

Report of FSI 20

(J DeRose & P Contraros)

The meeting was held from 26th to 30th March 2012. It was attended by John De Rose and Peter Contraros.

This sub-committee is a hub of decisions made at other committees. Almost all matters need to come through this sub-committee as it is where the flag states compare their attitudes and together decide what is going to be done and when. This is a very important committee where many technical aspects are discussed and the final agreement of flag states obtained.

Sec. Gen. remarks – The report for the Costa Concordia is still awaited – IMO is participating as an observer in the preparation of the report; A new item has been put on the MSC agenda - Passenger Ship Safety; there is also a need for co-operation on all accidents and he encouraged the implementation of mandatory instruments. He emphasised that the IMO is a technical body and politics should be avoided. The S.G's full remarks can be found at the following webpage:

<http://www.imo.org/MediaCentre/SecretaryGeneral/Secretary-GeneralSpeechesToMeetings>.

Agenda item 2 – Decisions of other IMO bodies.

Subjects covered by this agenda item were dealt with under the relevant agenda item. They include:-

Outcome of MEPC; anti-fouling systems on ships; port state control procedures; harmonised system of survey and certification; the RO Code; the new III Code (IMO Instrument Implementation); lifeboat release arrangements; member state audit scheme; port state control officers guidelines for LRIT and the ISM Code; and Casualty Analysis.

Agenda item 5 – Casualty Statistics and investigations.

WP 1/add.1 paragraphs 5.1 to 5.6 and the numerous sub-paragraphs refer.

WP 2 and 2/add.1 also refer.

There was discussion on the amount of accurate information being received and Flags were encouraged to provide adequate information. The members were reminded that Resolution MSC 255 (84) is mandatory under SOLAS and therefore adequate and accurate details should improve. GISIS was not considered to be an exhaustive database and timely and accurate reporting is essential for it to be effective.

The majority of the papers on this subject were sent directly to the working group.

78 cases were reported and examined; Four were found to be not up to standard – An FSI circular was issued; GISIS – some recommendations were made for improvement. Much of the discussion was based upon the number and quality of reports.

Peter Contraros went to the working group Mon and Tues and his report is below:-

QUOTE

The group having examined the casualty reports on the incident of BBC Atlantic (GISIS incident C0007492), Star Java (GISIS C0007492), Knud Laurenzen GISIS C0007521, Sand Falcon (GISIS C0007978) and Wellservicer (GISIS C0007678, decided to send them to the DE subcommittee for further action on the technical merits of the reports. In the case of the incidents on the above ships, the issue raised was the on-deck lifting appliances with regard to the potential risks inherent in the lifting systems from the manufacturing process to installation and operation on board. The design of the system was also questioned with respect to fitness for purpose.

The quality of the expertise involved in casualty investigation was discussed, and in particular on the subject of “lessons to be learnt”. Australia, United Kingdom and USA delegates questioned if the traditional experts (Captains) called for casualty analysis are sufficient for the purpose in today’s casualties investigation. RINA intervened stating that the expertise and experience of Naval Architects should be used, so that they can indentify and analyse the events in conjunction with other expertise such as metallurgists and mechanical/marine engineers. They can all contribute very effectively in such a process. UK, USA and Australia supported these views.

The required quality of Casualty Investigations was agreed in the revised Chapter 5 of the new Guidelines to the Code on Casualty Investigation (annex 2 of WP 2). This includes the initial response, quality of collection of evidence and reconstruction analysis that will be required of well qualified investigators.

The Sub-Committee agreed to re-establish the Correspondence Group (CG) on “Casualty Analysis” under the coordination of Canada, to continue its work on the following:

1. Receipt of Information from administrations on investigation of casualties and lessons to be learned
2. Identify safety issues
3. Consider possible lessons to be learned and submit to other IMO subcommittees appropriate technical issues to be further examined
4. Consider data on accident of Ro-Ro ferries
5. Revise and update MSC-MEPC.3/Circ.3.
6. Complete the revision of resolution A.884(21) and the appendix of annex to resolution A.849(20).

UNQUOTE

Agenda item 6 – Port State Control activities

WP 5 refers.

IACS presented the paper 6/9 outlining a solution to the reporting of ISM Code deficiencies by PSC officers and suggesting that the current guidelines being considered at this meeting be amended to ensure better communication between all the players involved. The Paris MOU representative disagreed that anything need be done – the guidelines adequately define the PSC officers responsibilities. There were a number of supports for the IACS position but they were outnumbered by the EU/Paris MOU members.

The drafting group agreed the guidelines without change but they will remain under review and papers were requested.

Concentrated Inspection Campaigns (CIC) were proposed by Egypt but this was not agreed to by other regimes.

Agenda item 9 – Analysis of difficulties with IMO instruments

WP 1 paras 9.1 to 9.11 refer.

The process by which corrective action after member state audits can be dealt with was discussed. It is not being dealt with effectively at present. Consideration was given to having a CG but this was considered to be premature. It was agreed that proposals should be submitted to the next session for a WG.

There was a proposal concerning the Ratification of Instruments – what is stopping ratification? There is a resistance as there are many reasons for non ratification and not all of them are related to an unwillingness of flags but often due to the inadequacy of the conventions as developed by IMO. Members wish to have more time to consider the proposal.

Agenda item 10 – Review of the Survey guidelines under the HSSC and the annexes to the Code for the implementation of mandatory IMO instruments..

Reporting procedure were considered on the results of lifeboat retrieval systems surveys.

The Sub-Committee considered the concerns expressed by IACS on the reporting procedure prescribed in MSC.1/Circ.1392 on Guidelines for evaluation and replacement of lifeboat release and retrieval systems. The Sub-Committee was of the view that, in case of the one-time follow-up overhaul examination of lifeboat release and retrieval systems, the factual statement issued by the manufacturer or one of its representatives, which is described in paragraph 17 of the annex to the circular, provides sufficient evidence to interested parties and therefore, the development of a specific format for this factual statement is not necessary.

IACS was requested to submit proposals to the next session.

Agenda item 12 – Review of the IMO instruments Implementation (III) Code

WP 1 paragraphs 12.1 to 12.19 refer.

Agenda item 13 –Development of a Code for Recognised Organisations.

WP 1 paragraphs 13.1 to 13.16 refer. WP 4 also refers.

This matter concerns the way RO's are approved and audited for compliance with flag requirements and will lead to the revoking of Resolutions A 739(18) and 789 (19) which are not considered very effective.

It was agreed non-exclusive surveyors can be used if they recognised and delegated by other approved RO's.

The limitation of liability was discussed at length when RO's are acting for flags, but it was finally agreed that only individual states can decide on this matter because it depends upon their national laws. It was therefore agreed that the RO Code would

include a suitable text to cover this matter but would be non-mandatory to ensure that there is no conflict with domestic regulation.

Next meeting of FSI.

FSI 21 will be held between 4 and 8 March 2013.

Working Groups and Drafting Groups will be established on:-

- Casualty Statistics and Investigations
- Harmonisation of PSC and guidelines on PSC convention.
- Review of survey guidelines under the HSSC, etc.

Correspondence Groups were agreed:-

- Casualty Statistics and Investigations
- Review of the Survey Guidelines under the HSSC and annexes

- **John E C De Rose**
- **Peter Contraros**

2 April 2012