From: Endress, Kurt - REE-ARS
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 11:09 AM
To: Kittell, Karen - REE-ARS; Haag, Benjamin - REE-ARS
Subject: RE: On second thought

Categories: SMTA

It appears that all web items ordered so far this year on production have been propagative.

```
SELECT wori.distribution_form_code, count(*)
FROM web_order_request_item wori
WHERE wori.created_date > '2025'
GROUP BY wori.distribution_form_code
```

distribution_form_code	(No column name)
BD	19
BL	4
CT	66
HS	1
IV	23
PL	18
SC	2
SD	8281

Kurt

From: Kittell, Karen - REE-ARS <karen.kittell@usda.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 10:58 AM
To: Endress, Kurt - REE-ARS <kurt.endress@usda.gov>; Haag, Benjamin - REE-ARS <Benjamin.Haag@usda.gov>
Subject: Re: On second thought

Do you want to calculate whether it should have been restricted from scratch, considering domestic/international, IPR, and propagative form? Or do you want to trust the action_for_id field to tell us which items were SMTA?

You can do it either way, but I think the easier way is to trust the action_for_id field AND is propagative. I'm confident the action_for_id field was corrected on Jan 3.

From: Endress, Kurt - REE-ARS <kurt.endress@usda.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 10:52 AM
To: Haag, Benjamin - REE-ARS <Benjamin.Haag@usda.gov>; Kittell, Karen - REE-ARS <karen.kittell@usda.gov>
Subject: RE: On second thought

Let me see if I understand.

The web_order_request_item.is_smta_restricted flag wasn't being set properly after the change to production on January 3.
The SMTAACCEPT action action_for_id field was created properly during this time.

We want to fix the web item is_smta_restricted flag.

Do you want to calculate whether it should have been restricted from scratch, considering domestic/international, IPR, and propagative form? Or do you want to trust the action_for_id field to tell us which items were SMTA?

This SQL identifies 1464 on production that are references in action_for_id but have SMTA restricted set to N.

```
SELECT count(*)
FROM web_order_request_item wori
JOIN web_order_request wor ON wor.web_order_request_id = wori.web_order_request_id
LEFT JOIN web_order_request_action wora ON wora.web_order_request_id
= wori.web_order_request_id AND wora.action_code = 'SMTAACCEPT'
WHERE wori.created_date > '2025'
  AND wora.action_code = 'SMTAACCEPT'
  AND wori.is_smta_restricted = 'N'
  AND wora.action_for_id LIKE CONCAT('%', wori.web_order_request_item_id, '%')
```

Kurt

From: Haag, Benjamin - REE-ARS <Benjamin.Haag@usda.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 10:39 AM
To: Kittell, Karen - REE-ARS <karen.kittell@usda.gov>; Endress, Kurt - REE-ARS <kurt.endress@usda.gov>
Subject: Re: On second thought

This gets back to my initial question/concern: based on the data (and the name), the acfion_for_id field of web_order_request_action appears to contain a list of WOR items to which that action applies. Is this correct?

If we can rely on that rule, the overall script logic would be:

1. Identify all problem WORs. These will be those that contain
    1. at least one SMTAACCEPT action, and
    1. NO items with is_smta_restricted set to "Y"
2. For each WOR, and for each SMTAACCEPT action, identify the web order items that the action references in **action_for_id.**
3. For each WOR item identified in 2), determine whether the related form is propagative, and if so, set its is_smta_restricted to "Y"

If this all correct, then 3) presents a problem, because the list of propagative/non-propagative forms isn't stored in the database. Assuming that I understand Trac 3015 and the related emails correctly.

First of all, however — is the above logic correct?

From: Kittell, Karen - REE-ARS <karen.kittell@usda.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 10:11 AM
To: Haag, Benjamin - REE-ARS <Benjamin.Haag@usda.gov>; Endress, Kurt - REE-ARS <kurt.endress@usda.gov>
Subject: Re: On second thought

You won't know how many items of the same accession would be referenced by the WOR action. That's the problem. Once you determine, for example PI 123456 has an action record for SMTA. You will then need to determine if the form of PI 123456 is propagative or not. If it is, then that record in the web_order_request_items will need to have the flag set to Y.

From: Haag, Benjamin - REE-ARS <Benjamin.Haag@usda.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 10:07 AM
To: Kittell, Karen - REE-ARS <karen.kittell@usda.gov>; Endress, Kurt - REE-ARS <kurt.endress@usda.gov>
Subject: Re: On second thought

I'm interpreting this as, "if a WOR action record references multiple items of the same accession, where each item has a different form code, only one of those items should have **is_smta_restricted** set to "Y.""

Is this correct? If it is — what would determine which item's flag is set?

Kurt — adding you for another pair of eyes.

From: Kittell, Karen - REE-ARS <karen.kittell@usda.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 16, 2025 9:58 AM
To: Haag, Benjamin - REE-ARS <Benjamin.Haag@usda.gov>
Subject: On second thought

Hey Benjamin,

I was thinking about the script you'll be running to correct the is_smta_flag. You're going to have to include form because, while it's unlikely, you can request leaves and seeds of the same accession, so we don't want both of those to be Y. They've been testing that on dev, so that's what made me think of it.
Sorry.
Kay