

TIANJIN PORT EXPLOSION



The huge explosion at Tianjin Port, which led to an enormous fire that affected a substantial part of the port, could lead to massive supply chain disruption. This briefing provides an overview of some of the potential consequences.

The origin

According to the Tianjin Police, the explosion happened in a warehouse operated by a logistics company called Rui Hai International Logistics Co. Ltd. Rui Hai describes itself as a government approved firm specialising in handling dangerous goods. The warehouse is reported to have been designed to store dangerous chemicals, including sodium cyanide (which is classified as “extremely harmful”) and the explosives sodium nitrate and potassium nitrate.

Two years ago the company was found to have flouted packaging standards, with Reuters reports citing an inspection carried out by the Tianjin Maritime Safety Administration.

Rui Hai will doubtless be facing substantial losses and it, together with the owner of the cargo which exploded, will be at the centre of investigations to ascertain whether the cargo was properly declared, handled and stored.

As a result of the fire, the following problems are likely to arise:

Damage or loss of both non marine and marine property

News reports show that warehouses, port buildings and real estate have all been damaged by the fire. In addition to this marine property, non marine property such as nearby residential buildings and road/rail infrastructure have also been damaged. Most of these property losses will no doubt be insured by Chinese insurers, but it is likely that some international reinsurers, including London players, will have reinsured the Chinese insurers.

London reinsurers will be reviewing their reinsurance exposure to see if they are likely to face claims.

Death and personal injuries

The press has already reported that over 50 people were killed as a result of the incident and it is expected that further deaths will emerge as the authorities continue their sweep of the disaster zone.



The injured and the families of the deceased will be looking to anyone they can to obtain answers to their questions and ultimately compensation.

The owners and manufacturers of the cargo which started the fire and Rui Hai will inevitably be in the firing line, with their respective product and operational liability insurers in the frame. Given the huge extent of the damage, it is extremely unlikely that either party's insurance will be sufficient to respond to the full extent of the overall losses.

Questions may also be asked of the port authority, Hong Kong listed Tianjin Port Development, on whose land the warehouse was located, concerning whether it discharged its obligations to ensure Rui Hai's compliance with lease/licence obligations and health and safety regulations.

Port and terminal equipment claims

It is suspected that expensive terminal equipment has also been damaged as a result of the incident. This again has probably been insured in the Chinese market, but, as with property, there could be an exposure for international and London reinsurers. Business interruption extensions to property policies will be under the spotlight if important equipment has been lost and operations affected.

Shipping container claims

TV footage and still photos show literally thousands of shipping containers damaged by the fire. They will be owned by a large number of shipping lines and container leasing companies and have been rendered total losses. It is unclear whether these were full or empty. The container shells themselves will be insured on a property basis, many with the TT Club.

The Club is currently examining its exposure. Given how many shipping lines are likely to have suffered losses, issues as to aggregation will also arise.

Cargo claims

It is unclear how much cargo has been affected by the explosions. So far, it has been reported that around 2,700 cars have been damaged, including most notably Renaults, Toyotas and Volkswagens and Land Rovers. Volkswagen in particular appears to have been particularly badly affected, with Chinese media reports citing significant damage to a number of well known brands, including the iconic VW Beetle (391), Golfs (114), Touaregs (1065) and Tiguan (257) amongst others. Reports also indicate that damage to Hyundai manufactured cars (some 4,000 Genesis and Equus sedans) could reach US\$130 million. Four helicopters operated by Eastern General Aviation Co. Limited are also known to have been damaged when a hanger door was blown off by the force of the explosion. There may also be damaged/destroyed bulk and break bulk cargoes.

As mentioned above, a large number of containers have been affected. The owners of the cargo due to pass through Tianjin will now be urgently trying to clarify with forwarders and shipping lines whether their cargoes may be those in the boxes. They in turn will be contacting the port operator so that they can locate which have been affected by the fire.

Cargo insurers will be in contact with their insureds and will be looking to see who they can make a recovery from in respect of the damage.

P&I Clubs and freight liability insurers will be facing enquiries from anxious members keen to clarify if they are likely to be held liable for cargo losses

under the contracts or carriage. The attitude of the Chinese courts and whether they will accept jurisdiction for losses and make forwarders, logistics operators and shipping lines liable is, at this stage, unknown.

Ports and terminal claims

In 2014, the Tianjin Port was the third largest in China and fourth largest globally in terms of total cargo throughput. It is simply huge, comprising 121 square kilometres of land. However, only a relatively small area, although still large by non-Chinese port standards, within the port was physically damaged by the explosion and fires.

Total cargo throughput in 2014 was 445.78 million tonnes. Of this, 286.77 million tonnes were non-containerised cargo comprising metal ore (110.50 million tonnes); coal (88.85 million tonnes); automobiles (26.21 million tonnes); steel (20.02 million tonnes); and crude oil (18.74 million tonnes). Total container throughput is stated to have been 14.06 million TEUs.

Whilst the port is operated by Tianjin Port Development, it is understood that there are a number of terminal operators with JV concessions at the port itself. There may be considerable disruption to some of these facilities. The port authority itself may also need to deal with traffic management and disruption issues. Terminal operators affected by loss of business will be looking for a remedy. As mentioned above, they will also be looking to make claims on the equipment insurance policies so that they can get their operations running normally as quickly as possible.

Terminal insurers will be assessing their potential exposure to liability claims.



Vessel calls and diversions

Immediately after the explosion, all calls and port authorities were suspended. The full suspension has now been lifted but oil tankers and oil supply ships are still prohibited from calling. The Tanggu container terminal has also suspended all new calls. Fortunately no vessels appear to have been damaged.

If the port is unable to operate in the normal manner in the coming days, pending investigations and the quarantining of affected areas, then it is likely that vessels calling at the container port and also at bulk and multi-purpose terminal areas will need to divert to other ports. This will lead to increased cost for the vessel operators and customer problems. Liner operators will face questions regarding deviation of cargoes, temporary storage, transshipment and even abandonment. Bulk operators and charterers will face issues regarding demurrage, port nomination, access to cargoes and questions of frustration.

Tianjin is one of the top ten ports in the world by container volume and local manufacturing companies may need to look at alternative ports to export their containerised product. This could lead to increased logistics costs in relation to inland legs. Customers buying road freight services from shipping lines and freight forwarders will expect them to develop solutions. Where freight rates have been agreed for road haulage, there may well be arguments between exporters and shipping lines/logistics operators about how much extra freight cost can be passed on. There may also be capacity issues if road vehicles need to divert to other ports which are further away, resulting in fewer haulage and trailer units being available.

Disputes between charterers and owners may arise and FD&D insurers

should prepare themselves for potential disputes. If there are contamination issues, port safety and/or berth safety may become an issue. The incident appears to have affected two terminals in particular.

Rail services

The port is served by multiple rail heads. Tianjin Port International Logistics Development Co. Ltd also owns and operates 15 scheduled freight train routes within China which carried 129,000 TEU of cargo in the first half of 2011. The destinations of the train routes cover most of north and west China, including Chengdu, Xian, Taiyuan and Urumqi. Three of the train routes are to the borders of respectively Kazakhstan, Mongolia and Russia.

If electricity supply has been affected and rail infrastructure damaged then these services could be disrupted with knock-on supply chain and revenue implications.

Marine services

There are a number of major marine operations at the port of Tianjin, including Chimbusco (Tianjin's bunkering services), the CSIC Tianjin Xingang Shipyard, the CSSC Xinhe Shipyard and Bohic Heavy Industry, which provide shipyard and ship repair services.

Disruption might be expected and business interruption insurers will need to consider their exposure and assist assureds with mitigation.

Industrial, processing and logistics operations

The explosion appears to have occurred where extensive industrial, processing and logistics services are undertaken. Some of these may have been destroyed by the incident whilst

others will inevitably be affected whilst part of the port is in closedown.

The extent of the explosion's impact is still only emerging. We do know, for example that businesses even up to six kilometres away from the epicentre of the explosion have been affected. It was reported in Lloyds List that Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics has a vehicle processing centre in Tianjin. Its staff are unharmed and its joint venture terminal and vehicle processing centre have suffered only some smaller material damage to buildings. It is also reported in Lloyds List that Caterpillar and Deere & Co have facilities near the port. Many of these industrial and logistics facilities will have property liability insurance in place to respond to their own or customer physical loss or damage claims.

It is unlikely, however, that many of them will have sufficient supply chain insurance or business interruption cover in place to protect them in full against the consequences of the explosion. Business interruption for them could be severe.

Global multinationals operating in Tianjin will likely insure their business interruption/supply chain risks in global insurance markets, including London, but the Chinese based companies will probably be insured in China.

Supply chain disruption

Motorola, Toyota, Samsung, Nestlé, Honeywell, Coca-Cola, Bridgestone, Lafarge and GlaxoSmithKline all have substantial facilities near to the explosion. 285 of the Fortune Global 500 companies are reported to have an office in Tianjin.

Entire supply chains could be affected by the closure of industrial and processing facilities within the port. Some goods manufactured inland which would ordinarily go through



The Chinese media is already reporting that more than 100 insurance claims have been made by dozens of insurance companies who have launched their contingency plans. These include China Life, whose Tianjin branch has some 42 clients involved in cases, and Ping An's subsidiary Ping An Property & Casualty which has received around 140 auto insurance claims and more than 100 property insurance claims.

How HFW can help

Our team of specialists, including in Shanghai, has many years of experience in handling the legal issues arising from major incidents such as the Tianjin explosion. We have handled large and complex issues relating to the interruption of business following numerous significant catastrophes, including major flooding incidents in Queensland (Australia) and Thailand, the Icelandic Volcano eruptions, Tsunamis in Thailand and Japan, Bangkok riots etc. Warehouse fires, terminal explosions and environmental disasters are well known specialities. Our proven track record in real time casualty response gained from more than 130 years as one of the world's leading transport and trade law firms means that we can harness 24 hour response and work with our clients closely as matters unfold both domestically and internationally.



For more information, please contact the author of this briefing:

Craig Neame

Partner, London
T: +44 (0)20 7264 8338
E: craig.neame@hfw.com

HFW's London office is part of an international network of 13 offices in 11 countries. For further information about international commerce related issues in other jurisdictions, please contact:

Julian Davies

Partner, Shanghai
T: +86 21 2080 1188
E: julian.davies@hfw.com

Nick Poynder

Partner, Shanghai
T: +86 21 2080 1001
E: nick.poynder@hfw.com

Paul Hatzler

Partner, Hong Kong
T: +852 3983 7666
E: paul.hatzler@hfw.com

Paul Apostolis

Partner, Singapore
T: +65 6411 5343
E: paul.apostolis@hfw.com

Gavin Valley

Partner, Melbourne
T: +61 (0)3 8601 4523
E: gavin.valley@hfw.com

Connie Chen

Special Counsel, Sydney
T: +61 (0)2 9320 4616
E: connie.chen@hfw.com

Stephen Thompson

Partner, Sydney
T: +61 (0)2 9320 4646
E: stephen.thompson@hfw.com

Hazel Brewer

Partner, Perth
T: +61 (0)8 9422 4702
E: hazel.brewer@hfw.com

Paul Wordley

Partner, London
T: 44 (0)20 7264 8438
E: paul.wordley@hfw.com

Guillaume Brajeux

Partner, Paris
T: +33 1 44 94 40 50
E: guillaume.brajeux@hfw.com

Pierre Frühling

Partner, Brussels
T: +32 (0) 2643 3406
E: pierre.fruhling@hfw.com

Jeremy Davies

Partner, Geneva
T: +41 (0)22 322 4810
E: jeremy.davies@hfw.com

Dimitri Vassos

Partner, Piraeus
T: +30 210 429 3978
E: dimitri.vassos@hfw.com

Simon Cartwright

Partner, Dubai
T: +971 4 423 0520
E: simon.cartwright@hfw.com

Jeremy Shebson

Partner, São Paulo
T: +55 11 3179 2900
E: jeremy.shebson@hfw.com

Lawyers for international commerce

hfw.com

© 2015 Holman Fenwick Willan LLP. All rights reserved

Whilst every care has been taken to ensure the accuracy of this information at the time of publication, the information is intended as guidance only. It should not be considered as legal advice.

Holman Fenwick Willan LLP is the Data Controller for any data that it holds about you. To correct your personal details or change your mailing preferences please contact Craig Martin on +44 (0)20 7264 8109 or email craig.martin@hfw.com

São Paulo London Paris Brussels Geneva Piraeus Dubai Shanghai Hong Kong Singapore Melbourne Sydney Perth