certification in a some developing countries.

## 11.    Hub development

The members reviewed the technical details provided in the Global Solutions document. UNICC identified a few areas where greater specification may be required. They proposed to identify questions in the document that should be further elaborated upon by the ESG members.

The process for the revocation of certificates was raised by members. The hub would not have a role in revoking certificates, but rather the information regarding revocation would be forwarded as a regular message to the receiving NPPO, who could then take action by either approving the revocation or sending a message back to the exporting NPPO indicating that certificate could not be revoked as it had been used in clearing the consignment. It was pointed out that identifying a particular certificate for revocation would require that NPPO's of importing countries verify the status of every certificate to know whether or not a particular certificate could be revoked.  In some countries not all certificates are verified and this would impose a new requirement for NPPOs. The members agreed that initial development of the hub is confined to facilitating the transfer of certificates only. To this end, only a message for revocation will be sent to the receiving NPPO. A message confirming revocation or indicating additional information could be added at a later date (e.g. following the pilot).

The issue of whether the exporting NPPO should receive messages on whether certificates are delivered are not delivered or both were reviewed. The members agreed that the hub should send these types of messages, but as a group (e.g. csv file).  The members reaffirmed that the hub should only transport messages, including the certificate and provide a simple verification that the certificate has been received. Any additional messaging requirements should be reviewed following the pilot.

Both business issues and technical issues are likely to be raised by countries contacting a central help desk. UNICC will provide help desk services which address technical issues, but non-technical business issues will need additional support. During the pilot, the PTC will work with country participants to develop guidance on non-technical business issues which may be provided to countries implementing the Solution.

The members decided that an agreement between parties using the hub for exchange is required to address legal liabilities and to ensure that users understand their responsibilities. The IPPC will work with UNICC to develop an appropriate use agreement.

As with the generic system, the Committee noted that countries may request system operation changes and as well as the system may require changes to schema, updates to the WSDL, etc. These process changes should be enacted through a formal change management process that is clearly understood by users and which includes a description of who should decide on changes for both hub and generic system.  The UNICC noted that the Solution should be backward compatible allowing for changes to be completed over a 1-2 year time-span. The members agreed to define a process before the establishment of the pilot.

## 12.    Criteria for selection

The UNICC indicated that they would provide criteria document outlining the technical and financial criteria required for assessment of the components of the Solution. The assessment of non-technical elements that would support implementation such as outreach

capacity, development experience, etc. will be developed by the IPPC and reviewed by the PTC. This non-technical evaluation will only be undertaken for the generic national system. For the hub, the UNICC will undertake evaluation of hardware and software and provide a recommendation that could fulfil the requirements being sought.

## 13.     Extent of harmonization of mapping and coding required for system operation

It was reported that some of the mapping is out of date and requires that e-certificates include a number of elements that are not required for paper certificates. For example, the "certificate name" requires three separate elements: "Document type", "Document Name" and "Document Description". Having multiple names could result in errors if one or more fields are populated incorrectly. The members indicated that this is an issue throughout the mapping.  Mr. Dellis and Mr. Alessandrini agreed to review the existing lists and produce a proposal for addressing the issue.

It was also reported that the mapping does not contain an option for attachments (e.g. additional information related to the certificate) other than the attachment of original phytosanitary certificates in the case of re-export phytosanitary certificates. The CPM has encouraged the ESG to advance the development of ePhyto including making the changes required to harmonize mapping provided that these do not severely impact NPPOs. Members agreed to add defined processes for attachments.

The members noted that many countries require additional non-mandatory information in the certificate. These non-ISPM 12 fields should be optional. To make the information be machine parse-able and harmonised, the information should be placed in defined fields of the schema. The Chair agreed following the meeting to request members to consult within their countries to identify the key non-ISPM 12 fields.

A member indicated that in some cases multiple weights may be used for a single commodity. A schema change is required to address this issue.

## 14.     UN/CEFACT Working Group on electronic exchange

The members were aware that the United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) had proposed new standards for the exchange of e-certificates. These were believed to differ from those established by the ESG but may not necessarily impact upon the development of the hub and generic system.

Mr. Markus Pikart, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) was invited to provide a report on recent discussions by UN/CEFACT on e-certification. He reported that a meeting of UN/CEFACT had taken place in the last week of April. The meeting had focused on electronic exchange in relation to the development of a standard for exchange for fisheries in Europe. The UN/CEFACT Working Group (WG) had also developed a handbook for agriculture e-documentation for project managers which is available at

https://www.unece.org/fileadmin/DAM/cefact/publica/UNNExT_e-BusinessStandardsHandbook.pdf . It specifically looks at four e-Business standards developed by UN/CEFACT in the areas of: electronic phytosanitary certificates; electronic reporting of sustainable fishery management; electronic exchange of laboratory analysis results; electronic management and exchange of CITES permits/certificates and approaches to traceability in agriculture trade. The WG also approved a standard for web-service e-cert exchange. Mr. Pikart noted that a standard for exchange is a new area for UN/CEFACT, since it is mostly focused on standards for the certificate. A document outlining the proposed guidance on exchange will be available in one to two weeks. He indicated that the document is not a standard, but a non-obligatory recommendation for implementation, in an effort to harmonize the exchange approach. The main difference between UN/CEFACT proposal and the proposal by the ESG is that the ESG proposes one Web Services Description Language (WDSL) message, designed for use through the Hub. The proposed UN/CEFACT WSDLs may offer additional features. At the same time, the proposed ESG process is much simpler based upon only the exchange of the envelope. The members agreed that it would be useful to evaluate the proposal by UN/CEFACT to determine if it provides improvements to the proposed ePhyto exchange. Comments on the proposed UN/CEFACT standard for exchange should be developed by the PTC and submitted to the UNECE Committee on Trade which facilitates the work of UN/CEFACT.

The PTC noted that IPPC should be better connected to the developments at UN/CEFACT in particular with respect to definitions in the Web Services Description Language (WSDL). The IPPC agreed to follow up with contacts at UNECE. The IPPC Secretariat also agreed to attend  28th UN/CEFACT Forum which occurs from 26 - 30 September 2016 in Bangkok, Thailand to ensure that ePhyto progress is raised at discussions on UN/CEFACT

The members discussed with UNECE the guidance required to support business changes for the implementation of e-certification.  Information that clearly explains the  processes and benefits of business change are really critical to advancing effective implementation of paperless systems for trade. The group agreed that business changes required to implement e-certification can significantly affect trade and government business practices. Without appropriate guidance on assessing these changes, there can be significant implications for trade or for government operation. For example, in many cases without implementation of e-documents in all border activities, the implementation of one or two documents can result in increased burdens on government and industry, if each is undertaking additional work to supply documents in multiple formats.

It was noted that that in many areas integration has occurred to facilitate business processes. The data models developed by UN/CEFACT for other areas such as for logistics, etc. link to the UN/CEFACT ePhyto schema and that although the WCO data model is slightly different, the data can be transferred if mapped.

The group noted that there are still some gaps on agreement for codes and harmonized terms (commodity classes, etc.) but further integration of lists between the WCO data

model and ePhyto would be very useful. However, given that ASYCUDA links to ASYCER, there may be some mapping completed that links the WCO data model to UN/CEFACT which is already available.

## 15.     Country selection

Mr. Neimanis provided a summary of the process used in reviewing the country readiness survey.  It was noted that many countries have since indicated a desire to participate even though many did not respond to the survey. In some cases, the survey request may not have necessarily reached the appropriate person responsible for ePhyto in a country.

The members agreed that as soon as the hub technical specifications are finalised, the information regarding "hook-up" this should be shared broadly so that countries can be prepared to participate following initial piloting. Some of the countries selected for testing the hub based upon an existing national system, can only transmit or receive. To prepare for implementation, the group agreed that a summary of country capacities should be developed.

Countries selected to use the generic system are at differing capacities. Business process analysis may indicate that significant business changes are required prior to any implementation of the generic national system. These changes may require long term efforts which may not make it practical to continue with a pilot of the country. The members therefore proposed that in-country assessments should be carried out to determine countries suitable for piloting the generic national system. Mr. Neimanis reported that Australia had made arrangements to visit Sri Lanka in June to initiate an assessment process. The Committee agreed that this should be used as a trial of the assessment process and that the assessment documents should be fully reviewed following the Sri Lanka visit. There will also be a summary report produced after the Sri Lanka visit outlining issues and where further country assistance may be required.  The Committee also agreed that assessments should then be carried out in Ghana (Syanda/Horn/Sela), Ecuador (Dellis/Alessandrini), Samoa (Neimanis/Karunaratne/Sela) based upon the revised assessment documents.

## 16.     Training of countries in the generic system

The group noted that the piloting of the generic system requires that the business assessment occur before a decision on candidate countries can be made. The group suggested that RPPOs should be engaged in supporting the assessment and training. Coordination and consistency is key to effective assessment and training. Once the assessment is completed training could be developed and delivered to those countries in a position to implement the Solution without unplanned for delays.

Once the pilot is complete, the business tools will be made available for all countries to undertake preparing for implementation. At the same time, the tool will be fully assessed in two countries requiring 100% capacity development.

The capacity development tools include:

- Business process analysis (both analysis of the current state and analysis of what is required in change);
- Business impact assessment (including cost/benefit analysis);
- Technical training tools;
- Starting (implementation) guides (which include information which manage expectations, etc.);
- Stakeholder engagement tools and guidance to industry to support changes that facilitate change acceptance by stakeholders;
- Advocacy materials (including an understanding of scope of ePhyto, costs associated with change and the benefits on implementation);

## 17.    Year of Trade Facilitation

The Coordinator noted that the theme of 2017 was trade facilitation. He suggested that there should be a workshop on trade facilitation which includes some advocacy information on ePhyto (e.g. pamphlets, web material, etc.)

The members suggested that the IAG could play an important role in advocacy of ePhyto during trade facilitation.  Also noting that Trade Facilitation focuses on 'non-tariff trade barriers' beyond the benefits that ePhyto will deliver.

## 18.    RPPO Consultations

The members noted that engaging RPPOs during the technical consultation may be an opportunity to have RPPOs lead in undertaking assessments of its member countries to determine readiness to implement an ePhyto Solution following piloting. It is also an opportunity to use the RPPO meetings to improve advocacy and understanding of the ePhyto project. The TC will be in Rabat (Morocco) from 14 till 18 October.  Mr. Neimanis indicated his willingness to represent ePhyto at the TC.

## 19.    Commodity Classes and ePhyto

The Technical Panel for the Glossary provided a report that indicated that commodity classes and commodities may be somewhat ambiguous and that the ePhyto project is adding precision to some terms that currently does not exist within the definition.

The members agreed that there are issues related to the harmonization of terminology (including the hierarchy of terms) but noted that ePhyto cannot resolve these issues which

exist with paper certificates.  ePhyto is intended to develop an electronic system for exchange not to resolve any existing issues of terminology. The members therefore concluded that the TPG should work to harmonize terminology that may be ambiguous and that the Chair of the PTC/ESG who is also a member of the Standards Committee would be willing to work with them in providing experience and advice on any proposed suggestions for change. The PTC/ESG  also agreed to associate codes to any terms developed by the TPG.

## 20.    Other Issues

20.1.   Regional updates

Mr. Neimanis noted that Australia has been seeking funding to support ePhyto project development in the region. He is seeking funds to maintain Mr. Karunaratne's support to the ESG.  He also reported that he is trying to secure funding to support training in other countries support his work and travel associated with ePhyto project. He suggested that a letter from IPPC Secretariat soliciting support from countries in funding assistance could be used to help with training and development. The members agreed that such a letter would be useful in obtaining funds from other developed countries and may bridge any shortfall in funding between the STDF project and the establishment of a self-sustaining mechanism for operation of the solution. It was also noted that many countries have already invested heavily in developing national systems and the implementation of the hub would reduce their investments in establishing point to point agreements on operation. The letter should be sent to countries in coordination with a timing that demonstrates clear progress in development.

Mr. Neimanis also noted that Japan has shown increasing interest in ePhyto development and is keen to participate.

Mr. Dellis noted that the NAPPO panel on eCertification is very supportive of the ePhyto project. The panel is working with South American RPPOs and trying to set up a collaborative meeting between ORISA and COSAVE to facilitate a training session in one of the pilot countries. Mr. Dellis is also working with other U.S. agencies to locate funding to support training in other developing countries. Mr. DEllis also noted that the U.S. will begin exchanging electronic certificates with Chile in June.

He noted that the U.S. has established a requirement that legal arrangements between countries must be in place prior to conducting any exchanges. These are an additional burden in managing point to point systems with additional costs.

The U.S. is also preparing to exchange certificates with Chile.

Mr. Syanda noted that the 2nd Global Symposium had advocated a larger regional workshop for the African region would be very useful in terms of advocacy and information

dissemination since understanding of ePhyto the region is minimal. A letter requesting the financial support for the workshop has been sent to the IPPC Secretariat which acknowledged receipt. The Secretariat advised that it is seeking donors who may be interested in supporting an ePhyto workshop. Mr. Syanda indicated that he would check with other agencies and report back.

He also noted that some countries in Africa are trying to seek funds on a local level to support electronic systems initiatives. In particular a number of African countries are establishing the ASYCUDA system and some of these are also installing ASYCER (i.e. Ethiopia, Uganda and Rwanda) because of its linkage to ASYCUDA. In particular, the module that links the national government's functions in revenue collection to other border control activities is a strong factor in system selection.

Kenya has established exchange of ePhytos with the Netherlands and is looking to establish exchanges with Australia.

Mr. Alessandrini reported that there were a few conference calls on ePhyto between COSAVE members and there was interest in undertaking a workshop in the COSAVE countries.

Ms. Chen conveyed that China has begun exchanging electronic certificates with Chile. She noted that there were some challenges since China relies on HS codes as the basis of commodity identification. She also mentioned that Finland has approached China to begin exchanging certificates. China is also seeking to establish a forum on electronic exchange of SPS certificates with eastern European countries on June 9th in Ningbo. Further information on the session is posted at: http://www.cceecexpo.org/site_en/zdoblh.html .

Mr. Horn indicated that the Netherlands has initiated a discussion amongst EU member states and the Commission on replacing legislation to permit acceptance of electronic certificates. The change may require 3 years to complete. The Commission is reviewing using UN/CEFACT schema for certificates.

He also reported that a regional workshop (NEPPO, Near East) is proposed which will include a discussion on ePhyto. If possible he will participate. He will also participate in the regional workshop for Eastern Europe where ePhyto may also be presented and discussed.

## 21.    Next meeting

The committee proposed that a next meeting be held in La Plata, Argentina in the week of 3rd – 7th October 2016.

## 22.    Teleconferences

The members agreed that teleconferences should be predictable and occur at similar time. The members asked that appointments be sent to ensure that members are aware of the

dates and times of meetings. The IPPC Secretariat agreed to schedule monthly teleconferences for the rest of 2016 and send out reminders.


## Action Items

| Description | Responsibility | Due Date |
|---|---|---|
| Develop approach for addressing remaining issues on harmonization and circulate to PTC | Dellis/Alessandrini | July 15 2016 |
| Request to PTC members regarding consultation on key non-ISPM 12 fields required by NPPOs | Horn | June 1 2016 |
| Revise Global Solutions Document to address:<br>  i. Align the terms used to describe "roles" of users of the generic system with terms used in ISPMs;<br>  ii. Who is eligible to cancel or withdraw certificates;<br>  iii. Who may attach documents and who may attach documents to a certificate;<br>  iv. A process for attachments | Neimanis/Sela | July 15, 2016 |
| Establish agreements for the Solution | UNICC and IPPC | August 1 2016 |
| Provide a listing of criteria for Solution selection | UNICC | August 1 2016 |
| Provide a listing of technical issues (that are not or are poorly defined in the Global Solutions document) that require consideration by the PTC | UNICC | August 1 2016 |
| Provide a recommendation on IT providers for generic national system and hub | UNICC | September 1 2016 |
| Define change management process for generic national system and hub | UNICC/PTC | October 2016 |
| Finalise country assessment process | Karunaratne | July 30, 2015 |
| Conduct country assessments of Sri Lanka, Ghana, Ecuador and Samoa | PTC | October 30, 2016 |
| Develop report on country assessment outcome | Sela | October 30 2016 |
| Establish teleconference schedule and circulate | Sela | June 15 2016 |
| Draft letter requesting financial support from developed countries to facilitate increased training and development and to bridge any financial implementation gaps between project funding and long term business operation | IPPC Secretariat | 1 September 2016 |