Report of the Working Group on Grape Model Regulations

BACKGROUND:

At the July 8, 2008 meeting of the Grape NCPN, a task was identified -- development of a "model regulation" that would be the basis for an NCPN stamp of approval for certification.

A working group was suggested in October; all have agreed to serve:
- Eric Amberg, Grafted Grapevine Nursery
- John Duarte, Duarte Nursery
- Bob Martin, USDA-ARS Corvallis
- Tim Martinson, Cornell University
- Susan McCarthy, California Dept. of Food and Ag
- Ruth Welliver, Pennslyvania Dept. of Ag
- Ray Johnson, Canadian Food Inspection Agency, to provide a NAPPO perspective
- Nancy Sweet, to assist with general communication

Statement of the Task: Develop a model regulation for a certification program that would be a minimal standard for NCPN-approved programs. We have a good starting point in existing state grape certification program regulations.

We were asked to have something prepared by March 2009.

FEBRUARY 2009 UPDATE:

This month, Bob Martin circulated a first draft of a model document for us to work with. The committee is very grateful to Bob for doing the groundwork! Several of us have commented on that draft. There is more that can be done via e-mail, and we can set our ending point for that discussion to be the time of the Washington meeting (March 25), if you wish. But the document we provide will not be a final product -- it will merely be the guts of what needs to be included or considered from a scientific-certification standpoint. Where does it go next, to decide on appropriate legal/regulatory language?

For example:

One issue that needs to be addressed to write these standards correctly is the relationship of the NCPN to the state regulatory agencies. Does the NCPN have any regulatory authority, and if so, through what mechanism? If not, how do states with regulatory authority take on the NCPN "brand"? Can we call NCPN an official certifying agency, and allow them to name state departments of ag as their agents? If a state wants to maintain different standards than NCPN standards (presumably higher standards), then how are those higher standards acknowledged or codified by NCPN?