“Effective partnership demands commitment to international standards”

Secretary-General William A. O’Neil
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The oil spilled by the Erika may now have been cleared away, but the ill-fated vessel has left a deeper legacy which is only gradually being revealed (see pages 3, 29)

Front cover: The celebration of World Maritime Day 2000 puts the focus on the importance of building partnerships to promote a culture of safety throughout the maritime industries. IMO stands firmly at the centre of global efforts to raise new standards and implement them universally.
**Erika sinking prompts legislative overhaul**

On 12 December 1999 the 37,238 dwt tanker *Erika* broke in two in heavy seas off the coast of Brittany, France, while carrying approximately 30,000 tonnes of heavy fuel oil. Although the crew were saved, some 14,000 tonnes of oil were spilled and more than 100 miles of Atlantic coastline were polluted.

Those are the bald facts that only begin to tell the story of an incident that has reverberated throughout the shipping world. And of a ship whose name has already joined the likes of *Exxon Valdez*, *Amoco Cadiz*, *Sea Empress* and *Torrey Canyon* on a melancholy list of vessel casualties that have repeatedly forced shipping to re-examine its safety record and practices.

IMO Secretary-General William O’Neil has led the industry in calling for a reappraisal of the “safety net” that underpins international shipping. Shortly after the event, he told an audience of shipowners, “The *Erika* was under class and had been inspected by port State control and industry inspectors several times, yet none of these surveys showed that the ship was about to split in two. We are all bound to ask why not.”

**Safety net feature**

As the industry waits for the full official investigation into the accident, new legislation is already working its passage through IMO. In July, IMO’s Sub-Committee on Safety of Navigation approved a new mandatory ship reporting system which would be applicable in the central English Channel, making it easier to track and communicate with ships in the area. The system would supplement the existing mandatory ship reporting systems already established at Ouessant and in the Pas de Calais.

The system will be put forward to the Maritime Safety Committee at its 73rd session in November–December 2000 for adoption and would enter into force at 0000 hours UTC, six months after its adoption by the Committee.

The proposal for the new mandatory ship reporting system should make possible a significant increase in safety, efficiency of navigation and environmental protection in and around the traffic separation system in operation off Les Casquets. (see page 29)

Perhaps more significantly, proposals for amendments to MARPOL 73/78, the international convention covering oil pollution from ships, have been submitted to IMO’s Marine Environment Protection Committee for consideration at its 45th session (MEPC 45), to be held in London from 2 to 6 October.

Belgium, France and Germany have jointly submitted a proposal for amendments to regulation 13G of Annex I of MARPOL 73/78. The proposed amendments are aimed at speeding up the phasing out of single-hull oil tankers. The age limits proposed are either lower than those currently provided for under regulation 13G, or apply to categories of oil tankers which, on account of their size, are not currently covered by this regulation.

The “double hull” requirements for oil tankers were introduced in March 1992, when IMO adopted amendments to Annex I of MARPOL 73/78 which introduced two new regulations, 13F and 13G, relating to standards for the design and construction of new and existing oil tankers (resolution MEPC.52/32).

Under regulation 13F, oil tankers delivered on or after 6 July 1996 had to comply with double-hull requirements or with equivalent design standards.

Under regulation 13G, single-hull crude oil tankers of 20,000 tons deadweight and above or product carriers of 30,000 tons deadweight and above (according to the products carried), delivered before 6 July 1996, had to comply with the double-hull requirements or with equivalent design standards defined in regulation 13F not later than 25 years, or in some cases 30 years, after their date of delivery.

Existing single-hull oil tankers which do not comply with requirements relating to segregated ballast tanks with protective location applicable from 1982 will no longer be permitted under regulation 13G of MARPOL 73/78 to operate after 2007 (1982 + 25 years), or in certain cases 2012 (1982 + 30 years), unless they comply with the double-hull requirements or equivalent design standards of regulation 13F. For existing single-hull oil tankers which do comply with requirements relating to segregated ballast tanks with protective location, this deadline will be reached by 2026 (1996 + 30 years) at the latest.

It is anticipated that a working group will be established at MEPC 45 to discuss proposals relating to the *Erika* incident. If the Committee agrees to make any amendments to MARPOL 73/78, these could be circulated for further consideration with a view to adoption at the following session, MEPC 46, scheduled for April 2001, allowing for the quickest entry into force in accordance with the Convention.

Amendments to the technical Annexes of MARPOL 73/78 can be adopted using the “tacit acceptance” procedure, whereby the amendments enter into force on a specified date unless an agreed number of States Parties object by an agreed date. If the amendments were adopted at MEPC 46, these amendments could enter into force in August 2002 at the earliest.

**Proposals welcomed**

Secretary-General O’Neil has welcomed the French, German and Belgian decision to steer their proposed legislation through IMO. In acknowledging the call from some quarters for regional legislation, he told shipowners, “any attempt to impose regional standards will simply divert the problem elsewhere. If the European Union, for example, imposes its own restrictions on tankers, we should not expect the ships that are displaced will go straight to the scrapyard. They will simply move to other areas such as Asia and continue trading.”

In order to facilitate discussion at MEPC 45, Secretary-General O’Neil took the initiative of commissioning a study to assess the year-by-year impact of the proposals to amend regulation 13G, taking into account:

- the volume of oil and oil products carried world-wide and by region;
• the number of single-hull tankers to be affected by the proposals
• the capacity of shipyards needed to replace the single-hull tankers to be withdrawn from service and the capacity available world-wide;
• the scrapping capacity of ship recycling facilities on an annual basis as well as other criteria.

The study will be undertaken by the IMO Secretariat, assisted by industry experts nominated by industry organizations, who will act as an Informal Group of Experts on the Impact Analysis of the Proposals to Amend MARPOL Annex I, regulation 13G. The work will be co-ordinated by the Marine Environment Division of IMO.

The Group is expected to draw on the expertise and experience of all available sources, including Member Governments and international organizations.

As IMO News went to press, clean-up operations in the wake of Erika had been all but completed and the remaining oil recovered from the vessel’s sunken fore section. According to press reports, French Prime Minister Lionel Jospin has declared the beaches cleaner than ever after the operation. Nevertheless, for countless businesses and individuals the burning issue now is one of compensation. Compensation is payable under the 1992 Civil Liability Convention and the 1992 Fund Convention, as enacted into French law, to any individual, business, private organization or public body who has suffered pollution damage as a result of the Erika incident.

Approximately US$12 million compensation is available from the shipowner’s liability insurer, the Steamship Mutual P&I Club. Additional compensation of up to approximately US$173 million is available from the International Oil Pollution Compensation Fund 1992 (1992 Fund). In other words, a total of US$185 million is currently available.

These limits may be insufficient to cover the total liability incurred by the break-up of the Erika. IMO’s Legal Committee, at its 82nd session in October 2000, will be considering a proposal to amend both the 1992 Civil Liability Protocol and the 1992 Fund Protocol to increase the limits of the said Protocols, in order to reflect the increasing cost of major oil spills now before the 1992 Fund.

The Erika incident has given a sharp reminder that, despite declining tanker accident figures world-wide, there is no room for complacency. Secretary-General O’Neill warned against suggestions that Erika might be considered an isolated case. “In my opinion, to claim that is a bit like burying one’s head in the sand, because we all know that there are other Erikas still sailing, other undetected substandard ships in danger of creating a disaster. The problem is an international one and IMO therefore has a duty to ensure that it is tackled on a global basis.”

Further information – web sites
IMO: http://www.imo.org
IOPC Funds: http://www.iopcfund.org/erika.htm
France: the report of the Assemblée Nationale is available at: http://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/2/dossiers/polmar/2polmar.htm
The report of the Sénat is at: http://www.senat.fr/rap/r99-4411/r99-4411.html

---

International Maritime Prize goes to Ian Williams of Australia

The prestigious International Maritime Prize for 1999 is to be awarded to Mr. Ian Mills Williams, former Manager, IMO Relations, at the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA).

The 84th session of the IMO Council in June took the decision to award the prize to Mr. Williams in recognition of his long service to the cause of maritime safety.

In particular, Mr. Williams has made a valuable contribution to saving seafarers’ lives through improved safety measures for bulk carriers. He was Co-ordinator of the MSC Inter-sessional Correspondence Group on adopted the new chapter XII to SOLAS, Additional Safety Measures for Bulk Carriers.

Mr. Williams was also an active member of the Panel of Experts selected by IMO to examine and make recommendations on passenger ro-ro ferry safety following the Estonia sinking in September 1994.

Mr. Williams first represented Australia at IMO’s 14th Assembly in 1985 and became involved with the work of the Maritime Safety Committee in 1988. He chaired the Sub-Committee on Ship Design and Equipment from 1994 until March 1999 – following his retirement in September 1998.

The prize, which includes a financial award and a sculpture in the form of a dolphin, will be presented to Mr. Williams in September during celebrations to mark World Maritime Day.

Ian Mills Williams

Mr. Williams was a key participant in the 1997 International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) Diplomatic Conference, which
Ballast water task force sets to work on alien invaders

The world’s oceans are under threat – from over-fishing and from physical destruction. As if this is not enough, they are also under threat from alien invaders – marine species transported beyond their natural range and dispersed across the globe by shipping.

In July, a Global Task Force was convened by IMO in alliance with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The Task Force launched a concerted response to this severe environmental problem.

The new initiative is the Global Ballast Water Management Programme, or GloBallast. Under the GloBallast programme, US$7.6 million is being deployed through IMO to assist developing countries to reduce the transfer of harmful marine organisms. This is being achieved through technical co-operation, capacity building and institutional strengthening activities in six initial demonstration sites in Brazil, China, India, Iran, South Africa and Ukraine. Activities to be undertaken include education and awareness raising, risk assessments and biological surveys, development of laws and regulations, training of personnel in ballast water management measures and the implementation of compliance monitoring and enforcement measures.

Shipping moves over 80% of the world’s commodities and transfers around 10 billion tonnes of ballast water each year. Ballast is absolutely essential to the safe and efficient operation of ships, providing balance and stability when empty of cargo. However, it may also pose a serious ecological, economic and health threat.

The problem arises when ballast water contains marine life. There are literally thousands of species that may be carried in ships’ ballast; anything that is small enough to pass through a ship’s ballast water intake pumps. This includes bacteria, small invertebrates and the eggs, cysts and larvae of various species.

The Chief Technical Adviser to the GloBallast initiative, Captain Dandu Pughicu, said that the development of larger, faster ships combined with rapidly increasing world trade means that the natural barriers to the dispersal of species across the oceans are being reduced. As a result, whole ecosystems are being changed and economic impacts can be massive. In one example from North America, the introduced European zebra mussel has infested over 40% of internal waterways and has required over US$5 billion in expenditure on control measures since 1989.

In several countries, introduced microscopic “red-tide” algae have been absorbed by filter-feeding shellfish, such as oysters. When eaten by humans, these contaminated shellfish can cause paralysis and even death. There are hundreds of examples of major ecological, economic and human health impacts across the globe. It is even feared that cholera may be transported in ballast water.

During the Task Force meeting in London in July, international environmental group Friends of the Earth described the GloBallast programme as “the most exciting environmental project in the world today”.

“With the planning phase completed and a clearly defined course of action agreed by the Global Task Force, the challenge now is to commence physical action,” said Captain Pughicu.

“In the next few months we will be working closely with the six pilot countries to develop their national action plans and commence implementation of activities,” he said.

Since July, the six pilot countries made substantial progress on developing their National Workplans. These detail the activities, budgets and timelines for the in-country implementation of the various components of the GloBallast programme.

IMO’s MEPC is working on developing mandatory regulations to address the problem of the transfer of harmful aquatic organisms in ballast water.

Main organizations involved in the GloBallast programme:
IMO – the specialized agency of the United Nations with responsibility for safety of shipping and the prevention of marine pollution by ships.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) – UNDP’s mission is to help countries in their efforts to achieve sustainable human development by assisting them to build their capacity to design and carry out development programmes in poverty eradication, employment creation and sustainable livelihoods, the empowerment of women and the protection and regeneration of the environment, giving first priority to poverty eradication.

Global Environment Facility (GEF) – GEF is a fund that helps countries translate global concerns into national action to help fight ozone depletion, global warming, loss of biodiversity and pollution of international waters by means of grant funding. The managing partners of GEF are the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme.

Further information:
Steve Raaymakers
GloBallast Programme Coordination Unit,
IMO, 4 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7SR
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7587 3251
E-mail: sraaymak@imo.org
The overall outline of a draft legal instrument has been prepared, though agreement still needs to be reached on a number of key issues. A working group at the MEPC’s 45th session in October will continue work on the issue and it is planned to hold a diplomatic conference during 2002 to adopt the new measures. The proposed instrument is a new international convention “for the control and management of ships’ ballast water and sediments.”

Current options for preventing the spread of harmful aquatic organisms in ballast water include exchanging the ballast water in deep ocean, where there is less marine life and where organisms are less likely to survive. Other options include various treatments of the ballast water en route to kill the living organisms — these include filtration, chemical, and radiation treatments.

Websites:
The GloBallast web site is under development and will be located at http://globallast.imo.org
IMO http://www.imo.org
IMO Focus Papers http://www.imo.org/imo/focus/intro.htm
Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) http://gesamp.imo.org/
National Marine Invasions Center, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center http://invasions.si.edu/

IMO/Singapore MOU extended

IMO Secretary-General Mr. William A. O’Neil and Mr. Chen Tze Penn, Director-General of the Maritime and Port Authority of Singapore (pictured left), exchanged official letters on 14 June 2000 to extend the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between IMO and Singapore on Third Country Training Programme (TCIP) for an indefinite period.

The MOU was first signed on 1 September 1998 for an initial period of two years. It is aimed at helping developing countries in the Asia-Pacific and Africa regions to enhance their ability to comply with international rules and standards under IMO conventions.

This is accomplished by organizing training courses in Singapore on a cost-sharing basis and by sending Singaporean experts free of charge to participate in or to conduct training courses held outside Singapore.

To date, four regional training courses have been held in Singapore and the Singaporean experts have also conducted four regional training courses organized in Ghana, India, Nigeria and Sri Lanka. Six more training courses will be held in the remainder of 2000, two in Singapore, two in Kenya and one each in the Philippines and Sri Lanka.
Maritime industry invited to participate in IMO’s technical co-operation activities

IMO’s Integrated Technical Co-operation Programme (ITCP) builds institutional and human capacities in the developing countries as a basis for the effective implementation and enforcement of IMO’s global maritime standards.

Although IMO has no regular budget allocation for technical co-operation activities, the Organization has established the Technical Co-operation Fund (commonly referred to as the “TC Fund”), primarily sourced from income generated from the sale of IMO publications, which provides seed money for partnership arrangements for the implementation of ITCP projects.

While the traditional source of counterpart funding and support has been from multilateral/bilateral donor agencies and organizations, the maritime industry and other private-sector entities are kindly invited to participate in the ITCP partnership initiatives by providing financial, material and other forms of in-kind support. Such support can be targeted on specific projects (e.g. maritime safety, environmental protection, maritime legislation) and/or geographic region (e.g. Africa, Asia, Pacific, Latin America/Caribbean).

MO’s technical co-operation brochure, which provides an overview of the ITCP, can be found at: http://www1.imo.org/TCD/

CONTACT DETAILS
The Director
Technical Co-operation Division
International Maritime Organization
4 Albert Embankment
London SE1 7SR
United Kingdom
Tel +44 (0)20 7735 7611
Fax +44 (0)20 7587 3259
E-mail: info@imo.org
Website: www.imo.org

Draft maritime code developed for Central African countries

A draft new maritime code for Member States of the Central African Economic and Monetary Commission (CEMAC) was developed earlier this year at a regional seminar organized by IMO, CEMAC and the Government of Cameroon.

The seminar in Douala, Cameroon, was held from 28 February 2000 to 3 March 2000 with the support of the IMO Technical Co-operation Fund and was attended by around 50 participants from Benin, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Gabon and Congo, as well as representatives from IMO, CEMAC and the Maritime Organization of West and Central Africa (MOWCA).

The new draft maritime code, which has been drafted by African lawyers, will, when it is finalized, be used as a model of maritime legislation for the Francophone African countries and is expected to improve and harmonize regional implementation of technical and legal standards. It will replace a maritime code adopted by CEMAC Member States in 1994, which is now outdated.

IMO consultants and national experts spent the four-day seminar analysing in detail the existing maritime code and its adequacy, and in particular the degree of implementation of international conventions. They recommended numerous amendments to the legislation on the basis of which the draft of a new maritime code was prepared. The updated draft is longer than the initial version and consists of new legislation covering the relevant IMO conventions and other international instruments.

The seminar agreed to endeavour to adopt the new code during another regional seminar scheduled for September 2000, when IMO consultants will submit the finalized version.

Model maritime legislation prepared for the Caribbean

A model Shipping Act and a model Shipping Pollution Act have been finalized as part of a package of model maritime legislation for the Caribbean States and Territories being prepared through a project co-financed by IMO’s Technical Co-operation fund and the Government of France.

The project includes three elements:
• preparation of a model Shipping Act and a model Shipping Pollution Act, covering all aspects of flag, port and coastal State jurisdictions;
• preparation of model regulations to give effect to the model Acts and other primary legislation;
• where necessary, expert advice can be provided to assist the Caribbean States and Territories in adapting the models to their particular circumstances.

The model Acts were finalized in July 2000 as a result of legal work carried out by a legal expert from the region, together with IMO’s Regional Maritime Adviser for the Caribbean, Mr. Curtis Roach. Mr. Roach has also prepared a first set of the model regulations, while the second and final set is expected to be finalized by the end of 2000.

The package of model legislation will be distributed throughout the Caribbean and to other English-speaking developing countries with similar legislative regimes.
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World Maritime Day 2000

The 2000 World Maritime Day message from the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization,
Mr. William A. O’Neil

We are now well into the first year of the 21st century and all the concern and fears about systems crashing when we moved from 1999 to 2000 proved to be unfounded. The precautions taken throughout the maritime world to assure that there would be no disruption to shipping were successful, and people and goods were moved throughout the oceans and waterways of the world unimpeded. Nevertheless, the occasion provided seafarers and those associated with sea transport the opportunity to reflect on how critical their role is to international commerce.

No matter where you may be in the world, if you look around you it is most probable that you will see something that either has been or will be transported by sea. There is every likelihood that the chair you are sitting on, the paper on which you are reading this message or the radio to which you may be listening or even the clothes you are wearing have something in their content that has been carried on board a ship. The vast majority of people do not give this fact a second thought. And that is how it should be. If the industry that facilitates the world-wide circulation of raw materials and finished products works efficiently and cost-effectively, there is really no reason why the man or woman in the street should be aware of it.

But once a year, on World Maritime Day, we in the shipping industry make an effort to raise its profile by focusing on some of the key themes related to our day-to-day work and bringing them to the attention of a wider audience. This year our theme is “building maritime partnerships,” a topic which we feel is highly appropriate for shipping because the industry is at the heart of one of mankind’s oldest and most basic partnerships – partnership in trade.

Here at IMO, our responsibility is to be the prime proponent and standard-bearer for a universal culture of safety throughout the maritime world. It is a difficult task because, while shipping is one of the few truly international industries, it is also a fragmented one, with participants coming from every conceivable part of the social, political and economic spectrum. Finding solutions that can embrace them all and still promote the overall objectives of safer ships and cleaner oceans is a daunting task. But the record shows, undeniably, that we have achieved considerable success and confirms that we have the capacity to build on it in the future.

The foundation stone of our success has been partnership. Indeed, partnership is a fundamental principle in IMO, which at its heart is a co-operative relationship between the 158 Member Governments who join together in framing, implementing and policing the standards and the rules and regulations that govern international shipping. It is a partnership that has produced more than 40 conventions and several hundred protocols and resolutions that together provide the blueprint for a safe, environmentally friendly and cost-effective industry.

Of course, we are well aware that this is not the whole story. For many years, we have recognized that the ability to implement rules and regulations is as important, if not more important, than the actual construction of the legislative regime itself. For more than 30 years, therefore, IMO has had a very active technical co-operation programme in place that has been helping those who lack the necessary resources and skills to play their full part in achieving our joint objectives.

That form of assistance is another example of how partnerships can work. And, over the past few years, our focus has been on extending the partnership concept to embrace – even more so than previously – the non-governmental organizations and private sector components that have a direct interest in our industry. Many of these have had links with IMO since its inception.

It is an approach that is becoming increasingly popular throughout the UN system and one to which I personally give my full support. So long as the objectives continue to focus on promoting safety and reducing pollution, I will encourage co-operative arrangements between IMO, individuals and organizations in all sectors.

It is clear that we cannot achieve anything if we try to go it alone. Partnerships are therefore essential, but they must also be recognized as a two-way street. Although we fully acknowledge that we need to draw on the technical competence, skills, expertise and knowledge that exist in the commercial world, at the same time a basic principle which I strongly believe must be accepted, and that is that IMO is the right and only place where issues concerning international shipping safety and environmental protection should be considered and adopted. We are in a unique position to provide the necessary guidance, leadership and focus.

Winning private-sector support for co-operative initiatives is a tough challenge, because of the large number of worthwhile, sometimes competing, demands put forward and the consequent need to convince industry that our cause warrants their attention. But

Mr. W. A. O’Neil
I believe most sincerely that, if the shipping industry wants to operate within a sound regulatory framework that is pragmatic, effective and consistently applied, it must - and will - continue to support IMO in its efforts to raise and implement standards globally.

Our experience with the application of the partnership philosophy has been outstanding. It has enabled IMO to undertake joint programmes with governments, labour, shipping and industry organizations which have a maritime interest. Without this form of assistance, the Organization would be unable to fulfil its technical cooperation mandate to provide guidance and support, particularly to developing countries, to enable them to meet the requirements for the proper implementation of international standards in shipping.

Of course, it goes almost without saying that we need more help, more support, more participation and more partnerships. But I don't want this message to be construed as a plea for funding - welcome though it would be. Instead I want to concentrate on the broader implications within the philosophy of partnership.

This year has seen a great deal of media and industry attention focused on the need to strengthen what has been termed the "safety net" that underpins the safety of international shipping. I make no apology for having personally stirred up some of this attention through the statements and speeches I have made in the wake of recent high-profile shipping accidents.

The safety net itself is nothing more - or perhaps I should say nothing less - than a series of partnerships. It begins with the partnerships between Member Governments here at IMO; it moves on to embrace the flag States, the shipbuilders and designers, the classification societies, the port State control inspectors, the charterers, the ship operators themselves and, ultimately, the seafarers who staff and operate the world's fleet. Hydrographers, map-makers, educators, equipment manufacturers, insurers and countless other groups or individuals all have their part to play as well.

At IMO, we are currently engaged in a process by which our Member States can strengthen the relationships within the various infrastructures that will produce tomorrow's seafarers. Panels of experts are currently assessing submissions made by Member Governments detailing how they are implementing the revised STCW Convention. This is a new process which, for the first time, gives IMO a direct involvement in the implementation of a convention. It is undoubtedly a breakthrough and has only been achieved through cooperation, consensus and respect for the competence of the Organization.

Shipping is a modern, international and multi-faceted industry that eventually touches just about everyone on the planet. And there is not a single individual or group involved with shipping that stands alone, outside the network of partnerships. It is fundamental that we all commit to a process of continually re-examining the standards that we have established and the mechanisms we have created for ensuring their proper, uniform implementation. In this, a global industry, our objectives can only be achieved through global partnerships in a global forum.

IMO: building maritime partnerships

The passage of even a short space of time can blur the memory and play havoc with our powers of recollection. Was it really less than a year ago that the industrial world - the shipping industry included - waited with bated breath in anticipation of a catastrophic and widespread computer failure that would bring the global infrastructure crashing down around us as the date clicked round from 1999 to 2000?

Banks would be unable to dispense money. Elevators all over the world would stop mid-floor and trap their occupants. Traffic lights would fail, causing gridlock in the world's cities. International and local telephone networks would malfunction, leaving cries for help unanswered and emergency services unable to operate. Aeroplanes would collide in mid-air as air traffic control systems failed. And vessels on the high seas would founder and collide as radars, steering gear and main engine control systems all ceased to operate and left them to the mercy of the wind and the weather.

Well, as we now all know, there was no major catastrophe and the world has moved safely on. The threshold to "Y2K" was crossed with little more than the occasional, isolated computer glitch, of which the consequences were rarely worse than a nuisance. Our fears about systems crashing proved to be unfounded. And, as far as the business of shipping was concerned, the movement of people and goods on the oceans and waterways of the world continued unimpeded.

Indeed, outside the world of shipping, the physical movement of people and goods by sea goes on almost unnoticed in people's daily lives. As ports have moved away from city centres, so ships and shipping have slipped from people's consciousness. Nevertheless, the shipping industry touches almost everyone on the planet, moving raw materials and finished products around the world to facilitate that most essential of all human partnerships, the partnership of trade. Building maritime partnerships is the theme of this year's World Maritime Day and, as this paper reviews some of the key events that are shaping our efforts to promote maritime safety and reduce the threat of pollution, partnership will be seen as the vital common ingredient.

The extent to which the whole "millennium bug" issue exercised the collective minds of the shipping industry was a reflection of just how far shipping has embraced an age in which the technology of the computer has superseded all others. Although most ships are still built of steel and operate in an essentially mechanical way, most of the subsystems aboard a modern ship are now controlled by computer or microchip technology. As a consequence, navigation systems, propulsion control, cargo handling, ballasting, communication and other vital elements were all identified as being at risk if the millennium bug had really bitten.

That it did not bite was down to preparation, planning, foresight and a large slice of good fortune. Here at IMO, we
began addressing the problem in 1997, when a circular bringing the problem to the attention of Member Governments was drawn up by the Sub-Committee on Radiocommunications and Search and Rescue and issued through the Maritime Safety Committee (MSC).

Crystal ball

It is, of course, part of our job to look into the future and to begin defining the rules and regulations that will give tomorrow’s shipping industry the best possible chance of being a safe one. But one of the problems we have is judging how far ahead we set the co-ordinates on our crystal ball. Too far, and we begin to deal with fantasy. Not far enough, and we run the risk of being re-active rather than pro-active.

The key is to identify trends just at the point where they become clearly established. Indeed, it is now a policy enshrined in the IMO system. Last year’s IMO Assembly, convened in November, directed the Organization to be more pro-active, so that “trends which might adversely affect the safety of ships and those on board and/or the environment may be identified at the earliest feasible stage and action taken to avoid or mitigate such effects.”

In 2000, the first clear manifestation of this approach has come with the call from the IMO Secretary-General William O’Neil for a co-ordinated investigation into the safety of large passenger vessels. As a result, the MSC, during its 72nd session, convened a working group tasked with undertaking a full review of the existing situation relating to such vessels in the light of current practices, the existing regulatory regime and the safety philosophy that governs their operation.

The statistics that underpin this initiative point clearly to a trend that is not only established but rapidly growing. The current world fleet of passenger ships of 50,000 gross tonnage and above is 47 strong. The first of these was built in 1961. But as many as 42 have been built since 1990; their average gross tonnage is a massive 71,140, while their average capacity is 2,287 passengers and 819 crew members – more than 3,100 people on board at any one time. At the larger end of the market, the 100,000 gross tonnage “barrier” has been broken and 5,000 people on board a single ship is now a reality. And, with an eye to the future, the shipping industry press has reported plans to build giants of 450,000 gross tonnage, capable of carrying 9,600 people.

There is no suggestion that these ships do not comply with existing rules. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that they do. But we have to make sure that the standards and operating procedures themselves have kept pace with the changes in design and operation that have characterized the cruise ship revolution. Are the rules themselves really geared up to provide a safe operating regime for what is in many ways a new category of vessel? The Load Line Convention, for example, was adopted in 1966; SOLAS in 1974. Although both have been updated, the shipping world for which they were designed was vastly different from that of today, and few vessels epitomize the evolution of shipping to a greater extent than these mammoth cruise ships.

The remit of the working group is all-embracing. It has been tasked to identify the potential risks that large passenger ships may face in the coming decade, and to examine a whole range of issues that arise from the construction, equipment, operation and management of these giant vessels. Factors such as crew training, particularly in crisis and crowd management, design, materials and evacuation provisions will all be reviewed, as will the safety and environmental implications behind the growing tendency for these floating cities to be operated in remote and sensitive areas.

Speaking at a conference on passenger vessel safety organized by the Institute of Marine Engineers in London...
earlier this year, Mr. O’Neil explained in detail the kind of work the group would be expected to undertake and the impact its findings could have. “It is essential,” he said, “that the survivability of these ships should be determined under various disaster scenarios and, if the standards are found to be wanting in any respect – stability after collision, fire protection and so on – then they should be changed.”

Rational behaviour – first casualty

He pointed out that passengers have little or no knowledge of ships and the sea and are on board primarily to have fun. When wind, waves, darkness and a disabled ship combine to create a totally hostile and foreign environment, rational behaviour may become the first casualty. How do you cope with thousands of irrational people in those circumstances? Particularly when a large proportion of the crew are not professional seafarers but are on board to provide hotel services, to work in the casinos, or are entertainers, musicians and dancers. Although they usually receive some training in how to handle emergency situations, many have little more experience of life at sea than the passengers themselves. Their reaction and response under the pressure of crisis could be uncertain, according to Mr. O’Neil.

Search and rescue will also fall within the working group’s remit. What happens when – assuming an orderly and successful evacuation – several thousand people, including children and the elderly, are crowded into scores of lifeboats and liferafts, waiting to be rescued? How long would they have to wait for assistance, particularly in the more remote regions of the world that are becoming ever more popular as cruise destinations? And how could so many people be accommodated aboard the ships that are able to go to their rescue? There is precious little extra room aboard a modern cargo vessel.

All of these issues and more will be considered by the working group, which will develop a draft work plan for the MSC and its subsidiary bodies. Establishing such a broad-based working group to draw on the many diverse technical disciplines present within IMO’s structure of committees and sub-committees serves to re-emphasize that IMO is the only organization in the world that could respond effectively to the demands of such an increasingly complex industry. But it goes a stage further by demonstrating that IMO also has the ability to anticipate problems before they occur, a quality which will become increasingly valued as the pace of technology quickens.

Of course, it is by no means the first time that such a cross-discipline group has been set up. In the mid-1990s, for example, the MSC established first a correspondence group and then a working group to consider the whole issue of bulk carrier safety, and to make proposals for changes in existing conventions concerning the structure and operation of this type of ship.

As a result, in November 1997, IMO adopted a new chapter XII of SOLAS 1974 on additional safety measures for bulk carriers, which entered into force on 1 July last year. The regulations in the chapter aim to prevent losses of bulk carriers due to structural failure following flooding of any hold in new ships and of the foremost hold of existing ships, which was identified as the cause of a number of bulk carrier losses in the early 1990s.

The regulations are detailed but, in summary, they state that all new bulk carriers 150 metres or more in length (built after 1 July 1999) carrying cargoes with a density of 1,000 kg/m³ and above (grains, for example, such as wheat and rice, and timber) should have sufficient strength to withstand flooding of any one cargo hold, taking into account dynamic effects resulting from the presence of water in the hold. For existing ships (built before 1 July 1999) carrying bulk cargoes with a density of 1,780 kg/m³ and above (such as iron ore, pig iron, steel, bauxite and cement), the transverse watertight bulkhead between the two foremost cargo holds and the double bottom of the foremost cargo hold should have sufficient strength to withstand flooding and the related dynamic effects in the foremost cargo hold. The chapter also contains a number of requirements for improving the structural integrity of bulk carriers, including strengthening the double bottom and bulkhead of the foremost hold where required.

These new SOLAS regulations are just some of a raft of measures that have been taken by IMO in recent years to improve bulk carrier safety. And there is some evidence that bulk carriers are, indeed, becoming safer places to work. Lloyd’s Register’s casualty statistics for 1999 reveal that just a single person was killed last year as a result of a bulk carrier loss. The average for the previous years had been just over 87. Nevertheless, the sea has a grim way of reminding us that there is never room for complacency. In March of this year, the bulk carrier Leader I. sank in the North Atlantic with the loss of 18 lives.

Although, collectively, these measures represent a very tangible step forward, they are open to the criticism that they were prompted only by a series of disasters in the early and mid-1990s in which heavy loss of life was sustained. It has long been acknowledged that safety legislation which anticipates, rather than reacts to, situations is the most effective. The initiative on passenger ship safety seeks to espouse that wisdom.

Luck plays a part

That is not to say that there have been no significant passenger ship accidents in recent years. There have, Norwegian Dream, Sun Vista, Ecstasy, Prinsesse Ragshild, Dashun, Monarch of the Seas, Romantica, Hanseatic, Royal Viking Sun, Albatross, Sagafrid, and Achille Lauro is a list long enough to prove the point. In some cases the ship concerned sank but, altogether, remarkably few lives were lost. In retrospect, it has become clear that luck played a major part – good weather, calm seas and other ships being in the vicinity, for example. But another list of names – Dona Paz, Fierté Gonaviene, Estonia, Scandinavian Star and Herald of Free Enterprise, all passenger ships in which many lives were lost, indicates what might happen if disaster strikes one of the industry’s new giants.

The working group will place the human element of safety at sea in sharp focus, continuing a policy that has now been clearly identified by IMO as vital for the future. So much so that resolution A.900(21), adopted at the IMO Assembly last November, directed the Organization and its various bodies, through its Council, to “focus their attention on shifting the emphasis onto people.” The importance of this new focus cannot be over-stressed, based as it is on the widely accepted truth that human factors account for most accidents at sea.
Of course, as we all know, nothing is that simple. So-called human error can, more often than not, be traced back to bad management practices. Should we really blame a seaman or an officer for making an honest mistake, however serious its consequences? Or should we look instead at the series of management decisions that placed a single person in such a position and which failed to establish a proper set of checks and balances to mitigate the effects of any error?

**Focus on people**

A people-centred management culture is today considered one of the essential ingredients in the safe and efficient running of any industry, and shipping is no exception. The International Safety Management (ISM) Code, which seeks to provide a framework for the way shipping companies manage and operate their fleets, recognizes this development. Moreover, it represents something of a new approach. Previously, IMO’s attempts to improve shipping safety and to prevent pollution from ships had been largely directed at improving the hardware of shipping – for example, the construction of ships and their equipment. The ISM Code, by contrast, concentrates on the way shipping companies are run.

The ISM Code entered into force on 1 July 1998 for passenger ships (including high-speed passenger craft), oil tankers, chemical tankers, gas carriers, bulk carriers and high-speed cargo craft of 300 gross tonnage and above. The deadline for the remaining thousands of cargo ships trading internationally is 1 July 2002. If they haven’t already done so, the owners of these vessels must now be getting under way the process of implementing the Code in their companies. SOLAS does not provide for any extension of implementation dates for the introduction of the ISM Code, and the countdown is ticking fast.

It is too early to assess the full impact of ISM Code implementation on the first tranche of ships, but there are signs it has already been effective, especially in making shipping company managers more aware of their responsibilities. Commercially, there are clear indications that ISM certification provides real value. A claims analysis by The Swedish Club, which provides both hull and protection and indemnity cover, has shown that vessels that were required to comply with the ISM Code by 1 July 1998 have around 30% fewer claims than vessels covered by the second deadline of 2002. This is good news for the P&I Clubs and their members, good news for the shipowners – and good news for safety at sea and protection of the marine environment.

Protection of the environment continues to increase in importance for IMO as we respond to the changing concerns not only of our industry but also of the wider world. Although dramatic oil-spill incidents such as the *Erika* dominate the headlines, there is a considerable body of work that goes on almost unnoticed, yet which is making an enormous contribution to the quality of mankind’s partnership with his environment.

One of the “unseen” problems we are currently tackling is that of ballast water management. When a ship takes on ballast water, it may also inadvertently ingest a soup of microscopic aquatic organisms. Some of these may be toxic, others potentially harmful if removed from their own local ecosystem and introduced into another at the end of a ballast voyage. The result is that toxins and pathogens can enter the food chain and unchecked predators can decimate fish and shellfish stocks that have no natural defence.

**Tankers are among the vessels for which the ISM Code has been a way of life since 1998**

Several options for preventing the spread of these harmful organisms in ballast water have been discussed, including exchanging the ballast water far out to sea, where there is less marine life and where organisms are less likely to survive, and treating the ballast water *en route* to kill the living organisms. A working group of the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) has been developing draft new regulations for ballast water management. Good progress is being made here, although a number of the issues remain open for further consideration.

**Insidious pollution**

Ships’ anti-fouling coatings are another source of unspectacular but insidious pollution. The compounds in anti-fouling paints slowly “leach” into the sea, killing barnacles and other marine life that have attached to the ship. But studies have shown that these compounds persist in the water, killing sea life, harming the environment and possibly entering the food chain. The MEPC’s working group on anti-fouling is developing a legal instrument to regulate the use of shipboard anti-fouling systems, in particular to phase out those containing organotins such as tributyltin, or TBT. The instrument will be considered in detail at the Committee’s next session in October this year. Under its terms, the application of
organotin compounds which act as biocides in anti-fouling on ships would be prohibited by 1 January 2003, and a complete prohibition would be in place by 1 January 2008. These dates will be subject to further discussion at a diplomatic conference, scheduled for October 2001.

**Greenhouse emissions**

Of equal importance are the moves currently being made within shipping to reduce pollution of the air. Greenhouse gas emission from ships is becoming a significant issue in the debate over global climate change. MEPC 42 agreed that IMO is the appropriate international body to consider issues related to a possible reduction of CO₂ emissions from ships and agreed to carry out a study on this matter, with a view to preparing a policy document for submission to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Last year, the MEPC also recognized that, for measures to reduce air pollution from ships in SO₂ emission control areas to be effective, bunker fuel oil must contain a lower sulphur percentage than the maximum permitted by regulation 14(1) of Annex VI of MARPOL 73/78. As a result, the Committee called on governments, particularly those in SO₂ emission control areas, to ensure the availability of low-sulphur bunker fuel oil within the area of their jurisdiction. It also called on the oil and shipping industries to facilitate the availability and use of such fuel.

Although reception facilities for wastes are required by MARPOL 73/78, the lack of facilities for dirty ballast water, waste oil and garbage is still a major problem in some areas. Indeed, it probably represents the main source of pollution of the marine environment. In November 1999 the IMO Assembly adopted a resolution requesting the MEPC to develop guidelines on the provision and use of port waste reception facilities. This year, the Committee has adopted guidelines for ensuring the adequacy of port waste reception facilities. They contain information for the provision and improvement of port waste reception facilities and provide information relating to the ongoing management of existing facilities, as well as for the planning and establishment of new facilities.

Putting the emphasis on people has an obvious resonance in a world where technology can deliver almost anything we ask it to. Technology today can provide an officer on a ship’s bridge with a “real-time” electronic chart display and a radar overlay, pinpointing precisely his own ship’s position and those of other ships round him. It can lead him or her through trial manoeuvres and predict what the consequences of any decision might be. But it cannot, ultimately, tell the officer on the bridge what to do. Even the best technology is almost useless if the people operating it are not awake, alert, motivated, educated, trained and qualified to the right standards.

The mechanism that produces the world’s professional seafaring human resource is defined in the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers 1978, known universally as STCW. STCW was substantially re-written in 1995 to reflect the growing understanding that experience and sea time did not necessarily add up to competence and ability.

The 1995 amendments to STCW stipulate in detail the required competencies associated with different tasks, the knowledge and understanding required to perform them, methods for demonstrating competence and criteria for evaluating it. They entered into force in 1997, and will begin to bite in 2002, when all seafarers must be trained in compliance with the new standards and carry certificates that comply with the 1995 amendments. Up to 1 February 2002, certificates in line with the provisions of the Convention which applied prior to 1 February 1997 may still be issued, recognized and endorsed.
That places the industry now in the middle of an important transition period. And, for the first time, IMO has a direct involvement in seeing that transition implemented. The 1995 amendments require Parties to the Convention to communicate information on compliance with the amendments to IMO. Details about to whom the responsibility for administering the Convention has been given, the legal and administrative measures taken to ensure compliance and, most significantly, the courses, training programmes, examinations and assessments established for each certificate covered by the Convention must be submitted. The information is then reviewed by panels of competent persons, who will report on their findings to the IMO Secretary-General, who will, in turn, report to the MSC on the Parties which fully comply.

**STCW list**

It will then fall to the MSC to approve a list, containing the names of the Parties deemed to be giving the STCW full and complete effect. The value of the list will be that certificates issued by the countries that are on it will be recognized by others as complying with the requirements of the Convention — with the obvious negative consequences for those countries that are not.

When the initial deadline for submissions was reached, 82 out of the 133 STCW Parties had passed on the required information, and several more submissions have been received since the deadline passed. More significantly, the initial 82 countries represented well over 90% of the world's ships and seafarers. By the beginning of August this year, 52 panels had completed their work and reported to the Secretary-General, while a further 30 had completed their initial evaluation and had sought clarification from the Parties concerned.

The initial timetable for reporting on the submissions has slipped a little. But the work represents a massive undertaking of a kind never previously attempted. We believe that what has been achieved so far merits considerable credit, and few could argue against that.

Full implementation of STCW will place tremendous responsibility on the shoulders of the nations that are increasingly providing the world's seafaring labour force. This is as it should be, at least in theory. But, in practice, there is little point insisting that countries adhere to stringent standards if they lack the technical expertise, resources and experience to implement them. That is why, for more than 30 years now, IMO has had in place a very active technical co-operation programme aimed at providing real, practical assistance wherever and whenever possible. In recent years, the increased proportion of private sector participation in technical co-operation activities has borne witness to the very tangible value of the projects undertaken. Helping establish the infrastructure to educate, train and equip people for careers in the shipping industry will continue to be a major focus for IMO's technical co-operation in the years ahead, and we will be actively encouraging the partnerships with the private sector.

Quality shipping needs quality seafarers. That was one of the conclusions of a seminar on quality shipping hosted earlier this year by the Maritime and Port Authority of Singapore, one of a series organized with the support of IMO. Influential figures from the shipping industry came together for two days to discuss how quality in shipping can be defined, achieved and maintained. They highlighted that an industry in which social conditions were poor, career progression unstructured and personnel responsibilities shirked could not expect to attract high-quality people. It is undeniable that seafaring can be a stressful, exhausting and often lonely profession. According to the International Transport Workers' Federation, hundreds of seafarers are abandoned each year when ships are placed under legal arrest following bankruptcy, insolvency or accident. And there are countless examples of ships' masters, officers and crews themselves being arrested in "knee-jerk" reactions to shipping casualties.

All of which can lead to diminishing morale and fading incentive. Little wonder that "human error" often gets the blame when accidents do occur. At IMO, we are actively promoting a culture of high regard for the seafarer and, in particular, for his or her welfare at work. Rather than viewing seafarers as "part of the problem", we are seeking ways in which they can become empowered to be part of the answer. The Seafarers Memorial, a sculpture to be commissioned for IMO's London headquarters, will serve as a constant reminder of the sacrifices that seafarers have made throughout history in pursuit of exploration and trade. On a more practical level, we are working on measures that will help restore motivation and ensure that a job at sea is an attractive proposition to the right kind of people.

By tackling issues of training and certification, STCW implicitly addresses the need for formal career structures. And a joint working group established with the International Labour Organization (ILO) has been set up to look at aspects of seafarers' working conditions, including their rights to health cover, sickness benefits and compensation for death, personal injury and abandonment.

**Shadow of piracy**

One issue that continues to cast a shadow over seafarers' lives is the threat of piracy and armed robbery at sea. The news in this respect is far from good. In 1999, the number of acts of piracy and armed robbery against ships reported to IMO was 309, an increase of 47% over the figure for 1998. The areas most affected in 1999 make all-too-familiar reading—the Far East, in particular the South China Sea and the Malacca Straits, the Indian Ocean, West Africa, South America and the Caribbean, and East Africa. Most of the attacks, regardless of where they took place, were in territorial waters and occurred while the ships were at anchor or berthed. According to many of the reports we received, crews were often violently attacked by groups of five to ten people carrying guns. Two crew members of the ships involved were killed and eleven wounded during the reported incidents. It has also been revealed that nine ships were hijacked, seven went missing and one was destroyed.

There is no easy answer to this problem, and it is certainly not within the compass of IMO to address the factors that encourage people to turn to crime. What we can do, however, is help our stakeholders to make crime at sea more difficult to perpetrate and to alleviate its effects. Last year the MSC revised the two previous sets of recommendations on preventing and suppressing piracy and armed robbery against ships, one aimed at governments, the other at shipowners and ship operators, shipmasters and crews. An IMO correspondence group is now preparing a draft instrument on the investigation and prosecution of the
crime of piracy and armed robbery against ships and is due to report to MSC 73 later this year, when a working/drafting group is expected to be established to finalize the draft instrument for adoption.

Although the human element may be high on the agenda at the moment, technical issues are by no means taking a back seat. What was once known as the art of navigation is now well and truly a science, and several important innovations that seem set to transform ships’ bridges still further are making significant progress through the legislative procedure. This year, the 72nd session of the MSC approved the draft text of a revised chapter V of SOLAS, which deals with safety of navigation, and instructed the Secretariat to circulate it with a view to adoption at the Committee’s next session (27 November to 6 December 2000).

When it comes into force, the new chapter will make it mandatory for ships to carry an automatic identification system, or AIS. These devices can automatically transmit details about a ship, such as its identity, speed, course and even the cargo being carried, to any appropriate receiver. On the bridge, this kind of information received from other ships can be used to enhance the navigating officer’s knowledge of the surrounding traffic situation, particularly when used in conjunction with radar and electronic charts. Ashore, it has the potential to provide vessel traffic services (VTS) authorities with their most valuable tool yet in their efforts to promote safe and efficient navigation through their areas of responsibility. It is expected that AIS will be mandatory on new ships built on or after 1 July 2002 and will be phased in on existing ships between 1 July 2002 and 1 July 2008. The dates will be finalized at the MSC’s next session.

Black box progress

The new chapter V will also include requirements for ships to be fitted with voyage data recorders (VDRs), similar in principle to the “black boxes” that have long since been carried aboard aircraft and which have proven their value time and again in air crash investigations. Although they are not designed to improve directly the safety of any individual vessel, their proponents say these devices will assist in promoting a safety culture in shipping by furthering our understanding of what causes accidents and of what actually happens in those vital minutes before disaster strikes. Which ships should fit them? There was general agreement at MSC 72 that VDRs should be fitted to all new ships and to existing ro–ro and passenger ships. But there was no consensus regarding carriage requirements for existing cargo ships, and this issue will have to be decided at MSC 73. At least one industry lobby group has suggested that the answer might lie in fitting a lower specification VDR unit to existing cargo ships, in order to overcome any practical difficulties in fitting the full specification recorder.

Finally, the revised chapter V will permit an electronic chart display and information system (ECDIS) to be accepted as meeting the chart carriage requirements for paper nautical charts. The gestation of electronic charts has been long and not without controversy. Yet it revealed how innovative the marine electronics industry can be and how rapidly it is able to develop new techniques. It also confirmed the potential complexity of any new technology and the consequent importance of thorough, if sometimes painstaking, regulatory review. That ships and their crews not to mention ship operators – will soon be able to gain the full benefit of what is a completely new navigation tool is testimony to the diligence of all concerned.

Altogether, the revised chapter V includes some 35 regulations (against the current 23), introducing new requirements for navigational equipment and taking into account advances in technology. It is expected that the new chapter will enter into force, under tacit acceptance, on 1 July 2002, although the exact date will be decided at MSC 73.

Technology and people form one of the basic partnerships that is central to our work here at IMO. Indeed, IMO is in essence a partnership, embodying a co-operative relationship between the Organization and the 158 Member Governments, who join together in framing, implementing and policing the standards and the rules and regulations that govern international shipping.

Erika and her aftermath

It would be impossible to conclude any review of the activities of IMO, and particularly our efforts to establish and strengthen partnerships, without mention of the Erika incident. For anybody who perhaps is not normally involved in the shipping industry and to whom the name means very little, here are the bald facts. In mid December last year, Erika, a 37,283 dwt tanker, broke in two in heavy seas about 110 km off the coast of Brittany in France. She was en route between a northern French port and Italy, and carrying a particularly unpleasant cargo of heavy fuel oil. Much of the cargo was spilled, and serious pollution – with the all-too-familiar consequences for the wildlife, people and the coastal industry of the region – resulted. But her crew were saved and now, albeit after much effort and expense, the beaches have been described by the French Prime Minister, Lionel Jospin, as cleaner than ever.

End of story? Indeed no. Like a stone cast into a pond, the sinking of the Erika is causing waves that are continuing to spread far beyond the original incident. Taking place as it did in the full glare of a highly sophisticated northern European publicity machine, it has forced a radical re-assessment of the industry’s “safety net” – the system of controls and inspections designed to ensure that any defects and departures from safe practices are detected and acted upon.

IMO Secretary-General William O’Neil has led the industry in calling for a re-appraisal of the safety net. Shortly after the event, he told an audience of shipowners, “The Erika was under class and had been inspected by port State control and industry inspectors several times, yet none of these surveys showed that the ship was about to split in two. We are all bound to ask why not.”

Fingers have been pointed at the age of the ship (she was built in 1975) and her design (single-hull). The sheer number of different nationalities involved in her ownership, chartering, registry, insurance, classification and crewing has also been a cause for concern – although, in truth, it represents nothing unusual in shipping and perhaps should be thought of as an element that we have to deal with, like the weather, rather than something we can seek to change.

The credibility of the classification system has been questioned, and there can be no question that the Erika incident did greatly damage the image of classification societies. Although the ship was inspected on several occasions, the deficiencies that led to her breaking in half
were not detected. Nevertheless, the fact remains that classification societies are not only essential partners in the promotion of maritime safety, they are probably more important now than they have ever been.

Some of what might be termed the “newer” flags that dominate shipping today have not yet been able to build up the experience of the traditional maritime countries, so they rely very much on the classification societies to perform technical work on their behalf. But it is a cause for concern that classification societies themselves do not show equal levels of competence, despite the fact that IMO has adopted minimum standards for “recognized organizations” acting on behalf of national shipping administrations.

Moreover, the way some shipowners have been able to switch between societies rather than carry out repairs is a worrying trend and one which threatens to bring the whole structure of class into disrepute. In IACS (the International Association of Classification Societies), the major societies have the mechanism to co-operate more closely with each other and to be much more open in disclosing information, particularly about the condition of ships. We can all agree that commercial confidentiality must be respected, but it should not be used as an excuse for hiding deficiencies that could endanger life.

Pollution – who pays?

And still the ripples from Erika spread. The beaches have been cleaned, but only at great expense and after the pollution had damaged the livelihoods of countless businesses and individuals. Compensation is payable under the 1992 Civil Liability Convention and the 1992 Fund Convention, as enacted into French law, to any individual, business, private organization or public body who has suffered pollution damage as a result of the Erika incident. Approximately US$12 million is available from the shipowner’s liability insurer, the Steamship Mutual P&I Club, while additional compensation of up to approximately US$173 million is available from the International Oil Pollution Compensation Fund 1992 (the 1992 Fund).

Yet experts believe this total of approximately US$185 million may be insufficient to cover the total liability incurred by the break-up of the Erika. As a result of this and other incidents, IMO’s Legal Committee will, at its 82nd session in October 2000, consider a proposal to amend both the 1992 Civil Liability Protocol and the 1992 Fund Protocol to increase the limits enshrined in these Protocols, to reflect the increasing cost of major oil spills.

No one can deny the importance of adequate and speedy compensation. But if ships did not spill oil it would not be necessary in the first place. So perhaps the most significant wave trailing in the wake of the Erika incident will be that which concerns the design and construction of oil tankers. Belgium, France and Germany have jointly submitted a proposal for amendments to regulation 13G of Annex I of MARPOL 73/78 (the international convention covering oil pollution from ships) which would accelerate the phase-out of single-hull oil tankers. The age limits proposed are either lower than those currently provided for under regulation 13G, or apply to categories of oil tankers which, on account of their size, are not currently covered by this regulation. Some observers are now questioning the impact such legislation might have on the world’s tanker fleet and, more importantly, the fleet’s ability to ensure that supplies of oil can meet global demands.

Any discussion must, of course, be based on facts. That is why IMO has commissioned a study to assess the impact, year by year, of the proposals to amend regulation 13G. The study will take into account factors such as the volume of oil and oil products carried worldwide and by region; the number of single-hull tankers to be affected by the proposals; the ability of the shipbuilding industry, worldwide, to replace single-hull tankers that might be withdrawn from service; and the scrapping capacity of ship recycling facilities, on an annual basis. It will be carried out by the IMO Secretariat, assisted by industry experts nominated by industry organizations, who will act as an informal group co-ordinated by the Marine Environment Division of IMO. The Group is expected to draw on the expertise and experience of all available sources, including Member Governments and international organizations.

The proposals for amendments to MARPOL are being put to the MEPC, for consideration at its next session (MEPC 45), to be held in London from 2 to 6 October this year. The following session of MEPC has been brought forward to April of next year, so that any amendments that are agreed at the meeting can be put in place as swiftly as possible.

IMO Secretary-General O’Neill has welcomed the French, German and Belgian decision to work for changes in the law at international level through IMO. Yet he has acknowledged that, from some quarters, there is a call for regional legislation. Speaking to a meeting of shipowners earlier this year, he warned of the dangers in undermining the well-proven principle of a global regulatory framework for what is a truly international industry. “Any attempt to impose regional standards,” he said, “will simply divert the problem elsewhere. If the European Union, for example, imposes its own restrictions on tankers, we should not expect the sub-standard ships that are displaced will go straight to the scrap-yard. They will simply move to other areas such as Asia and continue trading.” Seen in this light, the case for a global approach is compelling.

Partnership – the way forward

As the Erika incident forces the shipping industry to re-evaluate the network of partnerships that has been established to uphold and promote acceptable standards of safety, it should not be overlooked that, for most of the time, the network functions effectively. Every ship detained by port State control (and there are hundreds every year) is an example of the safety net doing what it was designed to do: stopping sub-standard ships from sailing. Port State control regimes throughout the world are being urged to strengthen their links with each other, sharing information on problem ships and gradually squeezing out habitual offenders. This is a development that can only be welcomed.

It also reinforces the message that more, not less, partnership is the way forward for a safer and cleaner maritime industry. As the only international body equipped to facilitate truly international partnership among the governments of the world’s shipping nations, IMO will continue to be vital to that process. But effective partnership demands commitment. And only a continued commitment to international standards of safety can hope to bring success in this new era of globalization. Our underlying message must be that safety is a collective responsibility, in which we all are partners with a responsibility and a role to play.
IMO to review safety of large passenger ships

Working group established

The Maritime Safety Committee agreed to undertake a global consideration of safety issues pertaining to passenger ships, with particular emphasis on large cruise ships, in response to a proposal by IMO Secretary-General Mr. William A. O’Neil. A working group on enhancing the safety of large passenger ships will begin work at the next session of the Committee (MSC 73, meeting in November-December 2000), to review the current safety regime as it relates to large passenger ships and identify areas of concern relating to:

- **the ship** – including construction and equipment, evacuation, operation and maintenance;
- **the people** – including crew, passengers, rescue personnel, training, crisis and crowd management;
- **the environment** – including search and rescue services, operation in remote areas and weather conditions.

The working group will also identify the potential risks facing future large passenger ships and develop a draft work programme for the Committee and its subsidiary bodies to address safety concerns.

The proposal to review large passenger ship safety was presented to IMO by the Secretary-General in a paper entitled “Enhancing the safety of large passenger ships”.

In the paper, Mr. O’Neil noted the achievements of the shipbuilding and ancillary industries in delivering gigantic cruise ships embodying state-of-the-art technology.

He said the safety of such ships was not in doubt, nor was there concern that such vessels met the most recently adopted safety standards applicable to ships of this category – particularly those standards in the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS).

However, “what merits due consideration is whether SOLAS and, to the extent applicable, the Load Line Convention requirements, several of which were drafted before some of these large ships were built, duly address all the safety aspects of their operation, in particular in emergency situations. Also, whether the training requirements of the STCW Convention relating to personnel operating large cruise ships are in need of any review or clarification in the circumstances.”

The paper noted that, according to statistical information, there were at present 47 passenger ships of 50,000 gross tonnage* and above, built between 1961 and 1999, totalling 3,324,853 gross tonnage, capable of carrying 106,484 passengers and 38,389 crew members. Of these, 42 passenger ships, totalling 2,987,889 gross tonnage and capable of carrying 96,075 passengers and 34,439 crew members, had been built since 1990; their average gross tonnage was 71,140, while their average capacity was 2,287 passengers and 819 crew members or 3,106 persons on board.

**Ro-ro passenger ships only to fit helicopter landing area**

The Committee adopted an amendment to SOLAS chapter III, regulation 28.2, for helicopter landing areas on ro-ro passenger ships, issued in May 1999, recommending that non-ro-ro passenger ships of 130 metres in length and upwards be fitted with helicopter landing areas – since there was a delay between the regulation coming into effect for new ships and the adoption of the amendment making it applicable to ro-ro passenger ships only.

**AIS and VDRs to be required under new draft SOLAS chapter V**

The Committee approved the revised draft text of chapter V (Safety of navigation) and instructed the Secretariat to circulate it with a view to adoption at the next session (MSC 73, 27 November to 6 December 2000).

The revised chapter includes 35 regulations, against the current 23, introducing new requirements for navigational equipment and taking into account advances in technology. It is expected that the new chapter will enter into force, under tacit acceptance, on 1 July 2002, although the exact date will be decided at MSC 73.

---

* The figure of 50,000 gross tonnage has been used for the sake of argument only, and not as an attempt to define “large passenger ships”.

The original requirement was part of a package of amendments to SOLAS adopted in November 1995, based on proposals put forward by a panel of experts set up by IMO in December 1994 following the ro-ro ferry Estonia disaster of September 1994 in which more than 850 people were killed.

Regulation 28.1 of SOLAS chapter III requires all ro-ro passenger ships to be provided with a helicopter pick-up area, and existing ro-ro passenger ships were required to comply with this regulation not later than the first periodical survey after 1 July 1997. The requirement for a helicopter landing area for all passenger ships of 130 metres in length and upwards was deferred to 1 July 1999.

MSC/Circ.907, Application of SOLAS regulation III/28.2 concerning helicopter landing areas on non-ro-ro passenger ships, issued in May 1999, recommended that non-ro-ro passenger ships of 130 metres in length and upwards constructed on or after 1 July 1999 need not be fitted with helicopter landing areas, and this should not constitute a reason for detaining or delaying the ship – since there was a delay between the regulation coming into effect for new ships and the adoption of the amendment making it applicable to ro-ro passenger ships only.
The new chapter, when it comes into force, will make it mandatory for ships to carry an automatic identification system (AIS). It is expected that these will be mandatory on new ships built on or after 1 July 2002 and will be phased in on existing ships between 1 July 2002 and 1 July 2008. The dates will be finalized at the next session. AISs can be used in conjunction with ship reporting systems and enable the ship's identity and other details to be given to the shore authorities automatically.

The new chapter V will also include requirements for ships to be fitted with voyage data recorders (VDRs). There was general agreement that these should be fitted to all new ships and to existing ro-ro and passenger ships. But there was no consensus regarding carriage requirements for existing cargo ships, and this issue will have to be decided at MSC 73.

The revised chapter V will permit an electronic chart display and information system (ECDIS) to be accepted as meeting the chart carriage requirements for paper nautical charts.

**New and amended routing systems and mandatory ship reporting systems adopted**

The Committee adopted the following:

- **Chile** – amended traffic separation schemes (TSSs), including associated routing measures, in the approaches to the ports of Iquique and Punta Arenas.
- **Peru** – new TSS, including associated routing measures, along the Peruvian coast.
- **China** – new TSS, including associated routing measures, in the waters off the Chenshan Jiao Promontory, together with an associated routing system and a mandatory ship reporting system.
- **United States** – recommended tracks off the California coast for ships of 300 gross tonnage and above and for ships carrying hazardous cargo in bulk.
- **Cuba** – area to be avoided at the approaches to the ports of Matanzas and Cardenas.
- **United Kingdom** – Abolition of the areas to be avoided around the EC1 and EC3 lighted buoys.

**IMDG Code gets “user-friendly” overhaul**

The Committee adopted a revised and reformatted International Maritime Dangerous Goods (IMDG) Code, which is intended to be more user-friendly and understandable.

“Amendment 30” to the IMDG Code involves the complete reformatting of the IMDG Code as well as revisions to various sections of the Code and to transport requirements for specific substances. The reformatted IMDG Code will enter into force on 1 January 2001, with a 12-month transitional period ending 31 December 2001.

The reformatted IMDG Code includes seven parts, two appendices and an index:

- General provisions, definitions and training (Part 1);
- Classification (Part 2);
- Dangerous Goods List (DGL) and limited quantities exceptions (Part 3);
- Packing and tank provisions (Part 4);
- Consignment procedures (Part 5);
- Construction and testing of packagings, intermediate bulk containers (IBCs), large packagings, portable tanks and road tank vehicles (Part 6);
- Requirements concerning transport operations (Part 7);
- Appendix A – List of generic and N.O.S. (Not Otherwise Specified) Proper Shipping Names;
- Appendix B – Glossary of terms;
- Index.

The present Code appears in four volumes, but the reformatted Code will appear in two volumes: one covering parts 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 7; the second incorporating Part 3, the two Appendices and the Index.

The Committee agreed to hold further discussions at the next session on whether the IMDG Code – or parts of it – should be made mandatory.

Under SOLAS chapter VII (Carriage of dangerous goods), the International Bulk Chemical Code (IBC Code) and the International Gas Carrier Code (IGC Code) are mandatory, and are referred to in the regulations of the chapter, but the IMDG Code is only referred to in a footnote.

In MARPOL Annex III, Regulations for the Prevention of Pollution by Harmful Substances Carried in Packaged Form, the IMDG Code is also referred to.

**Revised STCW – implementation reviewed**

The Committee reviewed progress in the implementation of the revised International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), in particular the evaluation of information by STCW Parties relating to compliance with the Convention.

The information is being reviewed by panels of competent persons, who will report on their findings to the IMO Secretary-General, who will, in turn, report to the Committee on the Parties which fully comply.

By the deadline of 1 August 1998 for submission of information, 82 out of the 133 STCW Parties had communicated information on implementation of the requirements of the revised Convention. The 82 Parties which met the deadline represent well over 90% of the world’s ships and seafarers.

By 15 May 2000, 42 panels of competent persons had completed their work on assessing information sent to IMO by Parties to the Convention. A further 40 panels had completed their initial evaluations and requested clarification from the Parties concerned. Clarifications had been provided by 32 and replies were still awaited from eight Parties.

In order to meet deadlines for submission of documents to the next (73rd) session of the MSC (scheduled for 27 November to 6 December 2000), the work of the panels needed to be completed by mid-August.

The Committee agreed that the Secretary-General should notify, by 1 October 2000, those Parties whose panels had failed to complete their evaluations and that he should submit a status report to MSC 73 by 16 October 2000 on the progress made by the panels, indicating the reasons why the panel(s) were not able to complete their work. Furthermore, the Secretary-General should be prepared at MSC 73 to distribute the report on compliance with STCW if the Committee determined that all reasonable efforts had been made to complete the work.

The Committee approved MSC/Circ.948, Preparation of reports pur-
suant to STCW regulation 1/7, paragraph 2, which urges Parties to the STCW Convention to respond to requests for clarifications without undue delay and sets out the proposed plan of action for MSC 73.

**Amendments to STCW Code adopted**

The Committee adopted amendments to part B of the STCW Code, including clarification of provisions in the Code. The amendments include a table listing certificates or documentary evidence required under the STCW Convention and a table of differences between STCW certification requirements and STCW 95 certification requirements.

The amendments to the STCW Code are to be disseminated via an STCW Circular (STCW.6/Circ.5).

The Committee also approved the following:

- Draft Assembly resolution to revoke those resolutions superseded by the 1995 amendments to the STCW Convention for submission to the 22nd IMO Assembly in November 2001.
- MSC Circular (MSC/Circ.949) to revoke those circulars superseded by the 1995 amendments to the STCW Convention.
- MSC Circular (MSC/Circ.950), Guidance on arrangements between Parties to allow for recognition of certificates under STCW regulation 1/10, which covers recognition of certificates issued by another Party. The circular includes elements to be included in a written undertaking between the Parties concerned regarding recognition of certificates.
- MSC Circular (MSC/Circ.951) providing recommendations on the certification of officers in charge of an engineering watch and engineering watchkeeping provisions on fishing vessels powered by main propulsion machinery of 750 kW or more, to apply on entry into force of the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel (STCW-F), 1995, and pending the adoption of relevant amendments. The circular is intended to establish minimum standards of competency for officers in charge of an engineering watch on fishing vessels powered by main propulsion machinery of 750 kW.
- MSC/Circ.952 on IALA standards for training and certification of vessel traffic service (VTS) personnel.
- The Committee approved a revised Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)/International Labour Organization (ILO)/IMO Document for Guidance on the Training and Certification of Fishing Vessel Personnel. The original Document for Guidance was adopted in 1985. The revised Document for Guidance is scheduled to be published soon in conjunction with ILO and FAO.

**Research study on unlawful practices linked to seafarer certificates**

The Committee received an update on an IMO research study to establish the nature and extent of unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency. Evidence gathered so far for the study, being carried out by the Seafarers International Research Centre, Cardiff, United Kingdom, suggests that the problem may be more widespread than initially thought.

Over the period January to May 2000, the research team collected data from seafarers, employers, unions and officials in national Administrations, and made visits to Administrations in northern Europe and major labour-supplying countries in South and South-East Asia.

Approximately half the seafarers interviewed from the labour-supplying countries in the South and South-East Asia region had reported first-hand experience or knowledge of unlawful practices associated with certificates among officers and crew with whom they had sailed.

Established malpractice between manning agents and training institutes had been reported, although the team had also obtained evidence of collusion by officials in the issuing of genuine certificates through unlawful means.

The next phase of the research project will involve visits to major flag States and labour-supplying countries in Eastern and Southern Europe, Latin America, the Mediterranean region and South-East Asia.

Further information on the study can be obtained from the Seafarers International Research Centre (SIRC) website: http://www.cf.ac.uk/uwec/masts/.

**High-speed craft to get new Code in 2000**

The Committee approved a draft new International Code for High-Speed Craft, 2000, with a view to its adoption at MSC 73. It is intended that the Code will apply to all HSC built after the date of entry into force, likely to be 1 July 2002.

The original HSC Code was adopted by IMO in May 1994, but the rapid pace of development in this sector of shipping has meant an early revision of the Code. The original Code will continue to apply to existing high-speed craft.

The changes incorporated into the new Code are intended to bring it into line with amendments to SOLAS and new recommendations that have been adopted in the past four years – such as, requirements covering public address systems and helicopter pick-up areas.

Consequential amendments to SOLAS chapter X (Safety measures for high-speed craft) – to refer to the new Code – were also approved.

**Revised SOLAS chapter II-2 and Fire Safety Systems Code approved**

The Committee approved a draft new revised SOLAS chapter II-2 (Construction – Fire protection, fire detection and fire extinction) and its related Fire Safety Systems Code, with a view to its adoption by MSC 73 in December 2000, with entry into force in 2002.

The revised chapter is intended to be clear, concise and user-friendly, incorporating the substantial changes introduced in recent years following a number of serious fire casualties.

The draft revised chapter includes seven parts, each including requirements applicable to all or specified ship types, while the Fire Safety Systems (FSS) Code, which will be made mandatory under the new chapter, includes detailed specifications for fire safety systems in 15 chapters.

**Asbestos to be prohibited on new ships – new regulation approved**

The Committee approved a new regulation prohibiting the new installation of materials which contain asbestos on
all ships. The new regulation 3-5 will be included in SOLAS chapter II-1 (Construction – Structure, subdivision and stability, machinery and electrical installations) and is intended to be adopted at MSC 73 in December 2000, with entry into force in 2002.

The proposed regulation states that “For all ships, new installation of materials which contain asbestos shall be prohibited except for:

- vanes used in rotary vane compressors and rotary vane vacuum pumps;
- watertight joints and linings used for the circulation of fluids when, at high temperature (in excess of 350°C) or pressure (in excess of 7 x 10^9 Pa), there is a risk of fire, corrosion or toxicity; and
- supple and flexible thermal insulation assemblies used for temperatures above 1000°C.”

Piracy and armed robbery against ships – review of proposed code

The MSC reviewed a preliminary draft text of a code of practice/instrument for the investigation and prosecution of the crime of piracy and armed robbery against ships. The Committee agreed that the Correspondence Group which developed it should continue its work, with a view to finalizing the draft instrument for adoption at MSC 73.

The idea for such a code/instrument was developed during 1998–1999 at a series of expert missions and seminars and workshops around the world organized by IMO.

Participants at the seminars recommended that governments need to intensify their efforts to combat piracy and armed robbery against ships, and IMO should consider developing an international code for the investigation of piracy and armed robbery against ships and recommending prosecution and an appropriate punishment for the crime.

Enhanced inspection guidelines amended

The Committee approved draft amendments to Assembly resolution A.744(18), Guidelines on the enhanced programme of inspections during surveys of bulk carriers and oil tankers, with a view to their adoption at MSC 73.

The amendments include detailed requirements for the evaluation of the longitudinal strength of the hull girder of oil tankers, and an amendment to make mandatory the inspection of the outside of the ship’s bottom during dry-dock surveys of oil tankers and bulk carriers of 15 years of age and above.

Bulk carrier safety – Working Group reviews submissions

A Working Group on Bulk Carrier Safety reviewed submissions relating to bulk carrier safety made in the light of the 1998 report on the sinking of the bulk carrier Derbyshire in 1980 with the loss of 44 lives, presented at the 69th session of the MSC in May 1998 by the United Kingdom.

The submissions included the results of seakeeping tests on models of bulk carriers to determine green-sea loads on hatch covers and deck wetness, carried out by the United Kingdom, and information submitted by the International Association of Classification Societies (IACS).

The Committee agreed to instruct the Sub-Committee on Stability and Load Lines and on Fishing Vessel Safety (SLF) to further review the current submissions in the context of that Sub-Committee’s ongoing review of issues arising from the Derbyshire report – these include: strength of hatch covers and coamings; freeboard and bow height; reserve buoyancy at fore end, including forecastles; structural means to reduce loads on hatch covers and forward structure; and fore deck and fore end access.

The SLF Sub-Committee next meets in September 2000.

FSA study on bulk carrier safety

The Committee reviewed progress in carrying out a formal safety assessment (FSA) study on bulk carrier safety through a collaborative effort outside IMO under the co-ordination of the United Kingdom. The Committee also reviewed progress in an independent FSA study on bulk carrier safety being conducted by Japan and the results of a hazard identification study on water-tight integrity of the fore end of bulk carriers carried out by IACS.

Formal safety assessment is described as a rational and systematic process for assessing the risks associated with any sphere of activity, and for evaluating the costs and benefits of different options for reducing those risks. It therefore enables, in its potential application to the rule-making process, an objective assessment to be made of the need for, and content of, safety regulations.

FSA consists of five steps:

- identification of hazards (a list of all relevant accident scenarios with potential causes and outcomes);
- assessment of risks (evaluation of risk factors);
- risk-control options (devising regulatory measures to control and reduce the identified risks);
- cost/benefit assessment (determining cost-effectiveness of each risk-control option); and
- recommendations for decision-making (information about the hazards, their associated risks and the cost-effectiveness of alternative risk-control options is provided).

With regard to the collaborative FSA study, the project is currently working on ranking the hazards associated with bulk carriers in order to identify the most important hazards to be considered in detail. A combined list of over 150 hazards associated with over 800 initiating causes has been developed from submissions from international participating organizations.

Further information on the FSA collaborative project can be found on the project website at http://www.fsa.mcga.gov.uk

Amendment to form of Cargo Ship Certificates adopted

The Committee adopted an amendment to the Safety Construction Certificate and the Cargo Ship Safety Equipment Certificate, given in the appendix to the annex to the 1974 SOLAS Convention to include “Bulk Carrier” to be listed under “Type of Ship”.

The amendment follows the adoption in 1997 of a new chapter XII (Additional safety measures for bulk carriers) to SOLAS.

A similar amendment was adopted to the appendix to the Annex to the 1988 SOLAS Protocol – to include “bulk carrier” under “type of ship”.

The amendments will enter into force under tacit acceptance on 1 January 2002.
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More long-term funding initiatives sought for technical co-operation programme

Funding is the key to long-term and sustainable delivery of IMO’s Integrated Technical Co-operation Programme (ITCP), which helps developing countries develop the infrastructure (human resources, institutions) needed for the effective implementation and enforcement of IMO’s global maritime standards, the Technical Co-operation Committee (TCC) reaffirmed at its 48th session in June.

The TCC urged IMO Member Governments to keep the Organization informed of new initiatives, partnerships and developments which can boost the resources for technical co-operation projects. The Committee was given a renewed mandate by the 21st IMO Assembly in November 1999 to “devise effective and innovative means of attracting and securing further financial and in-kind support for the ITCP” (Assembly resolution A.901(21)).

The Committee highlighted the following four ways of increasing funding, based on recommendations issued to Member Governments (TC/Circ.61) following the last session of the Committee in June 1999:

- partnership agreements between members of the international donor community and IMO;
- using project profiles and project documents – developed by beneficiary Member States and regional entities in close co-operation with IMO – as instruments for attracting and generating funding;
- Member States to organize national meetings bringing together development co-operation and maritime entities, representatives of the corporate sector and IMO for the purpose of building ITCP support;
- ascertaining at national level whether corporate donations to the ITCP are eligible for tax relief.

Seed money for partnership arrangements for the implementation of ITCP projects comes from IMO’s Technical Co-operation Fund (commonly referred to as the “TC Fund”) – which is primarily sourced from income generated from the sale of IMO publications.

Meanwhile, the maritime industry and other private-sector entities have been invited to participate in the ITCP partnership initiatives by providing financial, material and other forms of in-kind support.

The Committee expressed its appreciation for new or potential partnerships which have been developed in the last year (since the 47th TCC session in June 1999), including:

**France**
The Government of France has indicated that it intends to provide during 2000, under the IMO/France programme, approximately US$120,000 (the same amount as provided in 1999) for six ITCP projects. A further contribution is expected to be made during 2000 in support of a marine environment activity, as well as for enhancing maritime safety on Lake Victoria. The amount will be determined at a later stage.

The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs organized a meeting in Paris on 15 September 1999 to secure funding support for 2000 within the framework of the IMO/French Protocol, and to improve co-ordination between development partners. That meeting brought together a cross-section of interested government departments; it has also attracted the interest of the French corporate sector in building ITCP support.

**Hong Kong, China**
The Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government of the People’s Republic of China has signed an MOU with IMO for the purpose of promoting the delivery of IMO’s technical assistance activities for Asia and the Pacific Islands Region.

**Italy**
The Government of Italy has provided approximately US$594,198 to support the training programme at the IMO International Maritime Academy at Trieste during 2000.

**United Kingdom**
The Government of the United Kingdom has signed an MOU with IMO to provide US$47,910 as funding support for a Flag State Implementation (FSI) activity.

**Contributions incentive scheme**

Australia, Denmark, Greece, Hong Kong (China), the Netherlands and the Republic of Korea donated during 1999 the amount shown in brackets, to the corresponding activity indicated. The amounts arose from interests accrued under the contributions incentive scheme for the period 1996-97.

Australia (£5,809.60).................Projects in the Asia/ Pacific region

Denmark (£11,039.75).............TC Fund

Greece (£39,860.35).............TC Fund

Hong Kong, China (£7,214.32) ...TC Fund

Netherlands (£10,786.79)........TC Fund

Republic of Korea (£10,196.69) ..TC Fund

IMO’s technical co-operation brochure, which provides an overview of the ITCP, can be found at http://www.imo.org/TCD/
First impact-assessment exercise of the ITCP carried out

IMO’s Integrated Technical Co-operation Programme (ITCP) does have a beneficial impact in building capacities for improved implementation of IMO standards and in supporting sustainable maritime development, according to a consultants’ impact-assessment report reviewed by the Committee.

The assessment of impact of IMO’s assistance to developing countries under the ITCP was carried out during early 2000, following decisions taken by the Committee at its 47th session (June 1999). This was the first time that IMO organized an impact-assessment exercise (IAE) in connection with its technical co-operation programme, and such exercises will now be repeated every four years.

The consultants’ report noted that the ITCP’s principal function was to promote change, through advisory services and training, although the sustainability of such change was primarily the responsibility of the beneficiaries. A number of recommendations were therefore presented to IMO and ITCP recipients with a view to improving the development, execution and follow-up of the ITCP activities.

The first IAE reviewed the ITCP activities during 1996-1999 and was undertaken by three independent, external consultants. It covered a total of 73 projects dealing with marine environment protection, survey and inspection of ships and the promotion of the revised International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), the majority of which were financed or co-financed by the TC Fund.

The IAE involved extensive analysis at IMO Headquarters, followed by field reviews in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Latin America, where the consultants met with representatives of developing countries and partner organizations to measure, directly with the beneficiaries, the impact of the activities carried out during the four-year period under review.

The conclusions and recommendations of the IAE report were welcomed by the Committee, which noted that this first exercise had determined the effectiveness of the ITCP in delivering technical assistance and identified practical measures for further improvements, especially in relation to: (a) programme and project design; and (b) more effective and sustained follow-up to the provision and receipt of advisory services and training.

The IMO Secretariat is now carrying out an in-depth examination of the report’s recommendations, and of the suggestions made by the Committee, with a view to putting in place any required improvements. The Committee urged ITCP beneficiaries to continue providing feedback and to work with the Secretariat in developing mechanisms to sustain the benefits of the assistance that they receive.

Regional presence boosts IMO effectiveness

IMO’s two regional co-ordinators in Africa have had a successful year, carrying out needs assessment missions in 25 countries and establishing strong contacts with Member States, the donor community and regional/sub-regional organizations involved in the maritime sector, the Technical Co-operation Committee was told at its 48th session in June.

Ghana hosts an IMO regional presence office for West and Central Africa (Anglophone) and Kenya hosts one for the Eastern and Southern Africa sub-region. Negotiations between IMO and the Government of Côte d’Ivoire are in progress for the opening of a regional presence office for the Francophone West and Central Africa sub-region.

The regional presence has resulted in increased effective liaison and coordination between IMO and other UN agencies and with sub-regional institutions involved in the maritime sector as a whole. The Regional Co-ordinators have established and maintain strong links and contacts with the UN Economic Commission for Africa (ECA); Organization of African Unity (OAU); United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); African Development Bank (ADB); Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA); Maritime Organization of West and Central Africa (MOWCA); Port Management Associations; South African Transport and Communications Commission (SATCC); East African Co-operation (EAC); and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

The launch of the regional presence offices in Africa has also enabled IMO to participate in the preparation and formulation of the United Nations Common Country Assessment and Development Assistance Framework (CCA/UNDAF) documents, which present national development programmes based on identified priority needs. The documents are then used by the donor community as a basis for funding support.

IMO had been involved in preparing the draft CCA/UNDAF document in Mauritius early this year – including national maritime activities as identified during a needs assessment mission. In other regions, partnership between IMO and regional institutions continues, for example the Regional Programme on Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA) in co-operation with UNDP and the Global Environment Facility (GEF), as well as joint projects developed with the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), for example a project on safety regulations for ships not covered by IMO conventions.

In South Asia, IMO is involved in a programme supported by the South Asia Co-operative Environment Programme (SACEP) and UNEP involving regional workshops on port reception facilities and oil spill contingency plans.

IMO has signed two Memoranda of Understanding with a view to obtaining more in-kind support and promoting regional implementation of the ITCP,
one MOU with Singapore for a “Third Country Training Programme” and an MOU with the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region Government of the People’s Republic of China, for maritime technical co-operation.

In the Pacific Islands, the MOU with the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the partnership arrangements with the Secretariat of the Pacific Community (SPC) were signed two years ago.

The partnership with SPC includes projects on the development of safety and load lines regulations for non-convention-sized ships, the upgrading of maritime training facilities and the upgrading of the South Pacific maritime code.

SPREP has secured considerable in-kind support for the ITCP projects and promoted their delivery. Examples include projects on oil response, development of national legislation and provision of assistance to governments for pollution control programmes and monitoring and management of waste disposal.

In Latin America, the two Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) signed with the Secretariats of the two regional networks of maritime authorities covering South America, Cuba, Mexico and Panama (ROCRAM) and Central America and the Dominican Republic (ROCRAM-CA), assigning them responsibilities for the co-ordination and execution of certain ITCP projects, have had a positive impact.

In the Caribbean, the UNDP has approved funding for the post of a Regional Maritime Adviser for a period of one year. The Adviser will provide technical support to the region relating to IMO’s work and will be directly involved in the development and delivery of the Caribbean component of the ITCP.

---

**Funding doubts threaten World Maritime University**

The Government of Sweden has warned that future funding of the World Maritime University (WMU) could be in doubt unless the international maritime community shows its commitment to seeking a solution to the “hand-to-mouth” style of the University’s funding.

In a statement to the Technical Co-operation Committee at its 48th session in June, the delegation of Sweden reiterated the Government of Sweden’s continuing commitment to the concept of the WMU but stressed the need to place the University on a more sustainable financial footing. The delegation stated that, although the Government of Sweden and the City of Malmö were pleased to host the WMU, the latter’s financing was an international responsibility and Sweden’s commitment was subject to the continuing cost-sharing partnerships of other donors.

A lack of response by the international community in seeking a solution to the University’s financial sustainability would signal a change in the founding principles and Sweden’s commitment might be reconsidered accordingly.

The WMU was established in 1983 and to date some 1,500 men and women, from 140 countries in Asia, Latin America, Africa and (mostly Eastern) Europe, have graduated from its courses, with more than 90% of them obtaining employment in maritime administration, education and management.

The WMU costs between US$7 million and US$8 million a year, plus a number of contributions in kind from the City of Malmö, evaluated at around US$1 million. The Swedish Government each year seeks and obtains the approval of the Parliament to cover one third of the budget for the ensuing year, as approved by the Board of Governors. Thus, out of a budget in the order of US$7.5 million, the Swedish Government provides US$2.5 million.

This contribution represents no ongoing legal commitment on the part of

---
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the Swedish Government, but can be counted on — on the basis of several official and unofficial assurances — so long as the other two thirds of WMU expenditure are financed by other contributors or from other sources.

The Swedish delegation stated that, so far, the necessary means to finance the WMU budget have been forthcoming. The main contributors (aside from the Swedish Government and the City of Malmö) have been the Norwegian, French, Danish and Canadian Governments, and also German and Japanese foundations. However, the financing picture is one of “insufficient constancy” for an established academic institution as the WMU is, and the “hand-to-mouth style of the University’s funding persists”.

IMO Secretary-General Mr. William A. O’Neil told the Committee that tangible evidence was needed that IMO’s Members wanted to establish a solid foundation for the University’s financing. The University appreciated greatly the in-kind contributions, field trips, lecturers and donations such as China’s recent donation to buy computers. All these were elements which would convince non-governmental organizations that the University was worth supporting. But the body of IMO needed to support fully and embrace wholeheartedly any serious consideration to alternative arrangements of substance.

Mr. O’Neil said that he recognized that the financial aspects had been disturbing since the outset. Sweden contributed one third of the costs and the City of Malmö agreed to provide accommodation for students — and this had been increased to accommodate larger numbers.

The issue of funding had occupied IMO and the WMU Board of Governors from the start. Initially, UNDP contributions were a significant element in setting up the University, and traditional donors channelled their support to the WMU through their respective UNDP contributions. However, this funding facility was no longer available, with the result that the University’s traditional donors had now changed. The University had originally included a full-time fund-raiser, but since his retirement that burden of responsibility had been transferred to the Rector and to IMO. Mr. O’Neil said he was aware that the fund-raising aspect was taking up a certain amount of energy and time, but there was no viable alternative.

The WMU recently received a positive external assessment by the Association of European Universities, known by its French acronym of CRE, and a working group has been set up by the WMU Board of Governors to look into the recommendations of the CRE report and to review the whole question of funding for the University.

---

IMO Members urged to accept 1991 and 1993 amendments to IMO Convention

The Council urged Member Governments who had not already done so, to accept amendments to the IMO Convention adopted in 1991 and 1993, relating to the institutionalization of the Facilitation Committee and the enlargement of the IMO Council.

The 1993 amendments, when they come into force, would enable the Council to be enlarged from the present 32 members to 40.

The Council adopted a resolution urging early acceptance of the 1993 amendments, which will come into force 12 months after being accepted by two thirds of IMO Members. Currently, 18 acceptances are still required to bring the amendments into effect.

The Council urged Member States to deposit their instruments of acceptance by 31 October 2000, as deposit by this date will enable an enlarged Council to be elected at the 22nd session of the Assembly, due to take place in November 2001.
Rules for FPSOs/FSUs to be reviewed

Correspondence group established

Should floating production storage and offloading units (FPSOs) and floating storage units (FSUs) be classed as “tankers” or “platforms” – or should they have their own regulatory regime? This is one of the key issues to be addressed by a correspondence group established by the Sub-Committee to review IMO rules as they relate to FPSOs/FSUs with a view to clarifying the regulations – in particular, discharge requirements.

Currently, the unified interpretations (10.1.1) of Annex I of MARPOL 73/78 state that when a tanker is used as a FPSO or FSU, it should be treated as an “other platform”. This is interpreted by some to mean that discharge and equipment requirements for “drilling rigs and other platforms” apply – which are less stringent than those for “oil tankers”.

However, there is a view that it is necessary to establish whether FPSOs should count as “ships other than tankers fitted with cargo spaces . . . utilized to carry oil in bulk”, in which case, more Annex I regulations would be applicable. The main environmental concern is with those regulations covering discharges of oil and oily mixtures into the sea.

Some delegations believe that FPSOs and FSUs demand special regulatory treatment, being neither ships nor drilling platforms. A view was also expressed that a distinction should be made between rules applicable when the FPSO/FSU is “in transit” and when it is stationary. In general, except when transiting to avoid extreme environmental or emergency conditions, the FPSO/FSU “in transit” has to comply with the applicable provisions of Annex I as an oil tanker.

When on station, the FPSO or FSU is generally subject to the requirements of the flag Administration (for those FPSOs/FSUs that are flagged), those of the coastal State in which the unit operates and those of the industry or that are voluntarily complied with by the owners/operators.

The correspondence group will collate information on the development of FPSOs/FSUs together with information on regional or national regulations which are applicable to them and will exchange views on the extent of application of Annex I provisions to different types of FPSOs and FSUs.

Review of Annex I of MARPOL: advice sought from MEPC

The Sub-Committee continued its ongoing revision of Annex I (oil) of MARPOL 73/78. The aim is to produce a user-friendly, simplified annex, incorporating the various amendments adopted since MARPOL entered into force in 1983. In effect, the numerous amendments to MARPOL have resulted in a complicated set of regulations and unified interpretations. In many cases, it is difficult, and sometimes confusing, for end-users to comprehend the requirements.

The main aims of the proposed new draft annex are to: delete requirements that will be outdated by the time the new annex comes into force; separate hardware from operational requirements; and make clear the distinctions between requirements for new and requirements for existing ships (such as the phasing in of double-hull requirements for oil tankers), to be included under the so-called “grandfather clause”.

However, developing a format for the new annex is proving complex – owing to the complicated nature of the current annex. As a result, the Sub-Committee agreed to seek advice from the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) on the way forward, choosing from three options:

- To continue developing a new annex which would apply to new and existing ships, but certain existing ships would still be subject to the requirements of the current Annex I under the grandfather clause for certain ships (in particular, for construction of oil tankers);
- To develop a revised draft of Annex I incorporating all the requirements in the current and the new Annex I, intended to replace the current Annex I in its entirety;
- To prepare a set of amendments to the current Annex I without changing the structure and numbering of regulations.

The new revised Annex I is scheduled to be completed by 2002.

Review of Annex II of MARPOL 73/78

The Sub-Committee also continued its ongoing revision of Annex II (noxious liquid substances carried in bulk, i.e. chemicals) of MARPOL 73/78 and made progress on the draft revised text.

However, the completion of a revised Annex II is dependent on the completion of the evaluation of products being carried out by the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP) under the GESAMP revised hazard evaluation procedure. The revised procedure takes into account the ongoing development of harmonized hazard classification systems covering physical and biological properties that affect safety and protection of the environment under the United Nations Committee of Experts on the Transport of Dangerous Goods and of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).

GESAMP’s Working Group on the Evaluation of Harmful Substances (EHS) is re-evaluating each product, creating a revised GESAMP hazard profile (GHP) which is more extensive than the current one. This is then used by the BLG Sub-Committee’s ESPH (Evaluation of Safety and Pollution Hazards) Working Group to assign the appropriate Pollution Category and Ship Type for each product when they are transported under Annex II of MARPOL 73/78.

As part of the development of a revised Annex II of MARPOL 73/78, the BLG Sub-Committee is proposing alternative pollution categorization systems, possibly simplifying the existing five-category system for defining pollution categories into a three-category system. However, final decisions on which system would be most appropriate are dependent on largely completing the product evaluation process – anticipated to be nearing completion by summer 2002.
**Work on accidental outflow performance for tankers reviewed**

The Sub-Committee reviewed a draft new MARPOL regulation on accidental oil outflow performance, which is intended to provide criteria for the level of protection against oil pollution in the event of stranding or collision. The draft regulation, developed by a correspondence group and reviewed by a working group during the session, is based on probabilistic methodology for oil outflow analysis.

The draft regulation establishes the maximum permissible "mean oil outflow parameter" depending on the size of tanker – with different levels permitted for different tankers.

The aim is to provide a means of calculating the probably maximum quantity of oil which would actually be released from a double-hull tanker should there be damage. This calculation of the mean oil outflow would take into account the likely outflow of oil from cargo tanks which would be captured by non-oil compartments as well as a figure for the probability of a specific cargo tank being penetrated and the extent to which it might be damaged.

The draft regulation is intended to apply to tankers over 600 dwt, with different parameters proposed for tankers under 5,000 dwt and tankers over 5,000 dwt.

The Sub-Committee agreed to re-establish the correspondence group to work further on the draft regulation, including the evaluation of a series of tankers less than 5,000 dwt and the evaluation of a series of tanker designs to assess alternative methods for calculating oil capture, with a view to validating the proposed mean oil outflow criteria.

**Draft amendments to interim guidelines on alternative oil tankers agreed in principle**

The Sub-Committee agreed in principle to draft amendments to the Interim Guidelines for the approval of alternative methods of design and construction of oil tankers under regulation I/13F(5), to bring the guidelines into line with the new proposed regulation on accidental oil outflow performance.

Regulation 13F requires all new tankers to be built with double hulls – but allows in paragraph (5) "other methods of design and construction of oil tankers" to be accepted provided they “ensure at least the same level of protection against oil pollution in the event of collision or stranding”.

---

**OptiMar Ballast Systems**

Practical Ballast Water Treatment Solutions

- More Effective Than Open Sea Exchange
- Proven Technology
- Easy to Install and Maintain
- Fully Automated Ballast Management
- Capacities from 200 thr to 5000 thr
- Cost Effective and Available Today!

**OptiMar Ballast System**

The MicroBil Cylindrical Separator removes sediments from the water during ballasting and discharges these solids overboard. The powerful MicroBil UV design is inactivates biological organisms including zooplankton, algae, and bacteria. Water is also treated with UV during de-ballasting to ensure that all organisms are killed. The OptiMar System is integrated into existing ballast piping and processes the water with no effect on the normal operation of the ship. The system allows Full Automation of the the ballasting and treatment process from the MicroBil Control Panel.

More information please contact:

OptiMar A/S
Kamkepeng 101
N 4027 Skander, Norway
E-mail: info@optimar.com
Tel: +47-51542339 Fax: +47-51542339

Hyde OptiMar LLC
38045 Pinney Parkway
Cleveland, OH 44146 USA
Email: hyde@hydecom
Tel: 440-571-800 Fax: 440-571-8104

Please visit our website:

[www.ballastwater.com](http://www.ballastwater.com)
IMO Sub-Committee acts on *Erika* incident

New mandatory ship reporting system in English Channel approved

The Sub-Committee on Safety of Navigation has approved a new mandatory ship reporting system which would be applicable in the central English Channel, making it easier to track and communicate with ships in the area. It would supplement the existing systems already established at Ouessant and in the Pas de Calais.

The system will be put forward to the Maritime Safety Committee at its 73rd session in November-December 2000 for adoption and would enter into force at 0000 hours UTC, six months after its adoption by the Committee.

The proposal for the new mandatory ship reporting system follows the sinking of the tanker *Erika* off the west coast of France in December 1999 and should make possible a significant increase in safety, efficiency of navigation and environmental protection in and around the traffic separation system in operation off Les Casquets.

Under mandatory ship reporting systems, ships are obliged to give information about themselves, including their identity and cargo, to coastal authorities. Authorities can then track voyages and communicate with ships immediately should a dangerous situation, such as risk of collision or grounding, arise. Outside mandatory reporting systems, coastal authorities may only be aware of ships on radar screens – with no further information on the particular ship.

The implementation of a mandatory ship reporting system makes it easier to avert hazardous situations which can be caused by unidentified ships adopting erratic or even dangerous routes, stopping in a traffic lane after sustaining damage, or otherwise behaving in a manner which could give rise to confusion in the absence of information.

The new system, to be called MANCHEREP, would apply to all ships of over 300 gross tonnage and would cover the current traffic separation system off Les Casquets and the areas bordering upon it. Ships over 300 gross tonnage entering the area would be required to give information to the coastal authorities, including name of ship, position, destination and details of cargo if any potentially dangerous cargoes are carried on board. Coastal authorities would then be able to track the ships.

Currently, vessel traffic service (VTS) centres located at Corse, Jobourg and Gris-Nez monitor the traffic separation schemes (TSS) of Ouessant, Les Casquets and the Pas de Calais respectively, together with the surrounding areas. Mandatory ship reporting systems were put in place at Ouessant in 1996 (UESSREP) and in the Pas de Calais in 1999 (CALDOVREP).

The proposed mandatory ship reporting system “Off Les Casquets and the adjacent coastal area” would be based on the Jobourg VTS, which has been monitoring shipping in the traffic separation scheme off Les Casquets and the surrounding area since 1983. The system will replace the voluntary MAREP reporting system in place in the area.

Some 300 ships pass through the area every day, but the identification rate is just slightly above 40%. Setting up a mandatory reporting system will enable the rate to be increased significantly. Ships under 300 gross tonnage are recommended to make reports on a voluntary basis.

IMO Secretary-General Mr. William A. O’Neil, in his opening remarks to the Sub-Committee, noted that the proposal from France and the United Kingdom for the mandatory ship reporting system stemmed from the tanker *Erika* accident off the western coast of France in December 1999. Since then, the Government of France had been considering various measures to reduce the likelihood of similar incidents occurring round its coasts and to strengthen the safety of navigation and marine environmental protection.

Mr. O’Neil expressed his appreciation to France and other countries for bringing their proposals to IMO, stressing that IMO “is the right and only place where issues concerning international shipping safety and environmental protection should be discussed and resolved”.

“No-anchoring area” approved as new ships’ routing measure

The Sub-Committee approved a proposal to allow “no-anchoring areas” to be incorporated into the General Provisions on Ships’ Routing. This would mean that no-anchoring areas should be adopted in areas where anchoring is unsafe, unstable or hazardous, or where it is particularly important to avoid damage to the marine environment, to be observed by all ships or certain classes of ships.

The amendments (resolution A.572(14), as amended) to add “no-anchoring area” as a new ships’ routing measure will be put forward to MSC 73 for adoption, subject to confirmation by the 22nd Assembly in 2001.

“No-anchoring area” on Flower Garden Banks approved

The Sub-Committee approved the establishment of three mandatory no-anchoring areas on coral reef banks (Flower Garden Banks) in the north-western Gulf of Mexico.

The proposed measure, to be applicable to all ships, is expected to reduce significantly the risk of damage to the coral marine environment, without restricting the sea area available for navigation. The size of the areas and the proposed measures are limited to what is essential for the interests of safe navigation and the protection of the marine environment.

New TSSs along the Peruvian coast approved

The Sub-Committee approved four new TSSs along the Peruvian coast, for adoption by MSC 73:

1. Landfall and approaches to Talara Bay;
2. Landfall Off Puerto Salaverry;
3. Landfall and approaches to Ferrol Bay (Puerto Chimbote); and
4. Landfall and approaches to San Nicolas Bay.

New TSS in Humber approaches approved

The Sub-Committee approved the establishment of new TTSs and associated routing measures in the approaches to
the River Humber on the east coast of England to cope with the increase in the volume of maritime traffic.

**TSS in Prince William Sound approved**

The Sub-Committee approved amendments to the existing TTS in Prince William Sound (United States). The proposed amendments would reduce the potential for traffic congestion in the area and contribute to improving vessel traffic management and safety.

**Standard Marine Communication Phrases**

The Sub-Committee approved draft revised Standard Marine Communication Phrases (SMCP), intended to replace the Standard Marine Navigational Vocabulary (SMNV) adopted by IMO in 1977 (and amended in 1985).

The SMNV was developed for use by seafarers, following agreement that a common language – English – should be established for navigational purposes where language difficulties arise, and the SMCP has been developed as a more comprehensive standardized safety language, taking into account changing conditions in modern seafaring and covering all major safety-related verbal communication.

The SMCP has been undergoing trials by governments, maritime training institutes and others involved in maritime communications following approval of the first draft version by the MSC in 1997. It includes phrases which have been developed to cover the most important safety-related fields of verbal shore-to-ship (and vice versa), ship-to-ship and onboard communications. The aim is to get round the problem of language barriers at sea and avoid misunderstandings which can cause accidents.

The SMCP builds on a basic knowledge of English and has been drafted in a simplified version of maritime English. It includes phrases for use in routine situations such as berthing as well as standard phrases and responses for use in emergency situations.

Under the 1978 STCW Convention, as revised in 1995, the ability to understand and use the SMCP is required for the certification of officers in charge of a navigational watch on ships of 500 gross tonnage or above.

The SMCP will be presented to the 22nd session of the IMO Assembly in 2001 for adoption, after approval by the MSC, following clarification by the Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) on whether the SMCP meets requirements in the STCW Code (table A-II/1) and review by the Sub-Committee on Radio-Communications and Search and Rescue (COMSAR).

**Draft amendments to COLREG approved**

The Sub-Committee approved draft amendments to the Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 (COLREG), to be put forward to MSC 73 for adoption and to the 22nd IMO Assembly in November 2001 for final adoption.

- whistles and sound signals (rules 33 and 35);
- action to avoid collision (rule 8(a)) – to make it clear that any action to avoid collision should be taken in accordance with the relevant rules in COLREG;
- amendments with respect to high-speed craft (relating to the vertical separation of masthead lights); and
- amendments with respect to wing-in-ground (WIG) craft, to include a rule that WIG craft should keep well clear of all other vessels and another rule that WIG craft should exhibit a high-intensity all-round flashing red light when taking off, landing and in flight near the surface.

**Other issues**

The Sub-Committee also:

- **Prepared** a draft MSC circular on guidelines on ergonomic criteria for bridge equipment and layout, for submission to the MSC for approval.

- **Agreed** on a draft revision of resolution A.860(20), Maritime policy for a future global navigation satellite system (GNSS), to update the user requirements for general navigation and positioning and introduce user requirements for non-general navigation and positioning.

- **Agreed** new and amended performance standards, for adoption by the MSC, for:
  - shipborne global positioning system (GPS) receiver equipment;
  - shipborne GLONASS receiver equipment;
  - shipborne DGPS and DGLONASS maritime radio beacon receiver equipment;
  - shipborne combined GPS/GLONASS receiver equipment; and
  - marine transmitting heading devices (THDs).

- **Agreed** in principle draft guidelines on the operational use of shipborne automatic identification systems (AIS), for review by the MSC and subsequent finalization by the next session of the Sub-Committee before they are submitted to the 22nd session of the IMO Assembly for adoption.

- **Agreed** amendments to the draft revised International Code for High-Speed Craft (HSC 2000) due to be adopted at MSC 73, to bring carriage requirements for voyage data recorders (VDRs) into line with the draft new revised chapter V (Safety of navigation) of SOLAS also scheduled to be adopted by MSC 73.

- **Agreed** draft amendments to the 1994 HSC Code, to include carriage requirements for VDRs, intended to be submitted to the 74th session of MSC in spring 2001, following further review by the Sub-Committee on Ship Design and Equipment.

- **Agreed** amendments to the draft guidelines for the design, construction and operation of passenger submersible craft, to require these craft to have an underwater location device and to be fitted with a speed and distance device. The guidelines will be submitted to MSC 73 for approval.

- **Reviewed** a draft revised text of annex 2 – Recommendation on operational procedures for maritime pilots other than deep-sea pilots, to resolution A.485(XII), Training, qualifications and operational procedures for maritime pilots other than deep-sea pilots, and agreed to continue discussions at the next session of the Sub-Committee, scheduled for July 2001.
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Green Award scheme to extend to bulk carriers

The Green Award Foundation, which recognizes clean safe tankers, plans to extend the Green Award scheme to bulk carriers from 2001, according to managing director Hans de Goeij.

Currently, 121 tankers (including oil and product tankers) have joined the Green Award scheme – giving them special rates and other advantages in ports which participate in the scheme.

A Green Award ship has to meet high, but achievable, technical and managerial requirements, based on international shipping regulations, including IMO’s International Safety Management (ISM) Code. Under the voluntary scheme, the shipowner pays a fee to the Foundation for a technical and safety audit – including a visit to the shipowner’s offices – then an annual contribution. The initial award lasts three years, with annual inspections.

Website: http://www.greenaward.org

IMO Oil and Litter Information Network on the web

The IMO Oil and Litter Information Network was developed by Environment Canada, in collaboration with IMO, to function as a node of the information clearing-house which is being developed to support the implementation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)/Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities.

The aim of the information clearing house is to provide practical information to decision-makers and the public on pollution in the marine environment from oil and pollution in the marine environment from debris, litter and garbage.

The IMO Oil and Litter Information Network includes links to relevant websites, e-mail to relevant contacts, answers to frequently asked questions, a glossary of technical terms and references with advice on how to obtain them.

The Network can be accessed through the IMO website at www.imo.org.

AUSMEPA launched in Australia

The Australian Marine Environment Protection Association (AUSMEPA) was launched in Brisbane, Australia, in July 2000, bringing to seven the number of MEPAs world-wide.

The Hellenic Marine Environment Protection Association (HELMEPA) was launched in June 1983, when Greek shipowners’ and Greek seafarers’ representatives signed a Declaration of Voluntary Commitment “To Save the Seas”. The Greek initiative has been followed by similar programmes in Cyprus (CYMEPA), the United Kingdom (MEPA UK), Turkey (TURMEPA), Uruguay (URUMEPA), the Philippines (PHILMEPA) and now Australia (AUSMEPA).

HELMEPA – and its sister associations – carries out public awareness campaigns focusing on issues relating to the protection of the marine environment and has an active programme aimed at young people – HELMEPA JUNIOR – aided by the patented HELMEPA seagull character.

Two Greek teenagers became the first youngsters to address an IMO meeting in April 2000 when they spoke to the MEPC’s 44th session between 6 and 13 April 2000 about the work of HELMEPA JUNIOR
IMO MEMBER STATES

Membership of IMO now stands at 158
The latest Member is Tonga, whose instrument accepting the IMO Convention was deposited with the United Nations on 23 February 2000