

From: [Steve Capell](#)
To: [Kamola Khusnutdinova](#)
Cc: [Aliakbar Heydarov \[CUSTOMS GOV\]](#); [Liliana Fratini \[CBI-ORG\]](#); [Norris, Nancy EMLI:EX](#); [Nurbek Maksutov \[LIST\]](#); [Sue Probert \[LIVE\]](#); [Hanane Becha \[GMAIL\]](#); [Maria Teresa Pisani](#); [Nadezhda SPORYSHEVA](#)
Subject: Re: Inter-sessional approval of a 30-day public review: White Paper
Date: Tuesday, June 4, 2024 9:02:15 AM

This problem of transit documents is well known here in AU. The dept of Agriculture routinely prints original paper SPS certificates even when the XML data is already sent directly to the ultimate importing economy for precisely this reason.

I think the paper does a fine job of stating the problem but it feels a bit inconclusive on the solution.

I know that many of you are going to say “ah, that Steve, he’s on about verifiable credentials again”. But please let me be clear that the VC solution solves BOTH the transit authority verification and the ultimate import authority full digital data consumption at the same time with the same credential.

1. Issuing authority issues the SPS / CITES / etc document as a VC with built-in human rendering of the structured data. It can be sent with the shipment as a paper printout with QR on it or sent separately by email or be discovered given the consignment ID using a link resolver in the same way that UNTP makes DPPs discoverable.
2. Transit authority can scan the QR and will see the full version (not some subset) including current status (ie including updates). Transit authority can also retrieve the full digital data if they wish.
3. Ultimate importing authority can also get the data and verify it - either in advance (because it’s sent to them directly, or pulled from a link resolver given consignment ID, or uploaded by the importer to their single window. Any and all mechanisms work. Stuff updates also visible and verifiable. No digital wallets needed. The data is non-repudiable and verifiably signed by the issuing authority. End state is the same as if it had been sent as an XML over a peer to peer channel.
4. The issuer just issues the same human and machine readable VC irrespective of either transit authority or ultimate authority digital capability - either of which can have humans scan QR codes or have their machines access and verify the full data.

One complaint I keep hearing is “ah, by SPS certificates are G2G and the standard requires that they are sent directly from exporting G to importing G”. This is confusing the business model (importing G wants confidence that the data is issued by and endorsed by the exporting G) with the technical model (direct XML exchange vs VC presentation / discovery). Just because the data from exporting authority reaches the importing authority via a different technical route does NOT make it any less “G2G”

So - in my view this paper could offer a very clear and simple solution instead of the rather vague and inconclusive conclusion that it currently provides.

Kind regards,

Steve Capell
Director

+61 410 437854
steve.capell@gosource.com.au

On 1 Jun 2024, at 2:26 am, Kamola Khusnutdinova
<kamola.khusnutdinova@un.org> wrote:

The content of this email and attachments are considered confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete the email and any copies, and notify the sender immediately. The information in this email must only be used, reproduced, copied, or disclosed for the purposes for which it was supplied.