



REPORT

Johor, Malaysia
28 May – 1 June 2012

**Expert Working
Group on
Minimizing Pest
Movement by Sea
Containers
May, 2012**



Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

CONTENTS

1.	Opening of the meeting	3
1.1	Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and Host.....	3
1.2	Introductions	3
1.3	Roles of the Participants.....	3
1.4	Selection of the Chair.....	3
1.5	Selection of the Rapporteur.....	3
1.6	Adoption of the Agenda	3
2.	Administrative Matters	3
3.	Updates	3
3.1	November 2011 Sea Container Steering Committee Meeting	3
4.	Review of the Specification and SC comments.....	5
5.	Participation in Development of Industry Guidance	5
6.	Development of the Draft ISPM.....	6
6.1	Review of draft ISPM	6
7.	Next Steps.....	11
7.1	Further development of other components of the standard (e.g. containers for re-positioning)	11
7.2	Communication plan	11
7.3	Implementation plan.....	11
8.	Other Business	12
9.	Close of the Meeting.....	12

APPENDIXES

Appendix 1 - Agenda	13
Appendix 2 - Documents list.....	15
Appendix 3 - Participants list	16
Appendix 4 –Recommendations from the November 2011 SCSC meeting agreed to by the Standards Committee.....	20
Appendix 5 - EWG Sea Containers Workplan 2012.....	24
Appendix 6 – Stages in development of an ISPM.....	25

1. Opening of the meeting

1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat and Host

The International Plant Protection Convention (IPPC) Secretariat welcomed the members of the Expert Working Group (EWG) on the topic Minimizing Pest Movement by Sea Containers (2008-001), thanked them for their work in preparing for this meeting and hoped that the meeting would be productive. The host welcomed the EWG and wished them a pleasant stay in Malaysia.

1.2 Introductions

The members introduced themselves and outlined their experience in dealing with sea containers.

1.3 Roles of the Participants

The IPPC Secretariat informed the members that the role of the experts is to help produce a globally acceptable standard and noted that the participants are here as experts, not as representatives of their region or country. The IPPC Secretariat noted that its role is to facilitate these discussions, and stressed that long-term commitment is necessary for the adoption of a standard, which is usually a five-year process.

1.4 Selection of the Chair

The EWG selected Ms Nancy KUMMEN as Chair.

1.5 Selection of the Rapporteur

The EWG selected Mr Nico HORN as Rapporteur.

1.6 Adoption of the Agenda

The EWG approved the Agenda as attached in Appendix 1.

2. Administrative Matters

The EWG reviewed the Documents list as attached in Appendix 2.

The meeting participants are listed in Appendix 3.

3. Updates

Updates were given on the following topics:

3.1 November 2011 Sea Container Steering Committee Meeting

The IPPC Secretariat presented the report from the November 2011 Sea Container Steering Committee (SCSC) meeting. Some members raised points during the update and were advised to bring these up during the drafting of the standard.

Comments:

- One member stated that it is hard to differentiate between marine containers and other containers – trying to make that difference would add a complexity that is not needed. It needs to be clear that the standard is dealing with the mode of transport of any type of container (i.e. maritime routes) not dealing with only marine containers. It is dealing with all containers being carried by shipping lines, including reefers.
- A comment was made with regards to military containers and that they do not always move with commercial shipping. They can be moved on military transport and they should not be exempt from this standard.
- The ferrying of containers between ports will be dealt with when the containers leave the depots.

Commission on Phytosanitary Measures update

The steward presented an update from the Seventh Session of the Commission on Phytosanitary Measures (CPM) held in March 2012 where the steward and co-steward had given a presentation on the work of this EWG to a small group of interested CPM members at a side session. The PowerPoint presentation was shared with the EWG members.

Standards committee update

The Secretariat presented the results of the discussion by the Standards Committee (SC) at their April 2012 meeting. The SC had agreed with the EWG to continue the development of the draft standard but some concerns were raised on the role the EWG had in developing industry guidance. The SC felt that the standard should give guidance to national plant protection organizations (NPPOs). Based on further discussions, the SC agreed to several recommendations from the November 2011 SCSC meeting and these are outlined in Appendix 4.

Industry Liaison

The Container Owners' Association (COA) representative gave an update on industry liaison activities. Advisory messages have been sent to COA through a newsletter, to International Chamber of Shipping (ICS) through an advice note, and to the World Shipping Council (WSC) through a letter to members. The response from industry was positive. Industry acknowledges that the issue is important and the movement of containers has assisted in creating the problem. Industry supports the development of a standard and offered the following points for the EWG to consider when developing the draft standard:

Inspection

- large numbers of containers move empty and uninspected
- additional inspections impose huge productivity loss and cost
- inspection is primarily aimed at identifying any repairs that are needed to be done to the container
- it is possible to extend the role of the inspection to include other factors such as inspecting for the presence of pests but there are concerns about costs/productivity.

Cleaning

- cleaning is generally focussed on the inside of containers
- exterior cleaning will impose a huge unacceptable cost burden
- propose additional cleaning requirements as an "as required" basis
- clear guidance is required on how to dispose of pest contamination.

Depot and storage areas

- this is where inspection occurs most often
- prime focus for implementation of the standard
- it is not economically feasible to impose additional terminal inspections.

Packing

- greater potential for contamination at shipper premises
- not under control of shipping lines
- the standard should include obligations of shippers and those who pack containers.

Vessels

- it is not economically feasible to inspect containers on ships
- concentrate on interchange points.

It was noted that container cleaning is usually done at the demand location not at the surplus location. One of the reasons is environmental because cleaning at a surplus location means the container would need to be moved to a place to be cleaned, which increases fuel costs etc.

It was noted that Containerisation International's *Market Analysis: World Container Census 2010* reports that at the time of writing there were 17.8 million containers in the world. It was also mentioned that there are 429 million container movements per year from the top 100 ports (Container Systems top 100 container ports - 2010). Each container is handled at a Maritime terminal approximately 24 times a year. It was also noted that there are many more depots than terminals. Some concerns were raised about packed containers being a pathway for pests and the EWG agreed that packed containers could also pose a risk. Industry proposed that the implementation of this standard be in a phased-in approach, starting with empty containers, which are easier to get industry to inspect. The EWG was reminded that this approach would immediately help reduce the risk of the spread of pests by containers.

The EWG was also informed about industry safety standards where it may be appropriate to add phytosanitary criteria. These are the *Guidance on serious structural deficiencies in containers* CSC Circ. 134 (International Convention for Safe Containers (ICSC), 1972) and a Safety Standard (which is still under discussion and not yet published formally) and are for port authorities to make an assessment of whether the container is safe to transport.

The invited expert informed the EWG that he sits on an ISO committee (TS104) which deals with freight containers and anything that relates to containers. ISO standards can go beyond what governments agree and are not multilaterally agreed to by governments, unlike ISPMs which can be used by World Trade Organization (WTO) in international disputes. The EWG felt it should try to cooperate with ISO because ISO standards are used by the shipping industry and could be a useful communication tool.

4. Review of the Specification and SC comments

The Secretariat and the steward reviewed the specification and presented the adjustments the SC had agreed to as well as the discussions that the SC had.

One member noted that there is a need to also liaise with World Health Organization (WHO).

5. Participation in Development of Industry Guidance

The COA representative gave a presentation on guidance to the shipping industry:

- inspection and criteria commonly used in the shipping industry
 - . UCIRC Unified Container Inspection and Repair Criteria
 - . RCIRC Reefer Container Ins. And repair criteria
 - . Institute of International Container Lessors (IICL) 5 Guide for container equipment inspection
 - . IICL – General guide for container cleaning
- various company specific cleaning guidelines (most companies do not use IICL) are used
- other relevant guidance:
 - . Safe transport of containers by sea – guidelines on industry best practices – ICS/WSC
 - . Guidelines for packing of Cargo Transport Units (CTU) – International Maritime Organization/ International Labour Organization / United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (IMO/ILO/UNECE).

It was agreed that the EWG would assist Industry in determining which IPPC requirements would be useful in the above two documents to help ensure containers were cleaned. These suggestions could be included in the amendments to the in-house cleaning criteria that are being revised by the invited expert for use by COA, ICS and WSC. This cleaning criteria will be circulated to EWG members and

some international organizations (WHO, OIE, CBD), and comments collected by the Secretariat will be compiled and forwarded to the invited expert for possible inclusion in the IICL general guidelines for container cleaning. ML (Maersk) global cleaning criteria will be amended and offered to industry for adoption where other criteria as above are not used.

Once the above is done, shipping companies around the world could align their own cleaning criteria to this guidance.

The Industry representative asked if it was possible to identify containers that were higher risk but the EWG said this was difficult at the international level because it would vary from country to country.

There was discussion on whether the advice to Industry should be directed at cleaning facility staff, but it was decided since other staff (e.g. at depot etc.) might use it the direction should be generic.

The EWG discussed the development of a technical guidance document. It was decided that the group would gather some information and then provide this to the IPPC Implementation Officer for inclusion on the phytosanitary resource page (www.phytosanitary.info). The EWG felt that its members had the appropriate expertise as well as access to national manuals related to inspecting and cleaning containers.

6. Development of the Draft ISPM

6.1 Review of draft ISPM

The group agreed that this standard should provide guidance to NPPOs on what to do with respect to container cleaning and how to oversee the cleaning of containers by others. It should also provide guidance to industry on cleanliness including inputs, which would address the concerns of WHO, Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) with regards to invasive alien species. One member felt that the standard should tell both the NPPO and industry what to do but the other members felt that the standard should not be prescriptive to industry but only directed to the NPPO.

The group discussed the use of the words *sea container*, *freight container* and *international maritime trade* and decided for simplicity to only refer to *sea containers*. There was also discussion about the terms *shipping companies* and *shipping lines* and it was decided that *shipping lines* would include both.

Concerns were raised about the words *inspection* and *inspectors* as these imply activities that are officially approved by an NPPO. The group decided to use the term *visual checks* instead.

Comments were received from CBD on the second day of the meeting and incorporated into the draft standard.

There was a lengthy discussion about pest free versus clean containers and what wording to use. It was decided that the IPPC would use pest free containers but for the purposes of this standard the word *clean* would be used because the group agreed that pest freedom could only be decided by an NPPO not by industry. It was noted that the term *clean container* in the sense used by industry could go beyond IPPC requirements of pest freedom.

The EWG found it confusing to have three categories of containers listed in the document while only guidance on empty containers was provided. Therefore it was initially decided that this standard would only focus on empty containers ready for packing and that other categories would be addressed in the future by revision to the ISPM, if required. However, later in the discussions concern was raised by one member about the risk posed by repositioning containers. It was stated that the import of contaminated empty containers could contribute to the introduction and spread of quarantine pests. Some statistics were given (data collected by a small Fuqing port, in Fujian Province, China): Between January 2008 and September 2010, 18 145 repositioned containers arrived in this port and were examined (7% of the total container movement at that port). Interception data showed that there were

994 interceptions of 295 species of which 17 species were quarantine pests and these were intercepted 47 times. It was therefore decided that the standard would focus on describing clean containers and not deal with separate categories; these could be addressed when the ISPM is implemented. The standard sets the global criteria for clean containers regardless of whether they are empty or packed or for import or export. The description of the three categories of containers was removed from the draft standard and will be included in the implementation plan.

There was lengthy discussion around the concept of accreditation – specifically who would accredit and what would they accredit. A table of pros and cons was developed to aid in the discussion (Table 1). Concern was raised that if NPPOs should accredit depots, many NPPOs may not have enough resources to do so. It was brought up that under the IMO the owner of the container manages cleanliness but an NPPO can stop a container if it is not clean (pest free). There was a lengthy discussion on whether it should be the shipping lines that are accredited or the depots and cleaning facilities. The group decided that the most efficient way was to accredit the shipping line because they provide oversight to depots, they already audit the depots and they are the responsible parties. This could be accomplished by having a nominated person within each shipping line (e.g. maintenance manager) becoming the person responsible for IPPC requirements. This person would get accredited by the NPPO in the person's country and it would be recommended that other countries accept this accreditation. If NPPOs do not wish to accept this accreditation and wish to accredit the shipping line themselves, they would be requested to deal with the same nominated person in each shipping line. The concept of collaboration on accreditation is included in the draft standard. There was discussion about asking IMO to accredit shipping lines but it was pointed out that IMO only has jurisdiction on the high seas. Some members had concerns that if accreditation would not be done at an international level, making it the responsibility of the shipping lines, there would be thousands of depots for each NPPO to accredit. Also, accreditation of shipping lines in every country would be an enormous job and a burden on both industry and NPPOs. The steward felt that the EWG should propose a vision for what would be the best system for accreditation to present to the CPM Bureau, meanwhile the draft standard should leave options open. The EWG requested the IPPC Secretariat to seek guidance from the CPM Bureau on options for pursuing accreditation including the possibility of the IPPC Secretariat accrediting at a global level.

Table 1: Accrediting shipping lines: Pro and contra

Pro	Con	Issue
Gives the shipping line the ability to control their own process using IPPC criteria.	Creates a problem for some shipping lines if they do not have central control like the large shipping lines do.	
Cost recovery (Shipping lines can charge for the service).	Some small shipping lines may not survive.	
Less demand on NPPO resources.		
Integrates pest free requirements into existing cleaning requirements.		
Allows NPPO to deal with non-compliance by dealing with shipping lines.		

From an NPPO point of view, it is a pro that each country accredits the lines.	From a shipping line point of view, this is a con: They need global cleaning guidelines for consistency not individual contracts with individual countries.	Is the accreditation world wide or on a country by country basis? Suggestion: a nominated person in each shipping line is responsible for IPPC activities. This person gets accredited in the country where he/she is stationed – other countries can accept that global accreditation or if they prefer to accredit the shipping line themselves (nationally) they must deal with that same nominated person.
	Countries can only accredit shipping line activities in their own countries.	Who does the shipping line sign with for accreditation?

There was some concern raised that if a third party would accredit the shipping lines or the depots there would be a new layer of cost incurred. It was pointed out that cleaning can take place at depots, by third parties or at cleaning facilities.

There would be two points to be checked when verifying that the cleaning was correctly done. The first would be a visual check to see that the cleaning had been done correctly and the second would be to determine if the system of cleaning had been correctly implemented. The industry representative stressed that it is the end result that needs to be checked, i.e. that the container is clean. There was discussion of whether the NPPO should be involved in just auditing cleaned containers or in the system of visual checks and cleaning.

The EWG discussed the title of the standard and decided to remove the words “International Travel” from the title to make a more focused and clear title.

Background Section

The following specific survey information was originally in the background section of the standard but it was decided that it belonged in the present report instead:

A survey (MAF 2006) of empty and packed containers received in New Zealand from all over the world, indicated that around 24% of empty and 14% of packed containers had exterior contamination and 25% of empty containers and 18% of packed container had interior contamination. A high proportion of contamination was found to be on the underside of containers. The number of containers moving in international trade suggests that there is significant potential for large numbers of pests to be introduced by this means.

The background was also adjusted to reflect input from the CBD by adding the following wording: “It is recognized that IPPC’s mandate for this standard focuses on pests and that the IPPC also recognizes the potential impact on biodiversity, human/animal health, and infrastructure by non-native organisms. Thus this standard includes advice for preventing the introduction and spread of invasive alien species.”

Purpose Section

The purpose of the standard was adjusted to reflect some CBD input by adding the words *invasive alien species* to the purpose statement.

There was some discussion on whether the standard addresses minimizing the movement of pests or minimizing the risk of introduction and spread of pests. The EWG decided that it should address the latter as it was more appropriate and also in line with IPPC terminology.

There was a suggestion to add manure into the examples of contamination but the group decided against this because it is an issue for OIE, who could contribute it when they review the information provided to industry.

There was concern that there might be a need for cleanliness certificates for each container, however, the group felt that an electronic system used internationally would be a more viable option.

One member brought up that not all containers would need to be visually checked because some were going for domestic use. Industry indicated that it would be easier if all containers were checked because they could not differentiate the use of the container.

There was a suggestion to add nematodes as an example of contamination but an expert explained that nematodes cannot be visually detected hence the requirement for soil removal.

Disposal section

There was some discussion on what industry should do when they find a pest: Whether to always contact the NPPO or to kill it and dispose of it directly. It was agreed that in some circumstances they should consult with the NPPO. There was some discussion on what to do with contaminants, in particular if it is a live threat. All felt that contaminants should be disposed of through incineration, any soil removed and the wash water should be treated following local or national legislation to reduce the risk.

Field Trip

The EWG group had a day-long field trip to two ports, Johor Port in Pasir Gudang and the Port of Tanjung Pelepas, where they also toured a depot and were shown inspection and cleaning procedures for containers.

Johor Port

- 1 000 acre port with 24 berths
- 2 000 containers handled daily (40% export, 30% import and the rest trans-shipping)
- the export process consists of:
 - . container information entered into computer
 - . container delivered to the port
 - . physical inspection
 - . stacked in yard
 - . customs clearance (includes a customs inspection by the authority if required)
 - . released by customs and loaded onto ship
 - . shipped to destination
- the import process consists of:
 - . incoming ship discharge at terminal
 - . container stacked
 - . customs clearance (includes a customs inspection by the authority if required, and fumigation)
 - . pre-delivery information entered into the system
 - . gate out physical inspection
 - . delivery to consignee

Tanjung Pelepas and depot

- 2 538 acre port
- 186 000 twenty-foot equivalent units (TEU) capacity container yard
- 17th busiest port in the world
- depot deals with 9 000 empty containers per month

- wash water has the oil separated; then the water goes into the sewage treatment plant. Solids are removed from the drains at the depot monthly and treated according to Malaysian law (as scheduled waste).
- washing done internally, visual inspection externally; no mandatory requirement to clean all six sides (if no one pays no one will do it)
- after washing, the container gets sent to the port for loading to ship; only in the depot for an hour then back to the port.

The group reviewed some key points from the field trip:

- Depot will not be motivated to clean to the level of the standard unless they are asked to, therefore the target group is the shipping lines as they pay the bills.
- The rules should be made clear, generic, applicable and do-able.
- Key part of system is the depot: The group was informed that there was an equipment interchange receipt that indicates the condition of cleanliness, damage and controls the asset transfer. This is issued every time a container comes in or out of a depot and it could be used as a record for container cleanliness.

There was general discussion on non-compliant containers and it was agreed that the shipping lines are responsible for ensuring that only clean containers are shipped. However, if an importing country finds a non-compliance they can take action. NPPOs need to provide oversight by accrediting and auditing shipping lines. All depots should meet shipping line requirements or shipping lines should not use them. Depots may be under contract to several shipping lines. Shipping lines can modify their cleaning requirements to include requirements stated in the standard.

There was discussion on electronic reporting to provide data on whether a container has been cleaned or not. Currently there are two systems in use:

- The industry's Bayplan/Stowage Plan Occupied and Empty Locations (BAPLIE) system is a live file containing information on all containers loaded on a vessel, such as stowage position etc. The information contained in it might change but it is timely. It disappears after the voyage and could not be used as a verification file.
- The United Nations World Custom Organization (WCO) cargo report has a blank field that could be used for cleanliness info. There may be some operational issues but this data is maintained after the voyage.

Industry recommends using the BAPLIE system; however, NPPOs also deal with customs. BAPLIE contains information on empty containers loaded on a ship and is the only system in use that provides data on empty containers being moved. After much discussion, the EWG decided on the need for two data fields: (1) indication of cleanliness of the container and (2) date of last visual check. One EWG member would examine the possibility of having data transferred from the BAPLIE to the WCO system.

The group decided to delete the section on e-certification because it is covered by verification.

The section on packing areas was removed due to the difficulty in addressing the issue because packing areas can be anywhere (e.g. forest, banana plantation, factory or driveway).

There was some discussion on removing the section on recontamination because the standard would have no control over it but the group agreed that it provides good guidance and therefore retained it but changed the title to "Preventing contamination of clean containers".

There was discussion about why there was not a section in the standard for importing countries. It was pointed out that the standard was mostly for exporting countries and some felt there was no need for guidance for importing countries. Another member felt that some of the options in ISPM 20:2004 (*Guidelines for a phytosanitary import regulatory system*) were inappropriate, however, the group decided to leave the reference in because it qualifies the type of action that would be appropriate.

Notification

There was discussion on whether the shipping line should be copied on notification. The group decided that it would place an extra burden on the NPPO and that the current notification system following ISPM 13:2001 (*Guidelines for the notification of non-compliance and emergency action*) would be adequate.

The industry representative reviewed industry guidelines for container surveyors (inspection criteria for surveyors and cleaning guidelines used by depots) and guidance to shipping lines, and the EWG provided advice for appropriate wording for these documents. This advice included definitions of clean containers and pests, description of what parts of the container to examine for contamination, how to detect and dispose of contaminants, how to prevent re-contamination of clean containers and other general guidance that may also address concerns of other organizations (CBD, OIE, WHO). Shipping lines will use this information to establish contracts with their depots. Shipping lines (and possibly NPPOs) would then use these criteria to audit depots.

7. Next Steps

7.1 Further development of other components of the standard (e.g. containers for re-positioning)

The EWG discussed the section on containers for re-positioning and decided it was not necessary because the standard addresses the criteria for clean containers, whether they are empty and ready to be packed, repositioned or packed. Any remaining issues could be addressed in the implementation plan.

7.2 Communication plan

There are several opportunities for communicating this work. The group was reminded, however, that there is a need to be cautious until the SC has approved the draft standard for member consultation in order to manage expectations. So far there have been three press releases by industry. In addition, the Sub-Committee on Dangerous Goods, Solid cargoes and Containers (DSC) of IMO has stated that the IPPC guidance on clean containers could be addressed in the Guidelines for packing of Cargo Transport Units (IMO/ILO/UNECE) which are currently being amended.

Upcoming events include COA meeting in the Republic of Korea that the EWG member from the Republic of Korea will attend. In addition, there is opportunity for follow up articles on progress in COA newsletters and similar. Industry said there was no point in pursuing the Maritime Safety Committee part of IMO until the SC had reviewed the draft standard.

EWG members were invited to submit other ideas to IPPC Secretariat.

7.3 Implementation plan

One member provided a draft technical guidance document with pictures and guidance for facilitating implementation of the standard. This will be circulated to the EWG for comments and provision of additional pictures.

Another member provided some draft points and timelines on implementation. They are as follows:

Implementation Plan Planned Activities and Timelines

Date	Activity
May 2015	Standard and Technical Guidance Document completed
May 2015	Industry provides list of Shipping Line contact information and associated cleaning facilities to IPPC
June 2015	IPPC distributes Standard, Technical Guidance Document, and Shipping Line lists to NPPOs
June – Sept 2015	IPPC plans and schedules workshops for NPPOs and industry as needed. Also local workshops at ports
June - Dec 2015	NPPOs contact Shipping Lines to outline requirements and schedule visits to cleaning facilities. Subsequently, shipping line lists are distributed directly to NPPOs by industry
2017	Shipping lines are accredited and implementation begins
2020	Contracting parties only accept containers that are clean. Two-year period where warnings could be issued (phase-in period)

The concept of accreditation was discussed, in particular accreditation at the global level. Several questions were raised such as: what resources would be needed, who pays, what tools are going to be prepared (manual, guidelines, training etc), whether a communication plan would be needed to liaise with industry and international bodies. The IPPC Secretariat was requested to discuss this issue further with the CPM Bureau and seek legal advice.

The implementation plan should be finalized by the time the ISPM is adopted. The IPPC Secretariat was requested to discuss this further with the IPPC Implementation Officer to collaborate on developing a plan to help implement this ISPM after adoption.

8. Other Business

The invited industry expert presented packing guidelines that are being developed for ILO/IMO/UNECE. These will be posted end June 2012 for two weeks on the forum for the EWG to comment on.

The IPPC Secretariat provided an overview of the standard setting process (see appendix 6). The SC meeting report is available at:

[https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&tx_publication_pi1\[showUid\]=2184342&frompage=13355&type=publication&subtype=&L=0#item](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110798&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2184342&frompage=13355&type=publication&subtype=&L=0#item)

The IPPC Secretariat provided a tutorial on the IPP and EWG restricted work area and forum. The group agreed to use the forum to provide documents and comments to the rest of the EWG.

9. Close of the Meeting

The group discussed how to deal with extra issues and unfinished tasks such as the development of implementation and communication plans and the issues related to accreditation. The EWG reiterated that a considerable amount of work still needs to be done and the members are committed to continue with the work. The EWG developed a workplan, assigned tasks to the individual members and agreed to deadlines as presented in Appendix 5.

The Chair and IPPC Secretariat thanked participants for their contribution and closed the meeting.

Appendix 1 - Agenda**EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING
ON SEA CONTAINERS****28 May – 1 June 2012****The Puteri Pacific Hotel
Mutiara Room, Level 2
Johor Bahru,
Johor, Malaysia**

Daily Schedule: 09:00-12:00 and 13:00-17:00.

Monday starting time 10:00. Wednesday all day field trip

AGENDA*Up-dated 26 May 2012*

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
1. Opening of the meeting		
1.1 Welcome by the IPPC Secretariat		LARSON
1.2 Opening of meeting by host		
1.3 Introductions		
1.4 Roles of the Participants		
1.5 Selection of the Chair		
1.6 Selection of the Rapporteur		
1.7 Adoption of the Agenda	EWGSeaCon_2012_May_01	
2. Administrative Matters		
2.1 Documents List	EWGSeaCon_2012_May_02	
2.2 Participants List	EWGSeaCon_2012_May_03	
2.3 Local Information	EWGSeaCon_2012_May_04	
3. Updates	EWG Report Nov. 2011	
3.1 November Steering Committee Meeting update	Presentation of the update on the Sea Container standard given to CPM-7	SISSONS
3.2 CPM		HEDLEY/ASHBY
3.3 Standards Committee	EWGSeaCon_2012_May_06	LARSON
3.4 Industry liaison		DOWNES
4. Review of Specification and SC comments		HEDLEY/ASHBY
5. Participation in development of Industry Guidance		HEDLEY/DOWNES

AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT NO.	PRESENTER
6. Development of draft ISPM		
6.1 Review of draft international standard		HEDLEY
7. Next Steps		ASHBY
7.1 Further development of other components of the standard (e.g. containers for re-positioning)	EWGSeaCon_2012_May_05	HEDLEY
	EWGSeaCon_2012_May_05Re v.1 EWGSeaCon_2012_May_07	
7.2 Communication Plan – is it needed, what would it contain, who will do it		
7.3 Implementation Plan – is it needed, who will do it		
8. Other business		
9. Close of the meeting		
9.1 Adoption of the report		CHAIR
9.2 Close		CHAIR

Appendix 2 - Documents list**EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING
ON SEA CONTAINERS****28 May – 1 June 2012****The Puteri Pacific Hotel
Johor Bahru,
Johor, Malaysia****DOCUMENTS LIST***(last updated 29 May 2012)*

DOCUMENT NO.	AGENDA ITEM	DOCUMENT TITLE (PREPARED BY)	DATE POSTED / DISTRIBUTED
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_01	1.6	Agenda	10 April 2012
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_02	2.1	Documents list	10 April 2012
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_03	2.2	Participants list	10 April 2012
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_04	2.3	Local information	9 March 2012
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_05	7.1	Draft standard on minimizing pest movement by sea containers in international trade (draft 3)	10 April 2012
Link	3	EWG Report Nov. 2011	10 April 2012
-----	3	Sea container standard update given to CPM-7	10 April 2012
-----	5	Presentation by COA	10 April 2012
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_06	3.3	Update from the Standards Committee	29 May 2012
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_07	7.1	CBD comments on the draft standard	29 May 2012
EWGSeaCon_2012_May_05Rev.1	7.1	Draft standard on minimizing pest movement by sea containers in international trade (draft 4) – CBD proposal	29 May 2012

Appendix 3 - Participants list**EXPERT WORKING GROUP MEETING
ON SEA CONTAINERS****28 May – 1 June 2012****The Puteri Pacific Hotel
Mutiara Room, Level 2
Johor Bahru,
Johor, Malaysia****PARTICIPANTS LIST**

A check (✓) in column 1 indicates confirmed attendance at the meeting.
Members not attending have been taken off the list.

Up-dated 1 June 2012

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Steward	Mr John HEDLEY Principal Adviser International Policy Policy Branch Ministry for Primary Industries P.O. Box 2526 Wellington New Zealand Tel: (+64) 4 894 0428 Fax: (+64) 4 894 0742 Mobile: (+64) 298940428	john.hedley@mpi.govt.nz ;
✓	Co-Steward	Mr Steve ASHBY Food and Environment Research Agency, Defra, Plant Health Policy Programme Room 10GA07, Fera, Sand Hutton, York, YO41 1LZ United Kingdom Ph.: 01904 465633	steve.ashby@Fera.gsi.gov.uk ;
✓	Member	Mr Sebastião Roberto BRESSAN Rua Morro do Escravo Miguel, 252 – Ap. 702. Ondina CEP: 40170-000 – Salvador – BA – Brazil Ph.: 55-XX-71-33326114 Fax: 55-XX-71-32041237	sebastiao.bressan@agricultura.gov.br ; srbressan@oi.com.br ;

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Member	Mr Michael Patrick DOWNES Container Owners' Association (COA), Senior Technical Expert Centre Operations, Maersk Line Maersk Singapore Pte Ltd 200 Cantonment Road #10-00 Southpoint, 089763 Singapore Tel: +65 63183427 Mob: +65 96540462	Michael.Patrick.Downes@maersk.com ;
✓	Member	Ms Guanghao GU Deputy Director Bi-yan Road , Guang-ming District , Shenzhen city , Guangdong Province, P.C: 51810 China Telephone number: 0086 755 88211435 Fax: 0086 755 88211435	gugh@szciq.gov.cn ;
✓	Member	Mr Nico HORN Geertjesweg 15, 6706EA Wageningen, The Netherlands Mail Address: P.O. Box 9102,, 6700HC Wageningen, The Netherlands Ph.: + 31 – 317 – 496 626 Fax: + 31 – 317 – 421 701	n.m.horn@minlnv.nl ;
✓	Member	Ms Nancy A. KUMMEN, B.Sc. (Agr) M.P.M. Senior Forestry Program Officer Plant Health, Production and Biosafety Canadian Food Inspection Agency Canada Ph.: 250-470-5048	nancy.kummen@inspection.gc.ca ;
✓	Member	Mr JaeSeung LEE 433-1 Anyang6-dong, Manan-gu, Anyang, Gyeonggi-do 433-016, Korea, Republic of Ph.: +82-31-420-7669 Fax: +82-31-420-7605	yjaes3@korea.kr ;
✓	Member	Mr Frank J. SALANTRI Trade Director USDA-APHIS-PPQ 4700 River Road, Unit 140 Riverdale, MD 20737 USA Ph.: 301 734-6347	frank.j.salantri@aphis.usda.gov ;
✓	Representative from the Organizer (APPPC)	Mr Michael TANA Senior Adviser, Standards Group MAF, Wellington New Zealand Ph.: 64 4 894 0483	mike.tana@maf.govt.nz ;

	Participant role	Name, mailing, address, telephone	Email address
✓	Representative from the Host Country	Mr Ahmad Kamil YUNUS Director Crop Protection and Plant Quarantine Unit in the State of Johor Department of Agriculture Johor Bahru Malaysia Ph: +6072239395	kamilyunus@yahoo.com.my ;
✓	Invited Expert	Mr Bill BRASSINGTON ETS Consulting 1 Meadow Lane, Pitstone Bucks LU7 9EZ United Kingdom Ph.+ 44 (0) 7801 433171 Mobile Ph.+ 44 (0) 1296 668592 Office	bill.brassington@ets-consulting.org ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat lead	Ms Andrea SISSONS IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracall, Rome, Italy, 00153 Working remotely from United Kingdom Ph.: +44-1923829743	Andrea.Sissons@fao.org ;
✓	IPPC Secretariat	Mr Brent LARSON IPPC Secretariat FAO, Viale della Terme di Caracall, 00153 Rome Italy Ph.: +39 0657054915	Brent.Larson@fao.org ;

NOT ATTENDING

	Member	Mr Mohammad Reza ASGHARI Plant Protection Organization, Chamran Highway, Yaman Street, Tehran, I.R. Iran Ph.: +98-21-23091119, +98-912-1044851 Fax: +98-21-22409137	asghari@ppo.ir ;
	Member	Ms Salamina Seboko MAELANE P O Box 1424 Hammanskraal, 0400 Tshwane, South Africa Ph.: +27127110121/+27824424239/+2731332550 Fax: +2731 3682408	SalaminaM@nda.agric.za ; Seboko2005@yahoo.com ;

	Member	Ms Junko SHIMURA Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Programme Officer (Invasive Alien Species, Global Taxonomy Initiative) Secretariat, Convention on Biological Diversity 413 Rue St. Jacques, Suite 800 Montreal, QC H2Y 1N9 Canada Ph. (direct) (1) 514 287 8706	junko.shimura@cbd.int ;
--	--------	---	--

Appendix 4 –Recommendations from the November 2011 SCSC meeting agreed to by the Standards Committee

The following text is an excerpt from the April 2012 SC meeting report:

4.3 Update from the Sea containers steering committee (SCSC) (2008-001)

Report (November 2011)

There was no comment on the report.

Update on activities of the SCSC

The Steward provided updates¹ and introduced several suggestions by the Sea containers steering committee (SCSC) to the SC. The SCSC was proposing to provide guidance on how to deal with pest movement by containers, both for the NPPO (as an ISPM) and for the industry (by discussing how their procedures could be modified). The industry already has systems in place for cleaning containers, and these could possibly be modified to help reduce the pest risk in the movement of containers. The Containers Owners' Association (COA) manages approximately 90% of the 30 million containers moving in the world and is willing to make the necessary adjustments to their systems to help address phytosanitary issues. The industry is interested in the development of an international system. The SCSC requested the SC support for their work with industry on this matter. Work would also be carried out closely with international organisations, especially with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) and the World Customs Organization (WCO).

The steward noted that it was hoped that industry would develop cleaning procedures immediately, and that an ISPM would be developed to provide guidance to NPPOs on oversight of the process, including the verification of containers cleanliness and the accreditation of cleaning firms. One member noted that, with the industry already implementing procedures for cleaning, it will be easier for NPPOs to implement the future ISPM as the container industry has been consulted and is aware of this issue in advance. This would help avoid issues that had arisen for the implementation of ISPM 15:2009.

The following issues were discussed:

Expected status of the industry guidance. The proposed SCSC liaison work with industry would be fully reported to the SC and CPM. However, the steward noted that if the approach is supported by the COA, the IMO and other relevant organisations, it is very likely to be implemented. The role of NPPOs will be further developed, but there would be no conflict between the interim industry guidance and the draft ISPM. The Secretariat noted that contracting parties would need to support any changes in IMO guidance and additional fields in the WCO database through their national representatives to these organisations.

Reinfestation of containers. The steward expected that the draft ISPM would include guidance on this, but the first phase of this draft ISPM would focus on empty containers.

Packing. One member noted that, when being packed, the consignment may become contaminated. While the standard would cover only empty containers in the initial phase, the issue of how to avoid contamination may need to be considered. The steward noted that empty containers would be considered first, and then contamination at packing could be one issue to be considered later.

Expected level of inspection of containers by the NPPO. The steward noted that there is currently only a low percentage of containers being examined by NPPOs, but the industry does examine most containers as these are cleaned before they are used again. It is not expected that NPPOs will be closely involved in container inspections, but they would have an oversight role related to the accreditation of cleaning firms and the verification of cleanliness.

¹ SC_2012_Apr_21

One member noted that it would be useful to collect data on pest interceptions on containers. It would give a baseline for the future to demonstrate the impact of the ISPM.

The SC:

- (1) *Agreed* that the draft ISPM should recognize the three categories of containers: empty containers ready to be packed; empty containers for repositioning, and; packed containers.
- (2) *Agreed* that during the development of this draft ISPM:
 - . The draft should address sea containers defined as: *freight containers*.
 - . The term *overland* would be interpreted to mean the continuation of a sea voyage.
 - . Contamination at packing is a different topic related to cargo and should not be covered in this draft ISPM at this stage.
 - . The following international organizations would be relevant to help reduce the pest risks associated with sea containers and should be consulted: International Maritime Organization (IMO), Container Owners' Association (COA), World Customs Organization (WCO), Institute of International Container Lessors (IICL), International Chamber of Shipping (ICS), World Shipping Council (WSC), International Organization for Standardization (ISO).
 - . The Australian Quarantine and Inspection Service (AQIS) requirements for container floors should be used as the basis to help develop similar requirements for all three categories of containers.
 - . A technical document should be coordinated with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the OIE and should include general recommendations about safe disposal of dunnage and wash water, use of chemicals, etc., and the draft ISPM should include wording regarding limiting the spread of invasive alien species, etc.
 - . The IPPC should work with the container industry, and collaborating with other stakeholders, to supply some interim guidance.
 - . The IPPC standard setting process continues to develop a draft ISPM, consulting with members and relevant international organizations.

Note: additional decisions were previously made by e-decision 2012_eSC_May_02 (see Appendix 6), i.e. removal of conveyances from the scope and title, focus on empty containers, and emphasis on producing practical means of verifying the cleanliness of containers.

[...]

Appendix 6 to the April 2012 SC meeting report - Summary of standards committee e-decisions (Update November 2011 to April 2012)

[...]

0.2 SC approval of requesting the CPM-7 (2012) decision on the sea container standard (2008-001) development

Background

The Steward for *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade* (2008-001) outlined activities regarding the development of this draft standard at the November 2011 SC meeting.

He noted that this is a complex issue and the scope might have to be restricted (possibly excluding conveyances and initially only dealing with empty containers). In regards to working with industry, it was recognized that industry would play a key role in helping to reduce pest movement by sea containers and that specific guidance would need to be developed to assist them. In addition he felt it would be prudent to also try to help contracting parties deal with their responsibilities in regards to

preventing any threats posed to biodiversity by the movement of pests on sea containers. He invited SC members to send him contributions and views on these issues.

A small group of experts (a “Steering Committee”) from the expert working group further discussed this topic in the week following the SC November 2011 meeting and agreed with the assessment of the Steward. They agreed that the standard should be developed in a phased approach. Discussions with industry led to containers being limited to sea containers only excluding inland, intermodal freight, ferry, coastal, domestic and offshore. As the majority of sea containers are cleaned when they are empty, it was felt that targeting empty sea containers would have the greatest impact and that tackling conveyances in this draft would add too many new considerations and would therefore be overwhelming. The steering group recommended that the standard should initially deal only with empty containers and that conveyances should not be included in the scope.

It was agreed that it would be beneficial to liaise with:

- International industry organizations dealing with sea containers to develop specific guidance to incorporate into their operational procedures;
- Other international organizations to help ensure issues concerning biodiversity and the protection of the environment are addressed appropriately;
- The World Customs Organization (WCO) to explore the means of verifying the cleanliness of sea containers.

It was also noted that the Technical Consultation among RPPOs had requested that a side session on this issue be held at CPM-7 (2012); this would provide another opportunity for contacting parties to discuss the way forward on this topic.

Consultations between the SC Chair, the Steward and the Secretariat gave rise to the recommendation to keep the CPM informed of the issues associated with this high profile topic. An agreement from the SC was needed in order to inform the CPM on this issue and request its decision.

The whole background information and the initial draft text for submission to CPM-7 (2012) can be found from the URL below:

https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110885&no_cache=1&L=0&view=single_thread&cat_uid=19&conf_uid=27&thread_uid=87

Forum summary (02) – 13 January 2012

The SC was invited to engage in an on-line discussion forum, from 22 December 2011 to 13 January 2012, in order to decide whether the SC agreed to present to CPM-7(2012) the text mentioned above on the development of the Sea Container standard and to request the associated decisions from CPM.

There were good contributions from several SC members. Most SC members felt that the SC should focus on developing guidelines for NPPOs which may be applied to industry. SC members also agreed that industry should be involved in the development of such guidance from the beginning but any guidance should be directed to NPPOs. The SC agreed to propose removal of conveyances from the scope and title and that the standard should focus on empty containers initially. Emphasis was placed on producing practical means of verifying the cleanliness of containers.

Poll summary (02) – 23 January 2012

The SC Chair, in consultation with IPPC Secretariat, revised the text to be presented to CPM-7 (2012) based on SC forum discussion which closed on 13 January 2012. The revised draft text for submission to CPM-7 (2012) can be found in the support documents from the URL below:

[https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877&frompage=1110877&tx_publication_pi1\[showUid\]=2183345&type=publication&L=0](https://www.ippc.int/index.php?id=1110877&frompage=1110877&tx_publication_pi1[showUid]=2183345&type=publication&L=0)

The following revised text was then recommended to the SC for a request for decision by CPM-7:

“The CPM is requested to:

1. *note* that the topic, *Minimizing pest movement by sea containers and conveyances in international trade* (2008-001) is a complex issue and the standard will be developed in a phased approach with the initial standard being limited to empty sea containers.
2. *agree* that conveyances will be excluded from the scope and title of the draft.
3. *note* that it will be beneficial to liaise with international industry organizations dealing with sea containers to develop specific guidance for NPPOs.
4. *note* that efforts will be made to collaborate with other international organizations to help ensure wider biodiversity issues are addressed appropriately in the standard.”

The SC was then invited to engage in an on line poll, which closed on 23 January 2012.

The Chair of the SC and the Secretariat reviewed the opinions expressed in the poll.

It was concluded that the SC agreed to propose removal of conveyances from the scope and title and that the standard should focus on empty containers initially. Emphasis was placed on producing practical means of verifying the cleanliness of containers. Most SC members felt that the SC should focus on developing guidelines for NPPOs which may be applied to industry. However, from the poll results there was no consensus to move this issue forward to the CPM-7 (2012) at this time. It was considered whether to have an additional forum but there would not be enough time to come to a conclusion before CPM-7 (2012). The Chair included a paragraph on the issue in her report (CPM 2012/INF/10Rev1) and verbally covered the main points in her report to CPM-7 (2012).

For an update from the Sea containers steering committee, please see also document SC_2012_Apr_21 (Agenda item 4.3 of the April 2012 SC meeting).

Appendix 5 - EWG Sea Containers Workplan 2012

Task	Responsibility	Due Date
Communications Plan	Larson, Ashby, Downes	30 June 2012
Poster – abstract and poster	Sissons, Ashby, Horn, Kummen	30 July 2012
Collate list of conferences and dates where poster can be displayed	All EWG	ongoing
Information paragraph for listservs	Tana to develop, Sissons to post	30 August 2012
Review technical guidance document and provide comments to Tana	All EWG	30 August 2012
draft a summary for IPPC Secretariat to present to bureau including some numbers of depots and shipping lines that handle containers	Salantri	30 June 2012
Develop draft Implementation plan	Kummen	After receiving guidance from IPPC secretariat
Post packing guidelines being developed for ILO/IMO/UNECE on the forum for the group to comment on	Brassington	Comments due by mid-July
Seek guidance from the bureau on options for pursuing accreditation including the possibility of the IPPC Secretariat accrediting at a global level	Larson	30 September 2012
Investigate implementation plan options with IPPC implementation officer – (EWG would like to draft them and provide to implementation officer)	Larson	30 September 2012

Appendix 6 – Stages in development of an ISPM

Stages 2, 3 and 4 – Preparation of a draft ISPM, member consultation and adoption

