

**DEVELOPMENT OF PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR RECOVERY SYSTEMS FOR
ALL TYPES OF SHIPS**

Draft performance standard for recovery capability

**Dominica, Liberia, Marshall Islands, International Chamber of Shipping (ICS), BIMCO,
Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA), Intercargo, Intertanko, International
Federation of Shipmasters' Associations (IFSMA), International Marine Contractors
Association (IMCA), International Parcel Tankers Association (IPTA), Nautical
Institute (NI), and Oil Companies International
Marine Forum (OCIMF)**

SUMMARY

<i>Executive summary:</i>	This document comments on the revised proposal for recovery capability in DE 56/3 (Australia, Iceland, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, the United Kingdom and IMRF).
<i>Strategic direction:</i>	5.1
<i>High-level action:</i>	5.1.2
<i>Planned output:</i>	5.1.2.4
<i>Action to be taken:</i>	Paragraphs 5 & 6
<i>Related documents:</i>	MSC 81/25; COMSAR 10/11/1; DE 50/21, DE 50/21/1, DE 50/21/2, DE 50/21/3; DE 52/13; DE 53/6, DE/53/6/1; DE 54/7, DE 54/7/1, DE 54/7/2, DE 54/23 (paragraph 7); MSC.1/Circ.1182; DE 55/4, DE 55/4/1, DE 55/4/2, DE 55/WP.7, DE 55/22 (section 4), DE 55/INF.5 and DE 56/3

Introduction

1. This document comments on DE 56/3 in which Australia *et al* provide a view on the background to and proposed requirements for recovery systems at sea and is submitted in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 6.12.5 of MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.4 on '*Guidelines on the Organization and Method of Work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their Subsidiary Bodies*'.
2. In DE 55/4/1, the shipping industry explained the limitations and constraints that apply to ships when conducting rescue operations at sea. This submission was strongly supported by a significant majority of Administrations that spoke on the matter. DE 55/4/1 represents the best advice from the shipping industry on rescue at sea and most importantly

from those in the best position to understand the practicalities of this matter; the owners, masters and crews of ships that may be called upon to carry out rescue at sea.

3. Elements of DE 56/3 can be welcomed as they reflect further progress in recognising the value and substance of the information that has been provided by industry during consideration of this matter, however clarification regarding a number of proposals in this submission is requested and other proposals are not supported.

Comment

4. Comment or a request for clarification on paragraphs in DE 56/3 is made as follows:

- 4.1 Paragraph 7. *'Recovery of persons from the water should be the focus of the proposed recovery capability since recovery from a wide and unpredictable variety of survival craft is beyond the capabilities of many currently available recovery systems'*. In all submissions by the shipping industry on this topic the point has been made that in addition to legal (SOLAS/UNCLOS) requirements the industry has a long tradition of assisting those in need of recovery. The shipping industry seeks to maintain the flexibility of adapting existing shipboard equipment to meet the challenge of any particular rescue operation without being constrained by the limitations of the capabilities of, *'currently available recovery systems'*.
- 4.2 Paragraph 8. The shipping industry has not sought to limit its rescue provision to, *'better able to recover small numbers of people in distress'* the shipping industry has previously and will continue to seek to respond to the recovery of those in danger at sea without consideration to the specific number involved.
- 4.3 Paragraph 9. Clarification is requested as to how the functional capability will be *'demonstrated'*.
- 4.4 Paragraph 10. Advises that, *'Should a ship require fitting of dedicated recovery equipment to provide the required capability, then equipment suitable for that particular ship is widely available in the market'*. No evidence is provided to support the assertion that equipment suitable for all ships is available. Various manufacturers have in previous sessions of the Sub-Committee sought to demonstrate the function of particular *'rescue equipment'*. Such demonstrations (DE 55/INF.5 *et al*) have at best been unconvincing and in general show equipment only suitable for smaller ships including for fishing vessels. The adaptability of such equipment to an international fleet of increasingly large vessels has not been verified or satisfactorily demonstrated.
- 4.5 Paragraph 12. Refers to the, *'Spirit of UNCLOS and SOLAS'*. The co-sponsors agree that, all ships will in addition to addressing their UNCLOS and SOLAS *legal responsibilities* seek to offer within their capabilities such assistance as may be required to those in distress.
- 4.6 Paragraph 14. Refers to assisting in a recovery operation. The nature of assistance offered as well as the role that some ships may be able to undertake in a rescue operation will vary. These circumstances as advised in DE 50/21/3 (ICS *et al*) are due to factors including vessel size, construction, freeboard and/or manoeuvrability.
- 4.7 Paragraph 16. The need to refer this matter to the STW Sub-Committee, is questioned. DE 56/3 proposes that training requirements should be limited to familiarisation with the equipment provided, integrated with routine man-overboard drills, the cosponsors of this submission can support this proposal but do not support referral of the matter to the STW Sub-Committee.
- 4.8 Annex 2. Paragraph 4.5. It is considered inappropriate to specify the significant wave height (Hs) for which the recovery standard should be established. As advised in DE 50/21/3 (ICS *et al*) 3.0 metre Hs is a functional requirement used to

differentiate between the use of recovery systems in the North Sea Offshore Industry, it is not and should not be considered an appropriate functional requirement for application to general SOLAS vessels.

- 4.9 Annex 2. Paragraph 4.6. This allows the lifting appliance to be placed where a survivor may be obscured either by the flare of the bow or the curvature of the stern. It would be preferably to have the equipment placed, clear of the propellers and within the vessel's parallel mid-body.
- 4.10 Annex 2. Paragraph 4.7. It is considered inappropriate to require shipboard equipment that may, at the discretion of the Administration, be used in recovering casualties to be tested in accordance with resolution MSC.81(70). To require this would effectively require all shipboard equipment with planned use in recovery to be tested as required for LSA equipment, whether or not this was its original function.

Proposal

Regarding Annex 1 of DE 56/3, the co-sponsors propose:

5. Deletion of the word '*demonstrated*' in the second line of paragraph 1 of Annex 1.

Regarding Annex 2 of DE 56/3, the co-sponsors propose:

6. Much of this section is narrative and does not constitute a performance standard to be followed. Consequently the following sub-paragraphs should be deleted: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, [4.1], 4.5, 4.7 and 4.9.

- 6.1 Paragraph 1.3 Deletion in the first line of, '*cannot be demonstrated*' and substitution with '*is not*' and in the second line deletion of '*that an acceptable level of capability is achieved*'.
- 6.2 Paragraph 2.1 Deletion in the first line of, '*all*'.
- 6.3 Paragraph 4.1 Clarification of the phrase, '*either manually or mechanically*'. To avoid confusion, it may be appropriate to delete the entire phrase.
- 6.4 Paragraph 4.2 Deletion in the first line of, '*safest possible*'.
- 6.5 Paragraph 4.3 Deletion in the first line of, '*To the extent possible*' and substitution with, '*Where practicable*'. Deletion is also proposed in the last line of, '*whenever possible as it risks cardiac arrest in hypothermic casualties*'.
- 6.6 Paragraph 4.6 Amend section to read, '*Recovery equipment installed in a fixed location should be capable of operating clear of the ship's propellers and as far as practicable within the vessel's parallel mid-body length*'.
- 6.7 Paragraph 4.8 Deletion in the first line of, '*necessary*' and substitution with, '*required*'.

Action requested of the Sub-Committee

7. The Sub-Committee is invited to note the information provided and the requested clarifications and proposed amendments to Annex 1 and Annex 2 of DE 56/3 and to decide as appropriate.