

SUB-COMMITTEE ON HUMAN ELEMENT,
TRAINING AND WATCHKEEPING
3rd session
Agenda item 19

HTW 3/19
23 February 2016
Original: ENGLISH

REPORT TO THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE

Table of contents

Section		Page
1	GENERAL	3
2	DECISIONS OF OTHER IMO BODIES	3
3	VALIDATED MODEL TRAINING COURSES	3
4	REPORTS ON UNLAWFUL PRACTICES ASSOCIATED WITH CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY	12
5	GUIDANCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2010 MANILA AMENDMENTS	12
6	COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE 1995 STCW-F CONVENTION	19
7	ROLE OF THE HUMAN ELEMENT	21
8	REVISION OF THE GUIDELINES ON FATIGUE	22
9	REVISED GUIDELINES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ISM CODE BY ADMINISTRATIONS (RESOLUTION A.1071(28)) ON TRAINING AUDITS	25
10	REVIEW OF STCW PASSENGER SHIP-SPECIFIC SAFETY TRAINING	27
11	AMENDMENTS TO SOLAS CHAPTER II-1 AND ASSOCIATED GUIDELINES ON DAMAGE CONTROL DRILLS FOR PASSENGER SHIPS	31
12	COMPLETION OF THE DETAILED REVIEW OF THE GLOBAL MARITIME DISTRESS AND SAFETY SYSTEM (GMDSS)	32
13	REVISION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR ESCAPE ROUTE SIGNS AND EQUIPMENT LOCATION MARKINGS IN SOLAS AND RELATED INSTRUMENTS	33

Section	Page
14 AMENDMENTS TO THE IGF CODE AND DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR LOW-FLASHPOINT FUELS	33
15 REVIEW OF THE MODU CODE, LSA CODE AND MSC.1/CIRC.1206/REV.1	34
16 BIENNIAL STATUS REPORT AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR HTW 4	35
17 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR 2017	36
18 ANY OTHER BUSINESS	37
19 REPORT TO THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE	41

LIST OF ANNEXES

ANNEX 1	REVIEW GROUPS FOR DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW AND VALIDATION OF MODEL COURSES
ANNEX 2	DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR A GISIS MODULE RELATING TO REPORTING AND INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER ARTICLES IV, VIII AND IX OF THE STCW CONVENTION
ANNEX 3	DRAFT PRINCIPLES AND PROVISIONAL SCOPE FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE 1995 STCW-F CONVENTION
ANNEX 4	DRAFT ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON REVISED GUIDELINES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SAFETY MANAGEMENT CODE (ISM) CODE BY ADMINISTRATIONS
ANNEX 5	AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON STANDARDS OF TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING FOR SEAFARERS (STCW), 1978
ANNEX 6	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO PART A OF THE SEAFARERS' TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE
ANNEX 7	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO PART B OF THE SEAFARERS' TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE
ANNEX 8	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO SOLAS CHAPTER II-1 ON DAMAGE CONTROL DRILLS FOR PASSENGER SHIPS
ANNEX 9	BIENNIAL STATUS REPORT AND OUTPUTS ON THE COMMITTEE'S POST-BIENNIAL AGENDA THAT FALL UNDER THE PURVIEW OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE
ANNEX 10	DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR HTW 4
ANNEX 11	STATEMENTS BY DELEGATIONS

1 GENERAL

1.1 The Sub-Committee on Human Element, Training and Watchkeeping (HTW) held its third session from 1 to 5 February 2016 under the chairmanship of its Vice-Chairman, Ms. Mayte Medina (United States) as Mr. Bradley Groves (Australia), the Chairman, had been elected as Chairman of the Maritime Safety Committee and was not available to chair the session.

1.2 The session was attended by delegations from Member Governments and Associate Members of IMO; by representatives from United Nations and specialized agencies; by observers from intergovernmental organizations; and by observers from non-governmental organizations in consultative status, as listed in document HTW 3/INF.1.

Secretary-General's opening address

1.3 The Secretary-General welcomed participants and delivered his opening address, the full text of which can be downloaded from the IMO website at the following link:
<http://www.imo.org/MediaCentre/SecretaryGeneral/Secretary-GeneralsSpeechesToMeetings>

Chairman's remarks

1.4 In responding, the Vice-Chairman thanked the Secretary-General for his words of welcome, the confidence he had expressed in her to chair the deliberations of the Sub-Committee, and for his advice, and assured him that his advice and requests would be given every consideration by the Sub-Committee.

Adoption of the agenda and related matters

1.5 The Sub-Committee adopted the agenda (HTW 3/1), and agreed to be guided in its work, in general, by the annotations to the provisional agenda contained in document HTW 3/1/1 and Corr.1 and the arrangements in document HTW 3/1/2/Rev.1. The agenda, as adopted, with the list of documents considered under each agenda item, is set out in document HTW 3/INF.9.

2 DECISIONS OF OTHER IMO BODIES

2.1 The Sub-Committee noted the decisions and comments pertaining to its work made by MEPC 68, MSC 95, SSE 2 and III 2 as reported in document HTW 3/2 (Secretariat); and the outcome of SDC 3 relating to the draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 and associated guidelines on damage control drills for passenger ships in document HTW 3/WP.7, and took them into account in its deliberations under the relevant agenda items.

3 VALIDATED MODEL TRAINING COURSES

Preliminary review and report on model courses

3.1 The Sub-Committee considered document HTW 3/3 (Secretariat) providing a preliminary review of IMO model courses with the aim of identifying the sub-committee that should be primarily responsible for reviewing, updating and developing each model course in accordance with the *Revised guidelines for the development, review and validation of model courses* (MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15), and noted the anticipated workload and resources required of the Secretariat to review those courses which are older than five years and derived from the requirements of the STCW Convention and Code.

3.2 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 a further column should be inserted to indicate if the knowledge, understanding and proficiency of a model course remained valid with current provisions;
- .2 the Secretariat should not be overburdened with extra tasks that may not add value;
- .3 the Secretariat should continue to report on progress in reviewing and updating of model courses; and
- .4 the prioritization categories recommended by the Secretariat should be endorsed.

3.3 The Sub-Committee agreed:

- .1 to the prioritization categories assigned to model courses which are older than five years, taking into account the expert advice and justification provided, as set out in HTW 3/3, annex 1; and
- .2 with the modifications made to the list of all model courses (document HTW 2/WP.3, annex 5), as set out in HTW 3/3, annex 2, with a view to using the revised format for future reports to the Sub-Committee.

3.4 The Sub-Committee urged interested Member States and international organizations to assist the Organization in developing, reviewing and updating IMO model courses for which the Sub-Committee had assigned prioritization category I (new model courses to be developed as a result of new or amended IMO instruments) and category II (existing model courses that require significant changes, either individual or cumulative, due to amendments to IMO instruments and/or significant industry/technological changes).

Validation of model courses

3.5 The Sub-Committee noted that the draft revised model courses submitted by the Secretariat to this session in documents HTW 3/3/1 on Advanced Chemical Tanker Training, HTW 3/3/2 on Radar Navigation at operational level, HTW 3/3/3 on Personal Survival and Social Responsibilities and HTW 3/3/4 on Engine-room Simulator, had been revised and updated in accordance with the guidelines in force prior to the approval of MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15 on *Revised guidelines for the development, review and validation of model courses*, as the work on them had commenced prior to the adoption of the revised guidelines.

Revised model course 1.03 on *Advanced training for chemical tanker cargo operations*

3.6 The Sub-Committee gave preliminary consideration to the draft revised model course related to advanced training for chemical tanker cargo operations (HTW 3/3/1, annex).

3.7 In this context, the Sub-Committee recalled that, due to significant inconsistencies in alignment with the STCW Code, HTW 2 had been unable to finalize the review of the model course and had established a correspondence group under the coordination of the United States to continue that work intersessionally for finalization with a view to validation at this session.

3.8 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 significant work has been done to address the concerns raised at HTW 2;
- .2 the review of the model course should focus only on Part D as all the other aspects have already been considered at HTW 2; and
- .3 this draft model course lacks a reference to the need to cease operations on flammable cargoes in the proximity of electrical storms.

3.9 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee referred document HTW 3/3/1 to the drafting group to be established on validation of model courses, for detailed consideration and to compare the scope of the provisions in the STCW Code related to advanced training for chemical tanker cargo operations and the contents of the draft model course as presented, with a view to its validation by the Sub-Committee.

Revised model course 1.07 on *Radar navigation at operational level*

3.10 The Sub-Committee gave preliminary consideration to the draft revised model course related to training in radar navigation at operational level (HTW 3/3/2, annex) which was revised/updated in order to align it with the current performance standards for radar equipment set out in IMO resolution MSC.192(79). The draft model course was forwarded to the validation panel for their comments, which were incorporated, as appropriate.

3.11 In the absence of comments, the Sub-Committee referred document HTW 3/3/2 to the Drafting Group to be established on validation of model courses, for detailed consideration and to compare the scope of the provisions in the STCW Code related to training in Radar navigation at operational level and the contents of the draft model course as presented, with a view to its validation by the Sub-Committee.

Revised model course 1.21 on *Personal safety and social responsibilities*

3.12 The Sub-Committee gave preliminary consideration to the draft revised model course related to training in personal safety and social responsibility (HTW 3/3/3), which had been revised following the adoption of the 2010 Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention and Code. The draft model course was forwarded to the validation panel for their comments, which were incorporated, as appropriate.

3.13 In the absence of comments, the Sub-Committee referred document HTW 3/3/3 to the Drafting Group to be established on validation of model courses, for detailed consideration and to compare the scope of the provisions in the STCW Code related to training in Personal safety and social responsibility and the contents of the draft model course as presented, with a view to its validation by the Sub-Committee.

Revised model course 2.07 on *Engine-room simulators*

3.14 The Sub-Committee gave preliminary consideration to the draft revised model course related to training in engine-room simulators (HTW 3/3/4) which had been further revised/updated as instructed by HTW 2, consequent to the adoption of the 2010 Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention and Code. The draft model course was forwarded to the validation panel for their comments but, owing to time constraints, comments received could not be incorporated in time for consideration by the Sub-Committee.

3.15 In the ensuing discussion, the views were expressed that:

- .1 this model course had been submitted for validation under the existing process before the approval of the *Revised guidelines for the development, review and validation of model courses* as set out in MSC-MEPC. 2/Circ.15;
- .2 the contents should be aligned with the requirements of the STCW Code;
- .3 the advanced level course should reflect the relevant "Knowledge, understanding and proficiency" in the STCW Code; and
- .4 the content of the model course should take into account the international nature of IMO model courses and the delivery of such courses globally through different maritime education and training providers.

3.16 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee referred document HTW 3/3/4 to the Drafting Group to be established for finalization of the model courses, for detailed consideration and to compare the scope of the provisions in the STCW Code related to training in engine-room simulators and the contents of the draft model course as presented, with a view to its validation by the Sub-Committee.

Model course 3.12 on *On-board Assessment* (2001 Edition)

3.17 The Sub-Committee, having noted document HTW 3/INF.3 (IAMU and IMLA), accepted with appreciation the offer to revise the model course on *On-board Assessment* (2001 Edition) in parallel with model course 3.12 on *Assessment, Examination and Certification of Seafarers* and model course 6.09 on *Training course for Instructors*, and invited them to submit the draft model courses for consideration by the Sub-Committee at its next session.

Basic and advanced training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code

3.18 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information from Norway on its progress in preparing the draft new model courses on *Basic training*, and on *Advanced training, for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code*, and invited them to finalize the draft model courses and submit them for consideration by the Sub-Committee at its next session.

Development of model courses on *Basic training*, and on *Advanced training, for personnel serving on ships operating in polar waters*

3.19 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the offer by Argentina, Canada, Chile, Finland, Norway, the United States and CLIA to develop new model courses on Basic and Advanced training for personnel serving on ships operating in polar waters, under the coordination of Canada, and invited them to submit the draft revised model courses for consideration by the Sub-Committee at its next session.

Model Course on *Ratings as able seafarer engine in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine room*

Model Course on *Ratings forming part of a watch in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room*

3.20 The Sub-Committee appreciated the initiative of Singapore to develop new model courses on *Ratings as able seafarer engine in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room*, and on *Ratings forming part of a watch in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room*, as set out in documents HTW 3/3/5 and HTW 3/3/6.

3.21 In the ensuing discussion the following views were expressed:

- .1 the above model courses have not been circulated in advance and should therefore be validated at the next session;
- .2 they should be validated in accordance with the *Revised guidelines* set out in MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15;
- .3 the model courses for ratings in the deck and engine departments should preferably be developed by the same course developers;
- .4 if courses for deck and engine ratings and able seafarers are developed by different developers, the developers should work in close cooperation to ensure that the contents are harmonized;
- .5 there was no need for model courses for ratings and able seafarers (deck and engine) as their training was based on seagoing service; and
- .6 the Convention already provided an alternative to part of the sea service through attendance at an approved training course.

3.22 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that there is a need for model courses on *Able seafarer deck and ratings forming part of a navigational watch*, to facilitate the training of able seafarers and ratings.

3.23 In this context, the delegation of Germany offered to develop the model courses on *Able seafarer deck and ratings forming part of a navigational watch*.

3.24 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the above-mentioned offer by Germany, and invited Germany and Singapore to submit the draft model courses for deck and engine department able seafarers and ratings, for consideration by the Sub-Committee at its next session.

Revision of model course 1.08 on *Radar navigation at management level*

3.25 The delegation of China, having revised the model course on *Radar navigation at operational level*, informed the Secretariat, at the end of the session, of its interest and willingness to revise model course 1.08 on *Radar Navigation at management level*. In this regard, the Secretariat will prepare draft terms of reference for the course developer for consideration by the Sub-Committee, to facilitate progress with the revision of the model course, subject to acceptance of the offer by China at its next session.

Review of model courses and validation in accordance with the Revised guidelines (MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15)

Review Groups

3.26 The Sub-Committee considered document HTW 3/3/7 (Secretariat) and, in accordance with paragraph 2.1.3 of the *Revised guidelines for the development, review and validation of model courses* (MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15), agreed to establish review groups which will be tasked with reviewing the content of model courses against the specific instructions/terms of reference provided to the course developers, and resolving as many elements as possible found within model courses, prior to their submission to the Sub-Committee for validation.

3.27 The Sub-Committee recalled that review groups should include all stakeholders from Member States, international organizations, representatives from the maritime industry, maritime training and education establishments, seafarer representatives and other relevant professional organizations, to allow wide participation by experts.

3.28 In the ensuing discussion, the views were expressed that:

- .1 although not explicitly stated in the Revised guidelines, a review group should comprise at least five members;
- .2 terms of reference for course developers should be prepared in accordance with the format in the Revised guidelines; and
- .3 timelines for completion of course development prior to submission to the Sub-Committee must be developed.

3.29 The Sub-Committee acknowledged the expressions of interest by delegations to participate in the following review groups, which will work intersessionally:

- .1 review group for a new model course on *Ratings as able seafarer engine in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room* (document HTW 3/3/5);
- .2 review group for a new model course on *Ratings forming part of a watch in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room* (document HTW 3/3/6);
- .3 review group to revise model course 3.12, *Assessment, Examination and Certification of Seafarers*;
- .4 review group to revise model course 6.09, *Training course for Instructors*;
- .5 review group to revise model course 1.30, *On-board Assessment*;
- .6 review group for a new model course on *Basic training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code*;
- .7 review group for a new model course on *Advanced training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code*;

-
- .8 review group for a new model course on *Basic training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships operating in polar waters*;
 - .9 review group for a new model course on *Advanced training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships operating in polar waters*; and
 - .10 review group for a new model course on *Ratings as able seafarer deck*.

3.30 The Sub-Committee also invited interested delegations to submit their contact details to the Secretariat. The composition of the review groups established at this session is set out in annex 1.

3.31 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee, taking into account the urgent need for updated model courses by STCW Parties to implement the 2010 Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention and Code, referred document HTW 3/3/7 to the drafting group to be established on validation of model courses, for the preparation also of the terms of reference for course developers and the review groups identified in paragraph 3.29.

Establishment of the Drafting Group

3.32 The Sub-Committee established the Drafting Group on Validation of Model Courses, under the chairmanship of Capt. Kersee Deboo (India), and instructed it, taking into account decisions and comments in plenary, to consider documents HTW 3/3/1, HTW 3/3/2, HTW 3/3/3, HTW 3/3/4 and HTW 3/3/7 and:

- .1 compare the scope of the provisions in the STCW Code related to training in documents HTW 3/3/1 (Advanced Training for chemical tanker cargo operations), HTW 3/3/2 (Radar navigation at operational level), HTW 3/3/3 (Personal Safety and Social Responsibilities) and HTW 3/3/4 (Engine-Room Simulator) and the contents of the aforementioned draft model courses as presented, with a view to validation by the Sub-Committee;
- .2 taking into account the template provided in the annex to document HTW 3/3/7 (Secretariat), prepare draft terms of reference for course developers in accordance with MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15, annex 2, for the following model courses which have been authorized by the Sub-Committee to be developed or reviewed with a view to validation at HTW 4:
 - .1 draft a new model course on *Ratings as able seafarer engine in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room* (document HTW 3/3/5);
 - .2 draft a new model course on *Ratings forming part of a watch in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room* (document HTW 3/3/6);
 - .3 draft revised model course 3.12 on *Assessment, Examination and Certification of Seafarers*;
 - .4 draft revised model course 6.09 on *Training course for Instructors*;
 - .5 draft revised model course 1.30 on *On-board assessment*;

- .6 draft a new model course on *Basic training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code*;
 - .7 draft a new model course on *Advanced training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code*;
 - .8 draft a new model course on *Basic training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships operating in polar waters*;
 - .9 draft a new model course on *Advanced training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships operating in polar waters*;
 - .10 draft a new model course on *Ratings as able seafarer deck*, and
- .3 submit its report on Thursday, 4 February 2016.

Report of the drafting group

3.33 On receipt of the report of the drafting group (HTW 3/WP.6 and Add.1), the Sub-Committee approved it in general, and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

Validation of model courses

3.34 The Sub-Committee validated the model courses, as amended, on:

- .1 Advanced Training for Chemical Tanker Cargo Operations;
- .2 Training for Radar Navigation at operational level; and
- .3 Personal Safety and Social Responsibilities,

and instructed the Secretariat to finalize and publish them as soon as possible.

3.35 The Sub-Committee recalled that the validation of model courses by the Sub-Committee in this context meant that it had found no grounds to object to their contents. In doing so, the Sub-Committee had not approved the documents and they could not, therefore, be regarded as official interpretations of the Convention.

3.36 Owing to time constraints, the Sub-Committee noted that the group had been unable to finalize the revision of the draft revised model course on *Engine-Room Simulators* for validation at this session and had referred it back to the course developer for further revision, taking into account the comments and decisions of the Sub-Committee (see paragraph 3.15).

3.37 The Sub-Committee also instructed the course developer to finalize the revision of the aforementioned model course in accordance with the terms of reference prepared pursuant to the *Revised guidelines for the development, review and validation of model courses* (MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15), as set out in document HTW 3/WP.6/Add.1, appendix 11, and submit it to the next session with a view to validation.

Review groups for development, review and updating of model courses

3.38 The Sub-Committee agreed to the terms of reference for the course developers, as set out in document HTW 3/WP.6/Add.1, appendices 1 to 11, and established the following review groups for the development of new, and the revision of existing, model courses with a view to validation at its next session:

- .1 Review group for a new model course on *Ratings as able seafarer engine in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room*, to be developed by Singapore, (annex 1, appendix 1);
- .2 Review group for a new model course on *Ratings forming part of a watch in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room*, to be developed by Singapore (annex 1, appendix 2);
- .3 Review group for model course 31.2 on *Assessment, Examination and Certification of Seafarers*, to be revised jointly by IAMU and IMLA (annex 1, appendix 3);
- .4 Review group for model course 6.09 on *Training course for Instructors*, to be revised jointly by IAMU and IMLA (annex 1, appendix 4);
- .5 Review group for model course 1.30 on *Onboard assessment*, to be revised jointly by IAMU and IMLA (annex 1, appendix 5);
- .6 Review group for a new model course on *Basic training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code*, to be developed by Norway (annex 1, appendix 6);
- .7 Review group for a new model course on *Advanced training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships subject to the IGF Code*, to be developed by Norway (annex 1, appendix 7);
- .8 Review group for a new model course on *Basic training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships operating in polar waters*, to be developed by Argentina, Canada, Chile, Finland, New Zealand, United States and CLIA (annex 1, appendix 8);
- .9 Review group for a new model course on *Advanced training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on ships operating in polar waters*, to be developed by Argentina, Canada, Chile, Finland, New Zealand, United States and CLIA (annex 1, appendix 9);
- .10 Review group for a new model course on *Ratings as able seafarer deck* to be developed by Germany (annex 1, appendix 10); and
- .11 Review group for model course on *Use of engine-room simulation for training and assessment of seafarers in the engine department* (formerly model course 2.07 on *Engine-Room Simulator*), to be further revised by Turkey (annex 1, appendix 11).

3.39 The composition of the Review Groups, as set out in annex 1, appendices 1 to 11, may be updated as and when further expressions of interest are received by the Secretariat.

4 REPORTS ON UNLAWFUL PRACTICES ASSOCIATED WITH CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY

Reports on fraudulent certificates reported to the Secretariat

4.1 The Sub-Committee noted the information provided by the Secretariat (HTW 3/4), detailing fraudulent certificates found on board ships during inspections or reportedly being used, as reported to the Secretariat for the year 2014 and 2015, and urged Member Governments to report details of fraudulent certificates detected, using the revised reporting format (see STW 38/17, annex 1).

4.2 The Sub-Committee, noting the large number of fraudulent certificates reported by Parties, reiterated the invitation to Member Governments and international organizations to submit proposals on a strategy to address the problems associated with fraudulent certificates of competency to the next session.

4.3 The statement by the delegation of Ukraine is set out in annex 11.

Certification verification facility

4.4 The Sub-Committee noted the information provided by the Secretariat that the certification verification facility through the IMO website had been used 12,486 times during the year 2015.

4.5 In this context, the Sub-Committee urged Member Governments to provide the Secretariat with updated information to facilitate verification of certificates, and to respond in a timely manner to requests for verification of certificates.

4.6 The delegation of the Bahamas requested clarification regarding any follow-up action taken if the information provided was incorrect. In this context, the Sub-Committee clarified that Parties are required to have in place electronic databases and proper points of contact after 1 January 2017.

4.7 In this context, the delegation of India informed the Sub-Committee that India had introduced an electronic certificate verification system, and invited Member States to contact it when necessary.

5 GUIDANCE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2010 MANILA AMENDMENTS

5.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 93, taking into account the need for further guidance on implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments, had extended the target completion date of the output on "Development of guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments", until the end of the transitional arrangements, i.e. 1 January 2017.

5.2 The Chairman, in her opening remarks, reminded the Sub-Committee that this was the last session of the Sub-Committee before the end of the transitional period for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments, and reiterated the importance for Parties to ensure that the Manila Amendments are effectively implemented.

Implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments

5.3 The Bahamas (HTW 3/5) provided information outlining its experience with the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention and Code, in particular in issuing certification to seafarers and conducting STCW audits of training centres, and identified the need for developing appropriate STCW guidance to avoid unnecessary delays, administrative burden and cost to seafarers, ships, companies and STCW Parties due to an absence of such guidance on the application of the STCW Convention's requirements.

5.4 In the ensuing discussion, the following general views were expressed:

- .1 some of the issues raised in the document refer to possible amendments to the STCW Convention or Code that are beyond the remit of the assigned output;
- .2 if the guidance in STCW Code, part B needs improvement, an appropriate proposal should be submitted to the Committee;
- .3 some of the issues raised in the document need further clarity; and
- .4 caution is urged when addressing issues that may be outside the 2010 Manila Amendments.

5.5 The Sub-Committee agreed to the request by the delegation of the Bahamas to consider issues relating to "Training" or "Instruction" and the phrase "Before being assigned to any shipboard duties" in sections 5 and 6, respectively, of document HTW 3/5, and also under agenda item 10, as they would have a bearing on the discussions relating to passenger ship-specific training in document HTW 3/10 (see also paragraph 10.8).

"Training" or "Instruction"

5.6 The following views were expressed during the discussion on the clarification of the difference between the terms "training" and "instruction":

- .1 with regard to training or instruction, the Convention establishes appropriate training or methods for receiving appropriate instructions in the guidance provided in section A-VI/1, and therefore no confusion exists;
- .2 any issues not relating to the 2010 Manila Amendments are outside the mandate of the present output on "Guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments" and should therefore not be discussed by the Sub-Committee;
- .3 the issue is also related to passenger ship-specific training;
- .4 there is no need for any further guidance; and
- .5 familiarization training does not require issue of a Certificate of Competency or Certificate of Proficiency but only requires documentary evidence.

5.7 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed to refer the above issues to Working Group on Training Matters 1, established under agenda item 10, to consider them from the perspective of passenger ships and to advise the Sub-Committee as appropriate (see paragraph 10.13). The Sub-Committee further agreed that the terms "training" and "instruction" were clear and did not require additional clarification.

"Before being assigned to any shipboard duties"

5.8 The following views were expressed during the discussion on the clarification of the phrase "Before being assigned to any shipboard duties":

- .1 the phrase "Before being assigned to any shipboard duties" has been in use and its intent is quite clear;
- .2 personnel who have designated duties on a muster list should have undergone relevant training before being assigned any shipboard duties;
- .3 large numbers of personnel without operational duties have emergency duties on muster lists; and
- .4 the requirement is very clear and there is no need to provide any further clarification.

5.9 The Sub-Committee agreed that as this phrase had been in use and its intent was clear, there was no need to provide any further clarification.

5.10 The Sub-Committee, during its consideration of the remaining issues in document HTW 3/5, invited general comments on the following issues therein:

- .1 revalidation of certificates;
- .2 validity of certificates exceeds five (5) years;
- .3 Electro-Technical Officer (ETO) certification;
- .4 offshore training and certification guidance;
- .5 documentary evidence issued in accordance with regulation I/10.5 of the STCW Convention; and
- .6 updating MSC.1/Circ.1174 based on completion of audit.

Revalidation of certificates

5.11 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed, that:

- .1 some Administrations were of the view that revalidation of certificates could only be carried out on the basis of shore-based training;
- .2 guidance should be developed for the implementation of the STCW Convention but only on those issues that were within the remit of the assigned output;
- .3 the proposal was not in line with the Convention provisions;

- .4 this was an issue relating to the 2010 Manila Amendments;
- .5 this highlighted the difficulties in the interpretation of the requirement but was outside the remit of the planned output assigned to the Sub-Committee; and
- .6 any discussion on this issue required the approval of a new output by the Maritime Safety Committee.

5.12 The Sub-Committee agreed that this issue was outside the mandate of the assigned output on "Guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments" and therefore would require the approval of a new output for the agenda of the Sub-Committee by the Maritime Safety Committee in accordance with the Committee's Guidelines, if any Member State wished to proceed with the matter.

Validity of certificates exceeds five (5) years

5.13 In the ensuing discussion, the views were expressed, that:

- .1 this issue had been addressed in an earlier guidance in STCW.7/Circ.17; and
- .2 the Convention was clear.

5.14 The Sub-Committee agreed that this issue did not require further clarification since the Convention's requirements were clear.

Electro-technical Officer (ETO) certification

5.15 The Sub-Committee agreed that this issue did not require additional clarification, and Administrations were reminded that the Electro-technical Officer requirements will come into force on 1 January 2017, and that seafarers serving as ETOs must be trained and certified accordingly.

Offshore training and certification guidance

5.16 During the discussion on offshore training and certification guidance the following views were expressed, that:

- .1 resolution A.1079(28) on *Recommendation for the training and certification of personnel on Mobile Offshore Units (MOUs)* required familiarization training every five years;
- .2 familiarization training in the STCW Convention did not specify any frequency for the training;
- .3 the requirement in the aforementioned resolution was not consistent with the requirements in the STCW Code; and
- .4 familiarization training in the STCW Convention does not require issue of a certificate of proficiency, certificate of competency or documentary evidence.

5.17 The Sub-Committee recognized that there was an inconsistency in the provisions relating to familiarization training requirements in the STCW Code and in resolution A.1079(28). In view of the 2010 Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention and STCW Code, a consequential amendment to resolution A.1079(28) would be required to align the familiarization training requirements.

5.18 The Sub-Committee agreed that a consequential amendment was required and, therefore, agreed further to recommend to the Maritime Safety Committee that this inconsistency needed to be aligned in order to harmonize the aforementioned familiarization training requirements. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee proposed the deletion of paragraphs 5.3.3 and 5.3.4 of resolution A.1079(28), for consideration by the Committee.

Documentary evidence issued in accordance with STCW Convention, regulation I/10.5

5.19 The Sub-Committee agreed that there were explicit requirements for certification under regulation I/2 of the Convention, concerning which Administrations would need to establish electronic verification by 1 January 2017, and that there was no need for further clarifications in this regard.

Updating MSC.1/Circ.1174

5.20 The Sub-Committee agreed that this issue was outside the mandate of the assigned output on "Guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments", and would require the approval of a new output for the Sub-Committee by the Maritime Safety Committee to update the circular, and invited interested Member Governments to submit relevant proposals to the Maritime Safety Committee for consideration.

STCW-related information to be communicated through GISIS to reduce administrative burden

5.21 New Zealand (HTW 3/5/1) commented on the proposal in document HTW 2/6/1 (China) which provided information on its analysis of various reporting and information communication obligations of Parties under article IV, VIII, IX of the STCW Convention and section A-I/7 of the STCW Code from the perspectives of transparency and legal effect, and suggested that a future practical application of a GISIS module could reduce the administrative burden associated with implementation of the STCW Convention.

5.22 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed, that:

- .1 GISIS should provide access to the information to all States under regulation I/8;
- .2 the module would contribute to greater transparency for reporting requirements under regulation I/8;
- .3 caution must be exercised not to include reports not required by the Convention;
- .4 the module should not be overloaded with information;
- .5 it was not clear how much the GISIS module would be utilized;
- .6 access rights must be a part of the functionality of the module;

-
- .7 use of a module, if approved, should be voluntary; and
 - .8 the organizational impact on the Secretariat should be taken into account.

5.23 The Sub-Committee referred document HTW 3/5/1 to Working Group on Training Matters 2, to be established, for further consideration, together with the annex of document HTW 2/6/1 (China).

Standard for colour vision and eyesight acuity

5.24 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 95 (MSC 95/22, paragraphs 9.12 to 9.14) had instructed the Sub-Committee to consider the existing standards of colour vision and eyesight acuity for seafarers and to:

- .1 provide clarification, if necessary, under the Sub-Committee's existing output on "Guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments", and
- .2 advise the Committee on the best way forward for the development of a long-term solution to colour vision and eyesight acuity standards for seafarers.

5.25 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information provided by Japan in document HTW 3/INF.2 on a testing method for colour vision acuity for Japanese engineering personnel.

5.26 The Sub-Committee, in accordance with the instructions of the Committee, invited Member States and international organizations to submit comments and proposals related to standards of colour vision and eyesight acuity to HTW 4 for consideration.

Grounding accident of M.V. Rena

5.27 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information provided by New Zealand in document HTW 3/INF.4 on a recommendation made by the Transport Accident Investigation Commission of New Zealand in relation to the grounding of the vessel **M.V. Rena** (IMO No.8806802).

Establishment of Working Group

5.28 The Sub-Committee established the Working Group on Training Matters 2 and instructed it, taking into account comments and decisions made in the plenary, to:

- .1 consider documents HTW 3/5/1 and HTW 2/6/1, and advise the Sub-Committee, as appropriate; and
- .2 submit its report on Thursday, 4 February 2016.

Report of the Working Group

5.29 On receipt of the report of the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.4), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

STCW-related information to be communicated through GISIS to reduce administrative burdens

5.30 The Sub-Committee noted the progress made by the working group tasked to develop a framework related to the reporting and information communication requirements under articles IV, VIII, IX of the STCW Convention and section A-I/7 of the STCW Code for a proposed new GISIS module to reduce administrative burdens.

5.31 The Sub-Committee observed that the proposed framework for a new GISIS module on the STCW Convention reporting requirements should consist of two separate annexes: one relating to the reporting and information communication requirements under articles IV, VIII, IX of the STCW Convention, and the other relating to the reporting requirements in accordance with section A-I/7 of the STCW Code.

5.32 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, stated that the GISIS framework had two distinctive access criteria, namely, information that would be available to all and information that would be restricted. They reiterated that the current proposal for a framework had the requirements combined in the present format and should, therefore, be separated into two parts.

5.33 In this regard, they proposed that the word "RESULT" in columns 5 and 6 relating to the reporting requirements under section A-I/7 of the STCW Code should be deleted, which would then make the access rights to information automatically restricted and avoid any confusion and misinterpretations.

5.34 Accordingly, the Sub-Committee agreed to delete references to the word "RESULT" from the relevant columns under section A-I/7 part 1 and part 2 in the proposed framework.

5.35 The Sub-Committee agreed to the proposal by the delegation of Brazil that information uploaded by Member States should be made available to other Parties on a voluntary basis.

5.36 The delegation of Panama raised concerns regarding the workload on the Secretariat related to translating and uploading information provided by Member States for the GISIS module, and queried if the intention of the section in the draft framework relating to section A-I/7 was to reduce the burden of the Member States or that of the Secretariat.

5.37 The delegation of the United Kingdom informed that careful consideration should be given to the design of this GISIS module, in respect of how restrictions on access to information uploaded on to the module can be effected, and also inquired if this new module is intended to be a depository of the information to be reported by a Member State.

5.38 The Secretariat clarified that the Sub-Committee will provide a framework for developing a GISIS module for approval by the Committee, after which the Secretariat will discuss the technical aspects of how to ensure that all requirements of the final GISIS module will be met.

5.39 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee endorsed the framework consisting of two annexes as follows:

- .1 Reporting and information communication requirements under articles IV, VIII and IX of the STCW Convention; and
- .2 Reporting requirements in accordance with section A-I/7 of the STCW Code.

5.40 Furthermore, the Sub-Committee endorsed sections 1 to 5 of the draft framework relating to the reporting and information communication requirements under articles IV, VIII and IX of the STCW Convention, as set out in annex 2, and invited the Committee to approve it with a view to facilitating the design of the module.

5.41 Finally, the Sub-Committee noted the progress made on the remaining sections 6 to 21 of the draft framework relating to reporting and information communication requirements under section A-I/7 of the STCW Code, and agreed that they required further consideration, and instructed the Secretariat to report to the next session of the Sub-Committee on the benefits of this module.

6 COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE 1995 STCW-F CONVENTION

6.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 95, having considered document MSC 95/19/3 (Canada et al.) proposing the review of the annex to the 1995 STCW-F Convention so as to align the standards of the Convention with the current state of the fishing industry, had included in the 2016-2017 biennial agenda of the HTW Sub-Committee and the provisional agenda of HTW 3 a new output on "Comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention" with a target completion year of 2018 (MSC 95/22, paragraph 19.41 and annex 23).

Defining the scope for the comprehensive review of the STCW-F Convention

6.2 Iceland, Japan and Norway (HTW 3/6) provided information on the proposed areas of the annex to the 1995 STCW-F Convention that needed to be considered in order to define the scope of the comprehensive review of the STCW-F Convention and align the structure of the STCW-F with that of the STCW Convention, including the regulations and the Code.

6.3 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 the revised structure should be limited to the annex;
- .2 the convention should be harmonized with the Cape Town Agreement;
- .3 downscaling of standards should be avoided;
- .4 standards should also be based on tonnage of fishing vessel, as an alternative to length as at present;
- .5 the comprehensive review should be carried out in a logical and systematic manner;
- .6 the STCW-F Convention should be aligned with the STCW Convention;
- .7 the objective of the review should be to update the training requirements;
- .8 the review should not introduce requirements from other IMO instruments and should not be aligned with other IMO instruments that are not yet in force;
- .9 the review should take account of the reality and difficulties in the fishing industry;
- .10 the fast-tracked development of the 1995 STCW-F Convention may have introduced impediments to its wider ratification;

.11 the Convention should be brought up to date taking into account technical developments in the industry; and

.12 the principles and scope for the review must be clearly defined.

6.4 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed that there was a need, as a first step, to establish the principles and scope of the review.

Instruction to the Working Group

6.5 The Sub-Committee instructed the Working Group on Training Matters 2, established under agenda item 5, to consider document MSC 95/9/6 as the base document, also taking into account document HTW 3/6, and define, as a first step, the principles and scope of the review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention, including a list of issues for endorsement by the Sub-Committee with a view to approval by the Committee, before undertaking, as a second step, the authorized review in a systematic and organized manner.

Report of the Working Group

6.6 On receipt of the relevant part of the report of the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.4), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

6.7 The Sub-Committee endorsed the view of the group that a set of principles should be agreed prior to defining the scope for the comprehensive review of the Convention, and that the review should be carried out in a logical and systematic manner.

6.8 The Sub-Committee agreed that the scope of the review should be based on concepts and elements in the STCW Convention, 1978, as amended, and that there was accordingly no need to align the 1995 STCW-F Convention with the 2010 Manila Amendments, as a principle.

6.9 The Sub-Committee further agreed, with regard to the inclusion of references to the 2010 Cape Town Agreement in the proposed draft revised 1995 STCW-F Convention, that the revised Convention should not be dependent on other IMO instruments, and endorsed the recommendation of the group not to include in the principles any references to IMO instruments not yet in force.

6.10 Owing to time constraints, the Sub-Committee was unable to complete its work to define the scope for the comprehensive review, but finalized the provisional scope on the understanding that other items may be included in the scope at a later stage of the review with the approval of the Committee.

6.11 The Sub-Committee endorsed the principles and the provisional scope for the comprehensive review of the STCW-F Convention, as set out in annex 3, and invited the Committee to approve them, to enable the Sub-Committee to commence a systematic and comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention.

7 ROLE OF THE HUMAN ELEMENT

Minimum Manning and Seafarer Fatigue

7.1 The Nautical Institute and InterManager (HTW 3/7) provided, for preliminary consideration by the Sub-Committee, information on fatigue and its relation to the major area of concern to seafarers, in particular the Master/Chief Mate two-watch watchkeeping system, whereby the navigation of the ship is solely conducted by the master and one watchkeeping officer, and proposed to amend annex 5 of resolution A.1047(27) on *Principles of minimum safe manning*, so as to exclude the master from regular watchkeeping duties.

7.2 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 95 (MSC 95/22, paragraphs 9.18 and 9.19), when considering the proposal by the United Kingdom (document MSC 95/9/3) in relation to revising the *Guidance on fatigue mitigation and management* (MSC/Circ.1014), had agreed that SOLAS regulation V/14 and resolution A.1047(27) on *Principles of minimum safe manning* should not be amended.

7.3 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 fatigue has a linkage to manning levels on ships;
- .2 flag States understand the implications of fatigue when agreeing manning levels with companies;
- .3 the linkage between fatigue and manning should be taken into account during the revision of the guidelines on fatigue mitigation;
- .4 the proposal in document HTW 3/7 lacks proper justification;
- .5 the issue of manning of ships is outside the scope of the assigned output; and
- .6 the Sub-Committee must adhere to the clear instruction of the Committee that the principles of minimum safe manning should not be amended.

7.4 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee did not agree to amend annex 5 of resolution A.1047(27) as proposed in document HTW 3/7, as it was not consistent with the instructions from MSC 95.

Poster related to passage under pilotage

7.5 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information contained in document HTW 3/INF.5 (MAIIF and IMPA) relating to the dissemination of an educational poster with simple graphics and text, to improve understanding and awareness during passage under pilotage.

Seafarers' lookout information processing at sea and related training

7.6 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information contained in document HTW 3/INF.6 (China) on a research project conducted by the China Ocean Shipping (Group) Company training centre on seafarers' lookout information processing at sea and related training.

Other issues

7.7 The delegation of Angola made a statement, which is set out in annex 11.

8 REVISION OF THE GUIDELINES ON FATIGUE

8.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 95 had:

- .1 considered document MSC 95/9/3 (United Kingdom) providing comments related to the scope of the review and update of the *Guidance on fatigue mitigation and management* (MSC/Circ.1014) agreed by HTW 2, and proposing clarification of the scope in relation to manning; and
- .2 agreed with the clarification of the scope in relation to manning proposed by the United Kingdom, as set out in paragraph 11 of document MSC 95/9/3, and had instructed the HTW Sub-Committee to take this into account when revising the *Guidance on fatigue mitigation and management* (MSC/Circ.1014), and had agreed that SOLAS regulation V/14 and resolution A.1047(27) on *Principles of minimum safe manning* should not be amended.

Revision of the *Guidelines on Fatigue* in the annex to MSC/Circ.1014

8.2 Australia (document HTW 3/8) provided a proposal for the revision of the *Guidelines on Fatigue* in the annex to MSC/Circ.1014, which took into account the outcome of discussions at HTW 2 and MSC 95 and was based on contemporary fatigue and sleep research that included a risk-based approach to managing fatigue at sea.

8.3 The United States (document HTW 3/8/1) provided general support for the proposed draft revised *Guidelines on Fatigue* in the annex to MSC/Circ.1014 (document HTW 3/8), and provided an alternative proposal for Module 2 set out in its annex.

8.4 ICS (document HTW 3/8/2) provided comments on the proposal for revised guidelines on fatigue in document HTW 3/8, and proposed general principles relating to the scope, style, structure and content of the guidance to be taken into account during the revision of the *Guidelines on Fatigue*, in the annex to MSC/Circ.1014.

8.5 The Nautical Institute (document HTW 3/8/3) provided comments on the proposal for revised guidelines on fatigue in document HTW 3/8, which aimed to complement the guidelines by introducing the concept of Human Performance and Limitation (HPL) developed by them as a means to enhance safety for the maritime domain.

8.6 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 document HTW/3/8 should be used as the base document taking into account document HTW 3/8/1;
- .2 the principle of user-friendliness should be taken into account in the revision of the guidelines;
- .3 the concept of human performance and limitation is interesting but more information is required in order to consider them during the revision of the guidelines;
- .4 module 2 of the draft revised guidelines provides a comprehensive risk management approach that could be used by seafarers as appropriate to their circumstances;

-
- .5 the guidance is not intended to provide a stand-alone fatigue risk management system (FRMS);
 - .6 document HTW 3/8 provides a more robust basis for the review;
 - .7 fatigue at all levels should be taken into account;
 - .8 FRMS should be only one of the tools and not the only tool for fatigue management;
 - .9 the administrative workload could have an impact on fatigue;
 - .10 guidance should be practical and provide flexibility to manage fatigue for all stakeholders, be easy to read and not too academic;
 - .11 the guidelines should not be mandatory;
 - .12 the diversity of ships and shipping companies should be taken into account;
 - .13 a holistic view of all factors related to fatigue mitigation must be taken;
 - .14 the instructions of the Committee not to amend principles of manning and SOLAS regulation V/14 must be adhered to;
 - .15 managing fatigue is a two-pronged problem requiring both adequate human resources that match the operational workload, and effective management of those resources;
 - .16 the draft proposal places primary responsibility on the master and seafarers with a Fatigue Risk Management System (FRMS) that is subject to the documentation requirements of the ISM Code Safety Management System;
 - .17 increased administrative burdens on the master and seafarers may be counterproductive to reducing fatigue;
 - .18 fatigue should be managed through company safety management procedures;
 - .19 review of MSC/Circ.1014 should take into account the principles in document HTW 3/8/2;
 - .20 Module 6 should not include issues related to administrative burdens; and
 - .21 Module 6 should include issues related to administrative burdens.
- 8.7 The Sub-Committee agreed that:
- .1 there was general support for amending circular MSC/Circ.1014;
 - .2 there was general support for the principles in HTW 3/8/2 (ICS), namely:
 - .1 guidelines should be practical;
 - .2 guidelines should be drafted using non-mandatory language;

- .3 guidelines should be non-academic and user-friendly, and use simple language;
- .3 the guidelines should include a module for the Administrations;
- .4 document HTW 3/8 should be the base document; and
- .5 the Fatigue Risk Management System, as proposed in document HTW 3/8, is not the only way to address fatigue (Module 2) and, therefore, document HTW 3/8/1 should be taken into account when amending Module 2.

8.8 The Sub-Committee agreed not to forward document HTW 3/8/3 to the working group since there was a need for a more concrete proposal, and encouraged the Nautical Institute to submit a proposal to HTW 4 for consideration.

Study regarding compliance with minimum requirements for rest hours

8.9 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information provided by France in document HTW 3/INF.8 on a study regarding compliance with minimum requirements concerning rest hours on board coastal trade ships using a 6-hour-on / 6-hour-off two-watch system.

Establishment of Working Group

8.10 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee established the Working Group on Human Element Issues and instructed it, taking into account comments and decisions in the plenary, to:

- .1 consider documents HTW 3/8, HTW 3/8/1 and HTW 3/8/2, together with document MSC 95/9/3, and develop draft revised *Guidelines on Fatigue*, for consideration by the Sub-Committee; and
- .2 submit its report on Thursday, 4 February 2016.

Report of the Working Group

8.11 Having considered the report of the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.5), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

8.12 The Sub-Committee agreed that, in line with the proposal in document MSC 95/9/3, a holistic approach should be followed, including taking into consideration the issue of manning as it relates to fatigue, but that manning provisions should not be amended.

8.13 The Sub-Committee noted that, owing to time constraints, the group had not been able to complete the review of the proposed amendments to the guidelines and, recognizing the importance of completing this work as soon as possible, it had recommended the establishment of a correspondence group to progress the work intersessionally.

8.14 Accordingly, the Sub-Committee established a correspondence group, coordinated by Australia* and instructed it, taking into account comments and decisions made in the plenary (paragraphs 8.6 to 8.8), to:

- .1 review the proposed amendments to the *Guidelines on Fatigue* (MSC/Circ.1014), using as a basis document HTW 3/8, as amended by the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.5, annex 1) and taking into account the proposed principles set out in paragraphs 11 to 14 of document HTW 3/8/2, the approach for the revision presented in document MSC 95/9/3 and the additional requirements outlined in paragraph 12 of document HTW 3/WP.5;
- .2 when reviewing Module 2 on Fatigue and the Company, take into account the proposed additional modifications contained in document HTW 3/8/1 and that the fatigue risk management system should not be the only method to address Module 2;
- .3 consider whether port and coastal States and other stakeholders should be part of the guidelines and develop contents of the module(s), as appropriate;
- .4 consider the scope, contents and title of module 6 on Fatigue and the Administration; and
- .5 submit its report to HTW 4.

9 REVISED GUIDELINES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ISM CODE BY ADMINISTRATIONS (RESOLUTION A.1071(28)) ON TRAINING AUDITS

9.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 95, having considered document MSC 95/19/6 (Canada et al.), had included the new output "*Revised guidelines on the implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Administrations* (resolution A.1071(28)) on training audits", on the agenda of the HTW Sub-Committee for the 2016-2017 biennium with a target completion year of 2016.

9.2 Document MSC 95/19/6 proposed that all routine ISM audits (initial, annual, intermediate and renewal) should provide practical training opportunities for trainee auditors and also proposed amendments to the *Revised guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations* (resolution A.1071(28)), as set out in the annex to document MSC 95/19/6.

9.3 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 the Revised guidelines should be fully aligned with IACS guidelines;
- .2 formal training of auditors should continue to be carried out;
- .3 not all Administrations delegate their responsibility to recognized organizations (RO);

* **Dr. Michelle Grech**, Head of Section, Human Factors Ship Operations
Ship Safety, Australian Maritime Safety Authority
82 Northbourne Avenue
Braddon ACT 2612
Australia
Email: Michelle.grech@amsa.gov.au

- .4 the work and responsibilities of Administrations and ROs are not the same and, therefore, the requirements should not be aligned; and
- .5 the proposal makes no distinction between the scope of audits in terms of the depth of verifications, and also the training of auditors.

Instruction to the Working Group

9.4 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee instructed the Working Group on Human Element Issues, established under agenda item 8, to consider document MSC 95/19/6 and to prepare draft amendments to the *Revised guidelines on the implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Administrations* (resolution A.1071(28)) for consideration by the Sub-Committee, with a view to subsequent approval by the Committees.

Report of the Working Group

9.5 Having considered the relevant part of the report of the Working Group (HTW 2/WP.5), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

Revised guidelines on the Implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Administrations

9.6 The observer from IACS, recalling that the Committees were requested to keep the guidelines under review, drew the attention of the Sub-Committee to the fact that the Assembly had authorized the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee to keep the Revised guidelines under review and to amend or revise them as necessary, and asked why the Organization had to wait until the Assembly to adopt the amendments.

9.7 The Secretariat clarified that there were precedents, with respect to performance standards, where the Committees had been requested to keep the standards under review but amendments to them had had to be adopted by the Assembly; a similar procedure was being followed in this instance.

9.8 The Sub-Committee endorsed the draft amendments to the *Revised guidelines on the Implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Administrations* and the associated draft Assembly resolution, as set out in annex 4, with a view to approval by the Committees.

9.9 In this regard, the delegation of China made a statement, set out in annex 11, commenting on the proposed amendments.

Completion of work on the output

9.10 Subsequently, the Sub-Committee invited the Committees to note that the work on this output had been completed and to delete it from the agenda of the Sub-Committee (see paragraph 16.3 and annex 9).

10 REVIEW OF STCW PASSENGER SHIP-SPECIFIC SAFETY TRAINING

10.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that HTW 2 had:

- .1 agreed on the following principles:
 - .1 there should be no downgrading of existing training requirements;
 - .2 a three-tiered training approach should be adopted;
 - .3 there should be no duplication of existing training requirements and consistency of standards should be ensured;
 - .4 documentary evidence was sufficient as proof of training;
 - .5 no tables of competence were required for tier one, while tiers two and three should include tables of competence;
 - .6 training should be undertaken prior to duties being assigned on board;
- .2 endorsed, in principle, the draft amendments to STCW regulation V/2 and section A-V/2 of the STCW Code and invited interested Member States and international organizations to submit comments and proposals based on the text set out in document HTW 2/WP.4, annex 1, to HTW 3 for consideration; and
- .3 invited the Committee to extend the target completion year for the output "Review of the STCW passenger ship-specific safety training" to 2016.

Amendments to the STCW Convention on passenger ship-specific safety training

10.2 The United States and CLIA (HTW 3/10) proposed a revision of the draft amendments to the STCW Convention and Code relating to the training requirements for personnel on passenger ships as part of an active approach to enhance passenger ship safety in light of significant industry changes.

10.3 ICS and INTERFERRY (HTW 3/10/1) proposed a different text for amending the STCW Convention and Code relating to the special training for personnel on passenger ships, a key principle of which was that personnel were only required to complete training that was relevant to their designated capacity, duty and responsibility.

10.4 In the ensuing discussion, the following views relating to documents HTW 3/10 and HTW 3/10/1 were expressed:

- .1 document HTW 3/10:
 - .1 reflected closely the outcome of discussions at HTW 2 on this matter;
 - .2 recognized the global diversity of passenger ships;
 - .3 addressed the duplications and clarifications, identified at HTW 2;

- .4 supported the four-tier system of training;
 - .5 proposed that transitional provisions for emergency familiarization needed to be addressed;
 - .6 proposed the approval of training;
 - .7 proposed that, before being assigned shipboard duties, all persons employed or engaged on a seagoing ship must meet the standard of competence specified in section A-VI/1 of the STCW Code; and
 - .8 should be the base document for discussion in the working group.
- .2 document HTW 3/10/1:
- .1 proposed the downscaling of training;
 - .2 proposed that there was a need for ship-specific training;
 - .3 proposed that seafarers on certain voyages should be granted exemptions by administrations;
 - .4 did not provide clear and concise references;
 - .5 did not require this level of training to be approved; and
 - .6 proposed that ro-ro passenger ship training should not be identified as a distinctly different type of training.
- 10.5 The Sub-Committee also noted the following views:
- .1 the legal context of the proposed amendments to section A-I/14 and B-I/14 should be clarified and aligned;
 - .2 training requirements should not be too prescriptive; and
 - .3 flexibility for training should be provided to account for the difference in ship sizes and areas of operation through implementation of the ISM Code.
- 10.6 The Sub-Committee agreed that:
- .1 document HTW 3/10 should be the base document for discussion in the working group to be established;
 - .2 there should be four levels of training;
 - .3 there should be no requirements for course approvals for crowd management training;
 - .4 no exemptions should be granted;
 - .5 flexibility must be provided through the training standards to account for different types of ships and these standards should not be too prescriptive;

-
- .6 sections A-I/14 and B-I/14 should be aligned;
 - .7 the text should include a reference to compliance with the appropriate requirements in chapter VI; and
 - .8 duplication of requirements should be avoided.

10.7 In this regard, and in the context of passenger ship-specific training, the Sub-Committee also considered the proposals in sections 5 and 6 of document HTW 3/5. (see also paragraphs 5.4 to 5.6).

10.8 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed, in particular related to this agenda item:

- .1 familiarization training for passenger ships should be retained as presently existing in the STCW Convention;
- .2 there was no requirement for a COP, CoC or documentary evidence to establish familiarization training;
- .3 the proposal in section 5 should be considered by the working group tasked with discussing passenger ship-specific training; and
- .4 the intention of the phrase "before being assigned to any shipboard duties" was clear and did not need any further guidance.

10.9 After an in-depth discussion, the Sub-Committee referred document HTW 3/10, as the base document, together with some points from document HTW 3/10/1 and section 5 of document HTW 3/5 relating to "Training and Instructions", to Working Group on Training Matters 1 for detailed consideration and to prepare draft amendments to the STCW Convention and Code relating to revised training requirements for passenger ships, for consideration by the Sub-Committee with a view to approval by the Committee.

Enhanced damage stability training

10.10 CLIA (HTW 3/10/2) recalled the output from the Cruise Ship Safety Forum related to an enhanced damage stability training programme, and provided comments which it considered could be a basis for discussion on enhanced damage stability training during the review of STCW passenger ship-specific safety training.

10.11 In this context, the Sub-Committee was informed that the third session of the Sub-Committee for Ship Design and Construction (SDC 3) (HTW 3/WP.7):

- .1 had finalized the draft amendments to SOLAS regulations III/1.4, III/30 and III/37 but retained the drill frequency requirements in square brackets in regulation II-1/19-1.2, and had agreed that HTW should be requested to further consider and to take into account the damage control drill frequency requirements proposed in the draft SOLAS regulation II-1/19-1.2, bearing in mind crew workload and fatigue issues, and submit the finalized draft amendment to the ninety-sixth session of the Maritime Safety Committee (MSC 96) for approval and subsequent adoption (see also paragraphs 11.2 to 11.3); and

- .2 due to lack of time, SDC 3 had been unable to finalize the draft Explanatory Notes to the SOLAS chapter II-1 subdivision and damage stability regulations, and had decided to further consider this issue with a view to it being finalized at SDC 4.

10.12 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee did not support the proposals in document HTW 3/10/2 and the methodology for passenger ship-specific safety training for seafarers therein.

Establishment of the Working Group

10.13 The Sub-Committee established the Working Group on Training Matters 1 and instructed it, taking into account comments and decisions made in the plenary, to:

- .1 consider document HTW 3/10 as the base document, taking into account section 5 of document HTW 3/5 relating to "Training and Instructions" and some points from document HTW 3/10/1, and prepare draft amendments to the STCW Convention related to passenger ship-specific safety training for consideration by the Sub-Committee, with a view to approval by the Committee; and
- .2 submit its report on Thursday, 4 February 2016.

Report of the Working Group

10.14 Having considered the report of the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.3), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

STCW passenger ship-specific safety training

10.15 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, recalled that the Sub-Committee had agreed that passenger ship crowd management training did not require approval, and therefore reiterated that retaining the text in paragraph 3.2 of the annex to HTW 3/WP.3 relating to passenger ship crowd management training would create an inconsistency and result in misinterpretations.

10.16 The Sub-Committee therefore agreed to revise paragraph 3.2 of section A-V/2 of the draft amendment to passenger ship crowd management training.

10.17 The Sub-Committee, bearing in mind existing STCW regulation V/2, paragraph 1, also agreed that all provisions of the draft amendments could be met by all types of passenger ships on all types of trade.

10.18 In this context, the delegation of Norway expressed the opinion that the training requirements for passenger ships developed by the Sub-Committee still did not allow for enough flexibility to address the wide variety of passenger ship operations globally.

10.19 The Sub-Committee endorsed the draft amendments to the STCW Convention, as set out in annex 5, and to parts A and B of the STCW Code, as set out in annexes 6 and 7 respectively, related to passenger ship-specific safety training, and invited the Committee to approve them with a view to adoption at MSC 97.

Completion of work on the output

10.20 Subsequently, the Sub-Committee invited the Committee to note that the work on this output had been completed and to delete it from the agenda of the Sub-Committee (see paragraph 16.3 and annex 9).

11 AMENDMENTS TO SOLAS CHAPTER II-1 AND ASSOCIATED GUIDELINES ON DAMAGE CONTROL DRILLS FOR PASSENGER SHIPS

11.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 93 included a new unplanned output in the provisional agenda of SDC 2 on "Amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 and associated guidelines on damage control drills for passenger ships", with a target completion year of 2016, in association with the HTW Sub-Committee (MSC 93/22, paragraph 20.5).

Outcome of SDC 3

11.2 The Sub-Committee considered document HTW 3/WP.7 (Secretariat) informing that the Sub-Committee on Ship Design and Construction, at its third session (SDC 3), had:

- .1 finalized the draft new SOLAS regulation II-1/19-1, leaving the drill frequency requirements in square brackets, and finalized the draft amendments to SOLAS regulations III/1.4, III/30 and III/37 (document SDC 3/WP.4, annex 3), as reproduced in the annex to HTW 3/WP.7; and
- .2 requested the HTW Sub-Committee to further consider and to take into account the damage control drill frequency requirements proposed in the draft SOLAS regulation II-1/19-1.2 in square brackets, bearing in mind crew workload and fatigue issues, and submit the finalized draft amendment to the ninety-sixth session of the Maritime Safety Committee (MSC 96) for approval and subsequent adoption (see SDC 3/WP.4, paragraph 47.7).

11.3 The Chairman of the SDC Sub-Committee clarified that:

- .1 the SDC Sub-Committee had requested the HTW Sub-Committee to review only the frequency of drills that were retained in square brackets;
- .2 the amendments were part of a comprehensive package to be submitted to MSC 96 for approval;
- .3 the drill frequency was not intended to place a burden on seafarers and cause fatigue; and
- .4 the HTW Sub-Committee should provide a swift decision to facilitate the submission of the package to the Committee for approval.

11.4 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 consideration should be given to minimize fatigue during drills on board;
- .2 familiarization training should be dealt with under the STCW Convention, regulation I/14, and the ISM Code; and
- .3 a frequency needs to be specified for drills on board.

Instruction to the Working Group

11.5 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee instructed the Working Group on Training Matters 1, established under agenda item 10, taking into account comments and decisions made in the plenary, to:

- .1 consider the annex to document HTW 3/WP.7 containing draft new SOLAS regulation II-1/19-1.2 relating to the drill frequency requirements in square brackets, and finalize the draft amendments thereto; and
- .2 submit its report on Thursday, 4 February 2016.

Report of the Working Group

11.6 Having considered the relevant part of the report of the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.3), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

11.7 The Sub-Committee agreed that the draft amendments should be interpreted as follows:

- .1 the 3-month frequency is a requirement for the ship, and crew members on board such ships may not be able to participate in all of the scheduled drills due to their rota scheme;
- .2 some crew members assigned with damage control responsibilities may not be able to attend the damage control drill due to their watchkeeping duties; and
- .3 notwithstanding .1 and .2 above, a company should always ensure that crew members with damage control responsibilities are sufficiently trained and, therefore, that they participate regularly in these drills; the company may consequently have to adjust the scheduling of such drills.

11.8 In light of the foregoing, the Sub-Committee finalized the draft new SOLAS regulation II-1/19-1 on Damage control drills for passenger ships, as set out in annex 8, with a view to approval by MSC 96 together with the related amendments prepared by SDC 3, and subsequent adoption by MSC 97.

12 COMPLETION OF THE DETAILED REVIEW OF THE GLOBAL MARITIME DISTRESS AND SAFETY SYSTEM (GMDSS)

12.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that HTW 2 had considered the relevant output under the agenda item on "First outline of the detailed review of the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)", for which the NCSR Sub-Committee had been assigned as the coordinating organ and the HTW Sub-Committee as an associated organ. HTW 2, noting that no documents had been submitted, had deferred further consideration to this session.

12.2 The Sub-Committee was informed that MSC 94:

- .1 having considered the outcome of NCSR 2, had approved the revised plan of work (i.e. modifying the name of the output) and extended the target completion year of this output to 2016; and

- .2 had also approved a new output on "Draft Modernization Plan of the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)", with the target completion year of 2018, assigning the NCSR Sub-Committee as the coordinating organ and the HTW Sub-Committee as an associated organ.

12.3 The Sub-Committee noted that the target completion year for this output was 2016, and that the relevant new output was assigned to the Sub-Committee in its capacity as an associated organ.

12.4 The Sub-Committee, noting that no documents had been submitted for consideration or referred to the Sub-Committee by NCSR 2 for review, agreed to consider the relevant matter under the new output at the next session, pending further input/referral from NCSR 3.

13 REVISION OF REQUIREMENTS FOR ESCAPE ROUTE SIGNS AND EQUIPMENT LOCATION MARKINGS IN SOLAS AND RELATED INSTRUMENTS

13.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 94 had:

- .1 considered document MSC 94/18/6 (United States and ISO), proposing to clarify and harmonize existing requirements for escape route signs and equipment location markings in SOLAS regulations II-2/13, III/11 and III/20, to develop a new chapter of the FSS Code for this purpose, and to review related non-mandatory instruments for potential consolidation or consequential amendment; and
- .2 included, in the 2014-2015 biennial agenda of the SSE Sub-Committee and in the provisional agenda for SSE 2, a new unplanned output on "Revision of requirements for escape route signs and equipment location markings in SOLAS and related instruments", with a target completion date of 2016, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the coordinating organ in association with the HTW Sub-Committee.

13.2 The Sub-Committee, noting that no documents had been submitted for consideration or referred to the Sub-Committee by SSE 2 for review, deferred consideration to HTW 4.

14 AMENDMENTS TO THE IGF CODE AND DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR LOW-FLASHPOINT FUELS

14.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that:

- .1 MSC 94 had approved the extension of the target completion year to 2016 and changed the description of the output to "Amendments to the IGF Code and development of guidelines for low-flashpoint fuels", assigning the CCC Sub-Committee as the coordinating organ and the HTW as an associated organ;
- .2 MSC 95 had adopted the IGF Code, together with the associated SOLAS amendments and the related amendments to the STCW Convention and Code, and had approved the associated STCW Circular; and
- .3 the Sub-Committee on Carriage of Cargoes and Containers (CCC) was currently developing amendments to the IGF Code and guidelines for low-flashpoint fuels and that this was a work in progress.

14.2 The Sub-Committee, noting that no documents had been submitted for consideration or referred to the Sub-Committee by CCC 2, deferred consideration to HTW 4.

15 REVIEW OF THE MODU CODE, LSA CODE AND MSC.1/CIRC.1206/REV.1

15.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 93 had included an unplanned output on "Review of the MODU Code, LSA Code and MSC.1/Circ.1206/Rev.1" in the provisional agenda of SSE 2 with a target completion date of 2016, in association with the HTW Sub-Committee, as and when requested by the SSE Sub-Committee.

15.2 The Sub-Committee noted that SSE 2 had referred the proposals and comments related to manning, as contained in documents SSE 2/12 (annex, paragraphs 12 and 13) and SSE 2/12/1 (paragraph 12), to HTW 3 for consideration, with a view to providing general advice and input to SSE 3.

15.3 The United States (document SSE 2/12, annex) had proposed:

- .1 draft amendments to the MODU Code and to resolution A.1079(28) on *Recommendations for the training and certification of personnel on mobile offshore units (MOUs)*, in order to establish that the master should be designated as the Person In Charge (PIC) at all times when using dynamic positioning systems as the sole means of position-keeping (paragraph 12); and
- .2 amendments to the MODU Code to establish fire and explosion strategies for the disconnection or shutdown of specific systems in response to gas detection system alarms (paragraph 13).

15.4 Liberia et al. (document SSE 2/12/1), commenting on document SSE 2/12, paragraph 12, suggested that the designation of the master as the PIC at all times, when using dynamic positioning systems as the sole means of position-keeping, may conflict with the rights of the coastal State over units engaged in the exploration of natural resources.

15.5 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 the issues referred to could be more than operational issues, and may be outside the scope of the Sub-Committee;
- .2 the scope of both issues presented in the document must be verified to assess if they are within the remit of the Sub-Committee; and
- .3 in document SSE 2/12/1, paragraph 12, the question of responsibility should be given due flexibility in order to be able to comply with the procedures established by coastal States and companies, particularly in emergency situations.

Instruction to the Working Group

15.6 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee instructed the Working Group on Human Element Issues, established under agenda item 8, taking into account comments and decisions made in the plenary, to:

- .1 consider the proposals and comments related to manning, as contained in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the annex of document SSE 2/12, and paragraph 12 of document SSE 2/12/1, with a view to providing general advice and input to SSE 3; and
- .2 submit its report on Thursday, 4 February 2016.

Report of the Working Group

15.7 Having considered the part of the report of the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.5), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

15.8 The Sub-Committee endorsed the view of the group, with regard to the amendments proposed in paragraph 13 of the annex to document SSE 2/12, that crew who were required to operate shutdown logic systems should be familiarized with the system and should receive appropriate training, and that human element aspects should be considered in the design of these systems.

15.9 The Sub-Committee, taking into account the comments contained in paragraph 12 of document SSE 2/12/1, made no changes to the proposed amendments contained in paragraphs 12 and 13 of the annex to document SSE 2/12, and agreed to inform the SSE Sub-Committee accordingly.

16 BIENNIAL STATUS REPORT AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR HTW 4

Outcome of MSC 95

16.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 95 had approved the Sub-Committee's revised biennial agenda for 2016-2017 and the provisional agenda for HTW 3, as set out in annexes 19 and 20 to document MSC 95/22.

Outcome of A 29

16.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that the Assembly, at its twenty-ninth session (A 29), had adopted resolutions A.1097(29) on *Strategic plan for the Organization (for the six-year period 2016 to 2021)*, A.1098(29) on *High-Level Action Plan of the Organization and priorities for the 2016-2017 biennium* and A.1099(29) on *Application of the Strategic Plan and the High Level Action Plan of the Organization*.

Biennial status report for the 2016-2017 biennium

16.3 Taking into account the progress made at the session, the Sub-Committee prepared the biennial status report, as set out in annex 9, for consideration by MSC 96.

Proposed provisional agenda for HTW 4

16.4 Taking into account the progress made at the session, the Sub-Committee prepared its proposed provisional agenda for HTW 4, as set out in annex 10, for consideration by MSC 96.

Correspondence groups established at the session

16.5 The Sub-Committee established the Correspondence Group on Revision of the *Guidelines on Fatigue*, which is due to report to HTW 4.

Review groups for development, review and update of model courses established at the session

16.6 The Sub-Committee established 11 review groups to facilitate the development of seven new model courses and the review and updating of four existing model courses, pursuant to the 2010 Manila Amendments to the STCW Convention and STCW Code (see paragraph 3.38).

Arrangements for the next session

16.7 The Sub-Committee agreed to establish at its next session working/drafting groups on subjects to be selected from the following:

- .1 Validated model training courses (agenda item 3);
- .2 Guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments (agenda item 5);
- .3 Comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention (agenda item 6);
- .4 Revision of the guidelines on fatigue (agenda item 8);
- .5 Amendments to the IGF Code and development of guidelines for low-flashpoint fuels (agenda item 10);
- .6 Revision of requirements for escape route signs and equipment location markings in SOLAS and related instruments (agenda item 11);
- .7 Revised SOLAS regulation II-1/3-8 and associated guidelines (MSC.1/Circ.1175) and new guidelines for safe mooring operations for all ships (agenda item 12); and
- .8 Review of the MODU Code, LSA Code and MSC.1/Circ.1206/Rev.1 (agenda item 13),

whereby the Chairman, taking into account the submissions received on the respective subjects, would advise the Sub-Committee before HTW 4 on the final selection of groups.

Date of the next session

16.8 The Sub-Committee noted that the fourth session of the Sub-Committee had been tentatively scheduled to take place from 30 January to 3 February 2017.

17 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR 2017

17.1 In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Maritime Safety Committee, the Sub-Committee unanimously elected Ms. Mayte Medina (United States) as Chairman and Ms. Farrah Fadil (Singapore) as Vice-Chairman for the year 2017.

17.2 The Sub-Committee also expressed its appreciation to the outgoing Chairman, Mr. Bradley Groves (Australia), for his excellent leadership of the Sub-Committee, and extended him its best wishes for his new role as the Chairman of the Maritime Safety Committee.

18 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Guidelines for port State control officers on certification of seafarers' rest hours

18.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that:

- .1 III 1 had agreed to the draft MSC circular on *Guidelines for port State control officers on certification of seafarers' rest hours based on the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), 1978, as amended, and manning requirements from the flag State* (III 1/18, annex 5) and referred it to HTW 2 for review; and
- .2 HTW 2 had reviewed the draft MSC circular and advised that further work on the Guidelines was necessary at HTW 3, and that the United States had offered to prepare a document for submission to HTW 3 in collaboration with interested Member Governments and international organizations on this matter.

18.2 The United States (document HTW 3/18/1) proposed changes to the draft guidelines for port State control officers on certification of seafarers' rest hours by restructuring the original draft guidelines to highlight the three separate areas of inspection: 1. seafarer certification; 2. vessel manning; and 3. seafarers' hours of rest. It also indicated that the tables found in the annexes of the original draft guidelines contained duplications and inconsistencies which, if retained, would require a thorough review to confirm their correctness.

18.3 In the ensuing discussion, the following views were expressed:

- .1 particular attention should be paid to matters related to STCW Convention certification and manning issues;
- .2 any concerns of port State control officers relating to manning issues should be referred back to flag State authorities;
- .3 the proposal extended beyond the framework of the request from the III Sub-Committee;
- .4 the HTW Sub-Committee should only focus on the technical proposals in document III/1, annex 5;
- .5 communication in English is beyond STCW requirements;
- .6 no certificate is required for seafarers' rest hours;
- .7 the guidelines related to seafarers hours of rest are within the purview of the HTW Sub-Committee;
- .8 a number of erroneous references to the STCW Convention are included in the original draft provided by the III Sub-Committee;
- .9 the intention of the draft guidelines was to replace annex 11 of the existing *Guidelines on procedures for port state control* (resolution A.1052(27));
- .10 guidelines should be drafted to harmonize the rest of the requirements and not focus on detention of vessels;

- .11 the guiding principles for port State control of the manning of a foreign ship should constitute verification that the vessel and its personnel conform to the international provisions as laid down in SOLAS, STCW and in the *Principles of minimum safe manning* (resolution A.1047(27)); and
- .12 guidance on manning should include information on how to handle situations with persons over and above the minimum manning requirements.

18.4 The Sub-Committee agreed that:

- .1 document HTW 3/18/1 should be the base document for discussion in the working group;
- .2 it should consider STCW issues related to certification, hours of rest and manning; and
- .3 the III Sub-Committee should consider issues relating to port State control.

18.5 The Sub-Committee referred document HTW 3/18/1 to Working Group on Training Matters 1, for detailed consideration with a view to finalization of the draft *Guidelines for port State control officers on certification of seafarers' rest hours*.

Instruction to Working Group

18.6 After some discussion, the Sub-Committee instructed the Working Group, established under item 10, taking into account the comments and decisions made in the plenary, to:

- .1 consider document HTW 3/18/1 and prepare the draft MSC circular on *Guidelines for port State control officers on certification of seafarers' rest hours based on the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), 1978, as amended, and manning requirements from the flag State*, in particular, taking into account paragraphs 6.2.24, 6.2.26, 6.4.2.2, 7.2.7, 7.3.2.4 and 7.3.2.14 of document III 1/18, annex 5, and document III 2/16 (paragraph 7.12), for consideration by the Sub-Committee.

Report of the Working Group

18.7 Having considered the relevant part of the report of the Working Group (HTW 3/WP.3), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

18.8 Following discussions, the Sub-Committee agreed to revise the title of the draft guidelines as contained in document HTW 3/18/1, which now reads "*Guidelines for port State control officers on certification of seafarers, hours of rest and manning*".

18.9 The Sub-Committee, owing to time constraints, was not able to finalize the draft MSC circular on *Guidelines for port State control officers on certification of seafarers, hours of rest and manning* at this session.

18.10 The Sub-Committee agreed that the existing tables in the annexes needed to be retained as they were considered a useful tool by port State control officers. However, they should be restructured and condensed into two tables as follows:

- .1 table B-I/2 of the STCW Code; and
- .2 a table as an aide memoire, combining the information in the current annexes 2, 3 and 4.

18.11 The Sub-Committee agreed to retain in square brackets those provisions to which it had proposed changes but which were considered to be within the purview of the III Sub-Committee.

18.12 The Sub-Committee endorsed amendments to the main body of the draft guidelines, as set out in document HTW 3/WP.3, annex 3, and invited the III Sub-Committee to consider those provisions left in square brackets.

18.13 The Sub-Committee, having noted the progress relating to finalization of the annexes to the draft guidelines and that the annexes to the draft guidelines required further work given the many inconsistencies identified therein, agreed to inform the third session of the III Sub-Committee (III 3) that these annexes were expected to be finalized at HTW 4, with a view to approval by the Committees.

Status of footnotes in the STCW Convention

18.14 The Sub-Committee recalled that HTW 2 had instructed the Secretariat to undertake an analysis of the status of footnotes in the STCW Convention following the approval of MSC.1/Circ.1500 on *Guidance on drafting of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments*, which could also be adhered to when considering amendments to the STCW Convention and Code.

18.15 The Sub-Committee considered document HTW 3/18/2 (Secretariat) informing about the decision by MSC 61 on the status of footnotes in the STCW Convention, i.e. that they should not be considered part of the Convention, and advising that in accordance with the guidance in resolution A.911(22), footnotes are not to be regarded as mandatory instruments for treaty purposes, since they do not appear in the authentic text of the parent convention, i.e. the authentic texts of amendments to the STCW Convention and Code; therefore, footnotes should continue to be considered non-mandatory.

18.16 In the ensuing discussion, the views were expressed that the status of the notes in STCW Code, section A-I/9 and the footnotes reflecting the IMO model courses was unclear.

18.17 The Sub-Committee clarified that the notes in section A-I/9 were for explanatory purposes and were part of the Code, while IMO model courses only provided guidance to facilitate the development of training programmes to meet the objectives of the STCW Code and are not mandatory.

18.18 The Sub-Committee agreed that footnotes should not be considered part of the Convention and confirmed that, since they do not appear in the authentic text of the STCW Convention and Code, they should continue to be considered non-mandatory.

Guidelines for Dynamic Positioning system (DP) operator training

18.19 The Sub-Committee noted with appreciation the information contained in document HTW 3/INF.7 (IMCA) relating to training of dynamic positioning system (DP) operators.

Dispensations issued under Article VIII of the STCW Convention

18.20 The Sub-Committee noted information provided by the Secretariat (HTW 3/18 and addendum) on the submissions made by the Parties in accordance with article VIII of the STCW Convention concerning dispensations granted by them in the years 2014 and 2015. The Sub-Committee also requested Member Governments to submit the information related to dispensations issued in the format, as set out in the annex to document HTW 3/18 and addendum.

18.21 In this regard, the delegation of the Bahamas requested clarification on the purpose of reporting dispensations, asking what follow-up action is taken by the Organization on receiving these reports, and whether these reports could be submitted directly to GISIS.

18.22 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran requested clarification as to the goals and objectives of the Secretariat regarding the issuing of dispensation reports in the specified format attached to document HTW 3/18; whether the intention of the Sub-Committee was to increase or decrease the issuing of dispensations and, finally, what the Member States expected to achieve through the submission of these reports.

18.23 The Sub-Committee clarified that reporting of dispensations was an obligation of Parties to the Convention under Article VIII, that no follow-up action was taken by the Secretariat, and that there was currently no process to facilitate submission of dispensation reports directly to GISIS.

Reports of independent evaluation pursuant to regulation I/8 of the STCW Convention and section A-I/8 of the STCW Code

18.24 The Sub-Committee reminded Member Governments of the requirement for the submission of reports of independent evaluation pursuant to regulation I/8 of the STCW Convention and section A-I/8 of the STCW Code, which require a periodical independent evaluation of a Party's quality standards system to be conducted at intervals of not more than five years and for the report of this evaluation to be communicated to the Secretary-General. In this context, the Sub-Committee urged STCW Parties to refer to MSC.1/Circ.1164/Rev.15, with a view to ensuring that reports of independent evaluation pursuant to regulation I/8 of the STCW Convention and section A-I/8 of the STCW Code are submitted to the Secretary-General in a timely manner.

Expressions of appreciation

18.25 The Sub-Committee expressed appreciation to those delegates and observers who had recently relinquished their duties, retired or were transferred to other duties or were about to, for their invaluable contribution to its work and wished them a long and happy retirement or, as the case might be, every success in their new duties.

19 ACTION REQUESTED OF THE COMMITTEES

19.1 The Maritime Safety Committee, at its ninety-sixth session, is invited to:

- .1 approve sections 1 to 5 of the framework of a proposed new GISIS module related to Reporting and information communication requirements under articles IV, VIII, IX of the STCW Convention, 1978, as amended (paragraph 5.40 and annex 2);
- .2 approve the list of principles and the provisional scope for the comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention (paragraph 6.11 and annex 3);
- .3 approve the draft Assembly resolution on *Revised guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations*, with a view to adoption by the Assembly (paragraph 9.8 and annex 4);
- .4 approve the draft amendments to the STCW Convention and Code relating to passenger ship-specific training (paragraph 10.19 and annexes 5, 6 and 7);
- .5 approve the proposed text of paragraph 2 of the draft new SOLAS regulation II-1/19-1 on Damage control drills for passenger ships (paragraph 11.8 and annex 8);
- .6 forward the amendments to the main body of the draft *Guidelines for port state control officers on certification of seafarers, hours of rest and manning* to III 3 to consider those provisions left in square brackets (paragraph 18.12);
- .7 inform III 3 that work on amendments to the annexes to the draft *Guidelines for port state control officers on certification of seafarers, hours of rest and manning* is expected to be finalized at HTW 4 (paragraph 18.13);
- .8 approve the biennial status report of the Sub-Committee (paragraph 16.3 and annex 9);
- .9 approve the proposed provisional agenda for HTW 4 (paragraph 16.4 and annex 10); and
- .10 approve the report in general.

19.2 The Marine Environment Protection Committee, at its sixty-ninth session, is invited to:

- .1 approve the draft Assembly resolution on *Revised guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations*, with a view to adoption by the Assembly (paragraph 9.8 and annex 4).

ANNEX 1

**REVIEW GROUPS FOR DEVELOPMENT, REVIEW AND
VALIDATION OF MODEL COURSES**

APPENDIX 1

Review Group on new model course on Ratings as Able seafarer engine in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room

Course Developer/Coordinator: Singapore

Members of Review Group:

No.	Name	Email
1	Tu Zhiping (China)	tuzhp@coscoqmc.com.cn
	Wang Deling (China)	dlwang@shmtu.edu.cn
	Lin Yejing (China)	linyinj@dlmu.edu.cn
	Huang Lianzhong (China)	huanglianzhong@vip.sina.com
	Zhang Xingbiao (China)	Keller72@163.com
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Diofonce Tunacao (Philippines)	diofonce.tunacao@yahoo.com
4	Zbigniew Byczynski (Poland)	byczynski@morska.eolu.pl
5	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
6	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
7	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
8	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 2

Review Group on new model course on Ratings forming part of a watch in a manned engine-room or designated to perform duties in a periodically unmanned engine-room

Course Developer/Coordinator: Singapore

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Li Bin (China)	libin@coscoqmc.com.cn
	Lin Yejing (China)	linyj@dlmu.edu.cn
	Huang Lianzhong (China)	huanglianzhong@vip.sina.com
	Zhang Xingbiao (China)	Keller72@163.com
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Diofonce Tunacao (Philippines)	diofonce.tunacao@yahoo.com
4	Zbigniew Byczynski (Poland)	byczynski@morska.eolu.pl
5	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
6	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
7	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
8	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 3

Review Group on model course 3.12 on Assessment, Examination and Certification of Seafarers

Course Developer/Coordinator: IAMU and IMLA

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Han Jiexiang (China)	jsmsagtl@163.com
	Li Huilan(Ms) (China)	lihuilan_gz@126.com
	Rao Gunjin (China)	Raogunjin@Inmsa.gov.cn
	Fan Zhongzhou (China)	ffzz101@163.com
	He Qinghua (China)	capt_he@163.com
	Liu Tong (China)	tonel@163.com
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Jan Willem Verhoeff (Netherlands)	verhoeff@stc-r.nl
4	Diofonce Tunacao (Philippines)	diofonce.tunacao@yahoo.com
	Alfredo G. Haboc (Philippines)	ahaboc@philcamsat.com.ph
	Joseph Raluta (Philippines)	jraluta@yahoo.com.ph
	Arsenio Jr. Padilla (Philippines)	arspadilla@yahoo.com
5	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
	Chong-ju Chae (Republic of Korea)	katheshe76@naver.com
6	Zulfiqur Husain (Singapore)	zulfiqur_husain@mpa.gov.sg
7	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
8	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
9	Vadym Zakharchenko (IAMU)	zvn@onma.edu.ua
10	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 4

Review Group on model course 6.09 on Training course for Instructors

Course Developer/Coordinator: IAMU and IMLA

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Han Jiexiang (China)	jsmsagtl@163.com
	Li Huilan(Ms) (China)	lihuilan_gz@126.com
	Rao Gunjin (China)	Raogunjin@Inmsa.gov.cn
	Fan Zhongzhou (China)	ffzz101@163.com
	He Qinghua (China)	capt_he@163.com
	Liu Tong (China)	tonel@163.com
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Jan Willem Verhoeff (Netherlands)	verhoeff@stc-r.nl
4	Johanne Marie Trovåg (Norway)	johanne.trovag@hsh.no
	Elin Kvamsøy Sjursen (Norway)	elin.sjursenkvamsoy@sjofartsdir.no
5	Diofonce Tunacao (Philippines)	diofonce.tunacao@yahoo.com
	Alfredo G. Haboc (Philippines)	ahaboc@philcamsat.com.ph
	Joseph Raluta (Philippines)	jraluta@yahoo.com.ph
	Arsenio Jr. Padilla (Philippines)	arspadilla@yahoo.com
6	Zbigniew Byczynski (Poland)	byczynski@morska.eolu.pl
7	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
	Chong-ju Chae (Republic of Korea)	katheshe76@naver.com
8	Sergey Aysinov (Russian Federation)	saysinov@mtc.spb.su
9	Zulfiqur Husain (Singapore)	zulfiqur_husain@mpa.gov.sg
10	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
	Roger Towner (United Kingdom)	roger.towner@mcga.gov.uk
11	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
12	Vadym Zakharchenko (IAMU)	zvn@onma.edu.ua
13	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 5

Review Group on model course 1.30 on On-board Assessment

Course Developer/Coordinator: IAMU and IMLA

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Han Jiexiang (China)	jsmsagtl@163.com
	Li Huilan(Ms) (China)	lihuilan_gz@126.com
	Rao Gunjin (China)	Raogunjin@lnmsa.gov.cn
	Fan Zhongzhou (China)	ffzz101@163.com
	He Qinghua (China)	capt_he@163.com
	Liu Tong (China)	tonel@163.com
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Diofonce Tunacao (Philippines)	diofonce.tunacao@yahoo.com
	Alfredo G. Haboc (Philippines)	ahaboc@philcamsat.com.ph
	Joseph Raluta (Philippines)	jraluta@yahoo.com.ph
	Arsenio Jr. Padilla (Philippines)	arspadilla@yahoo.com
4	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
	Chong-ju Chae (Republic of Korea)	katheshe76@naver.com
5	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
6	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
7	Vadym Zakharchenko (IAMU)	zvn@onma.edu.ua
8	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 6

Review Group on new model course on Basic training for ships subject to the IGF Code

Course Developer/Coordinator: Norway

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Bernhard Löbermann M.A. (Germany)	bernhard.loebermann@dnvgl.com
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Pierre Jean Person (Marchall Islands)	pjperson@register-iri.com
4	Arsenio Jr. Padilla (Philippines)	arspadilla@yahoo.com
5	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
6	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
	Richard Wilby (United Kingdom)	richard.wilby@mcga.gov.uk
	Mamun Rahman (United Kingdom)	mamun.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
7	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
8	Vadym Zakharchenko (IAMU)	zvn@onma.edu.ua
9	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz

APPENDIX 7

Review Group on new model course on Advanced training for ships subject to the IGF Code

Course Developer/Coordinator: Norway

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Bernhard Löbermann M.A. (Germany)	bernhard.loebermann@dnvgl.com
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Pierre Jean Person (Marchall Islands)	pjperson@register-iri.com
4	Arsenio Jr. Padilla (Philippines)	arspadilla@yahoo.com
5	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
6	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
7	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
8	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz

APPENDIX 8

Review Group on new model course on Basic training for ships operating in polar waters

Course Developer: Argentina, Canada, Chile, Finland, Norway,
New Zealand, the United States and CLIA

Coordinator: Canada

Members of the Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Torsten Mathias Augustsen (Denmark)	tau@dma.dk
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Pierre Jean Person (Marchall Islands)	pjperson@register-iri.com
4	Wibbo Hofman (Netherlands)	hofmanw@nhl.nl
5	Joseph Raluta (Philippines)	jraluta@yahoo.com.ph
6	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
	Youngtae Kwon (Republic of Korea)	nel1083@nate.com
7	Sergey Aysinov (Russian Federation)	saysinov@mtc.spb.su
8	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
	Richard Wilby (United Kingdom)	richard.wilby@mcga.gov.uk
9	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
10	Vadym Zakharchenko (IAMU)	zvn@onma.edu.ua
11	Odd Rune Malterud (ITF)	Odd.Rune.Malterud@dnmf.no
12	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 9

Review Group on new model course on Advanced training for ships operating in polar waters

Course Developer: Argentina, Canada, Chile, Finland, Norway, New Zealand, the United States and CLIA

Coordinator: Canada

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Torsten Mathias Augustsen (Denmark)	tau@dma.dk
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Pierre Jean Person (Marchall Islands)	pjperson@register-iri.com
4	Wibbo Hofman (Netherlands)	hofmanw@nhl.nl
5	Joseph Raluta (Philippines)	jraluta@yahoo.com.ph
	Arsenio Jr. Padilla (Philippines)	arspadilla@yahoo.com
6	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
7	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
8	Odd Rune Malterud (ITF)	Odd.Rune.Malterud@dnmf.no
9	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 10

Review Group on new model course on Ratings as Able seafarer deck

Course Developer/Coordinator: Germany

Members of the Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	Liming, Lu (China)	luliming@msa.gov.cn
2	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
3	Diofonce Tunacao (Philippines)	diofonce.tunacao@yahoo.com
4	Zbigniew Byczynski (Poland)	byczynski@morska.eolu.pl
5	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
6	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
	Richard Wilby (United Kingdom)	richard.wilby@mcga.gov.uk
7	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
8	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

APPENDIX 11

Review Group on model course 2.07 on the use of Engine-room Simulation for training and assessment of seafarers in the engine department

Course Developer/Coordinator: Turkey

Members of Review Group

No.	Name	Email
1	S.M. Nazmul Huq (Bangladesh)	esse@dos.gov.bd
2	Lianzhong Huang (China)	juanglianzhong@vip.sia.com
3	Kersi N. Deboo (India)	kndeboo@angloeasterngroup.com
4	Pierre Jean Person (Marshall Islands)	pjperson@register-iri.com
5	Zbigniew Byczynski (Poland)	byczynski@morska.eolu.pl
6	Byeonggeun Chae (Republic of Korea)	bgchae@seaman.or.kr
7	Majibur Rahman (United Kingdom)	majibur.rahman@mcga.gov.uk
	Forkanul Quader (United Kingdom)	forknaul.quader@mcga.gov.uk
8	Davis Breyer (United States)	davis.j.breyer@uscg.mil
9	Tim Wilson (GlobalMET)	tim.wilson@manukau.ac.nz
	Vinayak Mohla (GlobalMET)	mohlav@angloeastern.com

ANNEX 2

DRAFT FRAMEWORK FOR A GISIS MODULE RELATING TO REPORTING AND INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS UNDER ARTICLES IV, VIII AND IX OF THE STCW CONVENTION

Reporting and information communication requirements under articles IV, VII, IX of the STCW Convention and Section A-1/7 of the STCW Code

No.	STCW reference No.	Description	Reporting time	Type of Information ¹	Transparency ²
Article IV of the STCW Convention					
1	Article IV(1)(a)	The text of laws, decrees, orders, regulations and instruments promulgated on the various matters within the scope of the Convention	As soon as practicable	TEXT	All Parties
2	Article IV(1)(b)	Full details, where appropriate, of contents and duration of study courses, together with their national examination and other requirements for each certificate issued in compliance with the Convention			Restricted
3	Article IV(1)(c)	Sufficient number of specimen certificates issued in compliance with the Convention			

¹ There are two types of information references:
TEXT: refers to detailed information submitted to Secretary-General or the Organization.
RESULT: refers to summarized outcome/output from the Secretary-General or the Organization as described by the STCW Convention and Code

² There are two types of transparency references:
ALL PARTIES: refers to information that would be available to all Parties.
RESTRICTED: refers to information that would be available only to Parties identified by the reporting Party.

No.	STCW reference No.	Description	Reporting time	Type of Information ¹	Transparency ²
Article VIII of the STCW Convention					
4	Article VIII(3)	Report to the Secretary-General giving information of the total number of dispensations in respect of each capacity for which a certificate is required that have been issued during the year to seagoing ships, together with information as to the numbers of those ships above and below 1,600 gross register tons respectively	As soon as possible after 1 January of each year		All Parties
Article IX of the STCW Convention					
5	Article IX(2)	Details of arrangements described in article IX(1) ³ shall be reported as early as practicable to the Secretary-General who shall circulate such particulars to all Parties	As early as practicable	TEXT	All Parties

³ Article IX(1): The Convention shall not prevent an Administration from retaining or adopting other educational and training arrangements, including those involving seagoing service and shipboard organization especially adapted to technical developments and to special types of ships and trades, provided that the level of seagoing service, knowledge and efficiency as regards navigational and technical handling of ship and cargo ensures a degree of safety at sea and has a preventive effect as regards pollution at least equivalent to the requirements of the Convention.

ANNEX 3

DRAFT PRINCIPLES AND PROVISIONAL SCOPE FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE 1995 STCW-F CONVENTION

PRINCIPLES¹

The following principles are proposed for the comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention:

- 1 The principal objective of the review should be to ensure that the proposed revised Annex to the 1995 STCW-F Convention provides internationally agreed minimum standards of professional competence for personnel serving on board seagoing fishing vessels commensurate with the need to ensure safe operational practices, safety of life at sea and protection of the marine environment.
- 2 The review should not downscale existing standards and requirements of the Convention.
- 3 The review should address inconsistencies, interpretations, MSC instructions, clarifications already issued, outdated requirements and technological advances;
- 4 The review should provide for flexibility in terms of compliance, and for required levels of training and certification and watchkeeping arrangements due to innovation in technology;
- 5 The Convention should aim to establish the standards of competence to be achieved and should allow Administrations to adopt training arrangements which are best suited to their own infrastructure and resources, provided that the level of competence required for certification is attained.
- 6 As an alternative to the requirements for certification embodied in the present Convention, the revised Annex to the Convention should provide for a "functional approach" to certification, to ensure that the required standards of professional competence are being attained. A "functional approach" allows the establishment of standards of competence in specified maritime skills required for safe operational practices, safety of life and property at sea and protection of the marine environment, whatever the shipboard organization.
- 7 The effective use of simulators and other modern training techniques and equipment should be considered in the review, including provisions and guidance on their use such as the assessment of standards of competence and the remission of seagoing requirements.
- 8 The review should consider the extent to which the existing control system adequately verifies compliance.
- 9 The review should address training requirements for effective communication; and
- 10 The review should give consideration to the reduction of unnecessary administrative burdens.

¹ The order in which the principles are listed is not intended to indicate prioritization.

PROVISIONAL SCOPE

The provisional scope for the comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention should take into account the following:

- 1 the articles of the Convention should not to be amended; and
- 2 the amendments should take into account the unique nature of the fishing industry, the fishing working environment and prevention of damage to the marine environment;

The following list of items is intended only to suggest the scope of the comprehensive review. Inclusion of a particular item on this list should not be viewed at this early stage as suggesting agreement has been reached on the need for any specific revisions to the STCW-F Convention.

1 General

- .1 consideration should be given to introducing GT as an alternative measurement to fishing vessel length;
- .2 the structure of the Annex of the Convention should be reviewed. In the course of this review, the need for a mandatory section and a guidance section may be considered;
- .3 consideration should be given to introducing standards for medical fitness;
- .4 consideration should be given to the scope of qualifications covered by the Convention;
- .5 consideration should be given to the training of deck-hands on board as reflected in resolution 4 of the STCW-F Conference, 1995;
- .6 consideration should be given to the training of skippers on fishing vessels [equal or more than 12 metres in length and] less than 24 metres in length;
- .7 consideration should be given to refer to other international instruments that may provide further guidance;
- .8 consideration should be given to introducing a control system; and
- .9 consideration should be given to address training requirements for effective communication.

2 Chapter II of the Annex of the Convention

- .1 the period of seagoing service for certification should be reviewed;
- .2 consideration should be given to introducing and clarifying criteria of competence;
- .3 consideration should be given to introducing simulator training for demonstrating competence; and

- .4 consideration should be given to reviewing the period of the approved seagoing service or equivalent for the revalidation requirements.

3 Chapter III of the Annex of the Convention

- .1 consideration should be given to clarifying the levels of basic safety training for all fishing vessel personnel.

4 Chapter IV of the Annex of the Convention

- .1 consideration should be given to the issue of rest hours.

ANNEX 4

DRAFT ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION

Adopted on [...]

**REVISED GUIDELINES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
SAFETY MANAGEMENT CODE (ISM) CODE BY ADMINISTRATIONS**

THE ASSEMBLY,

RECALLING Article 15(j) of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization concerning the functions of the Assembly in relation to regulations and guidelines concerning maritime safety and the prevention and control of marine pollution from ships,

RECALLING ALSO resolution A.741(18) by which it adopted the *International Management Code for the Safe Operation of Ships and for Pollution Prevention* (International Safety Management (ISM) Code),

RECALLING FURTHER resolution A.788(19) by which it adopted the *Guidelines on implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Administrations*,

NOTING that the ISM Code became mandatory, under the provisions of chapter IX of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), 1974, as amended, for companies operating certain types of ships, on 1 July 1998; and for companies operating other cargo ships and mobile offshore drilling units propelled by mechanical means of 500 gross tonnage and upwards, on 1 July 2002,

NOTING ALSO that the Maritime Safety Committee, at its ninety-second session, adopted, by resolution MSC.353(92), amendments to the ISM Code,

NOTING FURTHER resolution A.1071(28) by which it adopted the *Revised guidelines on the implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Administrations*,

RECOGNIZING that an Administration, in establishing that safety standards are being maintained, has a responsibility to ensure that Documents of Compliance and Safety Management Certificates have been issued in accordance with the ISM Code taking into account the aforementioned Guidelines,

RECOGNIZING ALSO that there may be a need for Administrations to enter into agreements in respect of the issue of certificates by other Administrations in compliance with chapter IX of the 1974 SOLAS Convention and in accordance with resolution A.741(18),

RECOGNIZING FURTHER the need for uniform implementation of the ISM Code,

HAVING CONSIDERED the recommendations made by the Marine Environment Protection Committee, at its [...] session, and the Maritime Safety Committee, at its [...] session,

1 ADOPTS the *Revised guidelines on implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Administrations*, as set out in the annex to the present resolution;

2 URGES Governments, when implementing the ISM Code, to adhere to the Revised guidelines;

3 REQUESTS Governments to inform the Organization of any difficulties they may experience when using the Revised guidelines;

4 AUTHORIZES the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee to keep the Revised guidelines under review and to amend or revise them as necessary in accordance with the rules and procedures of the Committees and issue it as an MSC/MEPC circular;

5 REVOKES resolution 1071(28) with effect from [...].

ANNEX

**REVISED GUIDELINES ON THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE ISM CODE BY ADMINISTRATIONS**

Table of contents

1	INTRODUCTION
1.1	The ISM Code
1.2	Mandatory application of the ISM Code
1.3	Verification and certification responsibilities
2	SCOPE AND APPLICATION
2.1	Definitions
2.2	Scope and application
3	VERIFYING COMPLIANCE WITH THE ISM CODE
3.1	General
3.2	Ability of the safety management system to meet general safety management objectives
3.3	Ability of the safety management system to meet specific requirements of safety and pollution prevention
4	CERTIFICATION AND VERIFICATION PROCESS
4.1	Certification and verification activities
4.2	Interim verification
4.3	Initial verification
4.4	Annual verification of Document of Compliance
4.5	Intermediate verification of Safety Management Certificates
4.6	Renewal verification
4.7	Additional verification
4.8	Safety management audits
4.9	Application for audit
4.10	Preliminary review (Document review)
4.11	Preparing the audit
4.12	Executing the audit
4.13	Audit report
4.14	Corrective action follow-up
4.15	Company responsibilities pertaining to safety management audits
4.16	Responsibilities of the organization performing the ISM Code certification
4.17	Responsibilities of the verification team

Appendix – STANDARDS ON ISM CODE CERTIFICATION ARRANGEMENTS

1	INTRODUCTION
2	STANDARD OF MANAGEMENT

3 STANDARDS OF COMPETENCE

3.1 ISM Code certification scheme management

3.2 Basic competence for performing verification

~~3.3 Competence for initial verification and renewal verification~~

3.3 Practical Training for performing verification

~~3.4 Competence for annual, intermediate and interim verification~~

4 QUALIFICATION ARRANGEMENTS

5 CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES AND INSTRUCTIONS

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 The ISM Code

1.1.1 The *International Management Code for the Safe Operation of Ships and for Pollution Prevention (International Safety Management (ISM) Code)* was adopted by the Organization by resolution A.741(18) and became mandatory by virtue of the entry into force, on 1 July 1998, of SOLAS chapter IX on Management for the Safe Operation of Ships. The ISM Code provides an international standard for the safe management and operation of ships and for pollution prevention.

~~1.1.2 The Maritime Safety Committee, at its ninety-second session held in June 2013, adopted amendments to sections 3, 6, 12 and 14 and footnotes of the ISM Code by resolution MSC.353(92). As a result it was necessary to revise the *Guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations (resolution A.1022(26))*, which are superseded by these Revised Guidelines.~~

1.1.32 The ISM Code requires that companies establish safety objectives as described in section 1.2 (Objectives) of the ISM Code and, in addition, that companies develop, implement and maintain a safety management system which includes functional requirements as listed in the Code's section 1.4 (Functional requirements for a safety management system).

1.1.43 The application of the ISM Code should support and encourage the development of a safety culture in shipping. Success factors for the development of a culture that promotes safety and environmental protection are, inter alia, commitment, values, beliefs and clarity of the safety management system.

1.2 Mandatory application of the ISM Code

1.2.1 The appropriate organization of management, ashore and on board, is needed to ensure adequate standards of safety and pollution prevention. A systematic approach to management by those responsible for management of ships is therefore required. The objectives of the mandatory application of the ISM Code are to ensure:

- .1 compliance with mandatory rules and regulations related to the safe operation of ships and protection of the environment; and
- .2 the effective implementation and enforcement thereof by Administrations.

1.2.2. Effective enforcement by Administrations must include verification that the safety management system complies with the requirements as stipulated in the ISM Code, as well as verification of compliance with mandatory rules and regulations.

1.2.3 The mandatory application of the ISM Code should ensure, support and encourage that applicable codes, guidelines and standards recommended by the Organization, Administrations, classification societies and maritime industry organizations are taken into account.

1.3 Verification and certification responsibilities

1.3.1 The Administration is responsible for verifying compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code and for issuing Documents of Compliance to companies and Safety Management Certificates to ships.

1.3.2 The *Guidelines for the authorization of organizations acting on behalf of the Administration* (resolution A.739(18)) and the *Specifications on the survey and certification functions of recognized organizations acting on behalf of the Administration* (resolution A.789(19)), which have been made mandatory by virtue of SOLAS regulation XI/1, and the *Guidelines to assist flag States in the implementation of IMO instruments* (resolution A.847(20)) are applicable when Administrations authorize organizations to issue Documents of Compliance and Safety Management Certificates on their behalf.

2 SCOPE AND APPLICATION

2.1 Definitions

The terms used in these Revised guidelines have the same meaning as those given in the ISM Code.

2.2 Scope and application

These Revised guidelines establish basic principles for:

- .1 verifying that the safety management system of a Company responsible for the operation of ships, or the safety management system for the ship or ships controlled by the Company, complies with the ISM Code;
- .2 carrying out the interim, initial, annual and renewal verification of the Document of Compliance and the interim, initial, intermediate and renewal verification(s) of the Safety Management Certificate and the issuing/endorsement of corresponding documents; and
- .3 the scope of the additional verification.

3 VERIFYING COMPLIANCE WITH THE ISM CODE

3.1 General

3.1.1 To comply with the requirements of the ISM Code, companies should develop, implement and maintain a documented safety management system to ensure that the safety and environmental protection policy of the Company is implemented. The Company policy should include the objectives defined by the ISM Code.

3.1.2 Administrations should verify compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code by determining:

- .1 the conformity of the Company's safety management system with the requirements of the ISM Code; and
- .2 that the safety management system ensures that the objectives defined in paragraph 1.2.3 of the ISM Code are met.

3.1.3 Determining the conformity or non-conformity of safety management system elements with the requirements specified by the ISM Code may demand that criteria for assessment be developed. Administrations are recommended to limit the development of criteria in the form of prescriptive management system solutions. Criteria for assessment in the form of prescriptive requirements may have the effect that safety management in shipping results in companies implementing solutions prepared by others, and it may then be difficult

for a Company to develop the solutions which best suit that particular Company, operation or ship. Therefore, particular operations should be ship-specific and fully reflected in manuals, procedures and instructions.

3.1.4 Therefore, Administrations are recommended to ensure that these assessments are based on determining the effectiveness of the safety management system in meeting specified objectives, rather than conformity with detailed requirements in addition to those contained in the ISM Code, so as to reduce the need for developing criteria to facilitate assessment of the companies' compliance with the Code.

3.2 Ability of the safety management system to meet general safety management objectives

The ISM Code identifies general safety management objectives in section 1.2.2. The verification should support and encourage companies in achieving these objectives, which provide clear guidance to companies for the development of safety management system elements in compliance with the ISM Code. However, the ability of the safety management system to achieve these objectives cannot be determined beyond whether the safety management system complies with the requirements of the ISM Code. Therefore, the objectives should not form the basis for establishing detailed interpretations to be used for determining conformity or non-conformity with the requirements of the ISM Code.

3.3 Ability of the safety management system to meet specific requirements of safety and pollution prevention

3.3.1 The main criterion which should govern the development of interpretations needed for assessing compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code should be the ability of the safety management system to meet the specific requirements defined by the ISM Code in terms of specific standards of safety and pollution prevention. The specific standards of safety and protection of the environment are specified in section 1.2.3 of the ISM Code.

3.3.2 All records having the potential to facilitate verification of compliance with the ISM Code should be open to scrutiny during an examination. These may include records from delegated SMS tasks. For this purpose, the Administration should ensure that the Company provides auditors with statutory and classification records relevant to the actions taken by the Company to ensure that compliance with mandatory rules and regulations is maintained. In this regard, the records may be examined to substantiate their authenticity and veracity.

3.3.3 Some mandatory requirements may not be subject to statutory or classification surveys, such as:

- .1 maintaining the condition of ship and equipment between surveys; and
- .2 certain operational requirements.

3.3.4 Specific arrangements may be required to ensure compliance with the ISM Code and to provide the objective evidence needed for verification in these cases, such as:

- .1 documented procedures and instructions;
- .2 documentation of the verification carried out by senior officers of day-to-day operations when relevant to ensure compliance; and
- .3 relevant records of the ships being operated by the Company, e.g. flag State records, port State controls, class and accident reports.

3.3.5 The verification of compliance with mandatory rules and regulations, which is part of the ISM Code certification, neither duplicates nor substitutes surveys for other maritime certificates. The verification of compliance with the ISM Code does not relieve the Company, the master or any other entity or person involved in the management or operation of the ship of their responsibilities.

3.3.6 Administrations should ensure that the Company has:

- .1 taken into account the recommendations, as referred to in paragraph 1.2.3.2 of the ISM Code, when establishing and maintaining the safety management system; and
- .2 developed procedures to ensure that these recommendations are implemented ashore and on board.

4 CERTIFICATION AND VERIFICATION PROCESS

4.1 Certification and verification activities

4.1.1 The certification process relevant to a Document of Compliance for a Company and to a Safety Management Certificate for a ship will normally involve the following steps:

- .1 interim verification;
- .2 initial verification;
- .3 annual or intermediate verification;
- .4 renewal verification; and
- .5 additional verification.

4.1.2 These verifications are carried out at the request of the Company to the Administration, or to the organization recognized by the Administration to perform certification functions under the ISM Code, or the verifications are carried out at the request of the Administration by another Contracting Government to the SOLAS Convention. The verifications will include an audit of the safety management system.

4.2 Interim verification

4.2.1 Interim certification may be issued under certain conditions as specified by the ISM Code and should facilitate the implementation of a safety management system.

4.2.2 The Company should apply for interim certification to the Administration.

4.2.3 The process of interim Document of Compliance verification of the management system undertaken by the Administration would require an assessment at the Company's offices in accordance with paragraph 14.1 of the ISM Code.

4.2.4 On satisfactory completion of the assessment of the shoreside safety management system, arrangements/planning may commence for the assessment of applicable ships in the Company's fleet.

4.2.5 The process of interim verification of the ship should be undertaken by the Administration to ensure that the ship is provided with a safety management system, in accordance with paragraph 14.4 of the ISM Code.

4.2.6 On satisfactory completion of the interim verification, an Interim Document of Compliance will be issued to the Company; copies should be made available by the Company to every shoreside premises and each applicable ship in the Company's fleet. As each ship is assessed and issued with an Interim Safety Management Certificate, a copy of the certificate should also be forwarded to the Company's head office.

4.3 Initial verification

4.3.1 The Company should apply for ISM Code certification to the Administration.

4.3.2 An assessment of the shoreside management system undertaken by the Administration would necessitate assessment of the offices where such management is carried out and possibly of other locations which may include delegated safety management system tasks, depending on the Company's organization and the functions at the various locations.

4.3.3 On satisfactory completion of the assessment of the shoreside safety management system, arrangements/planning may commence for the assessment of the Company's ships.

4.3.4 On satisfactory completion of the assessment, a Document of Compliance will be issued to the Company, copies of which should be made available to each shoreside premises and each ship in the Company's fleet. As each ship is assessed and issued with a Safety Management Certificate, a copy of it should also be forwarded to the Company's head office.

4.3.5 In cases where certificates are issued by a recognized organization, copies of all certificates should also be sent to the Administration.

4.3.6 The safety management audit for the Company and for a ship will involve the same basic steps. The purpose is to verify that a Company or a ship complies with the requirements of the ISM Code. The audits include:

- .1 verification of the conformity of the Company's safety management system with the requirements of the ISM Code, including objective evidence demonstrating that the Company's safety management system has been in operation for at least three months and that a safety management system has been in operation on board at least one ship of each type operated by the Company for at least three months; and
- .2 verification that the safety management system ensures that the objectives defined in paragraph 1.2.3 of the ISM Code are met. This includes verification that the Document of Compliance for the Company responsible for the operation of the ship is applicable to that particular type of ship, and it includes assessment of the shipboard safety management system to verify that it complies with the requirements of the ISM Code and that it is implemented. Objective evidence demonstrating that the Company's safety management system has been functioning effectively for at least three months on board the ship and ashore should be available, including, inter alia, records from the internal audit performed by the Company.

4.4 Annual verification of Document of Compliance

4.4.1 Annual safety management audits are to be carried out to maintain the validity of the Document of Compliance, and should include examining and verifying the correctness of the statutory and classification records presented for at least one ship of each type to which the Document of Compliance applies. The annual verification will address all the elements of the safety management system and the activities to which the requirements of the ISM Code apply. The purpose of these audits is to verify the effective functioning of the safety management system, and that any modifications made to the safety management system comply with the requirements of the ISM Code.

4.4.2 Annual verification is to be carried out within three months before and after each anniversary date of the Document of Compliance.

4.4.3 Where the Company has more than one shoreside premises and/or delegates safety management system tasks, the annual assessments should endeavour to ensure that all sites are assessed during the period of validity of the Document of Compliance.

4.4.4 During the annual verification, administrations should verify if the Company is operating all ship types on the Document of Compliance. Appropriate action should be taken if the Company has stopped operating a particular ship type.

4.5 Intermediate verification of Safety Management Certificates

4.5.1 Intermediate safety management audits should be carried out to maintain the validity of the Safety Management Certificate. The intermediate verification will address all the elements of the safety management system and the activities to which the requirements of the ISM Code apply. The purpose of these audits is to verify the effective functioning of the safety management system and that any modifications made to the safety management system comply with the requirements of the ISM Code. In certain cases, particularly during the initial period of operation under the safety management system, the Administration may find it necessary to increase the frequency of the intermediate verification. Additionally, the nature of non-conformities may also provide a basis for increasing the frequency of intermediate verifications.

4.5.2 If only one intermediate verification is to be carried out, it should take place between the second and third anniversary date of the issue of the Safety Management Certificate.

4.6 Renewal verification

Renewal verifications are to be performed before the validity of the Document of Compliance or the Safety Management Certificate expires. The renewal verification will address all the elements of the safety management system and the activities to which the requirements of the ISM Code apply. Renewal verification may be carried out from three months before the date of expiry of the Document of Compliance or the Safety Management Certificate, and should be completed before the date of expiry.

4.7 Additional verification

4.7.1 The Administration may, where there are clear grounds, require an additional verification to check if the safety management system still functions effectively. Additional verifications may be carried out following situations beyond normal procedures such as port State control detentions, or in the case of reactivation after the interruption of the operations due to a period out of service, or in order to verify that effective corrective actions have been taken and/or are being properly implemented. Additional verifications may affect the shore-based organization and/or the shipboard management system. The Administration

should determine the scope and depth of the verification, which may vary from case to case. The additional verifications should be completed within the time period agreed, taking into account guidelines developed by the Organization. The Administration should follow up on the results of the verification and take appropriate measures, as necessary.

4.7.2 On satisfactory completion of the shipboard assessment, the Safety Management Certificate should be endorsed for additional verification.

4.8 Safety management audits

The procedure for safety management audits outlined in the following paragraphs includes all steps relevant for all initial verifications. Safety management audits for the interim, annual, intermediate, and additional and renewal verification should be based on the same principles, even if their scope may be different from initial, annual, intermediate and renewal verification.

4.9 Application for audit

4.9.1 The Company should submit a request for audit to the Administration or to the organization recognized by the Administration for issuing a Document of Compliance or a Safety Management Certificate on behalf of the Administration.

4.9.2 The Administration or the recognized organization should then nominate the lead auditor and, if relevant, the audit team.

4.10 Preliminary review (Document review)

As a basis for planning the audit, the auditor should review the safety management manual to determine the adequacy of the safety management system in meeting the requirements of the ISM Code. If this review reveals that the system is not adequate, the audit will have to be delayed until the Company undertakes corrective action.

4.11 Preparing the audit

4.11.1 The auditor should review the relevant safety performance records of the Company and take them into consideration when preparing the audit plan, for example, flag State records, port State controls, and class and accident reports.

4.11.2 The nominated lead auditor should liaise with the Company and produce an audit plan.

4.11.3 The auditor should provide the working documents which are to govern the execution of the audit in order to facilitate the assessments, investigations and examinations in accordance with the standard procedures, instructions and forms which have been established to ensure consistent auditing practices.

4.11.4 The audit team should be able to communicate effectively with auditees.

4.12 Executing the audit

4.12.1 The audit should start with an opening meeting in order to introduce the audit team to the Company's senior management, summarize the methods for conducting the audit, confirm that all agreed facilities are available, confirm time and date for a closing meeting and clarify possible unclear details relevant to the audit.

4.12.2 The audit team should assess the safety management system on the basis of the documentation presented by the Company, and objective evidence as to its effective implementation.

4.12.3 The objective evidence should be collected through interviews and examination of documents. Observation of activities and conditions may also be included when necessary to determine the effectiveness of the safety management system in meeting the specific standards of safety and protection of the environment required by the ISM Code.

4.12.4 Audit findings should be documented. After activities have been audited, the audit team should review the objective evidence collected. This should then be used to determine what is to be reported as major non-conformities, non-conformities or observations, and should be reported in terms of the general and specific provisions of the ISM Code.

4.12.5 At the end of the audit, prior to preparing the audit report, the audit team should hold a meeting with the senior management of the Company and those responsible for the functions concerned. The purpose is to present the observations in such a way as to ensure that the results of the audit are clearly understood.

4.13 Audit report

4.13.1 The audit report should be prepared under the direction of the lead auditor, who is responsible for its accuracy and completeness.

4.13.2 The audit report should include the audit plan, identification of audit team members, dates and identification of the Company, and observations on any non-conformities and on the effectiveness of the safety management system in meeting the specified objectives.

4.13.3 The Company should receive a copy of the audit report. The Company should be advised to provide a copy of the shipboard audit reports to the ship.

4.14 Corrective action follow-up

4.14.1 The Company is responsible for determining and initiating the corrective action needed to correct a non-conformity or to correct the cause of the non-conformity. Failure to correct non-conformities with specific requirements of the ISM Code may affect the validity of the Document of Compliance and related Safety Management Certificates.

4.14.2 Corrective actions and possible subsequent audits should be completed within the time period agreed. For corrective actions this should not normally exceed three months. The Company should apply for the follow-up audits as agreed.

4.14.3 Failure to take adequate corrective actions, in compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code, including measures to prevent recurrence, may be considered as a major non-conformity.

4.15 Company responsibilities pertaining to safety management audits

4.15.1 The verification of compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code does not relieve the Company, management, those undertaking delegated safety management system tasks, officers or seafarers of their obligations as to compliance with national and international legislation related to safety and protection of the environment.

4.15.2 The Company is responsible for:

- .1 informing relevant employees and those undertaking delegated safety management system tasks about the objectives and scope of the ISM Code certification;
- .2 appointing responsible members of staff to accompany members of the team performing the certification;
- .3 providing the resources needed by those performing the certification to ensure an effective and efficient verification process;
- .4 providing access and evidential material as requested by those performing the certification; and
- .5 cooperating with the verification team to permit the certification objectives to be achieved.

4.15.3 Where major non-conformities are identified, Administrations and recognized organizations (ROs) should comply with the procedures stated in the *Procedures concerning observed ISM Code major non-conformities* (MSC/Circ.1059-MEPC/Circ.401).

4.16 Responsibilities of the organization performing the ISM Code certification

The organization performing the ISM Code certification is responsible for ensuring that the verification and certification process is performed according to the ISM Code and these Revised guidelines. This includes management control of all aspects of the certification according to the appendix to these Revised guidelines.

4.17 Responsibilities of the verification team

4.17.1 Whether or not the verifications involved with certification are performed by a team, one person should be in charge of the verification. The leader should be given the authority to make final decisions regarding the conduct of the verification and any observations. His responsibilities should include:

- .1 preparation of a plan for the verification; and
- .2 submission of the report of the verification.

4.17.2 Personnel participating in the verification are responsible for complying with the requirements governing the verification, ensuring confidentiality of documents pertaining to the certification and treating privileged information with discretion.

APPENDIX

STANDARDS ON ISM CODE CERTIFICATION ARRANGEMENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

The audit team involved with ISM Code certification and the organization under which it may be managed should comply with the specific requirements stated in this appendix.

2 STANDARD OF MANAGEMENT

2.1 Organizations managing verification of compliance with the ISM Code should have, in their own organization, competence in relation to:

- .1 ensuring compliance with the rules and regulations, including certification of seafarers, for the ships operated by the Company;
- .2 approval, survey and certification activities;
- .3 the terms of reference that must be taken into account under the safety management system as required by the ISM Code; and
- .4 practical experience of ship operation.

2.2 The Convention requires that organizations recognized by Administrations for issuing a Document of Compliance and a Safety Management Certificate at their request should comply with resolution A.739(18) on *Guidelines for the authorization of organizations acting on behalf of the Administration* and resolution A.789(19) on *Specifications on the survey and certification functions of recognized organizations acting on behalf of the Administration*.

2.3 Any organization performing verification of compliance with the provisions of the ISM Code should ensure that there exists independence between the personnel providing consultancy services and those involved in the certification procedure.

3 STANDARDS OF COMPETENCE

3.1 ISM Code certification scheme management

Management of ISM Code certification schemes should be carried out by those who have practical knowledge of ISM Code certification procedures and practices.

3.2 Basic competence for performing verification

3.2.1 Personnel who are to participate in the verification of compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code should have **at least five years' experience in areas relevant to the technical or operational aspects of safety management and a minimum of formal education comprising the following:**

- .1 qualifications from a tertiary institution recognized by the Administration or by the recognized organization within a relevant field of engineering or physical science (minimum two years programme); or
- .2 qualifications from a marine or nautical institution and relevant seagoing experience as a certified ship officer.

3.2.2 They should have undergone training to ensure and be able to demonstrate adequate competence and skills for performing verification of compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code, particularly with regard to:

- .1 principles and practice of management systems auditing;
- .12 knowledge and understanding the requirements of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code and its interpretation and application;
- .23 mandatory rules and regulations and applicable codes, guidelines and standards recommended by IMO, flag States, classification societies and maritime industry organization; and
- .3 the terms of reference which the ISM Code requires that companies should take into account;
- .4 assessment techniques of examining, questioning, evaluating and reporting;
- .5 technical or operational aspects of safety management;
- .64 basic knowledge of shipping and shipboard operations, including emergency preparedness and response; and
- .7 participation in at least one marine-related management system audit.

3.2.3 Such competence should be demonstrated through written or oral examinations, or other acceptable means.

3.3 Competence for initial verification and renewal verification

3.2.3 The time spent and the level of detail that is necessary on each of the topics listed in paragraph 3.2.2 should be appropriate to the qualifications and experience of the trainees, their existing competence in each subject, and the number of training audits to be carried out.

3.3.12.4 In order to assess fully whether the Company or the ship complies with the requirements of the ISM Code, in addition to the basic competence stated under paragraphs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 above, personnel who are to perform initial verifications or renewal verifications for a Document of Compliance or a Safety Management Certificate must possess the competence to:

- .1 determine whether the safety management system elements conform or do not conform with the requirements of the ISM Code;
- .2 determine the effectiveness of the Company's safety management system, or that of the ship, in order to ensure compliance with rules and regulations as evidenced by the statutory and classification survey records;
- .3 assess the effectiveness of the safety management system to ensure compliance with other rules and regulations which are not covered by statutory and classification surveys and to enable verification of compliance with these rules and regulations; and

- .4 assess whether the safe practices recommended by the Organization, Administrations, classification societies and maritime industry organizations have been taken into account.

3.3.22.5 This competence can be accomplished by teams that together possess the total competence required.

~~3.3.32.6 Personnel who are to be in charge of initial verification or renewal verification of compliance with the requirements of the ISM Code should have at least five years' experience in areas relevant to the technical or operational aspects of safety management, and should have participated in at least three initial verifications or renewal verifications.~~ Participation in verification of compliance with other management standards may be considered as equivalent to participation in verification of compliance with the ISM Code.

3.3 Practical Training for performing verification

3.3.1 In order to acquire the competences set out in paragraph 3.2.2 above, a person authorized to carry out ISM audits must have completed at least four training audits under the supervision of suitably qualified and experienced auditors and in accordance with the following criteria:

- .1 at least one of the ISM audits must be a company audit;
- .2 at least one of the ISM audits must be a shipboard audit; and
- .3 the training audits may be initial, renewal, annual or intermediate audits. Additional audits may be used, but only where they are fully scoped audits covering all elements of the ISM Code and all aspects of the management system.

3.3.2 The training audits described in paragraph 3.3.1 above constitute the minimum requirement, and procedures should be established for ensuring and demonstrating that the competences required in paragraph 3.2.2 have been achieved. The final number of training audits should be sufficient not only to demonstrate competence, but also to ensure that the prospective auditor has had sufficient practice to provide the confidence necessary to work alone.

3.4 Competence for annual, intermediate and interim verification

~~Personnel who are to perform annual, intermediate and interim verifications should satisfy basic requirements for personnel participating in verifications and should have participated in a minimum of two annual, renewal or initial verifications. They should have received the special instructions needed to ensure that they possess the competence required to determine the effectiveness of the Company's safety management system.~~

4 QUALIFICATION ARRANGEMENTS

Organizations performing ISM Code certification should have implemented a documented system for qualification and continuous updating of the knowledge and competence of personnel who are to perform verification of compliance with the ISM Code. This system should comprise theoretical training courses covering all the competence requirements and the appropriate procedures connected to the certification process, as well as practical tutored training, and it should provide documented evidence of satisfactory completion of the training.

5 CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES AND INSTRUCTIONS

Organizations performing ISM Code certification should have implemented a documented system to ensure that the certification process is performed in accordance with this standard. This system should, inter alia, include procedures and instructions for the following:

- .1 contract agreements with companies;
- .2 planning, scheduling and performing verification;
- .3 reporting results from verification;
- .4 the issuing of Documents of Compliance, Safety Management Certificates and Interim Documents of Compliance and Safety Management Certificates; and
- .5 corrective action and follow-up of verifications, including actions to be taken in cases of major non-conformity.

ANNEX 5

**DRAFT RESOLUTION MSC.[...](97)
(adopted on [...November 2016])**

**AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON STANDARDS OF
TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING FOR SEAFARERS (STCW), 1978**

THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE,

RECALLING Article 28(b) of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization concerning the functions of the Committee,

RECALLING FURTHER article XII of the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978 ("the Convention"), concerning the procedures for amending the Convention,

HAVING CONSIDERED, at its [ninety-seventh] session, amendments to the Convention proposed and circulated in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(i) thereof,

1 ADOPTS, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(iv) of the Convention, amendments to the Convention, the text of which is set out in the annex to the present resolution;

2 DETERMINES, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(vii)(2) of the Convention, that the said amendments shall be deemed to have been accepted on [1 January 2018], unless, prior to that date more than one third of Parties or Parties the combined merchant fleets of which constitute not less than 50% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant shipping of ships of 100 gross register tonnes or more, have notified to the Secretary-General of the Organization their objections to the amendments;

3 INVITES Parties to note that, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(ix) of the Convention, that the amendments annexed hereto, shall enter into force on [1 July 2018] upon their acceptance in accordance with paragraph 2 above;

4 REQUESTS the Secretary-General, for the purposes of article XII(1)(a)(v) to transmit certified copies of the present resolution and the text of the amendments contained in the annex to all Parties to the Convention;

5 REQUESTS ALSO the Secretary-General to transmit copies of this resolution and its annex to Members of the Organization, which are not Parties to the Convention.

CHAPTER V

Standards regarding special training requirements for personnel on certain types of ships

Regulation V/2

Mandatory minimum requirements for the training and qualifications of masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on passenger ships

1 This regulation applies to masters, officers, ratings and other personnel serving on board passenger ships engaged on international voyages. Administrations shall determine the applicability of these requirements to personnel serving on passenger ships engaged on domestic voyages.

2 Before being assigned shipboard duties, all persons serving on a passenger ship shall meet the requirements of section A-VI/1, paragraph 1 of the STCW Code.

~~3~~ 2 Prior to being assigned shipboard duties Masters, officers, ratings and other personnel serving on board passenger ships, seafarers shall have completed the training and familiarization required by paragraphs 5 4 to 7 9 below in accordance with their capacity, duties and responsibilities.

4 3 Seafarers Masters, officers, ratings and other personnel who are required to be trained in accordance with paragraphs 4, 6 and 7 7 to 9 below shall, at intervals not exceeding five years, undertake appropriate refresher training or be required to provide evidence of having achieved the required standard of competence within the previous five years.

5 Personnel serving on board passenger ships shall complete passenger ship emergency familiarization appropriate to their capacity, duties and responsibilities as specified in section A-V/2, paragraph 1 of the STCW Code.

6 5 Personnel providing direct service to passengers in passenger spaces on board passenger ships shall have completed the safety training specified in section A-V/2, paragraph 2 of the STCW Code.

~~7-4~~ Masters, officers, ratings qualified in accordance with chapters II, III and VII and other personnel designated on the muster lists to assist passengers in emergency situations on board passenger ships shall have completed passenger ship crowd management training in crowd management as specified in section A-V/2, paragraph 4 3 of the STCW Code.

~~8-6~~ Masters, chief engineer officers, chief mates, second engineer officers and any person designated on the muster lists of having responsibility for the safety of passengers in emergency situations on board passenger ships shall have completed approved training in crisis management and human behaviour as specified in section A-V/2, paragraph 3 4 of the STCW Code.

~~9-7~~ Masters, chief engineer officers, chief mates, second engineer officers and every person assigned immediate responsibility for embarking and disembarking passengers, for loading, discharging or securing cargo, or for closing hull openings on board ro-ro passenger ships shall have completed approved training in passenger safety, cargo safety and hull integrity as specified in section A-V/2, paragraph 4 5 of the STCW Code.

10 8- Administrations shall ensure that documentary evidence of the training which has been completed is issued to every person found qualified ~~under the provisions~~ in accordance with paragraphs 6 to 9 of this regulation.

ANNEX 6

**DRAFT RESOLUTION MSC.[...](97)
(adopted on [...November 2016])**

**AMENDMENTS TO PART A OF THE SEAFARERS' TRAINING,
CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE**

THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE,

RECALLING Article 28(b) of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization concerning the functions of the Committee,

RECALLING FURTHER Article XII and regulation I/1.2.3 of the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978 ("the Convention"), concerning the procedures for amending part A of the Seafarers' Training, Certification and Watchkeeping (STCW) Code,

HAVING CONSIDERED, at its [ninety-seventh] session, amendments to part A of the STCW Code, proposed and circulated in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(i) of the Convention,

1 ADOPTS, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(iv) of the Convention, amendments to the STCW Code, the text of which is set out in the annex to the present resolution;

2 DETERMINES, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(vii)(2) of the Convention, that the said amendments to the STCW Code shall be deemed to have been accepted on [1 January 2018], unless, prior to that date, more than one third of Parties or Parties the combined merchant fleets of which constitute not less than 50% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant shipping of ships of 100 gross tonnage or more, have notified to the Secretary-General of the Organization their objections to the amendments;

3 INVITES Parties to note that, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(ix) of the Convention, the annexed amendments to the STCW Code shall enter into force on [1 July 2018] upon their acceptance in accordance with paragraph 2 above;

4 REQUESTS the Secretary-General, for the purposes of article XII(1)(a)(v) of the Convention, to transmit certified copies of the present resolution and the text of the amendments contained in the annex to all Parties to the Convention;

5 REQUESTS ALSO the Secretary-General to transmit copies of this resolution and its annex to Members of the Organization, which are not Parties to the Convention.

ANNEX

CHAPTER I

Standards regarding general provisions

Section A-I/14

Responsibilities of companies

After existing paragraph 3, insert new paragraph 4 as follows:

- 4 Companies shall ensure that masters and officers on board their passenger ships shall have completed familiarization training to attain the abilities that are appropriate to the capacity to be filled and duties and responsibilities to be taken up, taking into account the guidance given in section B-I/14, paragraph 3 of this Code.

CHAPTER V

Standards regarding special training requirements for personnel on certain types of ships

Section A-V/2

Mandatory minimum requirements for the training and qualification of masters, officers, ratings and other personnel on passenger ships

Passenger ship emergency familiarization

1 Before being assigned to shipboard duties, all personnel serving on board passenger ships engaged on international voyages shall ensure attainment of the abilities that are appropriate to their duties and responsibilities as follows:

Contribute to the implementation of emergency plans, instructions and procedures

- .1 Familiar with:
 - .1.1 general safety features aboard ship;
 - .1.2 location of essential safety and emergency equipment, including life-saving appliances;
 - .1.3 importance of personal conduct during an emergency; and
 - .1.4 restrictions on the use of elevators during emergencies.

Contribute to the effective communication with passengers during an emergency

- .2 Ability to:
 - .2.1 communicate in the working language of the ship;

.2.2 non-verbally communicate safety information; and

.2.3 understand one of the languages in which emergency announcements may be broadcast on the ship during an emergency or drill.

Safety training for personnel providing direct service to passengers in passenger spaces

2 Before being assigned to shipboard duties, the additional safety training required by regulation V/2, paragraph 5, shall at least ensure attainment of the abilities as follows:

Communication

- .1 Ability to communicate with passengers during an emergency, taking into account:
 - .1.1 the language or languages appropriate to the principal nationalities of passengers carried on the particular route;
 - .1.2 the likelihood that an ability to use an elementary English vocabulary for basic instructions can provide a means of communicating with a passenger in need of assistance whether or not the passenger and crew member share a common language;
 - .1.3 the possible need to communicate during an emergency by some other means, such as by demonstration, or hand signals, or calling attention to the location of instructions, muster stations, life-saving devices or evacuation routes, when oral communication is impractical;
 - .1.4 the extent to which complete safety instructions have been provided to passengers in their native language or languages; and
 - .1.5 the languages in which emergency announcements may be broadcast during an emergency or drill to convey critical guidance to passengers and to facilitate crew members in assisting passengers.

Life-saving appliances

- .2 Ability to demonstrate to passengers the use of personal life-saving appliances.

Embarkation procedures

- .3 Embarking and disembarking passengers, with special attention to disabled persons and persons needing assistance.

Passenger ship cCrowd management training

~~4- 3~~ Before being assigned to shipboard duties, ~~The crowd management training required by regulation V/2, paragraph 4~~ for masters, officers, ratings qualified in accordance with chapters II, III and VII and personnel designated on the muster lists to assist passengers in emergency situations shall include, ~~but not necessarily be limited to:~~

- ~~.1~~ have successfully completed the crowd management training required by regulation V/2, paragraph 7, as set out in table A-V/2-1; and
- ~~.2~~ be required to provide evidence that the training has been completed in accordance with table A-V/2-1.
 - ~~.1~~ awareness of life-saving appliance and control plans, including:
 - ~~.1.1~~ knowledge of muster lists and emergency instructions;
 - ~~.1.2~~ knowledge of the emergency exits; and
 - ~~.1.3~~ restrictions on the use of elevators;
 - ~~.2~~ the ability to assist passengers *en route* to muster and embarkation stations, including:
 - ~~.2.1~~ the ability to give clear reassuring orders;
 - ~~.2.2~~ the control of passengers in corridors, staircases and passageways;
 - ~~.2.3~~ maintaining escape routes clear of obstructions;
 - ~~.2.4~~ methods available for evacuation of disabled persons and persons needing special assistance; and
 - ~~.2.5~~ search of accommodation spaces;
 - ~~.3~~ mustering procedures, including:
 - ~~.3.1~~ the importance of keeping order;
 - ~~.3.2~~ the ability to use procedures for reducing and avoiding panic;
 - ~~.3.3~~ the ability to use, where appropriate, passenger lists for evacuation counts; and
 - ~~.3.4~~ the ability to ensure that the passengers are suitably clothed and have donned their lifejackets correctly.

Crisis management and human behaviour training

~~3- 4~~ Before being assigned to shipboard duties, ~~m~~Masters, chief engineer officers, chief mates, second engineer officers and any person designated on the muster list as having responsibility for the safety of passengers in emergency situations shall:

- ~~.1~~ have successfully completed the approved crisis management and human behaviour training required by regulation V/2, paragraph ~~6- 8~~, in accordance with their capacity, duties and responsibilities as set out in table A-V/2-2; and
- ~~.2~~ be required to provide evidence that the required standard of competence has been achieved in accordance with the methods and the criteria for evaluating competence tabulated in columns 3 and 4 of table A-V/2-2.

Passenger safety, cargo safety and hull integrity training

4-5 Before being assigned to shipboard duties, the passenger safety, cargo safety and hull integrity training required by regulation V/2, paragraph 7-9, for masters, ~~chief mates~~, chief engineer officers, chief mates, second engineer officers and every persons assigned immediate responsibility for embarking and disembarking passengers, for loading, discharging or securing cargo or for closing hull openings on board ro-ro passenger ships shall at least ensure attainment of the abilities that are appropriate to their duties and responsibilities as follows:

Loading and embarkation procedures

- .1 Ability to apply properly the procedures established for the ship regarding:
 - .1.1 loading and discharging vehicles, rail cars and other cargo transport units, including related communications;
 - .1.2 lowering and hoisting ramps;
 - .1.3 setting up and stowing retractable vehicle decks; and
 - .1.4 embarking and disembarking passengers, with special attention to disabled persons and persons needing assistance.

Carriage of dangerous goods

- .2 Ability to apply any special safeguards, procedures and requirements regarding the carriage of dangerous goods on board ro-ro passenger ships.

Securing cargoes

- .3 Ability to:
 - .3.1 apply correctly the provisions of the Code of Safe Practice for Cargo Stowage and Securing to the vehicles, rail cars and other cargo transport units carried; and
 - .3.2 use properly the cargo-securing equipment and materials provided, taking into account their limitations.

Stability, trim and stress calculations

- .4 Ability to:
 - .4.1 make proper use of the stability and stress information provided;
 - .4.2 calculate stability and trim for different conditions of loading, using the stability calculators or computer programs provided;
 - .4.3 calculate load factors for decks; and
 - .4.4 calculate the impact of ballast and fuel transfers on stability, trim and stress.

Opening, closing and securing hull openings

.5 Ability to:

- .5.1 apply properly the procedures established for the ship regarding the opening, closing and securing of bow, stern and side doors and ramps and to correctly operate the associated systems; and
- .5.2 conduct surveys on proper sealing.

Ro-ro deck atmosphere

.6 Ability to:

- .6.1 use equipment, where carried, to monitor atmosphere in ro-ro spaces; and
- .6.2 apply properly the procedures established for the ship for ventilation of ro-ro spaces during loading and discharging of vehicles, while on voyage and in emergencies.

Table A-V/2-1
Specification of minimum standard of competence in passenger ship crowd management training

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Competence	Knowledge, understanding and proficiency	Methods for demonstrating competence	Criteria for evaluating competence
Contribute to the implementation of shipboard emergency plans and procedures to muster and evacuate passengers	<p>Knowledge of the shipboard emergency plans, instructions and procedures related to the management and evacuation of passengers</p> <p>Knowledge of applicable crowd management techniques and relevant equipment to be used to assist passengers in an emergency situation</p> <p>Knowledge of muster lists and emergency instructions</p>	Assessment of evidence obtained from training and/or instruction	Actions taken in case of an emergency are appropriate and comply with established procedures
Assist passengers <i>en route</i> to muster and embarkation stations	<p>Ability to give clear reassuring orders</p> <p>Ability to manage passengers in corridors, staircases and passageways</p> <p>Understanding the importance of and having the ability to maintain escape routes clear of obstructions</p> <p>Knowledge of methods available for evacuation of disabled persons and persons needing special assistance</p> <p>Knowledge of methods of searching passenger accommodation and public spaces</p> <p>Ability to disembark passengers, with special attention to disabled persons and persons needing assistance</p> <p>Importance of effective mustering procedures, including:</p>	Assessment of evidence obtained from practical training and/or instruction	<p>Actions taken conform with emergency plans, instructions and procedures</p> <p>Information given to individuals, emergency response teams and passengers is accurate, relevant and timely</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Competence	Knowledge, understanding and proficiency	Methods for demonstrating competence	Criteria for evaluating competence
	<p>.1 the importance of keeping order;</p> <p>.2 the ability to use procedures for reducing and avoiding panic;</p> <p>.3 the ability to use, where appropriate, passenger lists for evacuation counts;</p> <p>.4 the importance of passengers being suitably clothed as far as possible when mustering; and</p> <p>.5 the ability to check that the passengers have donned their life jackets correctly.</p>		

Table A-V/2-2

Specification of minimum standard of competence in passenger ship crisis management and human behaviour

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Competence	Knowledge, understanding and proficiency	Methods for demonstrating competence	Criteria for evaluating competence
Organize shipboard emergency procedures	<p>Knowledge of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .1 the general design and layout of the ship .2 safety regulations .3 emergency plans and procedures <p>The importance of the principles for the development of ship-specific emergency procedures, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .1 the need for pre-planning and drills of shipboard emergency procedures .2 the need for all personnel to be aware of and adhere to pre-planned emergency procedures as carefully as possible in the event of an emergency situation 	<p>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training, exercises with one or more prepared emergency plans and practical demonstration</p>	<p>The shipboard emergency procedures ensure a state of readiness to respond to emergency situations</p>
Optimize the use of resources	<p>Ability to optimize the use of resources, taking into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .1 the possibility that resources available in an emergency may be limited .2 the need to make full use of personnel and equipment immediately available and, if necessary, to improvise <p>Ability to organize realistic drills to maintain a state of readiness, taking into account lessons learnt from previous accidents involving passenger ships; debriefing after drills</p>	<p>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training, practical demonstration and shipboard training and drills of emergency procedures</p>	<p>Contingency plans optimize the use of available resources</p> <p>Allocation of tasks and responsibilities reflects the known competence of individuals</p> <p>Roles and responsibilities of teams and individuals are clearly defined</p>
Control response to emergencies	<p>Ability to make an initial assessment and provide an effective response to emergency situations in accordance with</p>	<p>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training,</p>	<p>Procedures and actions are in accordance with</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Competence	Knowledge, understanding and proficiency	Methods for demonstrating competence	Criteria for evaluating competence
	<p>established emergency procedures</p> <p><i>Leadership skills</i></p> <p>Ability to lead and direct others in emergency situations, including the need:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .1 to set an example during emergency situations .2 to focus decision making, given the need to act quickly in an emergency .3 to motivate, encourage and reassure passengers and other personnel <p><i>Stress handling</i></p> <p>Ability to identify the development of symptoms of excessive personal stress and those of other members of the ship's emergency team</p> <p>Understanding that stress generated by emergency situations can affect the performance of individuals and their ability to act on instructions and follow procedures</p>	<p>practical demonstration and shipboard training and drills of emergency procedures</p>	<p>established principles and plans for crisis management on board</p> <p>Objectives and strategy are appropriate to the nature of the emergency, take account of contingencies and make optimum use of available resources</p> <p>Actions of crew members contribute to maintaining order and control</p>
<p>Control passengers and other personnel during emergency situations</p>	<p><i>Human behaviour and responses</i></p> <p>Ability to control passengers and other personnel in emergency situations, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .1 awareness of the general reaction patterns of passengers and other personnel in emergency situations, including the possibility that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> .1.1 generally it takes some time before people accept the fact that there is an emergency situation 	<p>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training, practical demonstration and shipboard training and drills of emergency procedures</p>	<p>Actions of crew members contribute to maintaining order and control</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Competence	Knowledge, understanding and proficiency	Methods for demonstrating competence	Criteria for evaluating competence
	<p>.1.2 some people may panic and not behave with a normal level of rationality, that their ability to comprehend may be impaired and they may not be as responsive to instructions as in non-emergency situations</p> <p>.2 awareness that passengers and other personnel may, inter alia:</p> <p>.2.1 start looking for relatives, friends and/or their belongings as a first reaction when something goes wrong</p> <p>.2.2 seek safety in their cabins or in other places on board where they think that they can escape danger</p> <p>.2.3 tend to move to the upper side when the ship is listing</p> <p>.3 appreciation of the possible problem of panic resulting from separating families</p>		
<p>Establish and maintain effective communications</p>	<p>Ability to establish and maintain effective communications, including:</p> <p>.1 the importance of clear and concise instructions and reports</p> <p>.2 the need to encourage an exchange of information with, and feedback from, passengers and other personnel</p> <p>Ability to provide relevant information to passengers and other personnel during an</p>	<p>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training, exercises and practical demonstration</p>	<p>Information from all available sources is obtained, evaluated and confirmed as quickly as possible and reviewed throughout the emergency</p> <p>Information given to individuals, emergency response teams and passengers is accurate, relevant and timely</p> <p>Information keeps passengers informed</p>

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Competence	Knowledge, understanding and proficiency	Methods for demonstrating competence	Criteria for evaluating competence
	<p>emergency situation, to keep them apprised of the overall situation and to communicate any action required of them, taking into account:</p> <p>.1 the language or languages appropriate to the principal nationalities of passengers and other personnel carried on the particular route</p> <p>.2 the possible need to communicate during an emergency by some other means, such as by demonstration, or by hand signals or calling attention to the location of instructions, muster stations, life-saving devices or evacuation routes, when oral communication is impractical</p> <p>.3 the language in which emergency announcements may be broadcast during an emergency or drill to convey critical guidance to passengers and to facilitate crew members in assisting passengers</p>		<p>as to the nature of the emergency and the actions required of them</p>

ANNEX 7

DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO PART B OF THE SEAFARERS' TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE

1 The Maritime Safety Committee, at its [ninety-seventh session (25 November 2016)], adopted the following amendments to part B of the STCW Code.

2 Add the following new paragraph 3 after existing paragraph 2 of section B-I/14 and renumber the section accordingly:

3 The familiarization training required by paragraph 4 of section A-I/14 should at least ensure attainment of the abilities that are appropriate to the capacity to be filled and the duties and responsibilities to be taken up, as follows:

Design and operational limitations

.1 Ability to properly understand and observe any operational limitations imposed on the ship, and to understand and apply performance restrictions, including speed limitations in adverse weather, which are intended to maintain the safety of life, ship and cargo

Legislation, codes and agreements affecting passenger ships

.2 Ability to understand and apply international and national requirements for passenger ships relevant to the ship concerned and the duties to be performed.

Table B-I/2

List of certificates or documentary evidence required under the STCW Convention

Regulations	Type of certificate and brief description	Endorsement attesting recognition of a certificate¹	Registration required²	Revalidation of certificate³
V/2	Documentary evidence – Training for masters, officers, ratings and other personnel serving on passenger ships	No	No	No ⁴

Notes:

- ⁴ As required by regulation V/2, paragraph 3 ⁴ seafarers who have completed training in "crowd management", "crisis management and human behaviour" or "passenger safety, cargo safety and hull integrity" shall at intervals not exceeding five years, undertake appropriate refresher training or to provide evidence of having achieved the required standards of competence within the previous five years.

ANNEX 8

DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO SOLAS CHAPTER II-1 ON DAMAGE CONTROL DRILLS FOR PASSENGER SHIPS

Regulation 19-1 – Damage control drills for passenger ships

- 1 This regulation applies to passenger ships constructed before, on or after 1 January 2020.
- 2 A damage control drill shall take place at least every 3 months ~~[six weeks]~~. The entire crew need not participate ~~be involved~~ in every drill, but only those ~~each~~ crew members with damage control responsibilities ~~must participate in a damage control drill at least every [three months]~~.
- 3 The damage control drill scenarios shall vary each drill so that emergency conditions are simulated for different damage conditions and shall, as far as practicable, be conducted as if there were an actual emergency.
- 4 Each damage control drill shall include:
 - .1 for crew members with damage control responsibilities, reporting to stations and preparing for the duties described in the muster list required by regulation III/8;
 - .2 use of the damage control information and the onboard damage stability computer, if fitted, to conduct stability assessments for the simulated damage conditions;
 - .3 establishment of the communications link between the ship and shore-based support, if provided;
 - .4 operation of watertight doors and other watertight closures;
 - .5 demonstrating proficiency in the use of the flooding detection system, if fitted, in accordance with muster list duties;
 - .6 demonstrating proficiency in the use of cross-flooding and equalization systems, if fitted, in accordance with muster list duties;
 - .7 operation of bilge pumps and checking of bilge alarms and automatic bilge pump starting systems; and
 - .8 instruction in damage survey and use of the ship's damage control systems.
- 5 At least one damage control drill each year shall include activation of the shore-based support, if provided in compliance with regulation II-1/8-1.3, to conduct stability assessments for the simulated damage conditions.

- 6 Every crew member with assigned damage control responsibilities shall be familiarized with their duties and about the damage control information before the voyage begins.
- 7 A record of each damage control drill shall be maintained in the same manner as prescribed for the other drills in regulation III/19.5.

ANNEX 9

BIENNIAL STATUS REPORT AND OUTPUTS ON THE COMMITTEE'S POST-BIENNIAL AGENDA
THAT FALL UNDER THE PURVIEW OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE

Sub-Committee on Human Element, Training and Watchkeeping (HTW)								
Output number ^a	Description	Target completion year ^b	Parent organ(s)	Associated organ(s)	Coordinating organ	Status of output for Year 1 ^c	Status of output for Year 2 ^c	References ^d
5.1.1.6	Amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 and associated guidelines on damage control drills for passenger ships	2016	MSC	HTW	SDC	Completed		MSC 93/22, paragraph 20.5 HTW 3/19, section 11
5.1.2.4	Revision of requirements for escape route signs and equipment location markings in SOLAS and related instruments	2016	MSC	HTW	SSE	In progress		MSC 94/21, paragraph 18.24 HTW 3/19, section 13
5.2.1.1	Revised SOLAS regulation II-1/3-8 and associated guidelines (MSC.1/Circ.1175) and new guidelines for safe mooring operations for all ships	2017	MSC	HTW/SSE	SDC			MSC 95/22, paragraph 19.2
5.2.1.2	Amendments to the IGF Code and development of guidelines for low-flashpoint fuels	2016	MSC	HTW / PPR / SDC / SSE	CCC	In progress		MSC 94/21, paragraphs 18.5 and 18.6; HTW 3/19, section 14

Sub-Committee on Human Element, Training and Watchkeeping (HTW)								
Output number ^a	Description	Target completion year ^b	Parent organ(s)	Associated organ(s)	Coordinating organ	Status of output for Year 1 ^c	Status of output for Year 2 ^c	References ^d
5.2.1.14	Review MODU Code, LSA Code and MSC.1/Circ.1206/Rev.1	2016	MSC	HTW	SSE	[In progress]		MSC 93/22, paragraph 20.3 HTW 3/19, section 15
5.2.2.1	Guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments	2017	MSC	HTW		In progress		MSC 93/22, paragraph 11.4 HTW 3/19, section 5
5.2.2.2	Review of STCW passenger ship-specific safety training	2016	MSC	HTW		Completed		HTW 3/19, section 10
5.2.2.3	Validated model training courses	Continuous	MSC	HTW		Ongoing		HTW 3/19, section 3
5.2.2.4	Reports on unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency	Annual	MSC	HTW		Completed		HTW 3/19, section 4
5.2.5.2	Completion of the detailed review of the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)	2016	MSC	HTW	NCSR	Completed		MSC 90/28, paragraph 25.18 HTW 3/19, section 12
5.2.5.3	Draft Modernization Plan of the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) (2018)	2017	MSC	HTW	NCSR			MSC 95/22, paragraph 19.17.5

Sub-Committee on Human Element, Training and Watchkeeping (HTW)								
Output number ^a	Description	Target completion year ^b	Parent organ(s)	Associated organ(s)	Coordinating organ	Status of output for Year 1 ^c	Status of output for Year 2 ^c	References ^d
5.4.1.1	Comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention (2018)	2017	MSC	HTW		In progress		MSC 95/22, paragraph 19.3 HTW 3/19, section 6
5.4.1.2	Revision of the Guidelines on Fatigue	2017	MSC	HTW		In progress		MSC 95/22, paragraph 19.18 HTW 3/19, section 8
12.2.1.1	Revised guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations (resolution A.1071(28)) on training audits	2016	MSC	HTW		Completed		MSC 95/22, paragraph 19.5 HTW 3/19, section 9

Notes:

- a When individual outputs contain multiple deliverables, the format should report on each individual deliverable.
- b The target completion year should be specified as a year, or indicate that the item is annual or continuous. This should not indicate a number of sessions.
- c The entries under the "Status of output" columns are to be classified as follows:
 - "completed" signifies that the output for the year in question has been duly finalized;
 - "in progress" signifies that work on the output has been progressed, and that finalization is expected in the target completion year;
 - "ongoing" signifies that the outputs relate to work of the respective IMO organs that is a permanent or continuous task; and
 - "postponed" signifies that the respective IMO organ has decided to defer the production of relevant outputs to another time (for example, until the receipt of corresponding submissions) and accordingly that the output has been introduced on the post-biennial agenda;
 - "extended" signifies that further work is necessary and that the output will not be finalized as planned; and
 - due to the nature of annual outputs, the status can either be "completed" or "postponed".
- d References should be made to the relevant part of the organ's report on this item.

ANNEX 10

DRAFT PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR HTW 4

Provisional agenda for HTW 4

- Opening of the session
- 1 Adoption of the agenda
 - 2 Decisions of other IMO bodies
 - 3 Validated model training courses (5.2.2.3)
 - 4 Reports on unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency (5.2.2.4)
 - 5 Guidance for the implementation of the 2010 Manila Amendments (5.2.2.1)
 - 6 Comprehensive review of the 1995 STCW-F Convention (5.4.1.1)
 - 7 Role of the Human Element
 - 8 Revision of the Guidelines on Fatigue (5.4.1.2)
 - 9 Draft Modernization Plan of the GMDSS (5.2.5.3)
 - 10 Amendments to the IGF Code and development of guidelines for low-flashpoint fuels (5.2.1.2)
 - 11 Revision of requirements for escape route signs and equipment location markings in SOLAS and related instruments (5.1.2.4)
 - 12 Revised SOLAS regulation II-1/3-8 and associated guidelines (MSC.1/Circ.1175) and new guidelines for safe mooring operations for all ships (5.2.1.1)
 - [13 Review MODU Code, LSA Code and MSC.1/Circ.1206/Rev.1 (5.2.1.14)]
 - 14 Biennial status report and provisional agenda for HTW 5
 - 15 Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2018
 - 16 Any other business
 - 17 Report to the Maritime Safety Committee

ANNEX 11

STATEMENTS BY DELEGATIONS

STATEMENT BY ANGOLA

Madam Chair, since we are dealing with issues pertaining to training of seafarers, we found it opportune to make a statement, which serves to remind us of the important challenge we have but unfortunately has not been so far addressed adequately in this house.

While we acknowledge and sympathise with various efforts being currently made by this Organization, in particular the Programme for the Integration of Women in the Maritime Sector (IWMS) run through the TC, we fear that time may come when we will have to reconsider our positions and engage with the debate of whether we should continue encouraging women to pursue seafaring training or bluntly tell them that it is a waste of time to enrol themselves in a seafaring training as there is no guaranty that they will have the opportunity of securing and completing the required sea-time or being employed by shipowners.

It is definitely worth reminding us that during the Manila amendments, the issue of women access to maritime training and to employment on board ship was also discussed, which culminated with the adoption of Resolution (14) Promotion of the participation of women in the maritime industry, as set out in document STCW/CONF.2/DC/4. However, thus far nothing concrete has been done to materialize the recommendations therein agreed by Member States of this Organization. Also, having discussed the issue with various women cadets who have been struggling to get sea-time (some of them for years), and the fact that it is estimated that only 1 to 2% of world's 1.25 million seafarers are women (most of them from developed countries), there is reason to believe that the industry continue discriminating against women.

As we gather here to discuss the very issue of seafarers, some women trained as seafarers and who possess remarkable talent which can be used as available resources in sea going vessels, are currently being underutilized. Yet we hear people complaining about the shortage of seafarers! As we speak distinguished colleagues, there is not a functional mechanism in place at the IMO or elsewhere that encourages the maritime industry to make sufficient provision to increase opportunities for sea-time and on-the-job training for female seafarers, so that women may acquire the appropriate level of practical experience required to enhance professional maritime skills. Note that such sea-time is mandatory.

Clearly something has gone wrong, and we men in maritime are not in any way exercising our moral duty in order to make this wrong right. Equally, since IMO is, as the Secretary-General put it on his Monday's speech, "the single global body for maritime policy and regulation", we believe that it has unique responsibility to make sure that discrimination of women is no more, that is a wrong of the past, not for the present and definitely not for the future. We therefore challenge this Organization to rise up and respond effectively to its own key consideration in delivering IMO's mandate, which is "strengthening the human element without gender distinction".

We strongly believe that in the maritime industry, the IMO should remain the primary player in supporting the ideals of MDG 3 Promoting Gender Equality & Empowerment of Women, and MDG 1 Reduction of Poverty. Getting out of poverty is, for this Delegation, a right not a privilege. Therefore, allowing shipowners discriminating against women in the 21st century is a moral embarrassment that we all must correct immediately. Such correction is achievable but only if IMO exercises willingness, proactiveness, aggressiveness and resilience on the matter in question.

As we have stated earlier, we commend the work of this Organization, particularly in relation to funding maritime training for women and believe that it has the best of intentions on the issue of women employability. However, evidences suggest that it should do more in order to persuade shipowners and related stakeholders to shift their thinking on how women are perceived as seafarers – women seafarers, unfortunately, continue to be considered as liability to shipowners. That said, there is a compelling need for us to fix the status quo, which can only be possible with the support of international organizations, non-international organizations, governments and the industry itself.

We therefore kindly appeal to IMO to pay particular attention to the issue of women cadets who are unable to complete the required sea-time due to prejudice, which as a result, often the funding spent on the academic part of the training is often wasted, and this is a cause of particular hardship in developing countries where families have to make enormous sacrifices to pay for their children's education.

The IMO should lead with prudence and responsibility to make sure a policy regarding this important issue is developed so that Member States, ship owners and related stakeholders abide to the required non-discriminatory obligations in relation to women seafarers. We further urge the IMO, maritime industry and all relevant UN agencies to strengthen legislative and operational frameworks to ensure the safety and security of women working at sea.

We must take on the necessary dynamic challenge to ensure that the issue of women discrimination in our industry does not become an untreated problem. Let us create a progressive environment so that when in this very room or elsewhere we speak about seafarers training or employability, we do not just have men in our minds but also genuinely women.

STATEMENT BY UKRAINE – reports on unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency

This delegation would like to draw your attention to the fact that in accordance with the legislation of Ukraine the seaports of Ukraine in the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol have been closed since 15 July 2014.

Information on the closure of seaports was communicated by the IMO Circular Letters Nos. 3477 and 3490 in July and October 2014. Moreover, the Ukrainian Side has raised this issue at various IMO meetings, including 94th and 95th sessions of IMO Maritime Safety Committee, which were held in November 2014 and June 2015 respectively, as well as at 25th Meeting of States parties to the UNCLOS.

(8-12 June 2015, New York). In particular, the Ukrainian Side in its notes verbale emphasized that the Russian Side's "taking over" responsibility for the international shipping issues, safety of navigation, ship registration and certification of crew members of seagoing vessels in maritime areas adjacent to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as an integral part of the territory of Ukraine didn't not comply with basic principles and norms of the international law and effective legislation of Ukraine and should be deemed illegal.

In this regard, the Ukrainian Side proceeds from the fact that any documents – whether certificate of competency or seafarer's identity document – issued after 15 July 2014 by the so-called "harbour masters" of the seaports in the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, are null and void, have no legal effect and, by its very nature, should be considered fraudulent.

It should also be emphasized that the competent authorities of Ukraine ceased issuing such documents in the temporarily occupied territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol within the period from April until May 2014 (the last legitimate certificates of competency were issued by harbour master of Sevastopol seaport on 16 May 2014 and by the harbour master of Kerch seaport – on 9 April 2014). At the same time, the procedures for issue of certificates of competency and seafarers' identity documents by other legitimate authorities of the Ukrainian Side (seaports of Illichiv'sk, Izmail, Kherson, Mariupol, Mykolaiv and Odessa) remain in force.

With this in mind, this delegation is of the opinion that there is also a compelling need that should be taken into account to implement appropriate measures in standards of training of seafarers to prevent the mentioned unlawful practice associated with certificates of competency.

Concluding my statement, I would like to draw your attention once again to the document MSC 95/21/5 submitted by Ukraine as well as to the statement by Ms. Natalia Galibarenko, Permanent Representative of Ukraine to IMO at the 29th regular session of the Assembly. The IMO Member States, inter alia, were duly informed that the entry of vessels under foreign flags to the closed seaports in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol would be considered a violation of international law and of the laws of Ukraine, which entail the responsibility of the ship owners, operators and masters of ships. The Ukrainian Side also called on IMO to take all measures possible to make Russia cease its illegal actions, which threaten the safety and security of navigation in the Black Sea.

We would like these points to be reflected in the report and that our intervention be included into the final report of the Sub-Committee.

STATEMENT BY CHINA – proposed amendments to resolution A.1071(28) on *Revised guidelines on the Implementation of the International Safety (ISM) Code by Administrations*

1 China suggests to delete the words in paragraphs 4.4.1 and 4.5.1, "The annual verification of DOC and intermediate verification of SMC will address all the elements of the safety management system and the activities to which the requirements of the ISM Code apply". China is concerned that enlargement of the scope of intermediate and annual audit will result in the confusion of characteristics of initial, renewal, intermediate and annual audit and will increase burdens of the Administration and shipping companies.

2 China is against the proposal that the requirement of auditor should be unified to be in line with the requirement of the RO Code in section 11 of resolution A.1071(28). Considering the variation of the auditors working in the Administration and RO in respect of working experience and environment, it is China's view that there should be certain degree of flexibility allowed in the standard of the training and education of auditors as long as the quality of audit would not be undermined.

3 Amend 3.2.1.2 qualifications from a marine or nautical institution and relevant seagoing experience (minimum two years) as a certified ship management level officer. Considering different professional experience between support level officer and management level officer, China considers that the management level officer, e.g. captain or chief engineer, should be gained more privilege.

4 Amend 3.3.1 "In order to acquire the competences set out in 3.2.2 above, a person authorized to carry out ISM audits must have completed at least four training audits within two years from the first training audits under the supervision of suitably qualified and experienced auditors and in accordance with the following criteria". China suggests a clear time interval for four training audits.