



SUB-COMMITTEE ON STABILITY AND
LOAD LINES AND ON FISHING VESSELS
SAFETY
52nd session
Agenda item 19

SLF 52/WP.5
29 January 2010
Original: ENGLISH

DISCLAIMER

As at its date of issue, this document, in whole or in part, is subject to consideration by the IMO organ to which it has been submitted. Accordingly, its contents are subject to approval and amendment of a substantive and drafting nature, which may be agreed after that date.

DRAFT REPORT TO THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE

1 GENERAL

1.1 The Sub-Committee held its fifty-second session from 25 to 29 January 2010. The meeting was held under the chairmanship of Mr. Z. Szozda (Poland), who was elected as Chairman for 2010 at the opening of the session, on 25 and 26 January 2010. The Sub-Committee Vice-Chairman, Mr. K. Hunter (United Kingdom), who was also elected as Vice-Chairman for 2010 at the opening of the session, chaired the meeting from 27 to 29 January 2010 as acting Chairman, in accordance with rule 17 of the Rules of Procedures of the Committee, due to the unavoidable absence of the Sub-Committee Chairman.

1.2 The session was attended by delegations from the following Member Governments:

ALGERIA
ANGOLA
ARGENTINA
AUSTRALIA
BAHAMAS
BELIZE
BRAZIL
CANADA
CHILE
CHINA
COOK ISLANDS

CROATIA
CUBA
CYPRUS
DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S
REPUBLIC OF KOREA
DENMARK
ECUADOR
FINLAND
FRANCE
GERMANY
GREECE

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly asked to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.



ICELAND	PHILIPPINES
INDONESIA	POLAND
IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)	PORTUGAL
IRELAND	REPUBLIC OF KOREA
ITALY	RUSSIAN FEDERATION
JAPAN	SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS
LATVIA	SAUDI ARABIA
LIBERIA	SOUTH AFRICA
MADAGASCAR	SPAIN
MALAYSIA	SWEDEN
MALTA	THAILAND
MARSHALL ISLANDS	TURKEY
MEXICO	TUVALU
MOROCCO	UKRAINE
NETHERLANDS	UNITED KINGDOM
NIGERIA	UNITED STATES
NORWAY	URUGUAY
PANAMA	VANUATU
PAPUA NEW GUINEA	

and the following Associate Member of IMO:

HONG KONG, CHINA

1.3 The session was also attended by representatives from the following United Nations specialized agencies:

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION (ILO)
FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO)

1.4 The session was also attended by observers from the following intergovernmental organizations:

EUROPEAN COMMISSION (EC)
MARITIME ORGANIZATION FOR WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICA (MOWCA)
MARINE ORGANIZATION INVESTIGATORS' INTERNATIONAL FORUM
(MAIIF)

1.5 The session was also attended by observers from the following non-governmental organizations:

INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF SHIPPING (ICS)
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION (ISO)
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF MARINE INSURANCE (IUMI)
COMITÉ INTERNATIONAL RADIO-MARITIME (CIRM)
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLASSIFICATION SOCIETIES (IACS)

OIL COMPANIES INTERNATIONAL MARINE FORUM (OCIMF)
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF SHIPMASTERS' ASSOCIATIONS (IFSMA)
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT TANKER OWNERS
(INTERTANKO)
SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL GAS TANKERS AND TERMINAL OPERATORS
LIMITED (SIGTTO)
CRUISE LINES INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION (CLIA)
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DRY CARGO SHIPOWNERS
(INTERCARGO)
INTERNATIONAL PARCEL TANKERS ASSOCIATION (IPTA)
INTERNATIONAL MARINE CONTRACTORS ASSOCIATION (IMCA)
THE ROYAL INSTITUTION OF NAVAL ARCHITECTS (RINA)
INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORT WORKERS' FEDERATION (ITF)

Opening address

1.6 The Secretary-General welcomed participants and delivered his opening address, the full text of which is reproduced in document SLF 52/INF.6.

Chairman's remarks

1.7 In responding, the Chairman thanked the Secretary-General's words of encouragement as well as advice and requests would be given every consideration in the deliberations of the Sub-Committee and its working and drafting groups.

Adoption of the agenda

1.8 The Sub-Committee adopted the agenda (SLF 52/1/Rev.1) and agreed, in general, to be guided in its work by the annotations to the provisional agenda contained in document SLF 52/1/1. The agenda, as adopted, with the list of documents considered under each agenda item, is set out in document SLF 52/INF.7.

Statement by the delegation of Norway

1.9 The delegation of Norway informed the Sub-Committee on the progress in the follow-up actions after the capsizing and subsequent sinking of the anchor-handling vessel **Bourbon Dolphin**, in particular with respect to items under the remit of the Sub-Committee. The delegation of Norway also informed the Sub-Committee that proposals for new work programme items would be submitted to MSC 88 regarding various issues, amongst them the issue of minimum residual stability during anchor handling operations as well as other operations where vessels are subject to similar large external forces.

2**DECISIONS OF OTHER IMO BODIES****General**

2.1 The Sub-Committee noted the decisions and comments pertaining to its work made by DSC 13, MSC 85, STW 40, FP 53, DE 52 and MSC 86, as reported in documents SLF 52/2, SLF 52/2/1 and SLF 52/2/2, and took them into account in its deliberations when dealing with the relevant agenda items.

Application of the Committee's Guidelines

2.2 The Sub-Committee noted that MSC 86 had approved amendments to the Committee's Guidelines and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies (MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.2), which specify that the Committee should assess the implication for capacity-building and technical co-operation and assistance, initiated at the acceptance of a proposal of the work programme concerning new, or amendments to existing, mandatory instruments; as well as the associated Procedures for the assessment of implications of capacity-building requirements.

Outcome of the twenty-sixth session of the Assembly

2.3 The Sub-Committee noted the outcome of the twenty-sixth session of the Assembly, and in particular that A 26 had adopted:

- .1 Strategic Plan for the Organization (for the six-year period 2010 to 2015), as set out in resolution A.1011(26);
- .2 High-level Action Plan of the Organization and priorities for the 2010-2011 biennium, as set out in resolution A.1012(26); and
- .3 Guidelines on the application of the Strategic Plan and the High level Action Plan of the Organization, as set out in resolution A.1013(26),

and took them into account in its deliberations when considering agenda item 15 on Work programme and agenda for SLF 53 (see also paragraph 15...).

2.4 The Sub-Committee also noted that A 26 had adopted Global Integrated Shipping Information System (GISIS), as set out in resolution A.1029(26), which urges Member States and intergovernmental organizations to make ample use of the facilities for the reporting and transfer of data into the system.

3 DEVELOPMENT OF NEW GENERATION INTACT STABILITY CRITERIA

General

3.1 The Sub-Committee noted that MSC 85 had adopted the International Code on Intact Stability, 2008 (2008 IS Code) (resolution MSC.267(85)), together with the associated amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention (resolution MSC.269(85)) and the 1988 LL Protocol (resolution MSC.270(85)) to make the 2008 IS Code mandatory, which are due to enter into force on 1 July 2010, and that MSC 85 had approved MSC.1/Circ.1281 on Explanatory Notes to the International Code on Intact Stability, 2008, and MSC.1/Circ.1292 on Early application of the International Code on Intact Stability, 2008.

3.2 The Sub-Committee also noted that MSC 85 had approved SLF 51's proposal to change the previous title of the item on "Revision of the Intact Stability Code" to "Development of new generation intact stability criteria", reflecting the Sub-Committee's current work on the subject.

3.3 The Sub-Committee recalled that SLF 51 had re-established the Correspondence Group on Intact Stability to continue to work on the issues contained in the updated plan of action for intact stability work (SLF 51/WP.2, annex 4), and to further consider the new generation intact stability criteria.

New generation intact stability criteria

3.4 The Sub-Committee noted part 2 of the report of the Working Group on Intact Stability established at SLF 51 (SLF 52/3), where the group, when discussing the development of new generation intact stability criteria, had identified a three layer structure as the most appropriate, i.e. the first two levels corresponding to vulnerability criteria and the third one corresponding to the performance-based criteria.

3.5 The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Correspondence Group on Intact Stability (SLF 52/3/1 and SLF 52/INF.2), where the group had collected sample ship data relevant to the failure modes (i.e. restoring variation problems such as parametric excitation and pure loss of stability, stability under dead ship condition, and manoeuvring-related problems in waves such as broaching-to).

3.6 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had acknowledged that the vulnerability criteria could consist of two layers, in particular that the first layer is simpler; the second one is more complex but much simpler than direct assessment procedure; and that a ship which fails to comply with both criteria is requested to be examined with a direct assessment procedure. The correspondence group, after discussing criteria and the sample calculation results for several stability failures, considered three options as preliminary specifications of two-layered vulnerability criteria and direct assessment procedures, and also considered matters related to the ship-specific operational guidance.

3.7 In the context of the above, the Sub-Committee considered the following documents:

- .1 SLF 52/3/2 (Poland), providing results of analysis of the reasons of capsizing in quartering, extremely steep waves as obtained in the model tests carried out for a small ship, and proposing that the new dynamic stability standards should be based on analysis of the survivability potential of a ship exposed to a combined action of certain phenomena in quartering, extremely steep waves;
- .2 SLF 52/3/3 (Poland), containing summary of the discussion on the general approach to new generation intact stability criteria and the draft structure of the criteria in a figure;
- .3 SLF 52/3/4 (Poland), providing some results of model tests which involved surf-riding and broaching in extremely steep waves, and a proposal for the first level criterion of surf-riding in extreme waves;
- .4 SLF 52/3/5 (Germany), concerning continued incidents of large containerships due to the phenomenon of excessive stability which is not covered in the current discussion in the agenda item, and proposing that the German accident investigation report should be taken into account when considering amendments

to the 2008 IS Code (mandatory parts) in the context of dynamic stability effects as well as the non-mandatory operational guidance (MSC.1/Circ.1228) in support of future mandatory (design) criteria; and

- .5 SLF 52/3/6 and SLF 52/INF.3 (Japan), with regard to the vulnerability criteria, proposing vulnerability criteria for stability under dead ship condition and for broaching associated with surf-riding, having considered that option A in the correspondence group's report was the most appropriate in terms of smooth and sound implementation of criteria. Regarding restoring variation problems, after conducting the calculation (SLF 52/INF.3), it suggested that the proposed procedures and sample calculation results in the document should be considered for developing vulnerability criteria consistent with the direct stability assessment as the next step.

3.8 The Sub-Committee, having considered the above documents, noted, in particular that:

- .1 there was general agreement that the new generation intact stability criteria should be developed under the concept of stability failure;
- .2 with regard to the three options on the preliminary specifications of the two-layered vulnerability criteria and direct assessment procedures, as developed by the correspondence group, while several delegations preferred option A due to its simplicity and easiness to implement, others preferred option C considering its flexibility and potential for future innovative technology. In this context, the observer from IACS suggested the need for guidance on calculations;
- .3 regarding the proposal by Poland (SLF 52/3/2) on the combined action of certain phenomena in quartering, extremely steep waves, one delegation supported the proposal while another delegation did not;
- .4 regarding the proposal by Poland (SLF 52/3/4) for the first level criterion of surf-riding in extreme waves, there was little support for the proposal;

- .5 concerning the excessive stability addressed by Germany (SLF 52/3/5), several delegations shared Germany's concern and supported its proposal on the development of operational guidance, suggesting the draft guidance, once developed, should be referred to the NAV Sub-Committee for their input; and
- .6 several delegations supported the proposal by Japan (SLF 52/3/6) on vulnerability criteria for stability under dead ship condition and for broaching associated with surf-riding,

and instructed the working group to further consider the above documents and the associated views when developing the new generation intact stability criteria.

Review of action plan for intact stability work

3.9 The Sub-Committee instructed the working group if established, to review the plan of action for intact stability work (SLF 51/WP.2, annex 4) and prepare a revised plan, identifying the priorities, time frames and objectives for the work to be accomplished, and, if necessary, to consider the extension of the target completion date and advise the Sub-Committee accordingly.

2009 MODU Code

3.10 The Sub-Committee considered document SLF 52/2/2, reporting that MSC 86, in approving the draft Assembly resolution on Adoption of the Code for the Construction and Equipment of Mobile Offshore Drilling Units, 2009 (2009 MODU Code) (MSC 86/26, annex 14), which was later adopted by the twenty-sixth session of the Assembly by resolution A.1023(26), had considered proposals by IADC in document MSC 86/12/3, with regard to the proposed updating of the reference to, and reflection of the provisions of, the 2009 MODU Code in the 2008 IS Code, and had agreed to refer the matter to SLF 52 for consideration and advice to the Committee as appropriate.

3.11 Following discussion, the Sub-Committee, having noted the views of several delegations that the IS Code should only refer to the 2009 MODU Code, in order to avoid frequent amendments to the IS Code consequential to amendments to the MODU Code, instructed the working group to further consider the matter.

Establishment of the working group

3.12 The Sub-Committee established the Working Group on Intact Stability, and instructed it, taking into account comments made and decisions taken in plenary, and the second part of the report of the working group established at SLF 51 (SLF 52/3), to:

- .1 further consider the new generation intact stability criteria on the basis of the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/3/1 and SLF 52/INF.2), taking into account documents SLF 52/3/2, SLF 52/3/3, SLF 52/3/4, SLF 52/3/5, SLF 52/3/6 and SLF 52/INF.3;
- .2 review the plan of action contained in annex 4 to document SLF 51/WP.2, taking into account the progress made during the session, and prepare a revised plan, identifying the priorities, time frames and objectives for the work to be accomplished;
- .3 consider the views regarding the 2008 IS Code in relation to the 2009 MODU Code, taking into account documents SLF 52/2/2 and MSC 86/12/13, and advise the Sub-Committee accordingly;
- .4 consider whether it is necessary to re-establish a correspondence group and, if so, prepare terms of reference for consideration by the Sub-Committee; and
- .5 submit a written report (part 1) to plenary, and continue working through the week and submit part 2 of the report to SLF 53, as soon as possible after this session so that it can be taken into account by the correspondence group, if established.

Report of the working group

3.13 Having received the report of the working group (part 1) (SLF 52/WP.1), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as indicated in paragraphs hereunder, noting that part 2 of the group's report will be submitted by the Chairman of the group to SLF 53 as soon as possible after the session.

New generation intact stability criteria

3.14 In considering matters related to new generation intact stability criteria, the Sub-Committee noted the following:

- .1 the summary of the methodologies considered for the new generation intact stability criteria; and
- .2 the preliminary specifications of two-layered vulnerability criteria and direct stability assessment procedures,

and comments from the observer from IACS that the direct stability assessment, as it has a higher level of complexity, is expected to be applied only to ships deemed vulnerable for a particular failure mode.

3.15 The Sub-Committee endorsed the group's views that the additional modes of stability failure should be considered at a later stage of the development of new generation intact stability criteria.

3.16 The Sub-Committee also endorsed the group's recommendation that any operational guidance associated with this agenda item should be developed in consultation with relevant sub-committees (e.g., the DE, NAV and STW Sub-Committees).

Review of the plan of action

3.17 The Sub-Committee agreed to the updated plan of action for matters related to the new generation intact stability criteria, as contained in document SLF 52/WP..., annex 3.

Extension of the target completion date

3.18 In light of the above decisions, the Sub-Committee agreed to invite the Committee to extend the target completion date for this item to 2012.

Review the 2008 IS Code in relation to the 2009 MODU Code

3.19 The Sub-Committee agreed to the draft amendment to part B of the 2008 IS Code, as set out in annex ..., for submission to MSC 87 for consideration with a view to adoption in accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Maritime Safety Committee.

Re-establishment of a correspondence group

3.20 The Sub-Committee re-established the correspondence group, under the coordination of Japan*, and instructed the group, taking into account part 2 of the report of the working group, to:

- .1 continue to work on the items contained in the updated plan of action for the new generation intact stability criteria, as set out in annex 3 to document SLF 52/WP.1, taking into account documents SLF 52/3, SLF 52/3/1, SLF 52/3/2, SLF 52/3/3, SLF 52/3/4, SLF 52/3/5, SLF 52/3/6, SLF 52/INF.2 and SLF 52/INF.3 and relevant documents from previous sessions;
- .2 collect additional methodologies for vulnerability criteria and direct stability assessment submitted within end June 2010;
- .3 verify and further refine draft vulnerability criteria (levels 1 and 2) that identify the possible susceptibility of a ship to partial (excessive roll angles/accelerations) or total (capsizing) stability failures for each mode as listed in 2008 IS Code, part A, paragraph 1.2 (as contained in paragraph 2.2 of the Framework for the new generation criteria (SLF 51/WP.2, annex 1)). In doing so:
 - .1 additional sample ships may be identified, for which relevant data of the ships and the results of well-documented experiments are available, or which may instead constitute a representative sample population of ships, where detailed information may not be provided; and
 - .2 for sample populations of ships, where detailed information may not be provided, principal particulars (such as length) and notable features (such as post-Panamax) should be included;

* **Coordinator:**
Dr. Eng. Naoya Umeda
Associate Professor
Department of Naval Architecture and Ocean Engineering
Osaka University
2-1 Yamadaoka, Suita
Osaka 565-0871
Japan
Tel: + 81 6 6879 7587
Fax: + 81 6 6879 7594
E-mail: umeda@naoe.eng.osaka-u.ac.jp

- .4 review framework for new generation intact stability criteria development and terminology and revise, as appropriate;
- .5 develop, verify, and further refine direct stability assessment procedures for the following stability failures:
 - .1 in following/stern quartering seas associated with matters related to stability variation in waves, in particular reduced righting levers of a ship situated on a wave crest;
 - .2 caused by parametric resonance and stability variation in waves;
 - .3 under dead ship conditions; and
 - .4 caused by broaching including consideration of matters related to manoeuvrability and course keeping ability as they affect stability;
- .6 further consider matters related to large accelerations and loads on cargo, and persons on board; and
- .7 submit a report to SLF 53.

4 SAFETY OF SMALL FISHING VESSELS

General

4.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that, with regard to the draft Safety recommendations, SLF 51, having considered the outcome of the correspondence group (SLF 51/5), had agreed to the modifications by the working group (SLF 51/WP.3) and re-established the correspondence group to finalize the text of the draft Safety recommendations.

4.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that MSC 83 had agreed to expand the Sub-Committee's existing work programme item to enable it to develop practical guidelines to assist competent authorities in implementation of the Fishing Vessels Safety Code, the Voluntary Guidelines and the Safety recommendations, and that SLF 51 had considered document SLF-51/5/3 (FAO), providing some ideas relating to the development of new guidelines.

4.3 The Sub-Committee further recalled that, at SLF 51, having received the report of the working group (SLF 51/WP.3), it had re-established the Correspondence Group on Fishing Vessel Safety and approved terms of reference, as set out in paragraphs 5.31 of document SLF 51/17, and had instructed the group to submit its report to SLF 52.

4.4 The Sub-Committee had for its consideration the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/4/1, SLF 52/4/2 and its addendum, and SLF 52/4/3) submitted by South Africa, providing a final text of the draft Safety Recommendations (SLF 52/4/2) and the draft Implementation Guidelines (SLF 52/4/3), together with its recommendations on those new instruments (SLF 52/4/1); and document SLF 52/4 (Secretariat), relating to the outcome of FP 53 and DE 52 on the draft Safety Recommendations.

Report of the correspondence group

Safety Recommendations

4.5 The Sub-Committee noted that the correspondence group had already considered the outcome of FP 53 and DE 52 on the draft Safety Recommendations (SLF 52/4) and had incorporated them in the draft Safety Recommendations (SLF 52/4/2, annex).

4.6 In considering the recommendations by the group that the Safety Recommendations be published in all the official languages of the IMO made available on a CD (paragraphs 16.5 and 16.6 of document SLF 52/4/1), the Sub-Committee was informed by the Secretariat that the Organization does not publish codes and guidelines in more than the three working languages as a matter of policy apart from exceptional cases (i.e. the Fishing Vessel Safety Code and Voluntary Guidelines). Subsequently, the Sub-Committee, noting that the Safety Recommendations would be translated into all the official languages and annexed to the Committee's report, and that the end users were owners and operators of small fishing vessels from developing countries, agreed that, in view of the above, it would be appropriate to consider how the Safety Recommendations can be made available to users and implemented, and requested the working group to further consider the matter.

4.7 Regarding future amendments to the Safety Recommendations after its approval, the Sub-Committee noted that a relevant new work item should be proposed by interested Members in accordance with the Committee's Guidelines.

4.8 In respect to the relationship between FAO, ILO and IMO on future amendments to the Safety Recommendations, the Sub-Committee concurred with the group's recommendation referred to in paragraph 18 of document SLF 52/4/1, noting the fact that the similar procedure had been included in the preface of the Fishing Vessel Safety Code, 2005 and Voluntary Guidelines, 2005; which were approved by MSC 79.

4.9 In considering the proposal by the delegation of France for the working group to consider modifications relating to piping systems, forepeak and coaming heights, etc., the Sub-Committee, noted that the draft Safety Recommendations had been developed and finalized through the correspondence and working groups after years of extensive consideration as well as that these issues had already been considered by the DE Sub-Committee, and further noting that the proposed modifications had not been submitted prior to the session, decided not to pursue the matter further.

4.10 Following the above discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed to the draft Safety Recommendations for decked fishing vessels of less than 12 metres in length and undecked fishing vessels, set out in annex ..., for submission to MSC 87 for approval, and, if approved, for forwarding the above Recommendations to FAO and ILO for concurrent approval, as appropriate. The Secretariat was requested to incorporate any editorial corrections that may be identified in the draft Safety Recommendations, when finalizing the aforementioned annex.

4.11 Upon the finalization of the Safety Recommendations, the Sub-Committee thanked the correspondence and working groups and, in particular the lead-country (South Africa) that coordinated this effort, for their dedication and comprehensive work, which are considered instrumental in bring this matter to a successful conclusion.

Guidelines to assist competent authorities (Implementation Guidelines)

4.12 The Sub-Committee, having considered the draft Guidelines to assist competent authorities in the implementation of Part B of the Code of Safety for fishermen and fishing vessels, Voluntary Guidelines for the design construction and equipment of small fishing vessels, and the Safety Recommendations for decked fishing vessels of less than 12 metres in length and undecked fishing vessels (referred to as "Implementation Guidelines") (SLF 52/4/3), referred the draft Implementation Guidelines to the working group for further consideration, in particular instructing it to identify chapters and related annexes in the draft Implementation Guidelines for further review by the FSI Sub-Committee, as recommended by the correspondence group. The

Sub-Committee also instructed the group, if necessary, to consider the need for an extension of the target completion date and advise the Sub-Committee accordingly.

4.13 With regard to the correspondence group's recommendation that the Committee liaises with the TCC to assist developing countries wishing to make use of the Guidelines, the Sub-Committee agreed to consider this matter after completion of the Implementation Guidelines.

Establishment of the working group

4.14 The Sub-Committee established the Working Group on of Fishing Vessel Safety (FVS) and instructed it, taking into account comments made and decisions taken in plenary, the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/4/1) and the outcome of FP 53 and DE 52 (SLF 52/4), to:

- .1 consider how the Safety Recommendations can be best made available to users and implemented, and advise the Sub-Committee accordingly;
- .2 further develop the draft Guidelines to assist Competent Authorities in the implementation of Part B of the Code of Safety for fishermen and fishing vessels, Voluntary Guidelines for the design construction and equipment of small fishing vessels, and the Safety Recommendations for decked fishing vessels of less than 12 metres in length and undecked fishing vessels, based on document SLF 52/4/3; and
- .3 consider whether it is necessary to re-establish a correspondence group and, if so, prepare terms of reference for consideration by the Sub-Committee.

[Report of the working group

4.15 Having received the report of the working group (SLF 52/WP.2), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as outlined hereunder.

Safety Recommendations

4.16 In regard to how the Safety Recommendations can best be made available to users and implemented, the Sub-Committee [did not agree] [agreed] to the group's recommendation to

request the Secretariat to make the text of the Safety Recommendations available on the public side of the IMO website and to also disseminate it by means of a CD Rom at no cost to the user.

4.17 In this context, the Sub-Committee also [did not agree] [agreed] to invite the Committee to request Technical Co-operation Committee to consider including the Safety Recommendations within the Integrated Technical Co-operation Programme (ITCP) and, when implementing a related TC activity, securing funding for translation of the Safety Recommendations into the language of the recipient countries, if it is not one of the six official languages of IMO.

Implementation Guidelines

4.18 Having agreed to the draft implementation Guidelines, in principle, and to the timeframe for finalization of the Guidelines referred to in paragraph 10 of document SLF 52/WP.2, specifying, *inter alia*, 2011 as the date for submission of the final draft Implementation Guidelines to the Committee for approval, the Sub-Committee agreed to refer the draft Implementation Guideline to the FSI Sub-Committee so that they could consider the parts under their purview and report back to SLF 53 their comments and proposals.

Establishment of the correspondence group

4.19 The Sub-Committee re-established a correspondence group, under the coordination of South Africa*, and instructed it, taking into account the progress made at the session, to further develop the draft Implementation guidelines, taking into the outcome of FSI 18, and submit report to SLF 53.]

5 DEVELOPMENT OF OPTIONS TO IMPROVE EFFECT ON SHIP DESIGN AND SAFETY OF THE 1969 TM CONVENTION

General

5.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that SLF 51 had considered the report of the correspondence group (SLF 51/6), which considered six options to improve the effect on ship design and safety

* **Coordinator:**
Captain Nigel T. Campbell
South African Maritime Safety Authority
P.O. Box 3914
North End, Port Elizabeth, 6065, South Africa
Tel: +27 (0)41 585 0051
Fax: +27 (0)41 582 1213
E-mail: ncampbell@samsa.org.za
CG website: www.sigling.is/FVS-ISCG

of the 1969 TM Convention, including the pros and cons of those options, and noted its recommendation that any action by IMO, whether through or in parallel with the TM Convention, should be thoroughly evaluated as to its effects on ship design and the shipping industry.

5.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that SLF 51, having considered the report of the drafting group (SLF 51/WP.6), had agreed that an in-depth technical evaluation of the proposed six options should be undertaken in parallel, taking into account any further options that may be proposed, and had also agreed that, in order to remove disincentives for improved safety and to provide greater flexibility to incorporate future amendments, a way for adoption of amendments via tacit acceptance procedure should be developed.

5.3 The Sub-Committee further recalled that SLF 51 had re-established a correspondence group and instructed it to further develop and evaluate the options to improve the effect of the 1969 TM Convention on ship design and safety, based on document SLF 51/6 and taking into account document SLF 51/6/1; and to further investigate the options for amendments to the 1969 TM Convention.

Report of the correspondence group

5.4 The Sub-Committee considered the report of the Correspondence Group on Development of options to improve effect on ship design and safety of the 1969 TM Convention (SLF 52/5/2), noting that the group:

- .1 considered eight options (i.e. 1. “maritime real estate” MRE concept; 2. promoting use of existing Net Tonnage; 3. allowing semi-open spaces to be excluded from total enclosed volume; 4. revision of the net tonnage parameter to include a deck cargo allowance; 5. establishing a third tonnage parameter Gross Tonnage Maximum Capacity (GTMaxCap) that includes deck cargo volume; 6. taking no action; 7. ensuring the integrity and uniform implementation of the existing Gross and Net Tonnage parameters; and 8. establishing a third tonnage parameter adjusted net tonnage that includes deck cargo volume), evaluating these options and investigating the added value thereof;
- .2 after combining and dropping some of these eight options, selected four options, (i.e. (A) ensuring the integrity and uniform implementation of the existing Gross

and Net Tonnage parameters; (B) promoting use of existing Net Tonnage for tonnage-based fees but take no other action; (C) amending TM Convention to establish a third tonnage parameter, adjusted net tonnage, that includes deck cargo volume; and (D) “Maritime real estate” (MRE) concept with associated resolution recommending use of this value for tonnage-based fees) in the order of preference among the group, and requested the Sub-Committee to consider these options and further actions, as appropriate;

- .3 with regard to investigation of options for amendment of the TM Convention, informed the Sub-Committee that there was not enough time to consider the matter, recalling that SLF 51 had preferred the introduction of tacit amendment procedures, using the unanimous acceptance provisions of the Convention; and
- .4 was of the view that further information was necessary regarding the benefits of safety on each option and pros and cons of amending the TM Convention.

5.5 The Sub-Committee considered document SLF 52/5/3 (China), commenting that, if the tacit acceptance procedure is adopted and the TM Convention is frequently revised, as a consequence, this may cause difficulties for the industry and Administrations. Therefore, China expressed its preference for Option A of the correspondence group’s recommendations (SLF 52/5/2, annex 2) and suggested that the Sub-Committee should count and analyse safety-related accidents on containerships, find out the relevant root causes and provide feasible solutions that the requirements for deck lashings and securing arrangements be revised, and that requirements for operation and cargo handling on ships carrying containers on deck be developed.

5.6 Following the general discussion, the Sub-Committee noted that:

- .1 the majority of the delegations who spoke preferred not to amend the TM Convention, supporting the opinion of China; and
- .2 there is a need to further improve safety in implementing the TM Convention, e.g., container cargoes on deck to be included in tonnage calculation, or not penalizing under deck cargoes;

and generally agreed to option A, preparing amendments to the interpretations of the provisions of the 1969 TM Convention (circular TM.5/Circ.5), instead of amending the Convention.

Other matters

5.7 In the context of the agenda item, the Sub-Committee considered document SLF 52/5 (Secretariat), reporting that MSC 85, following consideration of document MSC 85/23/6 (India), proposing to develop requirements to ensure that new ships undertaking international voyages have adequate facilities for the carriage of trainees, had agreed to forward the above proposal to:

- .1 the SLF Sub-Committee, for consideration in the context of its work relating to the 1969 TM Convention; and
- .2 the STW Sub-Committee, for consideration in the context of its work on the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and the STCW Code,

and instructed the above Sub-Committees to advise the Committee accordingly. In this regard, the Sub-Committee noted that the correspondence group had taken into account the India's proposal (SLF 52/5/2, paragraph 7), when addressing the issue.

5.8 The Sub-Committee also considered document SLF 52/5/1 (Secretariat), informing that STW 40 had agreed that it might not be possible to include the provisions proposed by India within the requirements of the STCW Convention, and had advised India to prepare a draft resolution for consideration at STW 41. The Sub-Committee noted that STW 41, after consideration of the proposal by India (STW 41/7/11), suggesting a draft Conference resolution urging Member Governments to encourage shipowners to ensure adequate certified accommodation for trainees/cadets, considered the report of the drafting group (annex 4 to STW 41/WP.4), and agreed to the draft STCW Conference resolution 9, which urges shipowners, managers and companies to provide suitable accommodation for trainees on existing ships, and further urges shipowners and companies to provide adequate dedicated accommodation for trainees on all new buildings.

- 5.9 In this regard, the Sub-Committee noted, in the course of the discussion on the issue, that:
- .1 the majority of the delegations supported the action taken by STW 41, i.e. adopting a draft STCW Conference resolution [, and therefore the issue of the accommodation for trainees would not be addressed by the Sub-Committee];
 - .2 the majority of the delegations preferred not to amend the TM Convention to exclude accommodation space from gross tonnage calculation; and
 - .3 some delegations expressed the view that ship having large accommodation space for crew should not be penalized.

Establishment of a drafting group

5.10 The Sub-Committee established a drafting group, and instructed it, taking into account the comments made and decisions taken in plenary, and the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/5/2), to draft terms of reference for a Correspondence Group on Development of options to improve the effect of the 1969 TM Convention on ship design and safety.

Report of the drafting group

5.11 Having received the report of the drafting group (SLF 52/WP.6), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and agreed to re-establish the Correspondence Group on the 1969 TM Convention, under the coordinator of ...^{*}, and instructed it, taking into account the comments and decisions taken by the Sub-Committee, to:

- .1 consider further and finalize the information provided in annex 2 to document SLF 52/5/2 (Report of the correspondence group) with respect to improving the effect of the 1969 Convention on the design of ships and in particular with reference to the effect on safety;
- .2 examine, in relation to the options listed in annex 2 to document SLF 52/5/2:

* **Coordinator:**

- .1 improvement of crew accommodation; and
- .2 the tonnage measurement of ships carrying deck cargoes and, in particular, of containerships;
- .3 identify and investigate the benefits and disadvantages of the options listed in annex 2 to document SLF 52/5/2; and
- .4 submit a report to SLF 53.

6 TIME-DEPENDENT SURVIVABILITY OF PASSENGER SHIPS IN DAMAGED CONDITION

6.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that SLF 50 had noted document SLF 50/8 (ITTC), providing the first stage of the ITTC time-to-flood benchmarking study which concluded that, for ships having a relatively simple internal geometry in calm water, reasonable time-to-sink predictions appeared feasible, and had invited the ITTC to provide updated information on this matter.

6.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that SLF 51, having considered document SLF 51/8 (ITTC), providing a preliminary report on the second stage of the benchmark testing of numerical codes for time-to-flood prediction for damaged passenger ships for realistic cruise ship data with only two numerical results based on two codes, had invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit documents on the matter at this session.

6.3 The Sub-Committee, whilst noting that no documents were submitted, acknowledged that relevant research work was in progress and, having agreed to retain the item on the agenda for the next session, invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit relevant documents on the matter.

7 GUIDANCE ON THE IMPACT OF OPEN WATERTIGHT DOORS ON EXISTING AND NEW SHIP SURVIVABILITY

General

7.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that SLF 51 had agreed that, while the DE Sub-Committee should develop operational guidance, this Sub-Committee should develop design and

construction guidance from the survivability point of view, distinguishing between new and existing ships.

7.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that SLF 51 had instructed the SDS Correspondence Group to prepare a draft Guidance on the impact of open watertight doors on existing and new ship survivability.

7.3 The Sub-Committee noted the outcome of DE 52 (SLF 52/7) regarding the related matter and, in particular, that DE 52 had re-established the correspondence group and instructed it to further develop the draft Guidance for Administrations to ensure a consistent policy for determining the need for, and circumstances wherein, watertight doors may remain open during navigation.

Report of the correspondence group

7.4 The Sub-Committee considered the report of the SDS Correspondence Group (SLF 52/7/1) and noted that, with regard to the applicability of the draft Guidance to existing ships, the group agreed that the following new paragraph 3.2 should be added to the draft Guidance (SLF 51/10/1):

“3.2 For existing ships, the Administration may consider an allowance in the criteria stated above in connection with increased operational measures providing an equivalent level of safety.”

7.5 The Sub-Committee also considered document SLF 52/7/2 (Sweden), proposing that, since both the SLF and DE Sub-Committees have developed guidance on open watertight doors, the two guidance should be issued under one common MSC circular.

7.6 In considering the above documents, the Sub-Committee:

- .1 with regard to the applicability of the draft Guidance to existing ships (see paragraph 7.4), noted that, while some delegations expressed concerns mainly due to impracticability of applying the design guidance to existing ships, most delegations generally agreed to the compromise solution recommended by the correspondence group;

- .2 concerning fatalities caused by watertight doors, noted the opinion of some delegations that this matter should be viewed as an operational and training issue;
- .3 regarding harmonization of the two relevant guidance being developed by the DE and SLF Sub-Committees, agreed, in principle, with the proposal by Sweden that all the guidance under development on this matter should be issued in a single MSC circular; and
- .4 noted CLIA's view that, with regard to the suggested "floatability assessment" in the draft Guidance, this should be linked to the risk assessment approach proposed by the DE Sub-Committee and this approach may be appropriate for inclusion in a risk assessment for operation in areas of higher risk as proposed by the DE Sub-Committee.

7.7 In the course of the discussion, a question was raised whether the draft Guidance should apply to passenger ships only or be extended to include cargo ships, taking into account that revised SOLAS regulation II-1/22.4 may apply to both types of ships. The Sub-Committee, after extensive discussion, agreed that the draft Guidance should apply to passenger ships only, recalling that the matter has only been considered within the context of passenger ship safety, taking into account that the DE Sub-Committee has only developed relevant guidance for passenger ships. Subsequently, the Sub-Committee invited the Committee to note this course of action.

Establishment of the working group

7.8 The Sub-Committee established the Working Group on Subdivision and Damage Stability (SDS) and instructed it, taking into account comments and decisions made in plenary, and the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/7/1), to finalize the draft Guidance on the impact of open watertight doors on existing and new ship survivability, based on documents SLF 51/10/1 and SLF 52/7/1 and taking into account documents SLF 52/7 and SLF 52/7/2, and advise the Sub-Committee accordingly.

[Report of the working group

7.9 Having received the report of the working group (SLF 52/WP.3), the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as indicated in paragraphs hereunder.

7.10 The Sub-Committee agreed to the Guidance for the determination by administrations of the impact of open watertight doors on ship survivability under SOLAS regulation II-1/22.4 and previous SOLAS regulation II-1/15.9.3, as set out in annex Taking into account its earlier decision to issue the Guidance together with the Guidance for Administrations to ensure consistent policy for determining the need for watertight doors to remain open during navigation on passenger ships, under consideration by the DE Sub-Committee, in a single MSC circular (see paragraph 7.6.3), the Sub-Committee agreed with the recommendation of the group that, for user-friendliness, the Guidance should be incorporated in the Guidance under preparation by the DE Sub-Committee as an annex. The Sub-Committee requested the Secretariat to inform DE 53 accordingly and invited the Committee to note the proposed course of action.

7.11 The Sub-Committee agreed with the view of the group that the Guidance was not intended to be applicable to special purpose ships.

7.12 The delegation of Germany, supported by the delegations of the Bahamas and the Marshall Islands, reserved its position regarding paragraph 3.2 of the Guidance which envisages applying this Guidance to existing ships, as this might lead to retroactive requirements/modifications. The delegations were of the opinion that existing ships should be addressed through operational criteria only. The observer from CLIA associated himself with the concerns expressed in the reservation of the above delegations.]

8 STABILITY AND SEA-KEEPING CHARACTERISTICS OF DAMAGED PASSENGER SHIPS IN A SEAWAY WHEN RETURNING TO PORT BY OWN POWER OR UNDER TOW

General

8.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that SLF 51, following an extensive debate on the item, had noted that a majority of delegations who spoke were of the view, supporting the United States, that only operational guidance should be developed for safe return to port, which should also address the need for onboard computers.

8.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that SLF 51 had decided to refer the matter to the SDS Correspondence Group, to develop design and damage stability criteria for passenger ships for safe return to port by own power or under tow; prepare draft guidelines for operational

information for masters of passenger ships for safe return to port by own power or under tow; and prepare draft amendments to SOLAS regulation II-1/8-1.

Report of the correspondence group

8.3 The Sub-Committee, in considering the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/8/2), noted that:

- .1 concerning operational guidance, opinions were divided whether operational guidance alone or both operational guidance and design stability criteria should be developed. In this regard, the United States proposal (SLF 51/11/3) to amend SOLAS regulation II-1/8-1 was supported by the group, and it was suggested that some elements of MSC.1/Circ.1228 on Revised Guidance to the master for avoiding dangerous situations in adverse weather and sea conditions may be relevant for guidance;
- .2 regarding stability computers, the majority of the group was in favour of a mandatory requirement for onboard stability computers; and, as to whether damage control measures may be considered to form operational guidance advice to the master for the safe return to port, it was concluded that MSC.1/Circ.1245 on Guidelines for damage control plans and information to the master was sufficient; and
- .3 the group also considered relevant issues on design damage extent for Safe Return to Port (RtP), design stability criteria and on passenger ro-ro ships.

8.4 The Sub-Committee also considered document SLF 52/8/1, proposing a method to establish an attained index for safe return to port, that is, an additional subdivision index on “absolute survivability” called A_{SRtP} , based on the residual stability beyond the damage stability requirements of SOLAS chapter II-1, which are calculated in the format of a survivability index SS_{RtP} , using the requirements of the IS Code. The Sub-Committee noted that Germany had conducted sample calculations using the above indices and had proposed graphical illustration of SS_{RtP} .

8.5 After an extensive discussion on the above documents, the Sub-Committee supported the United States proposal (SLF 51/11/3) that only operational guidance should be developed; and

I:\SLF\52\WP\5.doc

that the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation II-1/8-1 should not be finalized until after the above guidance is developed, together with amendments on mandatory requirements for onboard computers.

Outcome of FP 53

8.6 The Sub-Committee considered document SLF 52/8 (Secretariat), reporting that FP 53, having considered document FP 53/18/1 (Italy and CLIA), containing draft Explanatory notes relevant to the safe return to port for passenger ships, had agreed, in principle, to the draft Explanatory notes and prepared a consolidated text of the draft Explanatory notes (FP 53/WP.7). The Sub-Committee noted that FP 53 had agreed that the SLF Sub-Committee should be kept informed on the progress made in respect of the development of the Explanatory notes for the assessment of passenger ship system's capabilities as appropriate and, in particular, had requested the Sub-Committee to comment on interpretations 15 and 69 set out in the annex to document FP 53/WP.7.

8.7 After a general discussion the Sub-Committee referred the aforementioned interpretations 15 and 69 to the SDS Working Group for further consideration.

Instructions to the SDS Working Group

8.8 Subsequently, the Sub-Committee instructed the SDS Working Group, established under agenda item 7, taking into account comments and decisions made in plenary, and the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/8/2), to:

- .1 further consider draft Guidelines for operational information for masters of passenger ships for safe return to port by own power or under tow, taking into account documents SLF 52/8/2 and SLF 51/11/3;
- .2 consider the matter requested by FP 53 in respect of the development of the Explanatory notes for the assessment of passenger ship system's capabilities, taking into account documents SLF 53/8 and FP 53/WP.7;
- .3 consider whether it is necessary to re-establish a correspondence group and, if so, prepare draft terms of reference for consideration by the Sub-Committee; and
- .4 present the outcome of the above matters as part of the working group's report.

[Outcome of the SDS Working Group

8.9 Having considered the part of the report of the SDS Working Group (SLF 52/WP.3) relating to the agenda item, the Sub-Committee took action as outlined in the following paragraphs.

Operational information for masters of passenger ships for safe return to port by own power or under tow

8.10 The Sub-Committee noted the views of the group regarding the contents of the draft operational information for masters of passenger ships for safe return to port by own power or under tow, as set out in paragraph 10 of their report (SLF 52/WP.3), in particular the recommendation to change the title to “Operational information for masters of passenger ships for safe return to port by own power or under tow”, since it should refer to operational information instead of guidelines, as information better represents the type of contents needed.

Establishment of the SDS Correspondence Group

8.11 The Sub-Committee agreed to establish the SDS correspondence group, under the coordination of the United Kingdom*, and instructed it to develop draft Operational information for masters of passenger ships for safe return to port by own power or under tow, taking into account the elements listed in paragraph 10 of document SLF 52/WP.3 and comments and proposals made in plenary (see paragraphs 8.3 to 8.5).

Outcome of FP 53 – Explanatory notes for the assessment of passenger ship system’s capabilities

8.12 The Sub-Committee endorsed the conclusion of the group that interpretations 15 (on SOLAS regulation II-2/21.3.2) and 69 (on SOLAS regulation II-1/18) should be deleted from the Explanatory notes for the assessment of passenger ship system’s capabilities, developed by

* **Coordinators:**

Andrew Scott
Policy Lead, Stability
Marine Technology Branch
Maritime and Coastguard Agency
Compass House, Tyne Dock
South Shields, Tyne & Wear NE34 9PY
Tel.: +44 (0)191 496 9905
Fax: +44 (0)191 496 9901
E-mail: andrew.scott@mcga.gov.uk

Ronnie Allen
Head, Marine Technology Branch
Maritime and Coastguard Agency
Spring Place, 105 Commercial Road
Southampton SO15 1EG
Tel.: +44 (0)2380 329 519
E-mail: ronald.allen@mcga.gov.uk

FP 53, for the reason set out in paragraph 13 of their report (SLF 52/WP.3). The Secretariat was requested to inform FP 54 accordingly.]

9 GUIDELINES FOR VERIFICATION OF DAMAGE STABILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TANKERS AND BULK CARRIERS

General

9.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that SLF 51, acknowledging the importance of complying with relevant damage stability requirements for operational loading conditions, had invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit the relevant information.

9.2 The Sub-Committee noted document SLF 52/9, informing that, at MSC 85, the Chairman highlighted that MSC 83 had already agreed on the need for this work item and stated that the SLF Sub-Committee should focus its efforts on the technical aspects and advise the Committee, in due course, of the outcome of its technical consideration. In supporting the Chairman's views, MSC 85 agreed to extend the target completion date as requested by the Sub-Committee and agreed that sub-committees should focus their deliberations on the technical or operational aspects of the work assigned.

Guidelines for verification of damage stability requirements for tankers

9.3 The Sub-Committee considered the following documents relating to the guidelines for verification of damage stability for tankers:

- .1 document SLF 52/9/1 (Denmark, Germany, Norway, Sweden and United Kingdom), presenting the results of data collection carried out with regard to damage stability verification made on tankers prior to departure, and inviting the Sub-Committee to develop guidelines to be applied in tankers' damage stability appraisal;
- .2 document SLF 52/9/2 (Republic of Korea), showing its investigation results of the practical concerns of introducing the guidelines for the verification of damage stability using a stability instrument for existing tankers and bulk carriers. The Republic of Korea proposed that existing tankers and bulk carriers should not be subject to the newly introduced guidelines for verifying the damage stability prior to departure;

- .3 document SLF 52/9/3 (RINA), suggesting that every tanker should have instant access to some means to check its intended loading condition against the damaged stability requirements, and introducing several means that would satisfy the requirement;
- .4 document SLF 52/9/4 (United Kingdom), informing of relevant IMO mandatory and voluntary instruments (e.g., SOLAS, the IBC and IGC Codes, and MARPOL), including the obligations of masters and maritime administrations;
- .5 document SLF 52/9/5 (IPTA), commenting on document SLF 52/9/1, and proposing a phased approach on this issue;
- .6 document SLF 52/9/6 (IPTA), commenting on document SLF 52/9/2, and reiterating that types 2 and 3 chemical tankers will still generally have a higher degree of subdivision than similar sized oil tankers, which more generally carry homogeneous cargoes in fewer, larger tanks;
- .7 document SLF 52/9/7 (ICS), commenting on document SLF 52/9/1, and proposing that document SLF 51/13/1 (draft guidelines for verification of damage stability for tankers) could provide a useful contribution toward the development of the technical assessment content of the guidance for stability data approval. It also attached issues that should be considered when developing guidance on the approval of stability data; and
- .8 document SLF 52/INF.4 (IACS), providing the IACS Guideline for Scope of Damage Stability Verification on new oil tankers, chemical tankers, and gas carriers, which are contracted for construction on or after 1 January 2010.

9.4 In considering the above documents, the Sub-Committee, having noted the views of those delegations that spoke on how best to proceed with the matter, agreed to first address tankers and then address bulk carriers after the work related to tankers has been completed.

9.5 The Sub-Committee noted that two distinct views were expressed by those delegations that spoke on the matter. The delegation of the Cook Islands, supported by several delegations, reiterated their contention, expressed at SLF 51, that no justification or compelling need had been demonstrated since, in their view, there was no substantive evidence to support the claim

(SLF 52/9/1) that one third of the tanker fleet currently poses an unacceptable risk to life at sea and to the environment. Other delegations expressed the view that there is an urgent need to develop guidelines for the verification of damage stability requirements for tankers since ships have been shown to regularly sail in conditions of loading significantly different from those in the approved stability information.

9.6 The Sub-Committee unanimously agreed that the ambiguities in the conventions' requirements regarding verification of compliance of tankers in various loading conditions with the relevant damage stability requirements highlighted by many delegations during the discussion should be addressed, in any event, to ensure that the aforementioned damage stability requirements can be consistently and effectively applied and vessel damage stability verified.

9.7 The Sub-Committee, after a lengthy discussion, therefore agreed that it would be beneficial to develop guidelines in order to enhance the ability of all concerned to verify the damage stability of their vessels.

9.8 With the above agreements in mind, the Sub-Committee decided to first develop the design and operational guidelines for verification of damage stability for tankers. In this context, the Sub-Committee agreed that the tanker guidelines should be divided into two parts (i.e. design and operational), and the delegations should take this into account when developing their proposals.

9.9 Subsequently, the Sub-Committee invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit proposals on the design and operational guidelines for tankers to the next session, in particular, on the scope, ship types, extent of such guidelines.

9.10 The Sub-Committee, having noted the concerns of several delegations regarding the port State control concentrated inspection campaign planned to be conducted as a result of the documents submitted to IMO on the matter, decided to invite MSC 87 to urge Member Governments to bear in mind the current work being undertaken by the Sub-Committee (i.e. its intention to develop design and operational guidelines) in this regard.

10 TENDERS OPERATING FROM PASSENGER SHIPS

10.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 84 had considered document MSC 84/22/8 (United Kingdom), proposing to develop provisions for the design, equipment and operation of tenders carrying passengers and crew from passenger ships to shore, to ensure that a consistent approach is adopted, together with document MSC 84/22/24 (CLIA), in which CLIA pointed out that its members have conducted, without serious incidents, numerous tender vessel operations each year involving tens of thousands of passengers and, therefore, CLIA could not support the proposal by the United Kingdom without details of tender vessel casualties and more specific guidance as to the scope of the work to be undertaken, bearing in mind that the above proposal might result in over-regulation of an already safe operation.

10.2 The Sub-Committee further recalled that MSC 84, following the discussion, had agreed to include, in the work programmes of the DE, FP, COMSAR, NAV, SLF and STW Sub-Committees, a high-priority item on “Safety provisions applicable to tenders operating from passenger ships”, with three sessions needed to complete the item, assigning the DE Sub-Committee as a coordinator, and that MSC 85 had included the item in the provisional agenda of the Sub-Committee at this session.

10.3 The Sub-Committee, having considered documents MSC 84/22/8 (United Kingdom) and MSC 84/22/24 (CLIA), noted that DE 53 would consider the draft guidelines on tenders and the outcome would be reported to SLF 53.

10.4 Recognizing the need for more information, the Sub-Committee invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit their proposals and comments on the item to the next session, taking into account the outcome of DE 53.

10.5 The Sub-Committee requested the Secretariat to inform DE 53 of the above outcome.

11 DAMAGE STABILITY REGULATIONS FOR RO-RO PASSENGER SHIPS

General

11.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 84, having agreed to include a new item on “Damage stability regulations for ro-ro passenger ships” in the Sub-Committee’s work programme, with two sessions needed to complete the item, had instructed SLF 51 to give a

preliminary consideration to the item and to include the item in the provisional agenda for this session.

11.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that SLF 51, having received the report of the working group (SLF 51/WP.1), had established the SDS Correspondence Group to consider the item.

Report of the correspondence group

11.3 The Sub-Committee considered the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/11/1), providing the group's view on the impact of the SOLAS 2009 amendments on ro-ro passenger ships, as compared to the SOLAS 90 regulations in association with the Stockholm Agreement (SA). The Sub-Committee noted that the majority of the group, after examining relevant research on the matter, had considered that some amendments to SOLAS 2009 may be necessary, believing that these should be based on further research work, in particular on smaller ships with fewer passengers and on ships with LLH (long lower hold), especially those fitted with B/10 longitudinal bulkheads.

11.4 The Sub-Committee had the following documents for consideration:

- .1 SLF 52/11/2 (Japan), providing calculations and model experiments to facilitate further examination on this issue and observing that the required GM was larger in the SOLAS 2009 than in the SOLAS 90 with SA in all the loading cases defined in SOLAS 2009, which indicated that the safety level of SOLAS 2009 for a relatively large ship becomes higher than that of SOLAS 90 with SA.
- .2 SLF 52/11/3 (Austria *et al.*), informing that the co-sponsors were of the view that the Sub-Committee should await the outcome of further research in this field, particularly since the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) had just launched a major study on this issue which should provide greater insight into the problem as well as on the need for possible rectification measures. They also expressed the view that, should a clear need for specific rectification measures emerge, early agreement on such measures would be helpful.

11.5 In considering the above-mentioned documents, the Sub-Committee, having noted the views of several delegations that the issue of smaller ships with fewer passengers as well as ships with LLH fitted with B/10 longitudinal bulkheads should be the main focus of the work on this

issue and that the Sub-Committee should await the outcome of further research in this field, decided that the SDS Working Group, established under agenda item 7, should further consider the matter.

Outcome of FP 53

11.6 The Sub-Committee considered document SLF 52/11 (Secretariat), informing that, in regard to the Guidelines for the drainage of fire-fighting water from closed vehicle and ro-ro spaces and special category spaces for passenger and cargo ships (MSC.1/Circ.1320), in particular with regard to the use of direct overboard drains above the bulkhead deck, FP 53 had considered that the 5° heel requirement for immersion of the bulkhead deck may not be a suitable value to use for conditions of severe listing but determined that this same consideration may affect a variety of casualty scenarios on ro-ro ships. In this regard, FP 53, having decided that the use of direct overboard drains above the bulkhead deck in accordance with SOLAS regulation II-1/35-1 should be accepted, invited the SLF Sub-Committee to re-examine the provisions of paragraphs 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 of the regulation from a holistic viewpoint to determine the validity of the 5° heel breakpoint on modern ro-ro ships.

11.7 After brief discussion, the Sub-Committee agreed to refer the matter to the SDS Working Group for detailed consideration and advice as appropriate.

Instructions to the SDS Working Group

11.8 Subsequently, the Sub-Committee instructed the SDS Working Group, established under agenda item 7, taking into account comments and decisions made in plenary, and the report of the correspondence group (SLF 52/11/1), to:

- .1 further consider the impact of the SOLAS 2009 amendments on ro-ro passenger ships, as compared to the SOLAS 90 regulations in association with the Stockholm Agreement, taking into account documents SLF 52/11/2 and SLF 52/11/3;
- .2 re-examine the provisions of paragraphs 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 of SOLAS regulation II-1/35-1 to determine the validity of the 5° heel breakpoint on modern ro-ro ships, taking into account document SLF 52/11; and
- .3 consider whether it is necessary to re-establish a correspondence group and, if so, prepare terms of reference for consideration by the Sub-Committee.

[Report of the SDS Working Group]

11.9 Having received the part of the report of the working group (SLF 52/WP.3) dealing with the agenda item, the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as indicated in paragraphs hereunder.

Outcome of FP 53 – Validity of the 5° heel breakpoint on modern ro-ro ships

11.10 The Sub-Committee endorsed the conclusion of the group that the 5° heel breakpoint as required by paragraphs 2.6.1 and 2.6.2 of SOLAS regulation II-1/35-1 (Bilge pumping arrangements) for modern ro-ro passenger ships was a reasonable value and should be retained (see paragraph 27 of SLF 52/WP.3).

Impact of the SOLAS 2009 amendments on ro-ro passenger ships, as compared to the SOLAS 1990 regulations in association with the Stockholm Agreement

11.11 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had discussed in detail the impact of the SOLAS 2009 amendments on ro-ro passenger ships, as compared to the SOLAS 1990 regulations in association with the Stockholm Agreement, and whether in this regard any amendments to SOLAS should be considered and that the group, in order to consider the different elements involved, had focussed its discussions on the s-value, R-value, long lower holds (LLH) and small ships with fewer persons on board. The outcome of the group's discussions is described in paragraphs 15 to 24 of document SLF 52/WP.3.

11.12 The Sub-Committee also noted the view of the group that further research in the matter should focus on designs optimised to the SOLAS 2009 regulations and that, since the new safe return to port (SRTP) requirements will affect new designs of ships, research projects should take these new design considerations into account. The general opinion in the group was that more research and the evaluation of further studies were important and necessary before considering any possible additional measures. The group was aware of three such studies currently ongoing and felt that as soon as results became available, they should be referred to the experts in the SDS correspondence group (see paragraph 11.13).

Instructions to the SDS Correspondence Group

11.13 The Sub-Committee agreed that the SDS Correspondence Group established under agenda item 8 should be instructed to further consider the impact of the SOLAS 2009

amendments on ro-ro passenger ships, as compared to the SOLAS 1990 regulations in association with the Stockholm Agreement, taking into account document SLF 52/WP.3, comments and proposals made in plenary, and any research results in the matter as they became available; and to submit a report to SLF 53.

12 DEVELOPMENT OF AN AGREEMENT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1993 TORREMOLINOS PROTOCOL

General

12.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 84, having agreed to include a new item on “Development of an agreement on the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol” in the Sub-Committee’s work programme, with the target completion date of 2011, had instructed SLF 51 to give a preliminary consideration to the item.

12.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that SLF 51 had agreed that the Secretariat should initiate a consultation process with States, having more than 500 fishing vessels of 24 metres in length and over, and that MSC 85, having endorsed SLF 51’s course of action, had requested the Secretariat to enter into consultation with those States. In this context, the Sub-Committee noted that the questionnaires on the technical and legal problems of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol were sent and some replies were received by the Secretariat (SLF 52/12/1).

12.3 Having recalled that SLF 51 had instructed the correspondence group to prepare a draft Agreement on the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol, the Sub-Committee, being informed that the group did not have enough time to consider details of the draft Agreement, i.e. identification of technical regulations of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol to be included in an Agreement, noted that the relevant matter had been discussed at the Bali Seminar on the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol and included in the outcome of the Seminar (SLF 52/12/2).

12.4 The Sub-Committee had for its consideration documents:

- .1 SLF 52/12 (Secretariat) on Development of an agreement on the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol;

- .2 SLF 52/12/Add.1 (Secretariat) on Additional explanation on two options and a draft Assembly resolution;
- .3 SLF 52/12/Add.2 (Secretariat) on Proposed amendments to the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol;
- .4 SLF 52/12/1 (Secretariat) on Reply to the questionnaire regarding implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol;
- .5 SLF 52/12/2 (Secretariat) on Outcome of the Subregional seminar/workshop on the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol (Bali, Indonesia); and
- .6 SLF 52/INF.5 (Secretariat) on Suggested modifications to the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol.

Options for implementation of the Protocol (Draft agreement and Assembly resolution)

12.5 The Sub-Committee, in considering documents SLF 52/12, SLF 52/12/Add.1 and SLF 52/12/2, relating to a draft agreement, Assembly resolution and other options for facilitating the implementation of the Protocol, noted, in particular, that:

- .1 document SLF 52/12 included the full report of the legal study prepared by the IMO consultant (annex 1), containing a draft Agreement on the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol; another option, that is, the similar measure taken for implementation of the MARPOL Annex IV; and other options regarding the Athens Convention relating to the Carriage of Passengers and their Luggage by Sea, 1974, and its Protocol of 2002, as well as a draft protocol to amend the International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea, 1996 (HNS Convention); and
- .2 document SLF 52/12/Add.1 provided additional information on the option to adopt an Assembly resolution to facilitate the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol (referred to as “Assembly resolution option”), based on the similar method successfully applied in the case of the implementation of

MARPOL Annex IV (see also the above subparagraph .1), under which Parties to the Torremolinos Protocol would be able to implement the necessary amendments immediately after the date of the entry into force of the current Torremolinos Protocol even before the amendments are formally adopted under article 11 of the Torremolinos Protocol and put into force, under the authority of the IMO Assembly. Also, the period of application of the amendments could be shortened as much as possible in arranging the meeting to adopt the amendments (Expanded MSC or Conference of the Parties) as soon as possible after the date of the entry into force of the Torremolinos Protocol.

12.6 The Sub-Committee, having noted the further explanation by the Secretariat that:

- .1 an Agreement is a new legally binding instrument, offering firm foundation to implement the amended Torremolinos Protocol. However, since Parties which have already ratified the Protocol may have to ratify the Agreement again, there is a need for serious consideration on the Agreement option; and
- .2 an Assembly resolution is a softer approach. However, having in mind the IMO's experience in implementing MARPOL Annex VI, the option would provide reasonable base for Member States to ratify the Protocol where Parties which have already ratified the Protocol would not have to ratify it again,

instructed the FVS Working Group, established under agenda item 4, to further consider the matter, in particular the pros and cons for two options, i.e. the draft Agreement option and the Assembly resolution option.

Questionnaire on the technical and legal problems of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol

12.7 The Sub-Committee was informed (SLF 52/12/1) that, in pursuance of the request by MSC 85, the Secretariat had sent letters to 11 States (China, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, the Russian Federation, Spain, Thailand, the United States and Viet Nam) that have more than 500 registered fishing vessels of 24 metres in length and over, in the form of a questionnaire regarding implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol as developed by SLF 51, and requested them to reply to the aforementioned questionnaire.

12.8 The Sub-Committee, having considered document SLF 52/12/1, providing replies to the questionnaire, and document SLF 52/12/2, providing the outcome of the Subregional seminar/workshop on the Implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol held in Bali, Indonesia (from 12 to 15 October 2009, organized by IMO and hosted by the Government of Indonesia), noted that:

- .1 regarding question 1 on some technical difficulties identified in the Beijing Seminar in 2004, some comments were provided and, in particular, Japan gave detailed technical comments on the current Torremolinos Protocol, which the Bali Seminar considered in detail;
- .2 regarding question 3 on the use of equivalence of length to gross tonnage, proposed by Japan based on its detailed analysis, which was also used in the ILO Working in Fishing Convention (C 188), some countries preferred to use equivalence of length to gross tonnage. In the Bali Seminar, majority of the Seminar had agreed that such equivalency should be used;
- .3 regarding question 4 on the concept of progressive implementation of the Protocol, some countries preferred the concept. The Bali Seminar, except for one country, had generally supported the concept, recognizing its usefulness that would give time to countries to prepare for the implementation of the Protocol;
- .4 regarding question 2 (i.e. if the Protocol was amended, such that it would only be applicable to fishing vessels on the high seas, would this reduce an obstacle to ratification?), while two countries were not in favour of the amendments, other countries provided affirmative replies. In this context, the Bali Seminar had agreed, in principle, that regulation I/3 (exemption) of the Protocol should be modified so that an Administration may exempt vessels engaged solely in fishing in its exclusive economic zone; and
- .5 concerning the number of fishing vessels, which was updated at the Bali Seminar, in recognizing significant reduction of fishing vessels, the Seminar had considered the condition of entry into force of the Protocol and the relevant clause of the draft Agreement (article 4), i.e. whether to reduce the aggregate number of fishing

vessels (14,000). Subsequently, majority of the Seminar agreed that the aforementioned number should not be reduced at this stage,

bearing in mind that the report of the Bali Seminar also included comments of countries from the East Asia Region, which had not replied to the questionnaire.

12.9 The Sub-Committee, having considered:

- .1 document SLF 52/12/Add.2, providing the proposed amendments to the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol, which should be annexed to a draft Agreement or Assembly resolution on the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol to facilitate the consideration by the Sub-Committee; and
- .2 document SLF 52/INF.5, suggesting other detailed modifications to the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol, which may be used when considering technical amendments to the Protocol,

noted that, concerning the proposed amendments to regulations of the Torremolinos Protocol (SLF 52/12/Add.2), the technical and legal problems would be generally solved in amending regulations. However, in case of amendments to articles of the Protocol, the explicit amendment procedure should be used, and it will take a long time to bring the amendments into force.

12.10 Following discussion on whether the Administration may exempt any vessel engaged solely in fishing in its EEZ, in particular in case the States are not the Party to the UNCLOS or on the extent of sea area where exemption is granted to vessels (e.g., less than 200 miles), the Sub-Committee referred documents submitted to this session to the FVS Working Group to further consider the matters to prepare the draft amendments to the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol.

Instructions to the FVS Working Group

12.11 The Sub-Committee instructed the FVS Working Group, established under agenda item 4, taking into account comments and decisions made in plenary, to:

- .1 further consider the options for the draft Agreement and the Assembly resolution for the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol, in particular the pros

and cons of the options, based on documents SLF 52/12 and its addendum, and advise the Sub-Committee accordingly;

.2 further consider the replies to the questions on the technical and legal problems of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol, in particular:

.2.1 whether the Administration may exempt any vessel engaged solely in fishing in its EEZ;

.2.2 the use of equivalence of length to gross tonnage;

.2.3 the concept of progressive implementation of the Protocol;

.2.4 the technical difficulties identified in the Beijing Seminar in 2004; and

.2.5 any other matters relevant to the implementation of the Protocol;

and prepare the draft amendments to the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol, based on documents SLF 52/12 and its addendum, SLF 52/12/1, SLF 52/12/2 and SLF 52/INF.5; and

.3 consider whether it is necessary to re-establish a correspondence group and, if so, prepare draft terms of reference for consideration by the Sub-Committee.

[Report of the working group]

12.12 Having considered the part of the report of the working group (SLF 52/WP.2) relating to the item, the Sub-Committee approved it in general and took action as outlined hereunder.

Options for implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol

12.13 The Sub-Committee noted that the group had considered in-depth documents SLF 52/12 and addenda and the comments made in plenary in order to recommend the most effective procedure to implement of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol and that the group could not reach a common consensus in the time available on the most viable option (i.e. Agreement or Assembly resolution) for accomplishing the above goal, taking into account the complex legal and policy issues related to this matter.

12.14 In discussing how best to proceed, the Sub-Committee agreed to instruct the correspondence group established under agenda item 4 (Safety of small fishing vessels) to

prepare a draft Agreement and draft Assembly Resolution, based on document SLF 52/12 and its addenda, including pros and cons for each option, for consideration at SLF 53 (see also paragraph 4...). In this regard, the Sub-Committee encouraged Member Governments and international organizations to make their legal and technical expertise available to the correspondence group so that it may complete its work on this important issue.

Questionnaire on the technical and legal problems of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol

12.15 The Sub-Committee noted the progress made by the group on the technical analysis on the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol and that the group had considered the proposed modifications to the Protocol set out in documents SLF 52/12/Add.2 and SLF 52/INF.5 as a basis for its discussions, taking into account the difficulties raised at the Beijing and Bali seminars and considering the replies to the questionnaire (SLF 52/12/1 and SLF 52/12/2).

12.16 In this context, the Sub-Committee expressed its appreciation the delegations of the Russian Federation and the Republic of Korea for provided answers to the IMO questionnaire on the technical and legal problems of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol, as set out in annex 3 to document SLF 52/WP.2.

12.17 In discussing how best to proceed, the Sub-Committee agreed to further instruct the aforementioned correspondence group to further develop the technical amendments to the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol using documents SLF 52/12/Add.2 and SLF 52/INF.5 as a basis, taking into account documents SLF 52/12/1, SLF 52/12/2 and SLF 52/WP.2, for consideration at SLF 53.

Intersessional meeting of the working group

12.18 The Sub-Committee discussed the need for the holding of an intersessional meeting of the working group to finalize the options for the implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol and develop the associated technical amendments related thereto in time for the Sub-Committee to meet this high-priority work by the target completion date of 2011, so that the final instrument(s) could be adopted at the next session of the Assembly. Following the discussion, the Sub-Committee, being of the opinion that the complexity and amount of the associated work load necessitates the holding of an intersessional meeting [date to be decided], considered that the working group should meet intersessionally for one prior to MEPC 61 and agreed to request the Committee to approve the holding of such an intersessional meeting of the working group.]

13 CONSIDERATION OF IACS UNIFIED INTERPRETATIONS

13.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that this was a continuous item on its work programme, which was established by MSC 78 so that IACS could submit any newly developed or updated unified interpretations (UI) for the consideration of the Sub-Committee with a view to developing appropriate IMO interpretations.

13.2 The Sub-Committee had for its consideration the following documents submitted by IACS:

- .1 document SLF 52/13, providing IACS Unified Interpretation SC 225 on the occupied volume by flooded water of a flooded space, that the volume of flooded water under SOLAS regulation II-1/2(14) should be determined to use the moulded capacity (i.e. the immersed volume of a space shall be the underwater moulded volume of that space) multiplied by the permeability, which was to be implemented from 1 April 2009;
- .2 document SLF 52/13/1, providing IACS Unified Interpretation LL 75, Rev.1 on permeability of store space in the damage stability calculation under regulation 27(3) and (8.d) of the 1988 LL Protocol, that the permeability assumed in the damage stability calculation for the flooding of any store space shall be 0.95 under the 1988 LL Protocol, which was to be implemented from 1 July 2009; and
- .3 document SLF 52/13/2, providing IACS Unified Interpretation LL 59, Rev.1 on cargo manifold gutter bars-freeing arrangements and intact stability, in relation to regulation 26 of the 1966 LL Convention and the 1988 LL Protocol for requirements of the freeing arrangements of type A freeboard ships as well as regulation 24(1)(g) of the 1988 LL Protocol, as amended by resolution MSC.143(77), regarding the requirements relating to freeing ports for the gutter bars greater than 300 mm in height around the weather decks of tankers in way of cargo manifolds and cargo piping, which was to be implemented from 1 July 2008.

Unified interpretations of SOLAS chapter II-1, and the 1966 LL Convention and the 1988 LL Protocol

13.3 Following the discussion of the above documents, the Sub-Committee requested the Secretariat to prepare the final text of the unified interpretations referred to in paragraph 13.2, and the draft associated MSC circular. Having considered document SLF 52/WP.7 (Secretariat) the Sub-Committee agreed to the draft unified interpretations of SOLAS chapter II-1, and the 1966 LL Convention and the 1988 LL Protocol as modified by resolution MSC.143(77), and the associated draft MSC circulars, set out in annexes ..., for submission to MSC 87 for approval.

14 SUBDIVISION STANDARDS FOR CARGO SHIPS

14.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 85, having considered document MSC 85/23/1 (United Kingdom), proposing to review the application of subdivision standards for cargo ships referred to in the footnote to SOLAS regulation II-1/4, which are deemed equivalent to part B-1 of SOLAS chapter II-1, to ensure consistency of approach in the application of subdivision standards for cargo ships, had agreed to include, in the work programme of the Sub-Committee and the provisional agenda for SLF 52, a new item on “Subdivision standards for cargo ships”, with a target completion date of 2011.

14.2 Having considered document MSC 85/23/1 (United Kingdom), proposing to consider deleting footnote .4 to SOLAS regulation II-1/4 and updating references to the remaining footnotes as necessary, the Sub-Committee noted the view of the delegation of Germany that footnotes .6 and .7 should also be considered in the context of this item and invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit their proposals and comments, as appropriate, on the matter to the next session.

15 WORK PROGRAMME AND AGENDA FOR SLF 53

General

15.1 Having noted the adoption of the High-level Action Plan of the Organization and priorities for the 2010-2011 biennium (resolution A.1012(26)), the Sub-Committee further noted that the Assembly, recognizing the need for a uniform basis for the application of the Strategic Plan and the High-level Action Plan throughout the Organization, and for the strengthening of existing working practices through the provision of enhanced planning and management procedures, adopted Guidelines on the application of the Strategic Plan and the High-level Action

Plan (resolution A.1013(26)). In particular, the Sub-Committee noted that the Assembly requested the Committee to review and revise, during the 2010-2011 biennium, the Committee's Guidelines on the organization and method of work (MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.2) with a view to bringing them in line with the Guidelines on the application of the Strategic Plan and the High-level Action Plan.

15.2 The Sub-Committee was informed that, in pursuance of the above request, the Secretariat, in consultation with the MSC and MEPC Chairmen, had prepared the draft revised Committee's Guidelines for consideration by MSC 87 (MSC 87/23), which also took account of the provisions of the Migration Plan approved by the Council. In this regard, the Sub-Committee in the context of this item, noted that, while the former format for "work programme" had been replaced by the new format for "biennial agenda" and "post-biennial agenda", the existing format for the reporting on the status of planned outputs was replaced by the new format and that the Committee Chairmen had agreed to implement the use of the aforementioned new formats from the start of 2010, as set out in annexes 1 and 4 of document SLF 52/WP.4.

Biennial, Post-Biennial and Provisional agenda

15.3 Taking into account the progress made at the current session, the decisions of MSC 86 and the provisions of the agenda management procedure, the Sub-Committee prepared a draft biennial agenda and post-biennial agenda, and provisional agenda for SLF 53 (SLF 52/WP.4), based on those approved by MSC 86 (SLF 52/2/2, annex), as set out in annexes [...], for consideration and approval by MSC 87. While reviewing the biennial agenda, the Sub-Committee agreed to invite the Committee to:

- .1 delete the output 2.0.1.5 – Guidance on the impact of open watertight doors on existing and new ship survivability as the work has been completed;
- .2 extend the target completion date for the following planned outputs:
 - .1 2.0.1.4 and 5.2.1.20 – Guidelines for verification of damage stability requirements for tankers and bulk carriers, to 2012;
 - .2 5.2.1.16 – Development of new generation intact stability criteria, to 2012;
and

- .3 5.2.1.21 – Safety of small fishing vessels, to 2011; and
- .3 replace the number of sessions needed for completion of output 5.2.1.17 – Revision of SOLAS chapter II-1 subdivision and damage stability regulations, to 2012, as the item has been included in the provisional agenda for SLF 53.

Arrangements for the next session

15.4 The Sub-Committee agreed to establish at its next session working groups on the following subjects:

- .1 intact stability;
- .2 fishing vessel safety; and
- .3 subdivision and damage stability.

15.5 The Sub-Committee also agreed, in principle, to establish drafting groups on:

- .1 amendments to the 1966 LL Convention and the 1988 LL Protocol; and
- .2 development of options to improve effect on ship design and safety of the 1969 TM Convention.

15.6 The Sub-Committee established correspondence groups on the following subjects, due to report to SLF 53:

- .1 intact stability;
- .2 fishing vessel safety;
- .3 subdivision and damage stability; and
- .4 1969 TM Convention,

and noted that, while the delegation of the Bahamas had expressed their concern over the number of correspondence groups exceeding three, they accepted the above arrangement of correspondence groups as an exceptional case.

Status of planned output

15.7 The Sub-Committee prepared the information on the status of planned outputs of the High-level Action Plan of the Organization and priorities for 2010-2011 biennium relevant to the Sub-Committee, set out in annex [...], which the Committee is invited to consider and take action on, as appropriate.

Date of the next session

15.8 The Sub-Committee noted that the fifty-third session of the Sub-Committee had been tentatively scheduled to take place from 10 to 14 January 2011.

16 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR 2011

16.1 The Sub-Committee decided to elect Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Sub-Committee for 2011 at the start of SLF 53.

Expression of appreciation

16.2 The Sub-Committee expressed sincere thanks and appreciation to Mr. Rob Gehling of Australia for his excellent services to the Sub-Committee over many years and, in particular, during the last five years when he served it as its Chairman.

17 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**Guidance on providing safe working conditions for securing of containers**

17.1 The Sub-Committee noted (SLF 52/17) the outcome of the DSC Sub-Committee relevant to this item that DSC 13, when considering agenda item on “Guidance on providing safe working conditions for securing of containers”, had agreed that document DSC 13/8/1 should be used as the basic document to progress the matter for finalizing the draft Guidance.

17.2 The Sub-Committee also noted that DSC 13, when considering the report of the working group (DSC 13/WP.2), had noted the view of some delegations that, before deciding on the dimensions for lashing position design, a formal safety assessment (FSA) should be undertaken and that the DE and SLF Sub-Committees, which had previously considered structural issues related to the agenda item, falling under their purview, should further consider the issue in the light of results of such an FSA. In this respect, the Sub-Committee noted that no FSA study had

been submitted for the Sub-Committee to take appropriate action. The Sub-Committee further noted that Denmark had submitted the FSA study on Dangerous goods transport with open-top containerhips (MSC 87/18/1 and MSC 87/INF.2).

Revision of SOLAS chapter II-1 subdivision and damage stability regulations

17.3 The Sub-Committee had for its consideration the following documents, relating to revision of SOLAS chapter II-1 subdivision and damage stability regulations:

- .1 SLF 52/17/1 (Germany), raising the issue of uniform application of cross flooding provisions contained in SOLAS regulation II-1/7-2, in relation to the Explanatory Notes (resolution MSC.281(85)) and resolution MSC.245(83) on Recommendation on a standard method for evaluating cross flooding arrangements;
- .2 SLF 52/17/2 (Germany), proposing to clearly define the sample damage cases and the scope of documentation in order to ensure uniform application, to be provided for onboard documentation (damage control booklets) as required by SOLAS chapter II-1, in relation to resolution MSC.281(85) and MSC.1/Circ.1245 on Guidelines for damage control plans and information to the master;
- .3 SLF 52/17/3 (Finland), proposing to amend the Explanatory Notes of the revised SOLAS chapter II-1 (resolution MSC.281(85)) in regulation 7-1.1.2 (Transverse subdivision in a damage zone), to clarify the transverse penetration depth in case of complex waterline shapes;
- .4 SLF 52/17/4 (Norway), containing proposals for amendments to the text of SOLAS chapter II-1 as well as the Explanatory Notes, for the purpose of clarifying the principles for establishing stability limit curves;
- .5 SLF 52/17/5 (Norway), proposing for editorial changes and comments to the text of SOLAS chapter II-1; and
- .6 SLF 52/17/6 (Norway), containing proposals for amendments to the text of SOLAS chapter II-1 intended for future improvements.

17.4 Following a general discussion on how best proceed with the above documents, the Sub-Committee, decided to consider the above documents in detail at the next session under the agenda item on “Revision of SOLAS chapter II-1 subdivision and damage stability regulations”, and referred documents SLF 52/17/1, SLF 52/17/2, SLF 52/17/3, SLF 52/17/4, SLF 52/17/5 and SLF 52/17/6 to the SDS Correspondence Group, established under agenda item 8, for consideration and advice to the Sub-Committee as appropriate.

18 AMENDMENTS TO THE 1966 LL CONVENTION AND THE 1988 LL PROTOCOL RELATED TO SEASONAL ZONE

18.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 86, having considered document MSC 86/23/3 (South Africa), proposing to amend the requirements of the 1966 Load Lines Convention and the 1988 LL Protocol to shift the Winter Seasonal Zone off the southern tip of Africa further southward by 50 miles thus allowing tankers to round the Cape of Good Hope on their summer marks all year round, had agreed to include, in the work programmes of the NAV and SLF Sub-Committees and the provisional agenda for SLF 52, a new item on “Amendments to the 1966 LL Convention and the 1988 LL Protocol related to seasonal zone”, with a target completion date of 2011, assigning the SLF Sub-Committee as coordinator.

18.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that, at MSC 86, in noting the above decision, the delegation of the Cook Islands, supported by a number of delegations, had expressed deep concern for extending the summer Load Line 50 miles southward off Cape Agulhas because, in their view, to reduce freeboard of laden ships, especially tankers in such dangerous waters, would be detrimental to maritime safety and the protection of the marine environment.

18.3 The Sub-Committee, in considering document MSC 86/23/3 (South Africa), noted that:

- .1 some delegations expressed concerns regarding the safety risks incurred by reducing freeboards and, therefore, felt that further metrological data, (e.g., wave heights and swells) was needed before a final decision is taken on this proposal; and
- .2 some delegations, supported the South Africa’s proposal, stating that sufficient data had been submitted against the criteria stipulated in the Load Lines Convention, and that, in other regions, the summer zone goes as far South as 47° S (660 nautical miles further into Southern Ocean), as in the case of New Zealand.

18.4 In response to the above comments, the delegation of South Africa pointed out that there was no appreciable difference in sea and weather conditions between the current winter seasonal zone and the proposed new zone contained in the annex to document MSC 86/23/3.

18.5 Following the discussion, the Sub-Committee, having noted the South Africa's intention to submit further relevant information on the matter, invited Member Governments and international organizations to submit relevant comments and data, with a view to finalizing the item at the next session. In this context, the Sub-Committee also invited Member Governments and international organizations, if they so wish, to contact South Africa for exchanging data and views.

18.6 The Sub-Committee requested the Secretariat to inform the NAV Sub-Committee of the outcome on this item.

19 ACTION REQUESTED OF THE COMMITTEE

19.1 The Maritime Safety Committee is invited to:

[to be prepared after the meeting by the Secretariat in consultation with the Chairman]
