



**Minutes of the virtual meeting of the Working Group to develop e-Learning materials  
on Export Certification system  
Monday 28 September 2020 20h00-22h30 (Rome time)**

### **1. Opening and meeting arrangements**

- [1] The IPPC Secretariat Implementation and Facilitation Unit Lead welcomed the participants, stressing that an e-Learning on phytosanitary export certification system is necessary as a complement of the IPPC guide to export certification<sup>1</sup>. He invited the participants to think about the scope and the target audience of this e-Learning. Also the recent development of the IPPC ePhyto solution should be taken in account. The Working Group (WG) elected Josiah SYANDA as Chairperson and Avtar VIRK as rapporteur. However, since Josiah SYANDA faced difficulties in internet connection, Damian CLARKE agreed to chair temporarily the WG during the first half of the meeting until Josiah SYANDA could connect properly.
- [2] The list of the participants is posted on the IPP<sup>2</sup>. The following members participated in the meeting: Mr Damian CLARKE, Ms Rocio Leila FERNANDEZ, Mr Marcus McELVAINE, Mr Ignacio MENENDEZ, Mr Roberto PAPA, Mr Bruno SCHIFFERS, Mr Josiah SYANDA, Mr Avtar VIRK. Mr Brent LARSON, Ms Sarah BRUNEL, Mr Descartes KOUMBA, Mr Artur SHAMILOV and Mr Denis ALLEX participated from the IPPC Secretariat.

### **2. Adoption of the Agenda**

- [3] The Working group adopted the following agenda :

### **3. Background information : the activities of the Capacity and Implementation Committee and the COMESA project**

- [4] The IPPC Secretariat IFU lead for phytosanitary export certification system e-Learning, provided information on the activities of the Capacity and Implementation Committee (IC) and on the COMESA project.
- [5] Roberto PAPA asked if the e-Learning is to be developed for the intention of all countries or COMESA countries only.
- [6] Josiah SYANDA asked information on the origin of this e-Learning: was it in response to specific African countries, how are their needs considered, are whether Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluations will be taken in account if some have been carried out.
- [7] The IPPC Secretariat replied that the e-learning is developed for the whole IPPC community, taking into account COMESA countries specific needs as this material is developed through a FAO project initially targeting COMESA countries. The demand for training came from the COMESA Secretariat, representing the COMESA countries, in the frame of the "FAO support to COMESA trade facilitation programme". The COMESA Secretariat asked to focus in a first time on 5 COMESA countries (Kenya, Malawi, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe). As the Phytosanitary Capacity Evaluation results are confidential, it is not possible to refer to them for specific countries. It was also considered that global elements regarding the capacity of the COMESA countries could also be explored through the FAO regional office.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/86042/>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/development-guides-and-training-materials/elearning-export/>

#### 4. Background information : focused revision of the ISPM 12

- [8] The IPPC Secretariat explained that the International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures 12 (ISPM 12) *Phytosanitary certificates* is in the process of revision with focus on some specific issues concerning the re-export. An expert working group delivered a draft amended version which was submitted for country consultation until the 30 September 2020. This draft including all comments will be submitted to the Standard Committee for review before a second country consultation in 2021.

#### 5. Demonstration on how to access the resources on the International Phytosanitary Portal

- [9] For the information of the WG members, the IPPC Secretariat demonstrated the way to find information on the website of the IPPC (International Phytosanitary Portal : IPP), in particular information concerning the Implementation Committee (IC)<sup>3</sup>, the COMESA project<sup>4</sup>, the IPPC guides and training<sup>5</sup> and contributed resources<sup>6</sup>.

#### 6. The COLEACP e-Learning platform

- [10] Bruno SCHIFFERS from COLEACP presented the e-Learning platform of the Comité de Liaison Europe-Afrique-Caraïbe, Pacifique (COLEACP). The COLEACP activities are targeted to stakeholders of African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries. Self-study courses are available to individuals, with four levels (introduction, intermediate, advanced, experimented), with a final test at the end of each level. At the experimented level, the course is highly interactive and the trainee is helped by a facilitator. Collective training courses are also available and are different to the self-study courses because they are open to a specific group of people for a certain period of time, generally four weeks. In collective courses, trainees have the possibility to exchange among them through a forum and are helped by a facilitator. The self-study and collective training courses are complementary, the collective training courses is based on the self-study course with the addition of facilitated sessions and interactive tools. Bruno SCHIFFERS explained that both the self-study and collective courses are prepared following a week per week program.
- [11] Roberto PAPA asked if e-Learnings prepared by COLEACP are available online in a sustainable way.
- [12] Bruno SCHIFFERS confirmed that e-Learning are developed by COLEACP under the Moodle platform and can be freely available and downloaded and are sustainably maintained over time on the COLEACP platform.

#### 7. Discussion on the organization of the work of the WG

- [13] Josiah SYANDA asked the opinion of the WG members on the public targeted, the objective of the training, what is to be reached, and the content to be prepared in consequence.
- [14] The IPPC Secretariat noted that the final objective is to improve the capabilities of staff in charge of export certification so as to improve phytosanitary export certification system in countries which would concretely translate in a decrease in the number of rejections after import control either for the presence of a prohibited pest or for a non-compliant Phytosanitary certificate.
- [15] Bruno SCHIFFERS declared that while this is a global objective, in his opinion the WG should first define the types of publics targeted, what are their respective specific objectives, what trainees should be able to do at the end of this e-Learning, so as to define the content of the e-Learning in consequence.

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/capacity-development-committee/>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/projects-on-implementation-and-capacity-development/comesa-trade-facilitation-programme/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/guides-and-training-materials/contributed-resource-list/>

- [16] For Ignacio MENENDEZ the different publics are the main actors of the phytosanitary export certification process: the exporters, the importers, the NPPO inspectors and the NPPO as a whole. He stated that each of these stakeholders has their own objective and needs.
- [17] Bruno SCHIFFERS suggested that drawing a flowchart describing the process of the phytosanitary export certification process, in line with ISPM 7 *Phytosanitary certification system* and 12 *Phytosanitary certificates*, and mentioning the stakeholders involved would help to understand what are the specific skills expected from each of these actors.
- [18] Josiah SYANDA agreed that such a flowchart would be necessary, taking in consideration the relevant ISPMs.
- [19] The IPPC Secretariat proposed to draft in collaboration with Bruno SCHIFFERS a preliminary document aiming at describing the phytosanitary export certification process and the actors involved. As a starting point this document will be submitted to the WG members for comments for at least two weeks. This document would then be discussed in next meeting.
- [20] The WG members agreed on this proposal.

### **8. Any Other Business**

- [21] No other business was discussed.

### **9. Next Meeting**

- [22] The next meeting will be organized after finalization of the document mentioned above in [19]. The chairperson thanked all the participants.