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Welcome to today's webinar for the CBC activity 22-23/01: Enhancing AEP competency.

My name is Denise Thomas, and I am an Assistant Director for Assessment Policy.

I would like to begin by acknowledging the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we gather today. We are on Ngunnawal Country, and I pay my respects to their Elders past and present. I extend that respect to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who are here with us today.

This webinar is a mandatory Continued biosecurity competency session for class 19 approved arrangement accredited persons.
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The purpose of this session is to provide you information on the class 14.4 approved arrangement and how, as an accredited person, you can direct a consignment for a rural tailgate inspection that can be undertaken by accredited industry personnel at the approved class 14.4 location.

We will also provide you with information that will assist you in understanding and managing some of the most common errors when lodging declarations through class 19 (AEP) and we will revisit non-compliance relating to Khapra beetle measures.
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This session will be divided into two parts. The first part will be for accredited persons under the class 19.1 non-commodity for containerised cargo clearance (NCCC) approved arrangement; and the second part is targeted at accredited persons for class 19.2 automatic entry processing for commodities AEPCOMM. The total time for the session is approximately 1 hour.

If you are an accredited person for both approved arrangements, you are required to complete the whole session. If you are accredited for class 19.1 non-commodity for containerised cargo clearance (NCCC) only, you may leave after completion of the class 19.1 AA component.

We’ll be recording today’s webinar and a copy of the recording will be made available through the [CBC activities link](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/training-accreditation/cbc-activities) on the department’s [Training and accreditation for approved arrangements](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/training-accreditation#broker-accreditation) webpage later on today and this will be available for those that are unable to join now or if you wish to revisit the information at a later stage.

Please feel free to post your questions in the Q&A box to the right of your screens. We will be answering some of those questions throughout this session. We will respond to any unanswered questions and publish them on our CBC activities webpage shortly and will notify you when they are available.

As this is a mandatory CBC session, there is an assessment component, which will be available straight after the webinar through your CBC provider. Please contact your CBC provider to access the material.

Please note you have until the 8th of August to complete this assessment.

Let me introduce our panel members who will present the webinar for you, they are Nicola Wise, and Natalie Bone both Senior Project Officers. Behind the scenes we have Kym Kunze, who will be managing your questions. We are all part of Assessment Policy, Cargo, and Conveyances Branch within Biosecurity Operations Division.

Welcome to each of you.

Let’s get started by taking a closer look at why we are here today.

Today’s session will provide you with information regarding the variation to the Class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement with the introduction of the Class 14.4 approved arrangement measures.

We will also discuss common lodgement errors when lodging declarations via the Class 19.1 (NCCC) and provide a refresh on non-compliance relating to Khapra beetle measures.

In the second part of the webinar, we will be discussing the common errors made when lodging declarations via the Class 19.2 (AEPCOMM) approved arrangement.

Let’s review our learning outcomes we will be covering today.
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They are:

* Identify a consignment that can be directed to a class 14.4 AA for a rural tailgate
* Explain the concern types relating to a class 14.4 approved arrangement
* Explain the reason a class 19 relodge error occurs
* Describe how to resolve a class 19 relodge error
* Identify non-compliance relating to Khapra beetle measures
* Identify common class 19.2 (AEPCOMM) processing errors
* Describe how to minimise class 19.2 (AEPCOMM) processing errors.

I will now hand you to Natalie to discuss the Class 19.1 variation and introduction of the Class 14.4 approved arrangement.

Thanks Natalie.
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Thanks Denise.

Let’s start by looking at the Class 19.1 NCCC component of the webinar.

Firstly, we will talk about how the department is partnering with industry to implement a new voluntary class of approved arrangement that will allow existing class 1.1 and class 1.3 Sea and air freight depots, with approved class 4.3 wash bay facilities, to perform certain rural tailgate inspection types and management activities.

Amendments to the class 19.1 NCCC will allow you to directly assess and report an FCL container with no other biosecurity concerns to a class 14.4 approved arrangement for a rural tailgate inspection using the class 19.1 NCCC.

The Class 14.4 approved arrangement authorises the biosecurity industry participant to perform rural tailgate inspections to manage biosecurity risks associated with imported containers subject to biosecurity control where the only concern is rural unpack.

The arrangement provides for greater flexibility in how approved sites operate their business, in allowing self-scheduled inspections, cleaning activities and release of containers based on their own workload and requirements and not departmental officer availability and schedules.

Industry will be able to direct consignments to a class 14.4 via the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement.

The updates will go live for you to use from the 8th of August, this year.

Nicola will now discuss the updates to the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangements requirements policy.
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Thanks Natalie.

The Requirements and conditions for approved arrangement class 19.1: non-commodity for containerised cargo clearance sets out the operating conditions that must be followed when assessing and reporting an import declaration under the class 19.1 approved arrangement.

Let’s have a closer look at what has changed.
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Two new concern types have been added to the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement.

They are RUAA and REAA.

RUAA concern type will present an outcome of approved arrangements rural tailgate inspection.

REAA concern type will present an outcome of approved arrangement rural tailgate external inspection.

These two concern types are to be used to refer only rural unpack destination non-commodity concerns to a class 14.4 approved arrangement site.

The RUAA and REAA concern types may only be utilised when there is no biosecurity impediment relating to goods.
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Conditions 14 and 15 have been updated to reflect further information regarding these new concern types.

Condition 14 details that accredited persons must correctly answer the department’s non-commodity general declaration questions and declare all non-commodity concern types.

This condition now provides additional information saying that if no concerns have been identified other than a rural unpack destination then you may use concern types of RUAA or REAA.

Condition 15 describes the requirement for entering an approved arrangement site number that must be an appropriate class to perform the biosecurity activity.

For concern types of RUAA and REAA the approved arrangement site location must also be a Class 14.4 approved arrangement.
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The two new concern types will sit in the concern type hierarchy along with the RURL concern type.

It is important to note though that if any other biosecurity concerns have been identified, then the RURL concern type needs to be applied.
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Table 3 in the Requirements and conditions for approved arrangement class 19.1: NCCC document has been updated to reflect the new concern types that are available.

We will now explain how to direct consignments using the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement to a class 14.4 approved arrangement for a rural tailgate inspection.
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The Class 14.4 approved arrangement authorises the biosecurity industry participant to perform rural tailgate inspections to manage biosecurity risks associated with imported containers subject to biosecurity control, where the only concern is rural unpack.
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The class 14.4: Rural tailgate inspection approved arrangement conditions policy sets out the scope for rural tailgates that can be performed under the class 14.4 approved arrangement.

They are limited to:

* general purpose
* reefer
* ISO tanker
* open top containers.
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That are:

* intended for delivery to a location that is within a postcode classified by the department as a rural area
* imported with compliant commodity documentation, where specified in biosecurity import conditions applicable to the goods within the container
* imported with compliant non-commodity documentation
* requiring rural tailgate inspection to address rural concerns only.

Slide 14

Containers that are out of scope of class 14.4 AA are:

* containers subject to commodity verification as part of the rural tailgate inspection (in accordance with import conditions)
* containers that require rural tailgate inspection prior to fumigation or commodity inspection and
* Containers that have any other identified commodity or non-commodity concerns.
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The class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement allows accredited persons to assess non-commodity documentation for containerised sea freight.

Natalie will now take you the following scenario which will demonstrate assessing and reporting an FCL container for a rural tailgate inspection at a class 14.4 AA using the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement (AA).
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Thanks Nicola, Let’s go through the scenario. You are assessing non-commodity documentation for an FCL general purpose container, containing office stationery from New Zealand, destined for unpack to delivery to Thredbo, NSW postcode 2625.

You are in possession of the:

* Bill of Lading
* Packing declaration, and
* Invoice.
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The class 19.1 approved arrangement requirements and conditions policy sets out the operating conditions that must be followed when assessing non-commodity biosecurity risks and lodgement of import declarations under the NCCC approved arrangement.

This consignment is a full container load, (FCL). For this cargo type, we require a cleanliness statement, unacceptable packaging material statement, timber statement, either ISPM 15 statement or treatment certificate if timber has been declared, an assessment of the unpack destination postcode and a determination of any khapra beetle concerns.

The non-commodity BICON case will determine the import conditions for this consignment.
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Let's run through the BICON search for this specific scenario. The first question we're asked is ‘are the goods being transhipped or imported?

We indicate that the goods are for import.
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We are asked how will the goods arrive?

In this scenario, it's an FCL general purpose container.
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Indicate no for the next question, are the imported goods personal effects?
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The next step asks, ‘Is the container being unpacked in a rural khapra risk postcode?’

BICON import conditions directs you to refer to the postcode delivery classification page on our website to manage the risk associated with unpack destinations for sea containers.
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The search tool on our website can be used to determine the unpack destination postcode.

Using the postcode delivery search tool, you determine that Thredbo, NSW postcode 2625 is a rural postcode.
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Being a rural postcode, you indicate in BICON that it is a rural destination. The container will require a rural tailgate inspection prior to delivery.
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You assess all non-commodity documentation and non-commodity biosecurity concerns as per the BICON non-commodity import conditions associated with this consignment and the only identified non-commodity concern is the rural unpack destination.
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You now answer no to the question ‘Are the goods classified as dangerous goods?’
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In the onshore assessment section of BICON you are asked “Will the rural tailgate inspection be performed by the department or by the biosecurity industry participant in accordance with the AA conditions for class 14.4?”

You can select department officer or biosecurity industry participant.

It is important to note that Rural tailgate inspections may only be performed by the biosecurity industry participant where there are no commodity and no other non-commodity concerns identified.

In this scenario you indicate that the rural tailgate inspection will be performed by the biosecurity industry participant.
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The onshore outcomes now appear, and you are directed to use the concern type RUAA.
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When lodging your import declaration in the ICS you enter concern type RUAA.

Noting condition 15, you must assign a location for your RUAA concern type outcome.

You must ensure that a class 14.4 AA site number is entered into the AQIS location field in the ICS.

This will direct your consignment for a rural tailgate inspection to be performed on the containers listed by the biosecurity industry participant in accordance with the AA conditions for class 14.4 – rural tailgate inspection.
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A re-lodge error direction may occur asking you to fix concern type if:

* another non commodity AEP concern type is entered
* another non commodity AEP concern type is entered and if a line commodity profile is active, or if
* a commodity profile identified.

You will be instructed to “Fix the value in the Department of Agriculture Concern field. RUAA or REAA concern types cannot be used when other non- commodity concern types or commodity biosecurity risks have been identified.”

The entry will be unable to be processed until the concern type is changed.

In this circumstance the rural tailgate cannot be performed by an industry biosecurity industry participant and the concern type will need to be changed to RURL for a departmental officer to undertake the inspection.

Information on the class 14.4 AA will be published on the CBC activities webpage, shortly. Let’s open for any questions.

I will now hand back to Denise to open for any questions.
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ANSWER LIVE QUESTIONS

Thanks Natalie, we have had a few questions come through, remember we won’t be able to answer all your questions today, but please put them in the Q & A and once we have answers and responses to them, we will publish them on our CBC webpage. So, one question that’s come through is

When will the details of the class 14.4 AA be published on the department’s website?

We have already published our draft changes to our class 19.1 Requirements and conditions document for NCCC that is on our Automatic Entry processing webpage on the department’s website. So, this now will detail the amendments to the class 19.1 NCCC that detail the changes the class 14.4.

Another question is.

Will the scope of what biosecurity industry participants can do under the arrangement be expanded?

So, the department is currently focused on implementing the arrangement for impediment free rural tailgate inspections. However, the department acknowledges industries strong interest in expanding the conditions to perform other low risk biosecurity activities. The department will seek to review possible future changes post the implementation.

Another question is around the two new concern types. So, this is a change to the class 19 that we have the ability now for the concern type REAA to be approved for a tailgate external inspection only. The concern type RUAA will allow the traditional rural tailgate inspection which is both internal and external.

I will now hand over to Natalie and will start to discuss the common errors when lodging a consignment via class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement.
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Thanks Denise.

Before we commence the case studies, I wanted to take this opportunity to remind you of the [Overview of the class 19.1 non-commodity for containerised cargo clearance (NCCC) approved arrangement](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/training-accreditation/cbc-activities#class-191-nccc) video that is available on the department’s website under the CBC activities webpage. This video provides a recap and review of the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement assessment and reporting process.
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In today’s session we will take a closer look at the common errors that may occur when lodging a consignment via the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement.

We have three case studies to look at:

* Case study 1 – Re-lodge – Fix lodgement questions
* Case study 2 – Re-lodge – Fix line container association
* Case study 3 – Re-lodge – Fix preferred loc (invalid).
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Let us have a look at our first scenario, Anne is a newly accredited for the class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement. She is lodging an FID under her class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement, for an FCL of metal furniture from Germany.

Anne answers the department’s non-commodity general declaration questions in the ICS based on her assessment and her non-commodity documentation assessment. These questions are specific to the cargo type.

The first question states: Are you an accredited person for FCL/FCX non-commodity clearances?

Anne answers ‘Yes’ to that question, as she is a class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement accredited person lodging the import declaration on behalf of a biosecurity industry participant covered by an approved arrangement.

Anne continues to the next general declaration question, which reads: Do all FCL/X containers on this declaration meet non-commodity requirements and are they designated to be unpacked in a metropolitan postcode or inside the boundary of an approved port?

Anne also answers ‘Yes’ to that question.

Anne then determines the consignment is to be delivered to a rural postcode in Australia and enters the Concern type ‘RURL’ according to the Requirements and conditions for approved arrangement Class 19.1: NCCC.
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As she completes the lodgement, instead of receiving a rural tailgate direction for the container, Anne receives a ‘Re-lodge error – Fix Lodgement Question,’ which will not allow the entry to be processed.

The direction states: Conflicting Concern type and declaration question answer (Question 7 (YES) and Concern type entered).

Although Anne has answered ‘Yes’ to the second general declaration question, declaring that the consignment meets all requirements, she has also declared a non-commodity concern by entering the concern type (RURL). The system is prompting Anne to fix the error.

Anne realises that she has incorrectly answered ‘Yes’ to the second general declaration question and amends the declaration by answering ‘No’ to indicate the consignment will be unpacked at a non-metropolitan postcode.

Once the conflicting information is amended, the system applies AEP rules to the lodgement and generates a rural tailgate direction.

The direction is sent to the brokerage’s nominated ICS email.

Nicola will now discuss our 2nd re-lodge scenario
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Thanks Natalie.

Let’s work through the next scenario, Amal is an accredited person for class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement. He is lodging an FID under his class 19.1 NCCC approved arrangement, for a FCL of new car parts from China.

Amal answers all the lodgement questions including the department’s non-commodity general declaration questions in the ICS based on his accreditation and document assessment. These questions are specific to the cargo type.

Amal answers ‘Yes’ to the first general declaration question.

He continues to the next general declaration question, and answers ‘Yes.’

He then completes the lodgement, instead of receiving a finalised and released direction for the container, Amal receives a ‘Re-lodge - Fix line container association,’ which will not allow the consignment to be processed.

The direction states: Check Line/Container Association. The following line is not linked to a container: 2.

This means that although Amal has answered the general declaration questions correctly, he did not assign each commodity line to a container. Amal assigned line 1 correctly but did not assign a container to line 2. The system is prompting Amal to fix the error.

Amal realises the error and assigns the container to line 2.

Once the conflicting information is amended, the system applies class 19 (AEP) rules to the lodgement and generates a finalised and released direction.

The direction is sent to the brokerage’s nominated ICS email.
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It is important to note: if the entry has been lodged in the ICS, then you will need to associate the line(s) in the ‘AQIS line view’ screen.

If you are using 3rd party software, you can associate lines to a container in the ‘other information’ screen and select either: ‘Apply available to all lines’ or ‘Apply allocated to all lines’.

Once this has been completed, the re-lodge error will be removed from the entry, and you should receive the applicable system generated directions.

Natalie will now discuss our 3rd re-lodge scenario
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Thanks Nicola.

In this scenario, Carl is lodging a consignment of rubber goods from Italy.

Carl answers the department’s non-commodity general declaration questions in the ICS based on his non-commodity document assessment. These questions are specific to the cargo type.

Carl answers ‘Yes’ to the first general declaration question.

Carl answers ‘No’ to the second general declaration question and enters the Concern type ‘RURL’ as the goods are being delivered to a rural unpack destination.

He completes the lodgement. Instead of receiving a rural tailgate direction for the container he receives a ‘Re-lodge error – Fix Preferred Loc (invalid), which will not allow the consignment to be processed.

The direction states: Missing/Invalid location data on lines 6000.

This means that although Carl has answered ‘No’ to the second general declaration question and entered a concern type of ‘RURL’, Carl also needed to ensure the consignment was being inspected at an appropriate Class 1 approved arrangement.

The system is prompting Carl to fix the error.
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For NCCC concerns the approved arrangement site ID must be entered at the Header level - AQIS inspection location.

For class 19 automatic entry processing for commodities (AEPCOMM) the approved arrangement site ID must be entered on each line using the AQIS Premises ID field.

Once Carl amends the lodgement and enters the approved arrangement Site ID using the Header level - AQIS inspection location field he will receive a rural tailgate direction for the container.
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To summarise:

A re-lodge direction is generated when there is not enough information supplied, or there is an error in the information entered in the import declaration.

This will require you to amend the import declaration in ICS/3rd party software to fix the error raised. This cannot be actioned by the department.

Let’s open for any questions.

I will now hand over to Denise.
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ANSWER LIVE QUESTIONS

Thanks Natalie.

We’ve had a couple of questions come through regarding Khapra and transportation through regional locations. I will take those on advice and seek answers from our scientist here to confirm that we have the correct information for you, they will be published on our website.

We’ve had another question the current list of AA sites only shows 1.1 to 12.3, When will be able to see the 14.4 sites?

The approval process is still in place with the 14.4 approved arrangements and as they are approved and go through the audit process, they will be published on our website. I believe that the class 14.4 requirements and conditions document will also be published shortly, so that more class 1.1 and 1.3 sea and air cargo sites will be able to apply for a 14.4 if they wish to do so.

There was another question regarding whether a class 1.1 or 1.3 needs to have a wash bay onsite, and I believe that that is part of the criteria for becoming a class 14.4 approved arrangement.

Another question that has come through is Will there be any penalties associated with incorrectly answering the questions? I presume what we are asking here is incorrectly answering the questions to the general declaration questions and a re-lodge error occurs. There won’t be any penalties at stage because we are asking you to go back and amend that import declaration and the questions, and to actually amend before any assessment is undertaken by the department. So, at that stage there won’t be any penalties in place at that point. If it does go through for document assessment, and there are found that there are incorrect questions answered such as community protection profile questions, then that could actually occur a non-compliance measure, but it would depend on the situation, but not when there is a re-lodge error.

So, thank you for those question. I’d now like to hand over to Nicola who will discuss non-compliance relating to Khapra beetle measures.
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Thanks Denise. We thought it was an opportune time to share some of the learnings relating to treatment certificate compliance that were identified during phase 6A of the urgent actions for sea containers.

Our Compliance Partnerships team continue to proactively engage with offshore treatment providers in relation to non-compliance with the treatment methodologies to improve compliance. We would like to make you aware of some of the common non-compliance being detected on offshore treatment certificates and some areas to pay attention to when assessing offshore treatment certificates under class 19 approved arrangements.

Most non-compliances that have been detected are in relation to methyl bromide fumigations.

We know that treatment rates to manage the risk of khapra beetle are different to treatment rates used to manage other types of biosecurity risk.

For methyl bromide fumigation, containers can be treated after packing. If treating the goods and the container at the same time, the higher of the dose, duration, temperature, and end point requirements must be met.
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The khapra rate is a dose of 80 grams per cubic metre³ or above, at 21°C or above, for a minimum of 48 hours, with an end point reading of 20 grams per cubic metre³ or above.

BICON import conditions will include a table detailing the requirements.

The fumigation must be undertaken in a chamber or sheeted enclosure in accordance with all the requirements in the Methyl Bromide Fumigation Methodology.

Remember to always refer to BICON for specific import conditions for your consignment.

Some of the recent common non-compliances are:

The incorrect treatment rate for khapra beetle – often we have seen instances where the lower timber rate has been applied.

And the incorrect treatment method for khapra beetle – for example, an unsheeted container instead of chamber or sheeted container.
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Some other areas of non-compliance for all treatment types are where the treatment certificate does not meet the overarching and prescribed documentation requirements as detailed in the [Minimum documentary and import declaration requirements policy](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/clearance-inspection/documentary-requirements/minimum-document-requirements-policy).

Examples of non-compliance in this area would be, incorrectly signed or dated certificates and certificates without an acceptable letterhead or ones without the container number linking the treatment to the specific container. When assessing documentation for treatments ensure you refer to this policy.

To assist, treatment certificate templates can be found on our website.

Now I will discuss the reporting of AEI numbers.
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Another area of concern that has been identified is AEI numbers not being entered, or incorrectly entered, when lodging import declarations.

You are required to enter an entity identifier, or AEI number for all treatment certificates issued for khapra beetle container treatments, including those issued by non-registered treatment providers.

We have developed an [AEI reporting requirements for khapra beetle sea container treatments](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/aei-reporting.pdf) infographic to assist you with determining the offshore providers AEI.

Treatment certificates issued by registered treatment providers have an AEI number listed on the certificate. In these cases, you are required to select the appropriate AEI code in ICS or third-party software.

Treatment certificates issued by non-registered treatment providers do not have an AEI on the certificate. In these cases, you are required to reference the offshore treatment providers webpage and enter a generic AEI based on the country and treatment type. In cases where a specific treatment provider is listed as ‘not acceptable’ they will be allocated a specific code to enter.
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When assessing treatment certificates, the sea container must have been treated offshore (within 21 days prior to export) to ensure it is free from khapra beetle.

To demonstrate compliance with this requirement you must possess evidence that the date of export (on the bill of lading, gate in gate out certificate or forwarder's cargo receipt) or the date of container sealing (on the sealing declaration) is within 21 days of the date of container treatment (as indicated on the treatment certificate).

We have developed several treatment infographics and they are available as a resource on our website to assist with the treatment assessment.

Let’s open up for any questions.

I will now hand over to Denise
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ANSWER LIVE QUESTIONS

Thanks Nicola, appreciate that, so we have had a couple of questions that probably link back to some of our earlier discussion.

One of them is about making amendments to an AEP entry and we have had this feedback regarding amendments and especially, at the moment, with the environment with locations for inspections need to be changed and therefore, that is considered to be a major amendment, and it opens up the AEP entry and you are asked to present documents to the department. That is situation and one of the relevant issues that we are going to address in second half of this year. We are going to look at the amendments and the considerations for a minor and major amendment, so I can only really say what this space and we have heard you, and we have heard the issues and we just need to work those through and see what we are able to do with our systems and our risk owners to possibly changing the major amendments, especially for the location of an inspection that needs to be changed.

We’ve had another question that was asking about Khapra and if you are unaware of a change in location, so initially you were told it was going to be a metropolitan unpack and then it was sent rural. I will look into that question further for you. If a broker is unaware that it is now going rural, I would imagine that would be a bypass and we would have to go down that investigation and see what actually does occur, but we will get more information and get back to you about that.

There was a question about mixed consignment and Khapra beetle concerns what treatment rate should be applied for methyl bromide?

Again, as we mentioned it is always the higher treatment rate of the dose, duration, temperature, and end point requirements must be met.

Thank you for your questions.
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That now concludes the mandatory continued biosecurity competency class 19.1 NCCC component of the webinar.

Please ensure you complete the assessment by the 8th of August 2022.

The webinar will be published on the CBC activity link on the department’s website under Training and accreditation for approved arrangements.

If you are accredited for class 19.2 automatic entry processing for commodities (AEPCOMM) approved arrangement, please stay online for content regarding common errors that may occur when lodging declarations under class 19.2 (AEPCOMM) approved arrangements.

[Pause for people to leave]
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Before we begin, let’s recap the learning outcomes for the class 19.2 automatic entry processing for commodities (AEPCOMM) approved arrangement component of the webinar.

They are:

* Identify common AEP Processing errors
* Describe how to minimise AEP Processing errors
* I will now hand over to Natalie to discuss AEPCOMM common errors.
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Thanks Denise

The class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement allows an accredited person to assess import documentation associated with specific commodities in scope of the approved arrangement.

We will look at four case studies today that review some of the most common AEP processing errors and their management through class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement.
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Let’s work through the first scenario.

Maria is processing a FCL consignment of Jasmine Rice from Vietnam.

She checks the [Approved commodities and related information for the class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/requirements/approved-commodities-class-19-2) webpage of the department’s website to see if this commodity is in scope.

She then checks the BICON case to determine the AEPCOMM code to use for her lodgement.
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Maria completes the BICON questions and obtains an AEPCOMM code of INS. She then lodges her consignment using her third-party software.

Maria receives an automated direction of AEP processing error stating: Line/s subject to biosecurity risk not approved under the department approved arrangement. Documentation to be presented to the department for assessment.

Taking a further look at this entry, Maria has answered ‘Yes’, to the lodgement question of: Are the goods parboiled rice packed in individual packages weighing 25 KG or less?

This means that Maria should be using the BICON onshore outcomes for parboiled rice.
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Let’s look to see if this is in scope for class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement.

Parboiled rice is in scope, but under condition 17 Maria must enter the AQIS commodity code (ACC) as specified in the BICON onshore outcomes against the relevant line in the ACC field.

Maria has entered INS which is correct, but Maria should also have entered the ACC of PARB.

The reason for this error is that Maria failed to enter the ACC code of PARB as the rice was parboiled.

ACC codes are used to provide the department with further information about the commodity risk, and in this instance identify that the goods are parboiled.

Nicola will now discuss our 2nd scenario.
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In our second scenario, Susan is lodging an FCL consignment of diplomatic goods from India.

Susan failed to check the Approved commodities webpage and BICON import conditions and lodges her import declaration with the AEPCOMM code of INS and adds the approved arrangement Site ID.

Susan received an automated direction of AEP processing error stating: Commodity AEPCODE is not suitable for tariff.

This direction is asking for documentation to be presented to the department for assessment.

Susan used the Tariff group used: 9999.31.01 Concessions – Goods description – diplomatic goods.
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Looking at the class 19.2 automatic entry processing for commodities (AEPCOMM) approved arrangement webpage on the department’s website, the UPE tariffs in scope are 9999.40.15 & 9999.60.24.

Diplomatic goods with tariff 9999.31.01 are out of scope for AEP.
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Viewing the BICON case onshore outcomes we can see there is no option to process this entry via AEPCOMM.

In this case as diplomatic goods are out of scope of the 19.2(AEPCOMM) approved arrangement, you will receive with an AEP Processing Error direction.

This entry will be required to be processed by the department.

Natalie will now discuss our 3rd scenario.
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Thanks Nicola.

In our third scenario, Ray is lodging a FCL consignment of wooden furniture from Vietnam.

Ray checks the Approved commodities for the class 19.2 automatic entry processing for commodities (AEPCOMM) approved arrangement webpage to see if this commodity is in scope.
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Ray performs a BICON search and determines the import conditions and AEPCOMM code to enter for his lodgement.

The onshore outcomes instruct him to use the AEPCOMM code of ‘REL’ as the goods have received an acceptable methyl bromide treatment offshore and all other requirements have been met.

Slide 58

Ray receives an automated direction stating: AEP Processing Error: AEPCOMM code not valid for the consignment under the department approved arrangement.

For one of the lines reported on the import declaration Ray used tariff 9105.21.00 – tariff group- other clocks.

On further investigation Ray was asked the Community Protection Profile lodgement question: Do the goods contain plant material, including wooden components? And he answered ‘Yes’ to this question.

By answering ‘Yes’ to this CP profile question Ray has provided a high-risk response, as goods with plant material are not in scope under the manufactured wooden articles and wooden products case.

Nicola will now discuss our final scenario.
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Thanks Natalie.

In our last scenario, Troy is lodging a consignment of wooden furniture from Indonesia.

Troy checks the Approved commodities for the class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement webpage on the department’s website for wooden furniture. He can see the tariff is in scope.

Troy determines the BICON import conditions for his consignment and establishes the AEPCOMM code of REL, which he enters in his lodgement.
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Troy receives an automated direction AEP processing error stating: Accredited person (XXXX) is not approved for AEP. Documentation to be presented to the department for assessment.

Although Troy works for a biosecurity industry participant that holds a class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement, Troy is not an accredited person under this arrangement and is therefore unable to lodge AEPCOMM entries.

This entry must be processed by the department.

Slide 61

We have reviewed the most common AEP processing errors that can occur when lodging a declaration.

If you happen to receive an AEP processing error outcome, please note: the department will not record non-compliance against the entry.

To avoid processing errors for AEPCOMM you must ensure you check the [Approved commodities and related information for the class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/requirements/approved-commodities-class-19-2) webpage of the department’s website to ensure the commodity is:

* In-scope of the approved arrangement
* Compliant with the BICON case and that the correct pathway is used
* Compliant with all relevant conditions for the lodgement.

Please ensure that you refer to the Requirements and conditions for approved arrangements class 19.1 and class 19.2 policy documents and that you are compliant with Minimum documentary and import declaration requirements policy and with the Non-commodity information requirements policy.

As well as ensuring you are compliant with the Approved commodities and related information for the class 19.2 automatic entry processing (AEPCOMM) approved arrangement, you must be compliant with all the relevant import conditions as determined in BICON.

Let’s open for any questions.

I will now hand back to Denise
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ANSWER LIVE QUESTIONS

Thanks Nicola.

One question that we have been asked is If I get an AEP processing error direction, can I fix it?

If you receive an AEP processing error, you are required to submit documentation to the department for assessment. So as we just said to avoid processing errors for AEPCOMM you must ensure you check the [Approved commodities and related information for the class 19.2 AEPCOMM approved arrangement](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/requirements/approved-commodities-class-19-2) webpage of the department’s website to ensure the commodity is:

* in-scope of the approved arrangement
* compliant with the BICON case and that the correct pathway is used
* compliant with all relevant conditions for the lodgement.

Another question is Will there be a fee for the department processing an AEP processing error entry?

The department will charge for the time it has taken to assess the documentation, as per the Charging Guidelines, located on the department’s website [Charging guidelines 2021](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/about/fees/charging-guidelines).
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That concludes our live webinar for today.

Our sincere thanks to you all for attending.

A reminder to participants, to please ensure you complete the appropriate component of the assessment (either NCCC only, or NCCC and AEPCOMM) by the 8th of August, through your CBC provider.

If you would like to review the information prior to undertaking the assessment, the webinar recording will be published on the [CBC activities](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/training-accreditation/cbc-activities) link on the department’s [Training and accreditation for approved arrangements](https://www.agriculture.gov.au/biosecurity-trade/import/arrival/arrangements/training-accreditation#broker-accreditation) webpage this afternoon.

Have a great day.

Goodbye.

[Video ends]

[End of transcript.]
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