

MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE  
99th session  
Agenda item 20

MSC 99/20/8  
13 February 2018  
Original: ENGLISH

## WORK PROGRAMME

### Proposal for a new output to amend paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code

Submitted by the Marshall Islands, Panama, ICS, BIMCO, INTERCARGO, IPTA,  
IMCA, IBIA and ITF

#### SUMMARY

*Executive summary:* This document proposes a new output to be included in the biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee on Ship Systems and Equipment (SSE), concerning the amendment of paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the International Life-Saving Appliance (LSA) Code

*Strategic direction, if applicable:* 6

*Output:* Not applicable

*Action to be taken:* Paragraph 25

*Related documents:* Resolutions A.1110(30), A.1111(30); MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5; MSC.1/Circ.1481 and MSC.1/Circ.1500

#### Introduction

1 This document is submitted in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs 4.6 and 6.12.2 of the *Organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies* (MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5), taking into account the *Application of the Strategic Plan of the Organization* (resolution A.1111(30)), and section 3.2.1 of the *Guidance on drafting of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments* (MSC.1/Circ.1500).

2 The co-sponsors highlight the need to amend paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the International Life-Saving Appliance (LSA) Code in order to ensure adequate safety standards for boats with single fall and hook systems, and propose a new output for inclusion in the biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee on Ship Systems and Equipment (SSE).

## Background

3 Paragraph 4.4.7.6.8 of the LSA Code states:

"to prevent an accidental release during recovery of the boat, unless the hook is completely reset, either the hook shall not be able to support any load, or the handle or safety pins shall not be able to be returned to the reset (closed) position and any indicators shall not indicate the release mechanism is reset. Additional danger signs shall be posted at each hook station to alert crew members to the proper method of resetting."

4 Paragraph 4.4.7.6.17 of the LSA Code states:

"where a single fall and hook system is used for launching a lifeboat or rescue boat in combination with a suitable painter, the requirements of paragraphs 4.4.7.6.7, 4.4.7.6.8 and 4.4.7.6.15 need not be applicable; in such an arrangement a single capability to release the lifeboat or rescue boat, only when it is fully waterborne, will be adequate."

5 The co-sponsors are of the view that lifeboats and rescue boats with single fall and hook systems face similar potential risks of accidental release during recovery operations as those with twin fall and hook systems. These systems are used and tested in a similar way as twin fall lifeboats and, therefore, should have similar safety standards. As a result, it is proposed that paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code should be amended to reflect this.

## IMO's objectives

6 This proposal for a new output to review paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code lies within IMO's mission statement of promoting safe, secure and environmentally sound, efficient and sustainable shipping.

7 This proposal is also consistent with IMO's strategic direction SD 6 which aims to "ensure that a universally adopted, effective, international regulatory framework is in place and implemented consistently, embracing and integrating new and advancing technologies, without causing unnecessary burdens.", as set out in the *Strategic Plan for the Organization for the six-year period 2018 to 2023* (resolution A.1110(30)).

## Need

8 As a result of the exemption provided in paragraph 4.4.7.6.17 of the LSA Code, lifeboats and rescue boats with single fall and hook systems have been installed with on-load release hooks, without the safety features specified in paragraph 4.4.7.6.8.

9 In order to ensure the safety of crew operating, maintaining and testing both lifeboats and rescue boats installed with different kinds of release mechanisms there should be consistency in the safety standards employed. The co-sponsors, therefore, believe that single fall systems should have the same level of safety provisions applicable to twin fall systems, including protection against accidental release.

## Analysis of the issue

10 Paragraph 4.4.7.6.17 of the LSA Code removes the requirement for single fall systems to have two release capabilities. However, it does not specify which type (off-load or on-load) single release capability should be employed.

11 It may have been assumed that manufacturers would choose not to fit on-load release hooks on single fall and hook systems. Accordingly, exemptions from the requirement for prevention of accidental release (paragraph 4.4.7.6.8) and the requirement for hydrostatic interlock (paragraph 4.4.7.6.15) were provided for single fall and hook systems.

12 Notwithstanding the above, manufacturers have applied this exemption to install on-load release hooks to single fall systems used for launching a lifeboat or rescue boat not meeting the safety requirement provisions in paragraphs 4.4.7.6.8 and 4.4.7.6.15, even though these hooks carry the same risk of accidental release as those installed in conventional lifeboats.

### **Analysis of implications**

13 The checklist for "identifying administrative requirements" is set out in annex 1 of this document.

14 The co-sponsors are of the view that the proposal will not lead to an additional financial burden on the Organization and national Administrations.

15 It is recognized that amendments to the IMO mandatory instruments, in particular, to the LSA Code, will have to be transferred into the national legislation of some Member Governments, in order to take legal effect on ships that fly their flags. In this respect, the anticipated outcome of this proposal will represent an administrative burden for those Member Governments. However, this administrative burden will be minimized through the application of the four-year cycle of SOLAS amendments (MSC.1/Circ.1481).

### **Benefits**

16 Amending the provisions for single fall lifeboat and rescue boat hooks in the LSA Code will improve crew safety while operating and testing these boats.

### **Industry standards**

17 The co-sponsors are not aware of any existing provisions, other than relevant requirements in the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), 1974, as amended, and the International Life-Saving Appliance (LSA) Code, as amended.

### **Output**

18 The proposed output should be considered by the Sub-Committee on Ship Systems and Equipment (SSE), at its sixth session, with a view to drafting an amendment to paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code for consideration, approval and subsequent adoption by the Maritime Safety Committee (MSC).

19 The co-sponsors propose two different options to amend paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code, as follows (additions and deletions shown through underlining and ~~striketrough~~):

Option 1 Delete paragraph 4.4.7.6.17:

~~["4.4.7.6.17 — where a single fall and hook system is used for launching a lifeboat or rescue boat in combination with a suitable painter, the requirements of paragraphs 4.4.7.6.7, 4.4.7.6.8 and 4.4.7.6.15 need not be applicable; in such an arrangement a single capability to release the lifeboat or rescue boat, only when it is fully waterborne, will be adequate.";]~~

Option 2 Amend paragraph 4.4.7.6.17 as shown below:

"4.4.7.6.17 where a single fall and hook system is used for launching a lifeboat or rescue boat in combination with a suitable painter, the requirements of paragraphs 4.4.7.6.7, 4.4.7.6.8 and 4.4.7.6.15 need not be applicable; in such an arrangement a single capability to release the lifeboat or rescue boat, only when it is fully waterborne, will be adequate. [These exemptions do not apply to single fall and hook systems with on-load release capability.]"

20 The co-sponsors suggest that for further clarity and removal of ambiguity, option 1 would be the most appropriate option.

21 It is proposed that the suggested amendment shall apply to new installations on or after the entry into force of the amendments to the LSA Code, and that for existing installations it shall apply only in cases of replacement.

22 It is anticipated that if MSC 99 approves this output for inclusion in the biennial agenda of the SSE Sub-Committee, this could possibly be completed in one session of the Sub-Committee.

#### **Human element**

23 The checklist for considering "human element issues by IMO bodies" (MSC-MEPC.7/Circ.1) is set out in annex 2 of this submission.

#### **Urgency**

24 The co-sponsors suggest that this issue should be further considered by the Organization as soon as possible and as a matter of priority. In this regard, the proposed output should be included in the High-level Action Plan for the 2018-2019 biennium.

#### **Action requested of the Committee**

25 The Committee is invited to consider the above proposal and approve a new output to amend paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code for inclusion in the 2018-2019 biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee on Ship Systems and Equipment (SSE) and the provisional agenda for SSE 6.

\*\*\*

**ANNEX 1**

**CHECKLIST FOR IDENTIFYING ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

This checklist should be used when preparing the analysis of implications required in submissions of proposals for inclusion of outputs. For the purpose of this analysis, the term "administrative requirement" is defined in accordance with resolution A.1043(27), as an obligation arising from a mandatory IMO instrument, to provide or retain information or data.

**Instructions:**

- (A) If the answer to any of the questions below is **YES**, the Member State proposing an output should provide supporting details on whether the requirements are likely to involve start-up and/or ongoing costs. The Member State should also give a brief description of the requirement and, if possible, provide recommendations for further work, e.g. would it be possible to combine the activity with an existing requirement.
- (B) If the proposal for the output does not contain such an activity, answer **NR** (Not required).
- (C) For any administrative requirement, full consideration should be given to electronic means of fulfilling the requirement in order to alleviate administrative burdens.

<p>1 Notification and reporting? Reporting certain events before or after the event has taken place, e.g. notification of voyage, statistical reporting for IMO Members, etc.</p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Start-up</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing</p>
<p>Description of administrative requirement(s) and method of fulfilling it: (if the answer is yes)</p>		
<p>2 Record-keeping? Keeping statutory documents up to date, e.g. records of accidents, records of cargo, records of inspections, records of education, etc.</p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Start-up</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing</p>
<p>Description of administrative requirement(s) and method of fulfilling it: (if the answer is yes)</p>		
<p>3 Publication and documentation? Producing documents for third parties, e.g. warning signs, registration displays, publication of results of testing, etc.</p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Start-up</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing</p>
<p>Description of administrative requirement(s) and method of fulfilling it: (if the answer is yes)</p>		
<p>4 Permits or applications? Applying for and maintaining permission to operate, e.g. certificates, classification society costs, etc.</p>	<p><b>NR</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Start-up</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing</p>
<p>Description of administrative requirement(s) and method of fulfilling it: (if the answer is yes)</p>		
<p>5 Other identified requirements?</p>	<p><b>Yes</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Start-up</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing</p>
<p>Description of administrative requirement(s) and method of fulfilling it: (if the answer is yes)</p>		
<p><b>Changes to national legislation to implement the proposed LSA Code amendment as discussed in paragraph 15 of the document.</b></p>		

\*\*\*



**ANNEX 2**

**CHECKLIST FOR CONSIDERING HUMAN ELEMENT ISSUES BY IMO BODIES<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Instructions:</b> If the answer to any of the questions below is:	
(A) <b>YES</b> , the preparing body should provide supporting details and/or recommendation for further work.	
(B) <b>NO</b> , the preparing body should give proper justification as to why human element issues were not considered.	
(C) <b>NA</b> (Not Applicable) – the preparing body should give proper justification as to why human element issues were not considered applicable.	
<b>Subject Being Assessed:</b> (e.g. resolution, instrument, circular being considered)	
<b>Provisions in paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code on safety standards for boats with single fall and hook systems</b>	
<b>Responsible Body:</b> (e.g. committee, sub-committee, working group, correspondence group, Member State)	
<b>The Maritime Safety Committee</b>	
1. Was the human element considered during development or amendment process related to this subject?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
2. Has input from seafarers or their proxies been solicited?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
3. Are the solutions proposed for the subject in agreement with existing instruments? (Identify instruments considered in comments section)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
4. Have human element solutions been made as an alternative and/or in conjunction with technical solutions?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
5. Has human element guidance on the application and/or implementation of the proposed solution been provided for the following:	
• Administrations?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
• Ship owners/managers?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
• Seafarers?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
• Surveyors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
6. At some point, before final adoption, has the solution been reviewed or considered by a relevant IMO body with relevant human element expertise?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
7. Does the solution address safeguards to avoid single person errors?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> NA
8. Does the solution address safeguards to avoid organizational errors?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
9. If the proposal is to be directed at seafarers, is the information in a form that can be presented to and easily understood by the seafarer?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
10. Have human element experts been consulted in development of the solution?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<b>11. HUMAN ELEMENT: Has the proposal been assessed against each of the factors below?</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> CREWING. The number of qualified personnel required and available to safely operate, maintain, support, and provide training for system.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> PERSONNEL. The necessary knowledge, skills, abilities, and experience levels that are needed to properly perform job tasks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> TRAINING. The process and tools by which personnel acquire or improve the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities to achieve desired job/task performance.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA

<sup>1</sup> Checklist from MSC-MEPC.7/Circ.1.

<input type="checkbox"/> OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY. The management systems, programmes, procedures, policies, training, documentation, equipment, etc. to properly manage risks.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> WORKING ENVIRONMENT. Conditions that are necessary to sustain the safety, health, and comfort of those on working on board, such as noise, vibration, lighting, climate, and other factors that affect crew endurance, fatigue, alertness and morale.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
HUMAN SURVIVABILITY. System features that reduce the risk of illness, injury, or death in a catastrophic event such as fire, explosion, spill, collision, flooding, or intentional attack. The assessment should consider desired human performance in emergency situations for detection, response, evacuation, survival and rescue and the interface with emergency procedures, systems, facilities and equipment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<input type="checkbox"/> HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING. Human/system interface to be consistent with the physical, cognitive, and sensory abilities of the user population.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NA
<p><b>Comments:</b></p> <p><b>The proposed amendments would improve crew safety while operating and testing boats fitted with single fall and hook systems.</b></p>	