



## MINUTES OF THE SEA CONTAINERS TASK FORCE VIRTUAL MEETING

*Thursday, 13 January 2021, 21:00-23:00 (CET)*

### Participants:

- Mr Greg WOLFF (CPM Bureau representative, the Chair of the meeting);
- Ms Stephanie BLOEM (IC Lead);
- Ms Marina ZLOTINA (SC representative);
- Mr Rama KARRI (NPPO of Australia);
- Ms Wendolyn BELTZ (NPPO of USA);
- Ms Sina WAGHORN (RPPOs representative);
- Mr Bingbing SONG (IMO representative);
- Ms Özlem SOYSANLI (WCO representative);
- Mr Nicolaas (Nico) Maria HORN (Expert from ex-SC EWG for sea containers);
- Mr Lars KJAER (Observer from WSC);
- Mr Shane SELA (Observer from WB);
- Mr James HOOKHAM (Observer from GSF);
- Ms Wendy ASBIL (Observer from Canadian NPPO);
- Mr John HEDLEY (Observer);
- Mr Brent LARSON (Lead of the Implementation Facilitation Unit of the IPPC Secretariat);
- Mr Artur SHAMILOV (IPPC Secretariat lead for the SCTF, Standards Setting Unit).

[1] Mr Frederick MAKATHIMA (NPPO of Kenya), Ms Guanghao GU (NPPO of China), and Mr Jiang MINDE (Observer from Chinese Industry) were missing.

### 1. Opening of the Meeting

#### 1.1. Opening

[2] Mr Greg Wolff, CPM Bureau representative to the SCTF, reintroduced that there have been changes in the IPPC Secretariat and that Mr Artur Shamilov took over the task to coordinate the SCTF's work. He noted that having worked with Artur in the past and speaking today, he is confident that SCTF continues to have generous support.

### 2. Administrative Matters

[3] The SCTF selected Mr Greg WOLFF (Canada, CPM Bureau representative to the SCTF) as Chairperson.

### 3. Meeting Arrangements

#### 3.1. Adoption of the Agenda

[4] Chairperson – informed that the draft agenda was distributed before the meeting and invited participants to adopt it.

[5] Chairperson – reminded the participants that SCTF had its virtual meeting back in October 2020. He also informed that virtual CPM would occur, and there will be an SCTF update during CPM. He highlighted that it is crucial to finalize the SCTF 2021 Work Plan and discuss a more focused approach and communications, which Secretariat will present. He noted that having a physical meeting at the end of the 2021 calendar year is very unlikely. Hence, there will be a need for SCTF to have two or three virtual meetings, which can be discussed at relevant agenda items.

[6] Chairperson – informed about meeting documents, updates, and SCTF Work Plan. He reported that two papers were submitted to the Secretariat, namely, the Australian peak industry group survey, and an industry developed brief guide to the CTU Code that includes a container packing list addressed to packers. The agenda was adopted (see Annex 1 to this minutes)(1).

## 4. SCTF and Programme

### 4.1. Items from last meeting

Chairperson – informed that the minutes from the last meeting (October 2020 virtual meeting) were circulated to all participants for comments. Minutes identified many action items, and currently, most of the action items are captured in the draft 2021 Work Plan, which the group will go through.

### 4.2. Finalization of the Work Plan

[7] Chairperson – noted Work Plan had been much simplified from what SCTF looked at previously. It has been improved each time from taking the first massive group of issues and putting them into a more consolidated version.

[8] SCTF – considered two columns (description for the action item column and the priorities column) in this table, mostly or entirely blank. The SCTF did not feel real value in spending time trying to prioritize (in the same regard with the description) among the items and agreed to keep all items of the Work Plan that are important to work and possibly be achieved in the timeframes and remove the others. For those items that cannot be achieved, SCTF can note them and include those in the broad recommendations to the CPM (2).

[9] Chairperson – reminded the discussion both in Baltimore in 2018 and the 2020 October virtual meeting that SCTF hope to come up with a recommendation or advice to the CPM on what to take into account when considering the next steps regarding sea containers in 2022. Although it was not included in the complimentary action plan, it can be interpreted and seen as a sort of value that we can gain from the experts here and the work we have done over the past four or five years. Since elaborating the recommendation or advice for CPM does not fit within the work 2021 Work Plan's specific output, it is suggested to specify the separate output. Meanwhile, SCTF should continue identifying elements that should be included in recommendations to CPM. That would also be captured in the final report.

[10] Chairperson – highlighted that SCTF might not have a clear consensus by the end of its mandate in terms of one particular direction, whether it is an ISPM that is recommended or it should be an IPPC recommendation in its defined sense or something else. And it may be that SCTF come up with a report and a series of considerations for CPM which outlines the pros and cons of each of these and might help the CPM in 2022 to make a decision, including identifying areas where they may want to pursue work.

[11] Mr Brent LARSON – reminded the participants that it is very similar to the grain standard situation, as the CPM could not get an agreement, whether to have guidance or standard. The conference was organized, and after seven years of discussion, some points were sent to the CPM, and the CPM had a discussion on how to move forward. SCTF might not come up with a conclusion but can propose some pros and cons.

[12] Chairperson – noted that there had been various comments made about different regions or experts' views of what the SCTF or the CPM should be doing over the longer term and will continue to discuss them.

[13] Chairperson – explained that the draft SCTF 2021 Work Plan is divided into **five outputs/work areas**, and the SCTF could consolidate at least one or two of these into one. The outputs/work areas are as follows:

- **Output/Work Area I** – NPPOs Surveys (government site surveys);
- **Output/Work Area II** – Industry Surveys (might go into Output/Work Area III);

- **Output/Work Area III** – Development of additional materials / Awareness raising (could be consolidated and trimmed down by combining it with Output/Work Area V, as both sometimes duplicate and seem very similar in the objective);
- **Output/Work Area IV** – Coordination with CPs, RPPOs, industry and other organizations;
- **Output/Work Area V** – Communication activities.

[14] The SCTF members were invited to see if everything in the draft Work Plan is feasible for 2021, taking into account the COVID-19 pandemic, and if something is not feasible, remove it from the Work Plan and include it in the final report.

**Output/Work Area I – NPPOs Surveys**

***(1) Activity 1.1 (NPPOs conducting surveys provide results and analysis of their national surveys to the SCTF)***

[15] Chairperson – In Activity 1.1, the SCTF have a September-October target period of 2021. However, at the previous meeting, China informed that there might be limitations due to security reasons. Considering restrictions right through this year in terms of physical contacting this activity is most constrained right now.

[16] Ms Sina WAGHORN – informed that in New Zealand, the survey was completed, and the COVID-19 pandemic did not interrupt it too much in terms of container numbers, and it should be on track, and it should provide with everything that was anticipated.

[17] Mr Lars KJAER – noted that the timeline for Activity 1.1 is tentative October. It does not seem to square with Activity 1.3, as it is impossible to summarize results without them received. He proposed to move Activity 1.1 and 1.3 to the end of 2021.

[18] Chairperson – reminded that during the last meeting, the SCTF agreed that under Activity 1.3, NPPOs and RPPOs would develop and submit short articles on pest risks to be published on the IPP. He assumed that this information would also come from the surveys' results, and therefore it is correct to move Activity 1.1 to the last phase of the sea containers work (November-December 2021).

[19] Ms Wendolyn BELTZ – informed that the survey is not going to be accomplished in the US, as there are still difficulties with the relationship between NPPO and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), asking the latter to help the NPPO.

[20] Ms Wendy ASBIL – also noted that in Canada the situation is similar to in the US. The agency will provide some data that have been collected. Still, it will be a small number compared to what was planned.

***(2) Activity 1.2 (Consider deletion of some fields from the inspection record template of the Guidelines on Sea Container Surveys for NPPOs to assist in better reporting by NPPOs)***

[21] Chairperson – reminded that at the last meeting, it was agreed for Activity 1.2 that some of the fields from the inspection template of the surveys' guideline will be deleted because it could result in better reporting.

[22] Ms Sina WAGHORN – informed that a company was contracted for the survey, and no information was provided until the survey was finished. She also did not recall difficulties filling some fields and proposed not trying to identify fields to delete.

[23] Mr Rama KARRI – recalled that in terms of sharing data, there was informal feedback on providing country-specific interception data identifying the countries. He was not aware of any of the actual field sensitivities and questioned the value of pursuing this item.

[24] Mr Lars KJAER – also recalled that Ms Guanghao GU raised this point and proposed the Secretariat contact China and ask what was causing a problem before deletion.

[25] Chairperson – asked the Secretariat to follow up with Ms Guanhao GU to see the fields that China has indicated that they may not submit data (3).

(3) *Activity 1.3 (Develop a paper summarizing the results of NPPO surveys)*

[26] Chairperson – noted that for Activity 1.3, it was agreed to move it to November 2021, which can also be a part of the recommendations or can be moved to become a communications aspect.

(4) *Activity 1.4 (Collect information on techniques used by NPPOs, port authorities/other stakeholders to survey and monitor cleanliness, safety and movement of CTUs)*

[27] Chairperson – stressed that Activity 1.4 is a vital part of the recommendations; that Australia had initiated a project on developing specific technologies; and it also related to customer surveys.

[28] Mr Rama KARRI – noted that it is about using technology, namely, using high-resolution cameras combined with algorithms to automatically detect the external risks before expanding the concept to internal risks, whereby the concept and the initial results quite encouraging. It is planned to undertake a free trial, which has been delayed slightly due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Once the field trials are completed, the updates will be provided at the next meeting.

[29] Chairperson – indicated that it could be an interesting part of any recommendations SCTF make on how the trials go if it is picking up external contamination very effectively.

(5) *Activity 1.5 (The World Bank to update the SCTF on the pilot to support selected CPs /NPPOs with national surveys)*

[30] Chairperson – asked Mr Shane SELA to provide any comments on whether the activity is still feasible, reminding that September was a feasible timeframe and assumed that everything would be known by then whether there have been any activities and probably not because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

[31] Mr Shane SELA – informed that it may be still feasible, and the discussions are ongoing with several Pacific countries but there are difficulties to implementing surveys. Awareness continues to be raised on the issue. However, it is a challenge for countries to implement surveys given resourcing, legislation and other challenges. . He proposed leaving the item for discussion at a future meeting (4).

(6) *Activity 1.6 (Include assistance to member countries on sea container cleanliness in the IMO technical development programmes)*

[32] Chairperson – noted that both activities 1.6 and 1.7 have the action parties and timeframes to be determined, which could be a signal or sign that they needed to be removed.

[33] Mr Bingbing SONG – suggested to the Secretariat for Activity 1.6 replacing the first word “Include” to “Consider” in the activity title (5). He also proposed keeping some contact and depending on the work outcome from the correspondence group on the inspection program after the next session in September 6-10, 2021. He informed that the basis for considering some technical cooperation activities would be the inspection program and the inclusion of some contamination guidance. It can be the point of departure for further cooperation between IMO, IPPC, and the individual Member States. He proposed to continue some further discussions with the IPPC Secretariat when the inspection program is finalized.

[34] Mr Brent LARSON – stressed the benefits for IPPC contracting parties in contacting their IMO representatives on these groups and suggested facilitating and encouraging. He proposed to get a list of who is in the correspondence group so that the Secretariat could create a target for some of the contracting parties to discuss with the IMO reps.

[35] Mr Bingbing SONG – agreed to forward a list of the correspondence group participants, noting that Mr Lancaster is the New Zealand coordinator.

(7) *Activity 1.7 Provide ideas to the Secretariat how the SCTF could address the action entitled Ensuring that regulations developed/implemented by NPPOs are based on PRA and consistent with Recommendation CPM 10/2015\_01 on Sea Containers*

- [36] Chairperson – recalled that for Activity 1.7, there was a concern during the October meeting that it must be ensured that NPPOs are always basing measures for sea containers on pest risk analysis and are consistent with the IPPC aspects and recommendations. He wanted to remove it since the NPPOs must base PRA measures or technical justification by being part of the IPPC and being bound by the Convention.
- [37] Mr Lars KJAER – proposed to use the rest of 11 months of their mandate on more essential issues. This activity will be discussed later in the final report and recommendations to CPM.
- [38] Chairperson – agreed to bring it into the final recommendations and proposed to remove Activity 1.7 from the 2021 Work Plan (6).

### **Output/Work Area II – Industry Surveys**

- Chairperson – recalled that the output II is a board work area, but there is only one activity (2.1 – Identify next steps to develop an App reflecting available information contained in the IPPC best practice guidelines published earlier this year to support the uptake of the CTU Code), which does not seem like an industry survey activity, and the nature of App would be more about awareness-raising. Taking into account that at the last meeting, it was noted that work was not progressing and the occurrence of the App later on in the draft Work Plan (awareness-raising part), he proposed removing it from the industry survey activity because it should be captured later on and it can be elaborated on that.
- [39] Mr Artur SHAMILOV – reminded that during the commenting period, there was a suggestion to remove it.
- [40] Mr Nicolaas Maria HORN – stressed the difference between an App for awareness-raising and one for the survey, providing instructions regarding the findings and observations. Hence since this activity was proposed under industry survey, it looks like the second type, but it is not clear whether that fits the SCTF timeframe.
- [41] Chairperson – recalled that going back to the minutes of the last meeting, in paragraph 29, Mr Lars KJAER had indicated that due to various reasons, the industry would not be in a position to develop the App, which was more survey type based as previously planned, and therefore the IPPC could continue to take on this task. If that is the case, this App becomes awareness-raising and can be moved to the work area on awareness and communication (7).

### **Output/Work Area III – Development of additional materials/Awareness raising**

- [42] Chairperson – introduced the next Output/Work Area III and proposed combining it with communications. Once agreed, one area with a title reflecting awareness-raising, communication, and development of additional materials could be established.

#### ***(1) Activity 3.1 (Consolidation of best practices guidelines developed by the SCTF)***

- [43] Chairperson – recalled that in paragraph 45 of the October virtual meeting minutes, the SCTF was going to look for risk management guidance material for sea containers and share it with the Secretariat (8). Special attention was paid to materials that are easy to translate into different languages that could be consolidated into an updated CPM recommendation. The original deadline was spring 2021, which was very soon. Hence, he proposed to put up a broader timeframe from spring to summer 2021.
- [44] Mr Lars KJAER – reminded that an updated version of the CPM recommendation was previously discussed. However, he could not find an action item explicitly calling out the revision or updating the CPM recommendation, which could be an essential part of the SCTF legacy. The current recommendation was developed in 2015. Hence, he suggested that the SCTF consider adding such an action item in the Work Plan.
- [45] Chairperson – noted that at the previous meeting, the development of the CPM recommendation was discussed, but he proposed to be more precise by calling it as considerations to the CPM – the final SCTF report with pros and cons considerations to distinguish from the current CPM recommendations.

He continued that the CPM recommendations have certain standing, and while they are not full ISPMs, they are published on the IPPC website and coming from a standard setting process. Hence, they have a certain amount of weight as a standard, but they are essential. He also questioned whether the SCTF need to update the CPM recommendation R-06 or not, as that is one thing that the SCTF have to get full consensus. He provided an example of China's position whereby they feel that the SCTF need to develop a standard. He noted that if the CPM decides to proceed with a standard, perhaps updating the current CPM recommendation on Sea containers (R-06) could be an interim step, and there could be some practicalities obtained from that exercise. He also acknowledged that at the end of the calendar year (end of the work of the SCTF), the SCTF might have a firm position supporting either a recommendation and/or a standard, and he proposed to capture that in the minutes of this meeting to benefit from all of the work over the next six months. He assumed that the work related to this item would probably come in during the November-December timeframe and would capture possible elements for inclusion in an updated CPM recommendation. He proposed to include this activity in work at the moment and determine at a later stage.

[46] Mr Lars KJAER – agreed with Chairperson's suggestion to include in the minutes of this meeting discussion on the possible revision of existing CPM recommendation on Sea containers (R-06), considering the possible lack of consensus within this group.

[47] Mr Brent LARSON – supported an idea to update the CPM recommendation on Sea containers (R-06), as these things need to be updated once a while, and there is a lot of information on it. He also proposed to suggest this update to the upcoming CPM as, according to the rules, to develop the recommendation or revise one, a request should arrive a year before presenting draft, and that will be especially timely if the SCTF were going to present the revised CPM recommendation on Sea containers as part of a package for the SCTF at the close of the mandate.

[48] Chairperson – also supported revision CPM recommendation on Sea containers, which would have to go for a consultation (9).

[49] Mr Brent LARSON – wanted to clarify Activity 3.1 where it says about consolidation of best practices. He questioned how parties in the supply chain should do things (to consolidate all guidance into one document that trade people can distribute) and which types of best practices (for doing the survey, raising awareness, or best practice for pest risk analysis) should be.

[50] Mr Lars KJAER – reminded that after the SCTF meeting in Shanghai, a document had been produced setting forth guidance to different key parties in the supply chain supplemented by a one-pager summarizing the guidance. This document incorporated earlier IPPC material. Hence, all the guidance the SCTF have been producing could be consolidated into one version of the guidance that trade associations could distribute to the prospective members to improve uptake of those guidelines and include that information into an updated CPM recommendation. He concluded that this could be a part of the SCTF legacy.

[51] Mr Nico Horn – highlighted the best practices for handling sea containers not getting contaminated and staying clean.

[52] Chairperson – agreed to change the title of Activity 3.1 to “Consolidation of best practices for pest risk management guidelines developed by the SCTF” and proposed to clarify this activity and time frames and move this towards the September-October timeframe, except for the idea of proposing a revision of CPM recommendation on Sea containers as one of the next steps, unless the SCTF is going to have an agreement on that at the end of this meeting, as this is the last meeting before the CPM-15 (10).

(2) *Activity 3.2 (Development of App on best practices published by the IPPC earlier this year)*

[53] Chairperson – recalled that the best practices are for handling sea containers, as Mr Nico Horn mentioned, to avoid pest contamination. He stressed the importance of determining the leads and the timeframes and the comments and financial resources to be identified.

- [54] Mr Shane SELA – suggested that the proposal introduces an additional cost for the Secretariat as well as ongoing maintenance to be posting on the website. He also suggested that whatever is being developed as web guidance could be made mobile-friendly so that people can look at it and read it on a mobile phone just as well as on the website.
- [55] Chairperson – proposed that this could be an item that the SCTF identified as wanting to put in its final report as one of the potential considerations. Given all of the discussions the SCTF had in Baltimore and elsewhere about the value of an app these days, he suggested recognizing that it is not going to be done this year but rather kept in mind for the SCTF final report considerations.
- [56] Mr Lars KJAER – supported the idea of having an app, oriented towards the packers.
- (3) *Activity 3.3 (SCTF to put forward a proposal to the Secretariat and IC IRSS Sub-group for an IRSS study to aggregate information on best practices and data related to the sea container surveys, legislative frameworks and other issues)*
- [57] Chairperson – noted that Activity 3.3 had to be removed from the 2021 Work Plan due to survey fatigue and the fact that people are focused on COVID-19 related impacts (11). He also stressed that adding work to an already tight schedule now was not justified.
- (4) *Activity 3.4 (Develop and publish a sea containers page as an IPP phytosanitary systems page)*
- [58] Chairperson – recalled that the group noted that Activity 3.4 had been done, and there will be enhancements to that and ongoing development.
- (5) *Activity 3.5 (NPPOs to provide relevant materials to be published on the Sea containers IPP page inter alia case studies)*
- [59] Chairperson – reported that under this activity, one paper from Australia had been received.
- [60] Mr Brent LARSON – proposed to issue a call for contributed resources to be reviewed by the IC.
- [61] Chairperson – agreed with the proposal as it will highlight the existence of the sea containers web page, and the paper from Australia will encourage more activities. He also noted that since this exercise is to be carried out throughout 2021, the SCTF agreed that the IPPC call should be issued (12).
- (6) *Activity 3.6 (NASCI/WB webinars with specific industry sectors to conduct outreach and to collect specific commodity/sector input)*
- [62] Ms Wendy ASBIL – recalled that two webinars were held – one with the Global Shippers Forum and the International Cargo Handling Coordination Association (ICHCA), and another with the World Shipping Council. She also reported that the activity had been initiated, and some smaller webinars have been planned, but the timeframe may not be feasible. Hence, they are planned to be undertaken once squeezed into the agendas of the various groups.
- [63] Chairperson – proposed to extend this activity till September to pull the information from that to help the SCTF with the final considerations.
- [64] Ms Wendolyn BELTZ – stressed the workshops’ usefulness and expressed the hope not to stop them after October or after the SCTF assignment. She also noted that two ideas for workshops were in place – workshops for NPPOs (for those countries that want to learn how other countries have addressed the issue and how they have approached industry), which was planned to organize pre or post CPM; and industry workshops (supply chain) to discuss challenges, generate ideas on next steps and collect suggestions for measures.
- [65] Chairperson – proposed to gain input from them right up until the SCTF finalize the report, to make it more outreach and awareness to summarize what will be presented to CPM, to a maximum possible extent.
- [66] Mr Brent LARSON – proposed to do three seminars, involve industry and make available for the whole world to join them, considering the different time zones and some languages.

- [67] Chairperson – questioned the idea as it could be complicated this year due to the COVID-19 pandemic and limited time for preparation. He proposed considering it as the SCTF end assignment and putting together broad three/four workshops across.
- [68] Mr Shane SELA – noted that it would be beneficial for some of the project countries to have some instructions on how to go about these surveys. He suggested that if Ms Wendolyn BELTZ and Ms Wendy ASBIL are willing to put together the presentations, he would be happy to coordinate a workshop.
- [69] Mr Rama KARRI – offered assistance in organizing the meetings.
- [70] Chairperson – concluded that Mr Shane SELA, Ms Wendolyn BELTZ, Ms Wendy ASBIL, and Mr Rama KARRI should explore the feasibility of a workshop. If the SCTF has a meeting following CPM, then the SCTF could consider putting on these workshops.
- [71] Mr Lars KJAER – asked for clarification on whether an industry workshop would be arranged, where all the supply chain partners could get together with roles and responsibilities to identify and engage the NPPOs. He also noted that Activity 3.7 (Deliver NPPO workshop to discuss challenges, generate ideas on next steps, and collect suggestions for measures) was never intended as an alternative to the webinars, as the latter was only introduced because of the COVID-19 pandemic, and they all should lead to a workshop in Washington, where we can draw operational conclusions that can go into the SCTF report.
- [72] Chairperson – considering Brent’s idea in having some NPPOs specific workshops, still pending for the NASCI workshop with the supply chain logistics and retailers, he proposed adding it in the table as a new Activity 3.7 (NASCI workshop NPPO and Industry) (13).

**Output/Work Area IV – Coordination with CPs, RPPOs, industry and other organizations**

- (1) *Activity 4.1 (Put forward a proposal to the port authorities round table for potential ways to collaborate)*
- [73] The SCTF agreed to remove Activity 4.1 from the 2021 Work Plan and do not pursue it further at this stage (14).
- (2) *Activity 4.2 (Establish collaboration with the International Association of Ports and Harbors (IAPH))*
- [74] The Secretariat informed that Mr Lars KJAER provided the contacts, and updates will be prepared for the next meeting (15).
- (3) *Activity 4.6 (Development of a letter in collaboration the IMO Secretariat informing stakeholders on inspection best practices based on the IPPC Sea container supply chains and cleanliness best practice guidelines)*
- [75] Chairperson – stressed the lack of information and consensus and highlighted that the activity says that the work will depend on the IMO correspondence group’s outcomes.
- [76] Mr Bingbing SONG – proposed to leave this issue between the IPPC and IMO Secretariats, as it will depend on this correspondence group’s outcome and the finalization of the inspection program.
- (4) *Activity 4.7 (Develop a proposal for additional data fields to be added to the WCO data model)*
- [77] Chairperson – noted that consultations have been delayed because of the COVID-19 pandemic and asked whether to keep this with the later timeframes or delete it from the table.
- [78] Mr Rama KARRI – recalled the update during the last meeting in October, where the workshop had been planned. Currently, a workshop with the industry to discuss Khapra Beetle policy requirements is planned, and it might be an opportunity to cover off this action item. He will provide further updates at the next meeting (16).



(5) *Activity 4.8 (Industry representatives identify challenges and ways to provide information to be reflected in a WCO data model so that NPPOs can consider this when/if a potential new data element is added in the WCO Data Model)*

[79] Chairperson – noted that Mr Lars KJAER commented that industry representatives could only meaningfully provide comments if/when a potential data element has been identified.

[80] Mr Brent LARSON – noted that the IPPC has been negotiating with the WCO for many years, as they are willing to do something. Still, it has never been clearly and precisely identified what the data elements are and what is possible.

(6) *Activity 4.9 (IPPC Sect. discusses with WCO Sect. the inclusion of phytosanitary aspects/criteria into the global AEO framework)*

[81] Mr Brent LARSON – noted that it is still under consideration, but only one step has been done. He also reminded the SCTF that there is a planned SAFE Review Meeting, 15-16 February 2021, and the Secretariat will try to participate (17).

(7) *Activity 4.10 (NPPOs examine legal/other considerations with respect to AEO)*

[82] Ms Wendolyn BELTZ – noted that some minimum security requirements had been added for sea container contamination in the US and for packing material that was rolled out in January of this year, but no data has been provided yet. She also stressed that it is a possible but not easy thing to move forward when examining legal and other considerations.

[83] Mr Lars KJAER – proposed to delete this item as it is not realistic to be done this year, and it might be outside of the remit of the SCTF.

[84] Mr Shane SELA – noted that in terms of global outreach, many countries have safe trader approaches applied to agricultural commodities and agricultural trade. He wondered if there could be some inclusion of sea container management within safe trader approaches .

[85] Chairperson – asked to include safe trader approach in the minutes to cover the comments' broad nature and highlighted success with that in some regions and with some conveyance and commodities.

[86] Ms Özlem SOYSANLI – provided two different discussions: (1) inclusion of some criteria under the AEO framework regarding the cleanliness of containers and regarding the agricultural requirements; (2) the SAFE Framework of Standards which is an overarching standard, which also includes the AOE program in it and this standard there are different pillars. She informed about the initiated discussion regarding the cooperation between customs and other government agencies at the national level, where some WCO members proposed that the National Agriculture and Food agencies also be indicated in the SAFE framework of standards. Some members supporting this idea of agencies cooperating with the customs and maybe is a little bit beyond the target of this SCTF. She also stressed that it is enshrined in the IPPC-WCO joint Work Plan.

[87] Mr Rama KARRI – proposed to continue pursuing this option as part of the SCTF or separately. He mentioned the discussions about the SAFE framework in detail at the meeting in Washington. He also supported the concept, which is a supply chain solution that helps the industry to have less regulatory burden as long as they do the right thing. He proposed to consider a recommendation for the CPM and capture in the minutes that it may continue to pursue.

[88] Chairperson – agreed to remove Activity 4.10 from the table, reflecting the minutes' conversation on having some considerations regarding SAFE traders in the final report (18).

(8) *Activity 4.12 (Participate in development of UNECE CTU Code App)*

[89] Chairperson – questioned whether Activity 4.12 the same app that was discussed earlier.

[90] Mr Lars KJAER – responded that it is a different app that gives specific guidance to the packer, including guidance on preventing pest contamination of cargo and containers. He recommended keeping this as a separate point, and he will coordinate with IPPC Secretariat to find out more about this activity (19).

**(9) Activity 4.14 (Development of an SCTF proposal for the revision of the CTU Code with respect to the pest risk issues)**

[91] Chairperson – noted that this activity would be done throughout 2021.

[92] Mr Bingbing SONG – noted that this activity is related to the one before about the app and that the work is still pending the final approval by ILO, one of the co-sponsor for the CTU code. He also noted that the IPPC Secretariat could also lead this activity, and contribution from the SCTF will be beneficial **(20)**.

**(10) Activity 4.15 (Additional contributions to UNECE handbook on national master plans for freight transport and logistics)**

[93] Chairperson – noted that this activity is still to come; hence it will be retained.

**Output/Work Area V – Communication activities**

[94] The SCTF members agreed that most of the activities under in area should remain.

**(1) Activity 5.6 (Industry representatives develop IPP news item on ongoing pest risk work)**

[95] Mr James HOOKHAM and Mr Lars KJAER offered elaboration of a news item for the IPP using the industry's materials.

[96] Chairperson – proposed to combine into communications package or work and to add to the IPP SCTF webpage.

**(2) Activity 5.12 (IPP news item on materials available including industry Quick Guide to the CTU Code and Container Packing Checklist)**

[97] The SCTF discussed Activity 5.12 and Mr Lars KJAER provided a Quick Guide to the CTU Code and Container Packing Checklist to the Secretariat. Ms Stephanie BLOEM, who previously offered NAPPO's support in translation into Spanish, informed that the Spanish translation of the document was submitted.

## **5. Updates**

### **5.1. IC December 2020 virtual meeting**

[98] Ms Stephanie BLOEM – provided an update to the SCTF on the IC virtual meeting on 16 December 2020. She informed them on the extension of the mandate until the end of 2021 on the SCTF deliverables and thoughts for the future in terms of pending deliverables, which had already been covered during this meeting (authorized economic operators, the WCO data models, the workshops, etc.). She positively responded to the IC on whether the SCTF was planning to update CPM-15 in 2021. Whether the SCTF plan could be published, the Secretariat informed that it would not be ready before the CPM, but it would be possible to notify contracting parties and the IC members when the Work Plan is posted. As for the revision of the CTU code, the IPPC Secretariat informed the IC that they would participate. There were also questions about the workshop on sea containers, where the idea behind the US-based workshop plan by the North American sea containers was reiterated. The initiative was to have various industries involved in that workshop to generate practical solutions to some of the issues of the SCTF. She also informed the IC on the issue of getting the data for the national surveys. On the question of getting additional data in case the SCTF extended the mandate in one year, the idea of bringing in the involvement of AEO to help the SCTF solve that situation was emphasized. Mr Brent LARSON also indicated two different undertaken activities – the national surveys and that questionnaire had received 60 responses, where the national surveys were the ones where the SCTF had fewer data.

[99] Chairperson – added that the SCTF paper for the CPM is that the SCTF will have to decide at this meeting whether the SCTF need to ask for permission to update the CPM recommendation.

## 5.2. Australian based peak industry group survey

[100] Mr Rama KARRI – reported that shared information provides the results from the survey about who unpacked and what kind of training is provided and some comments about what importers and exporters about any improvements in cleanliness. He noted that it is useful for authority as it provides some details about the relations in the supply chain.

[101] Chairperson – proposed to consider this information carefully for potentially including parts of that in the SCTF final report’s considerations and keep it as a reference document to go through the year.

## 5.3. Industry to provide a compilation of articles related to the roll-out of the Quick Guide and the Container Packing Checklist

[102] Mr Lars KJAER – explained that the SCTF discussed at the last meeting communication strategy, where the SCTF should approach maritime-related magazines and trade press. He highlighted that even though Mr James HOOKHAM and himself worked with others to put together a press release where the direct quotes attributed to offering the importance of pests contamination and addressing pest contamination are highlighted, only three of the 20 plus articles picked up on that point. He noted that all collective governments and industries are faced with the challenge that established media does not see pest contamination as an issue, and this needs to be taken into account in the development of a communication strategy. He concluded that packers do not read the news items on the IPPC website, and there is a need to think about how the SCTF get guidance material on minimizing pest contamination out to the frontline people.

[103] Chairperson – asked the Secretariat to capture these points as it is a crucial thing relating to how to have impactful communications and how to target the stakeholders.

## 5.4. IPPC and WCO Secretariats meeting

[104] Ms Özlem SOYSANLI – informed that a meeting on 26 November 2020 was held between two Secretariats. From the WCO Secretariat, there was a model team and SAFE framework of standards team. The joint work program and sea containers were mainly discussed. She also informed that there is an ongoing discussion in the Safe Working Group, whereby one WCO member would like to include the cooperation between customs and agricultural food agencies, either in the SAFE framework of standards or in the guidelines of the SAFE package and the text proposed for this purpose is: *“customs administrations should establish mutual cooperation with agriculture and food agencies. Cooperation may include joint controls at border crossing points in order to facilitate customs clearance or reduce common data required by each agency facilitating transition towards single window systems and jointly developed criteria and benefits for respective AEO programs”*. The final decision on this proposal will be taken in the Safe Working Group in April 2021. She suggested the IPPC Secretariat join that meeting to listen to these discussions.

[105] Chairperson – proposed establishing a repository of documents that will be reviewed to prepare the SCTF final considerations and information for the CPM (including the one in April)(21).

## 6. Communication

### 6.1. News article prepared by the Australian NPPO for publication on the IPPC webpage. The article relates to the issue of Khapra beetle contamination in sea containers

[106] Chairperson – noted that the Secretariat has been talking about having professional communications to focus on the SCTF-related communication activities.

## 6.2. IC request to provide short guidance to CPs on how to collaborate with other agencies at national level

[107] Mr Artur SHAMILOV – informed that there was a discussion during the IC meeting on a need for guidance for the NPPOs on how to approach the different agencies to collaborate better and sea containers. He noted that having a communication specialist will provide the person with technical information, for example, a letter type of guidance.

[108] Mr Brent LARSON – complimented that the NPPOs need to contact their IMO or WCO representatives to get support for these initiatives. He also noted that they do not know what to do or how to do it because they do not have a quick facts sheet to say what they need to convince IMO or WCO representatives. Hence, a communication person could help with that, but it might be useful for the SCTF to identify key messages they want to transmit.

[109] Chairperson – proposed to come back to this topic during the next meeting (22).

## 6.3. Communication support

[110] Mr Artur SHAMILOV – stressed a need for a professional communication specialist who could decently pack this information and reach a broader audience. He proposed an idea to ask the IC for the agreement and proceed with contacting the FAO communications team and finding out the expert who could help the SCTF, considering the industry and the government's experience and the limited time in 2021.

[111] The SCTF agreed to have a professional helping in this field also to address agenda item 6.2 (23).

## 7. Any other business

[112] Mr Brent LARSON – noted that as for the CPM recommendation, usually, a contracting party takes ownership of the request, and if the SCTF say they should do it, then there is a little group that is formed to draft something in time to get it out for consultation 2021.

[113] Chairperson – proposed identifying a small group for providing inputs during the revision of the CPM recommendation (24).

## 8. Date and arrangement of the Next Meeting

[114] The SCTF agreed that the next meeting date should be mid to late April for the next meeting after the CPM so that the SCTF can see the decisions on some of these things that the SCTF have asked (25).

## 9. Conclusions

[115] The SCTF agreed:

- (1) to adopt agenda (Annex 1);
- (2) to note items that cannot be achieved and will include them in the broad recommendations to the CPM;
- (3) to ask the Secretariat to follow up with Ms Guanghao GU to see the fields that China has indicated that they may not submit data under Activity 1.1;
- (4) to ask Mr Shane SELA to provide an update at the next meeting on Activity 1.5 (The World Bank to update the SCTF on the pilot to support selected CPs /NPPOs with national surveys);
- (5) to rename Activity 1.6 to “Consider assistance to member countries on sea container cleanliness in the IMO technical development programmes”;
- (6) to remove Activity 1.7 from the 2021 Work Plan;
- (7) to move activity 2.1 to work area on awareness and communication and remove Output/Work Area II from the 2021 Work Plan;
- (8) to share with the IPPC Secretariat risk management guidance materials for sea containers;

- (9) to ask the IC to request the CPM-15 to update the current CPM recommendation on Sea containers (R-06);
- (10) to change the title of Activity 3.1 to “Consolidation of best practices for pest risk management guidelines developed by the SCTF” and move this towards the September-October timeframe;
- (11) to remove Activity 3.3 (SCTF to put forward a proposal to the Secretariat and IC IRSS Sub-group for an IRSS study to aggregate information on best practices and data related to the sea container surveys, legislative frameworks and other issues) from the 2021 Work Plan;
- (12) to ask the IPPC Secretariat to issue a call for contributed resources (relevant materials on the Sea containers and case studies);
- (13) to add a new Activity 3.7 (NASCI workshop NPPO and Industry) and to ask Ms Wendy ASBIL to provide updates as necessary;
- (14) to remove Activity 4.1 (Put forward a proposal to the port authorities round table for potential ways to collaborate) from the Work Plan 2021;
- (15) to ask the IPPC Secretariat to provide updates on the next meeting concerning Activity 4.2 (Establish collaboration with the International Association of Ports and Harbors (IAPH));
- (16) to ask Mr Rama KARRI to provide further updates at the next meeting on the workshop with the industry to discuss Khapra Beetle policy requirements;
- (17) to ask the IPPC Secretariat to provide updates on the next meeting concerning Activity 4.9 (IPPC Sect. discusses with WCO Sect. the inclusion of phytosanitary aspects/criteria into the global AEO framework);
- (18) to remove Activity 4.10 (NPPOs examine legal/other considerations with respect to AEO) from the 2021 Work Plan;
- (19) to ask Mr Lars KJAER and the IPPC Secretariat to provide updates on the next meeting concerning Activity 4.12 (Participate in development of UNECE CTU Code App);
- (20) to ask the IPPC Secretariat also to coordinate Activity 4.14 (Development of an SCTF proposal for the revision of the CTU Code with respect to the pest risk issues);
- (21) to establish a repository of documents that will be reviewed to prepare the SCTF final considerations and information for the CPM;
- (22) to come back to the IC request to provide short guidance to CPs on how to collaborate with other agencies at national level during the next meeting;
- (23) to ask IC agreement to have a professional helping in communication field also to address agenda item 6.2 (IC request to provide short guidance to CPs on how to collaborate with other agencies at national level);
- (24) to identify a small group for providing inputs to the revision of the CPM recommendation if the CPM permits the SCTF, and identify candidates who would probably volunteer themselves;
- (25) that the next meeting date should be mid to late April for the next meeting after the CPM so that the SCTF can see the decisions on some of these things that the SCTF have asked.

[116] Consequentially, and following the SCTF decisions, the IPPC Secretariat will reorganize and restructure the 2021 Work Plan for consideration at future SCTF meetings.