



WHAT

HAPPENED??!

Boxes keep being loaded, ships keep sailing. Job done?



Post- implementation issues:

- Validity/accuracy of certificates
- Compliance testing for weighing equipment and Method 2 calculations
- "Container tourism"

FONASBA

Post- implementation issues:

- WSC members expressing concern about the accuracy of certificates issued in some parts of the world due to lack of oversight or compliance regulation by designated authorities
- Third FONASBA survey issued May 2017.

 Developed in conjunction with IMO Maritime Safety
 Division to gather evidence on some of these issues



Replies received from:

Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Côte D'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dubai, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Hungary, Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Portugal, Russia, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tunisia, Turkey, USA, Venezuela.

Thank you all for your detailed responses!



- Q1: What problems, if any, are affecting the mandatory weighing of containers? The majority of respondents reported that no major issues had been encountered and that container traffic was moving smoothly. Where issues had been reported, they were minor and resolved early on.
- Q2: What procedures are in place to deal with any containers that are not correctly certificated on arrival at the port? "NO VGM, no load". Pre-advice procedures are in place at many ports to identify non-compliant containers. Where containers are found to be non-compliant, they are either rejected or taken for re-weighing. Some ports routinely weigh all incoming containers.



- Q3: Are any penalties (other than rejection for loading) applied for non-compliant containers? In many respondent countries, no fines or other sanctions are applied. Elsewhere, charges for reweighing are applied in lieu of fines. Where fines are applied, they are often levied under national safety of navigation legislation.
- Q4: How is the designated authority ensuring compliance with Method 2? A number of countries have introduced regulatory and certification regimes for ensuring strict compliance with the requirements of Method 2, some of which are linked to quality certification. Elsewhere there is no oversight, or Method 2 is not used.



- Q5: Has your designated authority provided any statistics in relation to the number of non-compliant containers? Are those statics easily available? No respondent reported that statistics are available in the public domain. A very small number reported that some authorities (and some ports/terminal operators) kept records but these were for internal use only.
- Q6: How are containers from land-locked countries treated? Those countries receiving containers from landlocked or third countries report that they are subject to exactly the same compliance and monitoring procedures as those from the home country.



- Q7: Have your members noticed any changes in trade patterns that might indicate less rigorous control processes in neighbouring countries? No evidence of "container tourism" for the purposes of avoiding a more rigorous compliance or checking regime was provided.
- Q8: Any other comments regarding VGM implementation? A number of associations took the opportunity to comment on the benefits of the VGM regime on container handling and port/ship safety and the relatively painless introduction, while others noted the lack of compliance measures. Côte D'Ivoire proudly announced that 98% of the 180,915 containers handled to end May 2017 were compliant!



The survey results are available to view on the website at:

www.fonasba.com/member-survey

Advice of the survey was given to IMO's 4th meeting of the Sub-Committee on the Carriage of Cargoes and Containers (CCC.4) in September 2017 and will be referenced in the formal report of that meeting.

A copy of the survey summary will also be provided as an .INF paper to MSC 99 in May 2018.



Thank you.