INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP ON REDUCING THE INTRODUCTION OF PESTS THROUGH THE SEA CONTAINER PATHWAY

19-20 September 2022

DAY 1

19 SEPTEMBER 2022

Image: www.pexels.com

Contents

Workshop Presentations

ICHCA International was not directly involved in the design or operation of the IPPC Conference. The material presented belongs to the IPPC and/or individual copyright owners.

This document is intended to encourage readers to visit the original sources and to learn more about aspects of reduction of carriage of invasive pests through the sea container pathway in the interests of all stakeholders.

This document summarizes each presentation from the first day of the International Workshop On Reducing The Introduction Of Pests Through The Sea Container Pathway, 19-20 September 2022. It provides links to the relevant IPPC web pages and slide sets. In providing the summaries, any error or omission is ICHCA's responsibility, and we highly recommend that the reader visit the presenters' source slides for any topic that is of interest.

All the presentations can be found at: https://www.ippc.int/en/core-activities/capacity-development/sea-containers/international-workshop-on-reducing-the-introduction-of-pests-through-the-sea-container-pathway/

Summary

Day 1 of the workshop set the scene for the complexity of the containerised supply chain. It provided an introduction to the history of, and challenges that have been faced in, seeking to minimise pest contamination in the sea container supply chain. The formation, activity and final report of the Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF) was described.

In session 2, various stakeholders discussed the SCTF report and the arising issues. This included commentary by container operators and shipping lines; container service providers; ports and terminals; shippers and forwarders. The roles and responsibilities of actors in the supply chain were explored. Each of these made it clear that there was no simple or single solution to minimising pest contamination. It was also emphasized that 100% contamination free was not practicable.

There were presentations from national plant protection organisations on alliances and innovation in inspection and engagement in North America, China and Australia and New Zealand. A summary of inspection findings from Kenya spotlighted the concrete reality of risk.

Delegates also heard from the ceramics and coffee sectors on industry led initiatives and activities with transferrable potential and valuable learning.

Throughout the day, the CTU Code was referenced and in some cases directly discussed, including the introduction of new IMO guidelines for invasive pest inspection.

1.1. Container Logistics And Complexities Across Containerized Supply Chains

Lars Kjaer, World Shipping Council

This session explains the complexities of container flows through the supply chain, with multiple: border crossings, handovers of control, modes of transport, actors. There is no single point of control or access to containers during container trips except container depots, but these are not always part of every container trip. Contains a video that gives an indication of the complexity in under 2 minutes.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91539/

VISIBLE PESTS

It is worth noting that the focus of this work is primarily on prevention of ***visible*** pest contamination

1.2. Sea Containers Task Force (SCTF) Background to its establishment & work

Greg Wolff, IPPC

Provides a history of approaches made to addressing the risks of invasive pests carried on sea containers and their cargo. Including work and challenges in attempting to develop an International Standard for Phytosanitary Measures (ISPM).

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91540/

1.3. Final report of Sea Containers Task Force

Greg Wolff, IPPC

Some of the points noted

- There is low awareness of the CTU Code among contracting parties; wider awareness could reduce risk and the CTU Code should be promoted
- Individual responsibility cannot be borne solely by one sector (e.g., packers, carriers, consignors); a combined approach that reduces risk overall is needed
- Empty containers have much reduced oversight
- Communications and (voluntary guidance) recommended, e.g., apps
- More analysis is needed to understand how far incentives vs regulatory approach can deliver what is needed
- Without stakeholder support, success may be unachievable

TASK FORCE

Sea Container Task Force, 2017 to 2021, final report can be found at: https://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/cb9533en

Viewpoints and recommendations included:

- Continue raising awareness, sharing information and collaborating
- Consider requiring contamination inspection as part of safety inspection
- Voluntary measures implemented by industry may be an important component of a broad systems approach, combined with other measures

- Revision to existing IPPC recommendation
- Potential for development of ISPM (IPPC standard); no clarity though on meaningful, effective and practicable wording
- Container redesign: composite containers (integral steel floors) may make cleaning easier; if introduced through the normal replacement cycle, would be low impact, low cost(?) and need no other coordination

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91541/

2.1. Minimising Pest Contamination: Overview of SCTF – Container Operators and Shipping Lines

Uffe Frederiksen, Container Industry

Responsible business is ingrained in the cargo transportation industry. It recognises and re- affirms industry commitment to environmental protection in all its forms. Takes a pragmatic view of the options that have been considered. With around 250 million containers moved per year, it is not practicable to 'treat' every one. Currently available pesticides are harmful to the environment. It is not possible to 100% eliminate pests carried on sea containers. Future interventions require a risk-based approach. One potential route to reduce risk is the modification of the existing container design, though this does have significant physical limitations. It is not an easy solution, nor is it quick (3-5 year lead time for new container orders), but modifications such as 'all steel' bases might help.

ISPM

An ISPM is the standards setting instrument of the International Plant Protection Commission

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91542/

2.2. Pest movement via contamination of sea containers

Roland Karnbach, Container Service Providers

Handling and storage of commodities prior to and during the packing of the container constitute the most important stage of potential pest contamination. Contracting parties may lack the capacity and legal basis to carry out inspections, given the large volume of container movements involved. Costs associated with container inspections would be very high, result in significant delays, and present considerable challenges (e.g. resources, availability of inspection locations). Notes low awareness of CTU Code at container depots and limitations of the Code being non 'binding'. Includes a proposal for a 'clean path' model where re-inspection might occur where the container has passed through a higher risk circumstance.

CONTRACTING PARTIES

184 countries are Contracting Parties to the International Plant Protection Convention

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91543/

2.3. Roles and responsibilities for minimising pest contamination in the sea container supply chain

Tim Morris, UK Major Ports Group

Container terminals are terminals are one of the ultimate asset intensive, productivity reliant businesses. Key performance measures include berth productivity (e.g. crane moves per hour), space utilisation (e.g. container yard utilisation, stack height) and throughput (e.g. container dwell time). These are how terminals are measured, ranked, investment allocated and – to an extent – their people are rewarded (from crane driver to CEO). There is limited (and diminishing) physical interaction with containers in terminals for both safety and efficiency. Multiple handling and stop-starts increase emissions. Even in manual operations the speed of transfer really doesn't allow for a 'walk round'. There would need to be a significant upskilling of Terminal staff to be able to inspect/interpret images in relatively real time to diagnose what is and is not an issue. Appropriate 'risk-based' approach must underpin any further developments rather than blanket certification.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91544/

2.4. Shippers, forwarders and cargo handlers

Paul Zalai, Freight & Trade Alliance

Co-ordination is required between stakeholders to avoid unnecessary bureaucracy and achieve efficient processes to safeguard biosecurity AND cost-effectively facilitate trade. Sets out expectations of actors in the supply chain. Such as container operators and shipping lines supplying clean empty containers for use by shippers plus journey histories to biosecurity agencies (for assessment of contamination risk). Display of information on the inside of container doors to remind packers of health, safety and pest minimisation practice during container packing. Shippers: instruct cargo handlers pack safely and minimising pests (CTU Code). Cargo handlers: identification of biosecurity risks at supply chain "touch points"; development of technology aids, integration of data from the time of cargo packing into biosecurity risk assessment and training and education to raise pest contamination awareness.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91545/

IPPC GUIDANCE

Link: Sea Container Supply Chains and Cleanliness - This Guidance sets out the key parties in international container supply chains, roles and responsibilities for minimizing visible pest contamination and best practice for achieving these goals.

3.1. North American Sea Container Initiative Overview

Wendy Asbil, Wendy Beltz - NAPPO

Voluntary Canada-United States-Mexico government-industry initiative. Aims to enhance understanding of logistics of container movement to better understand challenges and opportunities for identifying and reducing pest risks in the sea container

supply chain. Conducts outreach and education to stakeholders, industries and organisations to encourage global adoption of similar, voluntary programs. Recommendations for North America include an outcomes-based protocol, suite of measures, import approach = export approach, recognition of industry contributions to solutions. Everyone in supply chain doing their own part so that sum of parts = success. Mix of non-regulatory and regulatory solutions depending on circumstances (using non-regulatory solutions first).

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91546/

3.2. Mediterranean Shipping Company

Claudio Bozzo, MSC

This presentation succinctly sets out infographics showing a model for Pest Prevention Responsibility for export, import and empty containers. It addresses responsibilities at the depot, terminal, rail yards and client premises.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91547/

3.3. Code of Practice: National standard system in China for addressing pest risks in inbound and outbound containers

Gu Guanghao

This presentation begins by noting that China is the country with the largest container throughput in the world, containers handled by China go to or come from more than 150 countries and areas Container throughput of Chinese mainland ports in 2021 was about 283 million TEUs, the inbound empty repositioning containers, 19.968 million TEUs. The number of biosecurity risk factors intercepted by China from inbound and outbound containers remains high. The presentation contains data on inspection and detection rates for biosecurity risks and risk categories and explains the national standard system of container plant quarantine in China. It also presents a framework proposal for an ISPM on sea containers.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91548/

3.4. The Sea Container Hygiene System

Rama Karri, Australia and Sina Waghorn, New Zealand

This presentation explains the arrangements for container hygiene. All containers arriving from high-risk countries are subject to mandatory inspection on arrival in Australia and New Zealand unless they are processed through offshore quality systems. The offshore risk management scheme has demonstrated measurable reduction in container contamination rates. Resources can be diverted to other higher-risk activities as there has been a

NOVEMBER 2007

IPPC has been working on the development of international standard for phytosanitary measures to reduce the risk of pest spread in sea containers since 2007

95% reduction of inspections of system sea containers with good compliance history. Initial set up costs offset by less congestion; reduced demurrage costs; reduced on-arrival inspections (from 100% to 5% with ongoing compliance); reduced on-arrival treatment or cleaning costs and reduced delay in discharge and clearance. See more of how this was achieved in the full presentation.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91549/

3.5. CTU Code And New Imo Container Inspection Guidelines

Lars Kjaer, World Shipping Council

The presentation highlights the development of the CTU Code noting that it was an industry initiative and a collaborative effort between industry stakeholders, IMO, UNECE and ILO. The CTU Code is approved by all three UN bodies (2013-2014) and consists of the Code, Annexes and Informative Material. It is a voluntary instrument constituting Best Practice that may be incorporated into or referenced in national law. See more of the presentation for how the Code addresses invasive pests and new IMO guidelines for the implementation of the inspection programmes for cargo transport units – pest contamination provisions:

- *40 The inspector should identify if there are any signs of pest contamination*
- 41 *It is recognized that proper identification of pest contamination may not be within the remit or knowledge of the inspector, therefore, if the inspector observes signs of pest contamination, they should report it as soon as is practicable to the pest contamination competent authority*
- *46 .1 Signs of pest contamination should be reported to the pest contamination competent authority with the following information: .1 inspection date; .2 origin of the CTU; .3 location of the pest contamination (exterior, interior and/or the cargo); .4 pest contamination type; and .5 planned date of onward movement, including destination to the extent known.*
- *46 .2 If the pest contamination competent authority cannot attend before the CTU is due for onward transportation, they should then forward the inspection details to the pest contamination competent authority of the CTU's next destination, if known.*
- *50 The pest contamination competent authority should establish, and make publicly available, the procedures it will follow for CTUs that in accordance with paragraph 46 have been found to have signs of pest contamination*

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91550/

3.6. The Good Phytosanitary Practices Program - Confindustria Ceramica, the Italian Ceramic Manufacturers Association

Enrico Lupi, Confindustria Ceramica

This presentation explains the GPP prevention program, based on ad hoc Guidelines, developed in cooperation with phytosanitary and quality systems experts and supported by CTDA (U.S. Ceramic Tile Distributors Association). The development involved mainly the Emilia-Romagna Region PPS, but also entomologists of the University of Modena and Reggio Emilia and a third party Certification body: Certiquality. 140 Italian brands qualified and the programme saw a reduction of treated containers by 83% from 2013 to 2020. Education and information were shared among all the participant companies and beyond. Preventive actions were carried out at company and sectoral level. Cooperation was seen among ceramic companies. The GPP model can safeguard both the ecosystem and international trade and can be extended to ceramic companies around the world and to other sectors.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91551/

3.7. Bio- security risks posed by the sea container pathway in Kenya

F. Koome, Kenya

This presentation reports on a country-wide inspection programme identifying containers surveyed, level of container contamination (56.3% of all the surveyed containers were contaminated); contamination levels empty vs packed. High and low risk contamination identified and nature of the contamination. It also includes a number of photographs of some of the types of invasive pests found. It concludes that full external and internal inspections of all containers on arrival is impractical; the risks associated with the pathway are diverse and not likely to be adequately mitigated by application of a single measure. It also states that current mitigations measures (CTU code) put in place by industry to manage contamination in sea containers are not adequately addressing the challenge and that the sea container pathway poses significant plant bio-security risk to Kenya.

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91552/

3.8. Practical solutions to reducing risks of transfer of plant pests and contaminants by the sea container pathway - Coffee industry perspective

Cleiton Papke, British Coffee Association

Here, the BCA discusses how movement of coffee underpinned by contractual and regulatory controls. The European Standard Contract for Coffee (ESCC) is universally used in Europe/UK. Because green coffee remains a live organism, pest control is vital to maintain quality & commercial value. The ESCC also stipulates that the seller to have “phytosanitary certificate,” and “fumigation certificates” if applicable. There is a legal requirement for movement into some countries and/or to clear Customs. Fumigation is carried out by professionally registered independent businesses. The existing contractual & regulatory measures deliver a high degree of pest control and meet the aspirations of Sea Containers Task Force report. Concludes that the majority of industries regulate themselves to assure the quality of their products and services. Opposes any new international requirement that all container and their cargos must be certified clean, as this would “…outweigh the benefits causing additional

burden on exporting countries, affecting the most vulnerable. There are existing preventive and remedial procedures in place already and a new certificate would not add value or assurance to the chain."

Link: https://www.ippc.int/en/publications/91553/

Conclusion

This concludes the summaries of the presentations from day 1 of the international workshop. A second ICHCA paper (to follow) will address the remaining presentations.

Disclaimer

ICHCA prepares its publications according to the information available at the time of publication. This document does not constitute professional advice, nor is it an exhaustive summary of the information available on the subject(s) to which it refers. Information contained in this document has been compiled with due attention to generally accepted good practice and, where appropriate, regulation. The aim is to share learning to prevent accidents and improve health and safety in cargo handling. References to external links, documents and web sites remain with the copywrite owners. ICHCA International is not responsible for, and cannot guarantee the accuracy of, information on sites that it does not manage; nor should the inclusion of a hyperlink be taken to mean endorsement by ICHCA International of the site to which it points.

Responsibility for health and safety compliance remains with the duty holder. Publications should always be read in conjunction with the relevant national and international legislation and any applicable regulations, standards and codes of practice. It should not be considered as an all-inclusive manual or handbook on any specific aspect of the subject matter to which the publication refers. Every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the information, but neither ICHCA, the author(s) nor any member of the ICHCA Technical Panel is responsible for any loss, damage, costs or expenses incurred (whether or not in negligence) arising from reliance on or interpretation of the publication. Comments set out in this publication are not necessarily the views of ICHCA or any member of the ICHCA Technical Panel.

Further Advice and Information

ICHCA International also offers a technical advisory service, with input from ICHCA Technical Panel, to answer member regulatory and operational cargo handling queries. For more information contact secretariat@ichca.com or visit www.ichca.com.