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1 GENERAL

1.1 The Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) held its thirty-sixth session from 10 to 14 January 2005 under the chairmanship of Rear Admiral Peter Brady (Jamaica). The Vice-Chairman, Mr. A.H. Kayssi (Lebanon), was also present.

1.2 The session was attended by representatives from the following countries:

ALGERIA JAMAICA
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA JAPAN
ARGENTINA LATVIA
AUSTRALIA LEBANON
BAHAMAS LIBERIA
BELGIUM MALAYSIA
BRAZIL MALTA
BULGARIA MARSHALL ISLANDS
CANADA MEXICO
CHILE MOROCCO
CHINA NETHERLANDS
CUBA NIGERIA
CYPRUS NORWAY
CZECH REPUBLIC PANAMA
DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S PERU
REPUBLIC OF KOREA PHILIPPINES
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC POLAND
OF THE CONGO PORTUGAL
DENMARK REPUBLIC OF KOREA
DOMINICA ROMANIA
ECUADOR RUSSIAN FEDERATION
EGYPT SAUDI ARABIA
ESTONIA SINGAPORE
FINLAND SOUTH AFRICA
FRANCE SPAIN
GERmany SWEDEN
GHANA THAILAND
GREECE TURKEY
HONDURAS TUVALU
ICELAND UKRAINE
INDIA UNITED KINGDOM
INDONESIA UNITED STATES
IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) URUGUAY
IRELAND VANUATU
ISRAEL VENEZUELA
ITALY

and the following Associate Member of IMO:

HONG KONG, CHINA
1.3 The following representatives from the United Nations and specialized agencies:

INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE (ILO)

1.4 The following specialized agencies and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations were also represented:

EUROPEAN COMMISSION (EC)
INTERNATIONAL MOBILE SATELLITE ORGANIZATION (IMSO)
INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING FEDERATION (ISF)
INTERNATIONAL UNION OIF MARINE INSURANCE (IUMI)
INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF SHIPPING (ICS)
INTERNATIONAL CONFEDERATION OF FREE TRADE UNIONS (ICFTU)
BIMCO
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CLASSIFICATION SOCIETIES (IACS)
OIL COMPANIES INTERNATIONAL MARINE FORUM (OCIMF)
INTERNATIONAL MARITIME PILOTS' ASSOCIATION (IMPA)
INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF SHIPMASTERS' ASSOCIATIONS (IFSMA)
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT TANKER OWNERS (INTERTANKO)
INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL OF CRUISE LINES (ICCL)
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DRY CARGO SHIPOWNERS (INTERCARGO)
THE INSTITUTE OF MARINE ENGINEERING, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (IMarEST)
INTERNATIONAL SHIP MANAGERS' ASSOCIATION (ISMA)
WORLD NUCLEAR TRANSPORT INSTITUTE (WNTI)
WORLD MARITIME UNIVERSITY

Attendance by representatives of the news media

1.5 At the opening of the session, the Chairman informed the Sub-Committee that in accordance with the “Guidelines for media access to meetings of Committees and their subsidiary bodies” adopted by the Council at its ninety-second session in June 2004, the proceedings of the Committee and its subsidiary bodies were now open to duly accredited representatives of the news media, unless there was a specific reason to the contrary. MSC 79 accordingly amended Rule 8 entitled “Publicity” of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, which was also applicable to its subsidiary bodies, to address this issue.

1.6 The Sub-Committee was also informed that MSC 79 had agreed that such attendance should be on the basis of the Council’s Guidelines which, inter alia, provided for the Committee to exclude media representatives from attending some or all of its deliberations, if it agreed that their presence would:

1 breach any undertakings of confidentiality relating to material or information being provided to the Committee;

2 create a potential security risk; or

3 jeopardize the efficient and effective conduct of the Committee’s business.
1.7 The Sub-Committee was further informed that MSC 79 had noted additionally that, in accordance with the Council’s Guidelines:

.1 meetings of working groups would be held in camera;
.2 the Organization expected the outcome of discussions to be reported accurately by the media, and named speakers not to be quoted without their prior consent;
.3 the Committee and/or the Organization retained the right to reply to rectify any published inaccuracies; and
.4 the recording, filming or photographing of the meeting proceedings without permission would not be allowed.

Secretary-General’s opening address

1.8 In welcoming the participants, the Secretary-General wished all present and the maritime community at large, a happy, healthy and successful, safe, secure and accident-free New Year and invited all with an interest in the affairs of IMO and the shipping industry to join forces together to create a safer, more secure, environmentally friendly and more efficient maritime world.

Recalling that the main objectives of the Organization for the current decade placed a particular emphasis on the human element, the Secretary-General expressed his satisfaction that, on different levels, this was being tackled not only within the Organization and by the Sub-Committee, but also by maritime administrations, classification societies, insurers, professional institutions and managers.

Referring to the image of shipping among the general public and politicians, the Secretary-General expressed the opinion that the contribution shipping made to the global economy and the community as a whole was being overlooked, even though shipping was largely safe, secure, efficient and environmentally friendly. He called on all who cared about shipping to work together to reverse this wrong perception and to endorse the theme for this year’s World Maritime Day 2005: “International Shipping – Carrier of World Trade”, which has been chosen to highlight the role of shipping today and the progress that has been made by shipping in terms of safety and the environment.

In appreciating the Sub-Committee’s contribution to maritime security and, in particular to the development of model training courses for ship, company and port facility security officers, the Secretary-General noted that the Sub-Committee would be taking another step forward in this direction by finalizing the training and certification requirements for ship security officers developed by the ad hoc correspondence group, and developing appropriate guidance for the training and certification of company security officers.

The Secretary-General drew attention to two recent analyses by accident investigators which had indicated that, due to inappropriate levels of manning and watchkeeping arrangements, fatigue had emerged as a significant contributory factor in accidents. While recognizing that the Organization’s principles of safe manning were arguably sufficiently comprehensive, he expressed the view that perhaps the time had come for these principles to be supplemented, possibly by some examples or norms against which maritime Administrations could evaluate submissions from shipping companies for the issuance of safe manning documents to ensure that their objective, of safe manning and watchkeeping at sea, was not only an aim, but also a reality.
In drawing attention to the widely reported shortage of seafarers, the Secretary-General considered that it was important that all concerned should do their utmost to tackle this problem before it reached unmanageable proportions and thus, adversely affected the safety, security and efficiency of the shipping industry as a whole.

In considering the information collated by the Secretariat on current databases’ standards, record systems and anti-fraud measures to prevent unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency, the Secretary-General noted that the Sub-Committee would be considering advice on the implications for the Organization if personal identification data of individuals holding a fraudulent certificate were to be included in any report published by the Secretariat.

He expressed his concern on the reported global loss of some 24,000 fishermen every year and reiterated his previous pleas urging Governments to promptly ratify the Torremolinos Protocol and the STCW-F Convention to enable both instruments to enter into force in the foreseeable future, which would contribute towards the improvement of the safety of fishermen, and the overall safety of life at sea.

In his concluding remarks referring to the catastrophe that followed the underwater earthquake west of the Indonesian Island of Sumatra, which had caused the loss of hundreds of thousands of innocent lives and significant damage to the environment and property, the Secretary-General spoke of his concerns about ships sailing in the area, offshore platforms and FPSOs and his relief at the news that there had been few casualties and that staff members and WMU and IMLI students from the region and their immediate families had not been affected.

The Secretary-General informed the Sub-Committee that he had communicated with the UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan and the Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Co-ordinator of the Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs and had offered assistance from IMO’s perspective in any way that may be required and had also communicated with the relevant Ambassadors and High Commissioners in London expressing the sympathy and condolences of the entire IMO membership and staff, offering similar assistance.

The Secretary-General reported that IMO had sought the co-operation of other relevant international organizations to assess the situation vis-à-vis aids to navigation and other maritime facilities in the affected region so that aid could not only safely reach the countries concerned by sea but also that shipping could continue to serve seaborne trade safely and efficiently.

He then invited the Sub-Committee to join him to convey sentiments of sympathy, compassion and condolences to the delegations of the countries struck by the catastrophe attending this meeting, and as a mark of respect to the memory of those, local people and tourists, who had lost their lives in this disaster, to observe one minute’s silence, while, outside, the IMO flag was lowered to half mast for the rest of the day.
The Secretary-General advised the Sub-Committee that a support scheme involving the industry and staff and an ad hoc Fund had been established for the deposit of any contributions from volunteering organizations and individuals.

1.9 The delegate from India expressed his deepest gratitude to IMO for giving support to the Herculean task of providing aid for the tsunami victims. He stated that the devastation caused to people and property was unimaginable and the efforts of the maritime community and the maritime administration during and after the tsunami was a testimony to the principles of discipline and dedication set forth by IMO, which was now being noticed. He reiterated his faith, trust and confidence in the Secretary-General for having been a moving spirit in this just cause.

1.10 The delegate from Indonesia, on behalf of the Indonesian Government and the people of Indonesia, expressed his sincere gratitude and appreciation to the Secretary-General and staff of the Organization as well as the delegates attending the 36th session of the Sub-Committee, for the deepest sympathy expressed to victims of the unfortunate natural disaster that had struck Indonesia and several countries in the rim of the Indian Ocean. He appraised the Sub-Committee of the steps taken by the Indonesian Government on relief and rehabilitation measures. He further requested that the Organization should issue a circular letter appealing to:

.1 the maritime community to help the countries affected by the tsunami disaster;

.2 the maritime industries to give donations in the efforts to relieve the victims following the desperate catastrophe; and

.3 the shipping companies and fishing industries whose ships are passing through or calling ports in the affected areas, to facilitate the carriage of humanitarian aid cargoes, if possible, without freight being charged.

Finally, he expressed his sincere gratitude and appreciation for the overwhelming support, co-operation and assistance given by the international community during the rescue period in Aceh.

1.11 The delegate from Malaysia appreciated the efforts of the Secretary-General and IMO staff towards the relief and reconstruction programmes in the disaster areas. He also
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expressed his sincere appreciation and gratitude for the heroic efforts of the personnel from the US Coastguard in rescuing the crew members of Selendang Ayu in extreme weather conditions off Alaska.

1.12 The delegate from Thailand expressed his sincere gratitude and appreciation to the Secretary-General and staff of the Organization as well as the delegates attending the thirty-sixth session of the Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping, for their expression of deepest sympathy to victims.

1.13 On behalf of the Government of Lebanon and in the name of the Lebanese people, the delegate from Lebanon expressed his sincere condolences to the families and friends of all the victims who had perished in the tsunami tragedy.

1.14 The Director of the International Mobile Satellite Organization (IMSO) expressed his horror and deep sadness at the catastrophic loss of life which occurred among the peoples of the coastal states of the Indian Ocean. He announced that IMSO, in co-operation with Inmarsat, would make available up to 1,000 digital land-mobile satellite terminals, free of charge, to the Secretary-General of IMO, for long-term disaster response and relief purposes in the region. He also advised that the terminals would be supported with a programme of basic user training to enable them to be used as quickly and effectively as possible and that he hoped to negotiate a package of subsidised airtime for the early use of these terminals.

1.15 The Secretary-General, in responding to the statements made by the various delegations appraised the Sub-Committee of the Organization's actions taken in this context including his agreement with the Executive Director of UNEP to support the establishment of an environmental crisis centre in Indonesia and to second two officers from IMO to assist UNEP in these activities. Furthermore, he had arranged to host a meeting on 12 January 2005, with representatives from WMO, IHO and IALA to establish an Action Plan to address any necessary action in respect of damage to navigational aids and maritime safety infrastructure in the region to ensure that the Organization’s shipping could safely transport relief and reconstruction material. The meeting would also discuss input to the proposed Tsunami Early-Warning System in the Indian Ocean. He also advised the Sub-Committee that the Director, Maritime Safety Division, would be attending the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Kobe, Japan (17 to 21 January 2005) and would provide input to that Conference from the maritime perspective.

1.16 The Secretary-General further advised the Sub-Committee that he had written to relevant non-governmental organizations, including the Round Table of shipping industry organizations and some shipowners’ associations requesting that they contribute generously to the “Tsunami Maritime Relief Fund”.

Chairman’s remarks

1.17 In response, the Chairman thanked the Secretary-General for his words of guidance and encouragement and assured the Secretary-General that his advice and requests would be given every consideration in the deliberations of the Sub-Committee and its working groups.

He stressed that the Sub-Committee had before it a demanding and challenging meeting. In spite of that and given the successful history of the Sub-Committee in producing sound and robust international legislation and guidance pertinent to training, certification and watchkeeping, in an efficient way, he was confident that the same mentality would prevail in this session too. On
behalf of the Sub-Committee, he also expressed sympathy and condolences to families and friends of those who had lost their loved ones in this natural disaster in South Asia.

Adoption of the agenda and related matters

1.18 The Sub-Committee adopted the agenda (STW 36/1) amending agenda item 5 “Passenger ship safety”, as approved by MSC 79, and agreed, in general, that the work of the Sub-Committee should be guided by the annotations to the provisional agenda and timetable (STW 36/1/1), as amended. The agenda of the session, including a list of documents submitted under each agenda item, is given at annex 1.

2 DECISIONS OF OTHER IMO BODIES

Decisions of MSC 78 and MSC 79

2.1 The action taken by the Sub-Committee with respect to the decisions and comments of MSC 78 and MSC 79 on items on its agenda are reported under the relevant sections of this report and in particular:

.1 the development of amendments to part B of the STCW Code to include engine-room resource management (agenda item 5 - passenger ship safety, document STW 36/5);

.2 outcome of MSC 78 – Measures to enhance maritime security (agenda item 8, document STW 36/8/1);

.3 outcome of MSC 78 – Training and certification requirements for company and port facility security officers (agenda item 13, document STW 36/13);

.4 the Sub-Committee’s terms of reference (agenda item 14 – Work Programme, document STW 36/14/Add.1);

.5 the review of the STCW Code requirements regarding demonstration of competence (agenda item 16 – Any other business, document STW 36/16/1); and

.6 performance of GMDSS operator’s certificate holders (agenda item 16 – Any other business, document STW 36/16/2).

2.2 The Sub-Committee was also informed of other decisions and comments pertaining to its work, taken by the Committee at its seventy-eighth and seventy-ninth sessions (STW 36/2 and Add.1) as given in paragraphs 2.3 to 2.10 below.

Communication of information

2.3 The Sub-Committee noted that the Committee had received the Secretary-General’s reports on three STCW Parties pursuant to STCW regulation I/7 (MSC 78/26, paragraphs 15.24 to 15.27 and MSC 79/23, paragraphs 7.8 and 7.9); had confirmed that the procedures for assessment of information had been followed correctly in respect of those Parties, and had issued MSC/Circ.1121 and MSC/Circ.1134 on Parties to the STCW Convention confirmed by the Committee, at its seventy-eighth and seventy-ninth sessions, as having demonstrated to be giving ‘full and complete effect’ to the relevant provisions of the STCW Convention, as amended.
2.4 The Sub-Committee noted that the Committee had received the Secretary-General’s reports on thirty-six STCW Parties pursuant to STCW regulation I/8 (MSC 78/26, paragraphs 15.31 to 15.34 and MSC 79/23, paragraph 7.15); had confirmed that the procedures for assessment of information had been followed correctly in respect of those Parties, bearing in mind that MSC 77 had agreed that any information on the outcome of this process with respect to reports on independent evaluation required by regulation I/8, should not be promulgated until MSC 80.

**Approval of competent persons**

2.5 The Sub-Committee noted that the Committee had approved (MSC 78/26, paragraph 15.35 and MSC 79/23, paragraph 7.16) additional competent persons nominated by Governments, as listed in the annex to MSC/Circ.797/Rev.11.

**Method of work related to new work programme items**

2.6 The Sub-Committee noted that MSC 78 had agreed that a decision to include a new item in a sub-committee’s work programme did not mean that the Committee agreed with the technical aspects of the proposal. If it was decided to include the item in a sub-committee’s work programme, detailed consideration of the technical aspects of the proposal and the development of appropriate requirements and recommendations should be left to the sub-committee concerned. MSC 78 also noted that a number of submissions by Member Governments supporting proposals for new work items made by other Member Governments often expanded the scope of the original proposal. The Committee decided that, in order to facilitate proper consideration of the proposals, these submissions should also include a justification for this expanded scope, as appropriate, in accordance with paragraphs 2.9 to 2.20 of the Guidelines on the organization and method of work (MSC/Circ.1099).

**Item on “Casualty analysis” in the work programme of the sub-committees**

2.7 The Sub-Committee noted that, following consideration of the proposal by STW 34 to delete the item on “Casualty analysis” from its work programme and to deal with the matter under the agenda item on “Any other business”, MSC 77 had agreed to consider the matter at its next session to take into account the outcome of the MSC Correspondence Group on FSA, on the application of the FSA methodology to the analysis of casualties. MSC 78 having noted the outcome of the afore-mentioned correspondence group had decided that the item on “Casualty analysis” should remain on the work programme of the sub-committees.

**Acceptance and implementation of the 1993 Torremolinos Protocol and the 1995 STCW-F Convention**

2.8 The Sub-Committee noted the information forwarded by MSC 79 contained in documents MSC 78/21/1, MSC 79/17/2 and relevant paragraphs of MSC 79/2/1/Add.1.

**Trial reporting system**

2.9 The Sub-Committee noted that MSC 79, taking into account the views of MEPC 52 and their endorsement by C 93, had decided to halt the trial of the new reporting procedure and re-establish the previous reporting procedure with immediate effect.
Distribution of IMO documents

2.10 The Sub-Committee noted that C 93, having considered matters related to the distribution of IMO documents:

1. noted the budgetary implications arising from the proposed translation of existing documents on the IMO public website; from the proposed translation of subsequent documents; and from the proposed appointment of a dedicated website editor; and

2. reiterated the decision taken at its ninety-second session with respect to the distribution of documents inter alia:

1. that the distribution of hard copies of meeting documents to IMO Member States be limited to one copy per delegation, as from 1 July 2004 and, for the time being, subject to some flexibility in recognition of the fact that some Member States may have difficulties in accessing the documents on the IMODOCS website; and

2. that non-governmental organizations would not receive meeting documents in hard copy as from 1 July 2004.

Decisions of other Sub-Committees

2.11 The Sub-Committee was also informed (STW 36/2/1) of the decisions and comments, pertaining to its work of the eighth session of the Sub-Committee on Radiocommunications and Search and Rescue; the forty-seventh session of the Sub-Committee on Design and Equipment; the twelfth session of the Sub-Committee on Flag State Implementation; the forty-seventh session of the Sub-Committee on Stability and Load Lines and on Fishing Vessels Safety; and the ninth session of the Sub-Committee on Dangerous Goods, Solid Cargoes and Containers. The action taken by the Sub-Committee with respect to these decisions and comments thereon are reported under the relevant sections of this report and in particular:

1. the basic safety training and updated work plan of DE 47 (agenda item 7 – Measures to prevent accidents with lifeboats, document STW 36/7);

2. outcome of DSC 9 - Measures to enhance maritime security (agenda item 8, document STW 36/8/2);

3. performance of GMDSS operator's certificate holders (agenda item 16 – Any other business, document STW 36/16/2); and

4. casualty analyses information relating to training issues for passenger ships referred to the Sub-Committee for consideration as appropriate (agenda item 16 – Any other business, document STW 36/16/7).

Decisions of MEPC 51 and MEPC 52

2.12 The action taken by the Sub-Committee with respect to the decisions and comments of MEPC 51 and MEPC 52 on items on its agenda are reported under the relevant sections of this report.
3 VALIDATION OF MODEL TRAINING COURSES

3.1 The Sub-Committee noted the information provided by the Secretariat (STW 36/3) on the status of production of model courses and the progress made with their translation into French and Spanish. According to updated information provided by the Secretariat, the Sub-Committee also noted that the following model courses had been developed and revised:

- Duly authorized officers for control and compliance measures;
- Survey of Machinery Installation with Compendium;
- Survey of Electrical Installation with Compendium;
- Survey of Fire Appliances and Provisions;
- Survey of LSA and Arrangements;
- Hull and Structural Survey; and
- Survey of Navigational Aids and Equipment,

and 26 model courses have been translated into French and 30 model courses have been translated into Spanish. Of these translated model courses 14 had been published in French and 17 in Spanish. The rest are in the process of production and would be available shortly. The translation of the other courses is being undertaken in a phased manner as reported earlier.

3.2 The Sub-Committee further noted the oral update provided by the Secretariat on the progress made relating to the development of the model course for AIS training (STW 35/19, paragraph 9.1) which has been circulated to the validation panel for their comments and is expected to be available for validation at STW 37.

Amendments to MARPOL Annexes I and II and the IBC Code

3.3 The Sub-Committee also noted that MEPC 52 had adopted amendments to Annexes I and II of the MARPOL 73/78 Convention and consequential amendments to the IBC Code which had been also adopted by MSC 79 and instructed the Secretariat to update the model courses 1.02 and 1.04 before the amendments to Annexes I and II of MARPOL 73/78 and the IBC Code come into force on 1 January 2007.

Validation of model courses

3.4 The Sub-Committee gave preliminary consideration to the following draft model courses:

- Operational use of IBS; and
- Safety of fishing operations (support level),

contained in documents STW 36/3/1 and STW 36/3/2 and agreed to establish a drafting group to consider both.

3.5 The delegation of Norway expressed the view that the title of the model course related to IBS should be changed to include INS, as it had references to this system within the proposed draft model course on ‘Operational use of IBS’. The Sub-Committee agreed to amend the title of this model course accordingly.
Establishment of a drafting group

3.6 The Sub-Committee established a drafting group and instructed it, taking into account the comments made in plenary, to:

.1 consider and comment on the texts as appropriate on the draft model courses, set out in the annexes to documents STW 36/3/1 and STW 36/3/2; and

.2 report to plenary on Thursday, 13 January 2005.

Report of the drafting group

3.7 On receipt of the report of the drafting group (STW 36/WP.4), the Sub-Committee validated the model courses set out in annexes to documents STW 36/3/1 and STW 36/3/2 as amended by the group and instructed the Secretariat to publish them as soon as possible.

3.8 The Sub-Committee recalled that validation of model courses by the Sub-Committee in this context meant that it found no grounds to object to their contents and, in doing so, the Sub-Committee had not granted approval to the document and, therefore, they were not regarded to be an official interpretation of the Convention.

3.9 The Sub-Committee expressed thanks to members of the IMO/ILO validating group for their work in reviewing the drafts.

4 UNLAWFUL PRACTICES ASSOCIATED WITH CERTIFICATES OF COMPETENCY

Information on current databases’ standards, record systems and anti-fraud measures

4.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that STW 35, noting that only 32 STCW Parties had responded to the questionnaire given in MSC/Circ.1088, had agreed that further information from STCW Parties was required to complete the data.

4.2 The Sub-Committee further recalled that STW 35 had invited STCW Parties which had not responded to the questionnaire to submit data for consideration at STW 36 and had also urged STCW Parties to adopt procedures for maintaining and updating records for certificates and measures to prevent unauthorized access to database containing information relating to certificates and records.

4.3 The Secretariat provided an analysis of the data collected in response to the questionnaire given in MSC/Circ.1088 (STW 36/4) and in particular:

.1 in all countries except two, the information on certificates and endorsements was stored electronically and in some, it was backed up with card indexes (39%) and ledgers (25%);

.2 the database in all countries was updated on a regular basis;

.3 the number of seafarers in the register/database varied widely from less than 100 to 172,016 for masters and officers and from 15 to 324,392 for ratings;
most countries kept information on their databases or the registers on the status of the certificates related to the following:

1. validity;
2. suspension;
3. cancellation;
4. reported lost; and
5. destroyed;

17 countries had not initiated any prosecution in response to unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency. In the remaining 34 countries (56%), the number of prosecutions ranged between a few to 100 in Greece (0.3% of seafarers on their database), 124 in Liberia (0.02% of seafarers on their database) and 319 in the Philippines (0.14% of seafarers on their database).

4.4 The Sub-Committee noted the above information provided and confirmed that the work entrusted to the Secretariat had now been completed.

**Reporting format on fraudulent certificates**

4.5 The Sub-Committee recalled that STW 35 had discussed the possibility of including the name and passport number or other identification details of the individual holding a fraudulent certificate in the report published by the Secretariat. Such data would be of interest to Member States for assessing the need for any further action.

4.6 The Sub-Committee further recalled that STW 35 had agreed that before deciding on the provision of details of the identity of the individual involved, it needed to examine the legal implications, particularly in connection with provisions of international treaties and national legislation relating to the protection of personal data and the implications for the Organization in publishing such information and instructed the Secretariat to study the matter vis-à-vis the position of, and the implications for the Organization, if such information was to be published, and advise STW 36 accordingly.

4.7 The Sub-Committee considered the advice from the Legal Division (STW 36/4/1) and agreed it was not appropriate to include the name and passport number or other identification of the individual holding a fraudulent certificate in the report published by the Secretariat.

4.8 The delegation of Cyprus, supported by others, was of the opinion that if the nationality of the individual holding a fraudulent certificate was included in the report published by the Secretariat, it would assist Member Governments in gaining information that could eventually lead to a prosecution. The Sub-Committee agreed that this should be further discussed at the next session, after the IMO Legal Division had examined the matter in detail.

4.9 The delegation of the United Kingdom advised the Sub-Committee that they had a ‘CoC’ checker on their website [www.mega.gov.uk](http://www.mega.gov.uk), which allowed Administrations and shipping companies to check the authenticity of certificates issued by the United Kingdom. In order to use the system, registered users could input the details of a person claiming to have specific qualifications issued by the United Kingdom Administration. This system provided only a positive or negative response to a specific request for verification. The delegation urged those with a legitimate interest to register with the United Kingdom Maritime and Coastguard Agency.
and use the system in the fight against unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency.

4.10 The delegation of the United Kingdom further advised the Sub-Committee that, recently, it had co-operated with Bangladesh to prosecute the holder of a fraudulent certificate of competency and was of the opinion that more such co-operation was required on an international and global basis to effectively tackle unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency.

4.11 The Sub-Committee agreed that it was necessary to concentrate on the implementation of existing IMO requirements, to promote the intensification by Governments and industry of efforts to prevent and suppress unlawful acts associated with certificates of competency and to concentrate on the human element.

4.12 The Sub-Committee further agreed that this issue would need to be discussed on a regular basis to minimize and prevent unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee decided to recommend to the Committee to make this a continuous item on its work programme and agenda while discussing the work programme (see agenda item 14).

5 PASSENGER SHIP SAFETY

5.1 The Sub-Committee recalled (STW 36/2) that MSC 78 approved the revised work plan on large passenger ship safety redrafted by its Working Group on Large Passenger Ship Safety based on the recommendations of the sub-committees and the need to avoid any duplication of work.

5.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that the title of this agenda item had been amended, following a corresponding decision by MSC 79 to: “Passenger Ship Safety” (MSC 79/23, paragraph 4.19) (see agenda item 1).

5.3 The Sub-Committee considered the Committee’s instruction (STW 36/5) to:

   .1 prepare amendments to part B of the STCW Code for engine-room resource management, taking into account that this recommendation may be expanded to cover more than just passenger ships; and

   .2 review the model courses for crisis and crowd management to incorporate the safe area concept and provide recommendations to MSC 80,

and the proposal by Singapore (STW36/5/1) to amend part B of the STCW Code to include guidance on engine-room resource management and agreed to refer them to the Working Group to be established to consider training matters.

5.4 The Sub-Committee noted that the work plan had been amended by MSC 79 (STW 36/5/Add.1) for issues relevant to the Sub-Committee.

5.5 The delegation of the Republic of Korea advised the Sub-Committee that their training institutions were already conducting training courses on ‘engine-room resource management’ which were applicable not only to passenger ships but to all types of ships and that guidance on ‘engine-room resource management’ should be included in the STCW Convention.
5.6 The delegation of the United States was of the opinion that the proposed amendments to part B of the STCW Code should cover all types of ships and furthermore that the concept of safe area should be included in the crowd and crisis management model courses.

5.7 The Sub-Committee subsequently agreed that the proposed amendments may be expanded to cover more than passenger ships.

Establishment of the working group

5.8 The Sub-Committee established a working group to consider training matters and instructed it, taking into account the comments and decisions made in the plenary, to:

.1 consider the proposal contained in document STW 36/5/1 (Singapore) and prepare draft amendments to part B of the STCW Code for engine-room resource management, taking into account that this may be expanded to cover more than just passenger ships; and

.2 review the model courses for crisis and crowd management to incorporate the safe haven concept and provide recommendations to the Sub-Committee.

Report of the Working Group

5.9 On receipt of the report of the Working Group (STW 36/WP.3), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

5.10 The Sub-Committee endorsed amendments to part B of the STCW Code, section B-VIII/2, part 3-2, on guidance on engine-room resource management and the associated STCW.6 Circular as set out in annex 2 and invited the Committee to adopt the amendments in accordance with its Rules of Procedure.

5.11 In reviewing the model courses on crowd and crisis management to incorporate the safe area concept, the Sub-Committee decided to use the definition of “safe area” prepared by FP 48. A number of places in the existing model courses, that required amendments, were identified for consideration when the model courses would be revised, to incorporate the “safe area” concept, and accordingly, the Sub-Committee instructed the Secretariat to revise IMO model course 1.28 - Crowd Management, Passenger Safety and Safety Training for Personnel Providing Direct Services to Passengers in Passenger Spaces and IMO model course 1.29 - Proficiency in Crisis Management and Human Behaviour Training Including Passenger Safety, Cargo Safety and Hull Integrity Training, as appropriate.

5.12 The Sub-Committee agreed, as it would need to consider the outcome of COMSAR 9 on this matter at its next session, to invite the Committee to extend the target completion date to 2006 (see agenda item 14).

6 TRAINING OF CREW IN LAUNCHING/RECOVERING OPERATIONS OF FAST RESCUE BOATS AND MEANS OF RESCUE IN ADVERSE WEATHER CONDITIONS

6.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that STW 33 had provisionally considered documents STW 33/13 (United Kingdom) and STW 33/13/1 (Denmark) and the need for the development of
additional guidelines or new training requirements for launching/recovery operations of fast rescue boats but agreed that a co-ordinated approach was required and that it was appropriate to develop training requirements after the DE Sub-Committee had finalized the necessary design and equipment specifications.

6.2 The Sub-Committee noted that DE 47 had agreed that no further work was required for design and equipment specifications for fast rescue boats.

6.3 The United Kingdom (STW 36/6) informed the Sub-Committee that concerns had been brought to the attention of their administration regarding the requirements for Fast Rescue Boats (FRBs) and Means of Rescue (MOR) and were concerned that if these craft are used, serious injury would occur if the crew has not been trained in launching and recovering these craft in heavy weather.

6.4 The United Kingdom also advised that the requirement for the Fast Rescue Boat “intended to be launched and retrieved even under severe adverse weather conditions” means that Ro-Ro passenger ship operators should ensure that both fast rescue boat launching and operating crews were appropriately trained to meet this requirement.

6.5 The United Kingdom also drew the Sub-Committee’s attention that currently, the requirements of the STCW Code, Section A-VI/2, paragraph 6 that “the level of knowledge of the subjects listed in column 2 of table A-VI/2-2 shall be sufficient to enable candidates to launch and take charge of a fast rescue boat in emergency situations” did not fully reflect the complexity of FRB launching and recovery, and further, the STCW Code did not sufficiently recognize the need for launching appliance operator(s) to be trained or achieve an appropriate level of competence. Consequently, the United Kingdom proposed to amend part A of the STCW Code to include additional training requirements for launching and recovery operations of fast rescue boats in adverse weather conditions and issue an MSC circular providing additional guidance for ongoing training for fast rescue boat launch and recovery teams and boat crews.

6.6 The United Kingdom further drew the Sub-Committee’s attention to the fact that the proposed amendments to Table A-VI/2-2 of section A –VI/2 of the STCW Code would require the revision of IMO Model course ‘Proficiency in Fast Rescue Boats (Model course 1.24)’.

6.7 The delegation of Norway, supported by others, expressed concern that the training proposed by the United Kingdom could expose the seafarers to the risk of serious injury or death. In their view, the text of the proposed amendments would need to be amended, to ensure that such training in adverse weather conditions, is performed under strictly controlled conditions, to minimize the risk of personal injury and it would be more appropriate if a realistic training was arranged not on board but at shore-based training centres with suitable training facilities.

6.8 The Sub-Committee agreed that it was desirable from a competence point of view to have realistic training of the crew in launching/recovering operations of fast rescue boats and means of rescue in adverse weather conditions; however such training should be at the discretion of the master as the requirement to minimize the risk of injury to seafarers was paramount.

6.9 Noting the numerous incidents reported in launching/recovering operations of fast rescue boats and means of rescue in adverse weather conditions resulting in injuries to seafarers, the Sub-Committee agreed to refer the proposal contained in document STW 36/6 to the Working Group established to consider training matters.
Working Group

6.10 The Sub-Committee instructed the working group established to consider training matters, taking into account the comments and decisions made in the plenary, to:

.1 consider the proposal contained in document STW 36/6 (United Kingdom) and prepare the draft amendments to part A of the STCW Code and a draft MSC circular to provide additional guidance for ongoing training for fast rescue boat launch and recovery teams and boat crews; and

.2 consider the need to revise IMO model course 1.24 – Proficiency in Fast Rescue Boats.

Report of the Working Group

6.11 On receipt of the report of the working group (STW 36/WP.3), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

6.12 The Sub-Committee endorsed the draft amendments to part A of the STCW Code along with the draft MSC resolution, on additional training requirements for the launching and recovery operations of fast rescue boats, as set out in annex 3, and invited the Committee to approve the amendments with a view to adoption at MSC 81.

6.13 The Sub-Committee agreed that, in addition to ongoing training requirements for fast rescue boat launch and recovery teams, and boat crews in order to minimize the associated risks, it was also necessary to develop initial on board training requirements for seafarers involved with the launching and recovery of fast rescue boats. Accordingly, it endorsed the draft MSC circular, set out in annex 4, providing guidance on training for fast rescue boats of launch and recovery teams and boat crews and invited the Committee to approve the circular.

6.14 In view of the proposed draft amendments to part A of the STCW Code, the Sub-Committee agreed that there was a need to revise IMO model course 1.24 – Proficiency in Fast Rescue Boats, and accordingly, the Secretariat was instructed to revise IMO model course 1.24, before the amendments enter into force.

6.15 The Sub-Committee agreed, as the work thereon has been completed, to invite the Committee to delete this item from its work programme (see agenda item 14).

7 MEASURES TO PREVENT ACCIDENTS WITH LIFEBOATS

7.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 74 had decided to include a new agenda item ‘Measures to prevent accidents with lifeboats’ to be co-ordinated by the DE Sub-Committee in the work programme of the Sub-Committee (MSC 74/24, paragraph 21.34).

7.2 The Sub-Committee further recalled that STW 35 had developed amendments to table A-VI/2-1 of the STCW Code, which were adopted at MSC 79 with entry into force on 1 July 2006.

7.3 The Sub-Committee considered the issues referred to it by the DE Sub-Committee (STW 36/7), and noted that DE 47 had:
.1 after careful consideration of a proposal by the Republic of Korea (DE 47/5/2), agreed that shore-based training was essential to prevent accidents with lifeboats, recommended that requirements for basic safety training for seafarers should be amended to also include a requirement that seafarers serving on ships with free-fall lifeboats should have training including participation in a free-fall launch; and

.2 reviewed the work plan on measures to prevent accidents with lifeboats which includes identifying possible changes to requirements on training and exercising of personnel for referral to the STW Sub-Committee.

7.4 In this context, the Sub-Committee noted that:

.1 Section A-VI/1, paragraph 2 of the STCW Code required that seafarers employed or engaged in any capacity on board ship with designated safety or pollution prevention duties in the operation of ships shall, before being assigned to any shipboard duties, receive approved basic training or instruction in:

.1 personal survival techniques as set out in table A-VI/1-1;
.2 fire prevention and fire fighting as set out in table A-VI/1-2;
.3 elementary first aid as set out in table A-VI/1-3; and
.4 personal safety and social responsibilities as set out in table A-VI/1-4; and

.2 the STCW Convention does not specify that all seafarers serving on board ships are required to have mandatory training in survival crafts.

7.5 The United Kingdom drew the attention of the Sub-Committee to MSC/Circ.1137, providing guidelines for simulated launching of free-fall lifeboats, and was of the opinion that simulated launches should be considered in lieu of actual participation in a free-fall launch.

7.6 The Marshall Islands drew the attention of the Sub-Committee to MSC/Circ.1115 which had been issued in light of several reports on injuries sustained by seafarers during free-fall launches of free-fall lifeboats from heights greater than 20 metres, agreeing that Administrations may accept launching by falls in lieu of free-fall launching, provided that a simulated free-fall launch was conducted at six months intervals.

7.7 The Sub-Committee agreed that maximum safety precautions should be taken during drills related to free-fall launches and that simulated launches should be the preferred option during drills.

Working group

7.8 The Sub-Committee instructed the working group established to consider training matters, taking into account decisions and comments made in the plenary, to discuss the issue that seafarers serving on board ship with free-fall lifeboats should have participated in a free-fall launch and advise the Sub-Committee, as appropriate.
On receipt of the working group’s report

7.9 On receipt of the report of the working group (STW 36/WP.3), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

7.10 The Sub-Committee noted the guidance in MSC/Circ.1115 that allowed the flexibility for Administrations to accept free-fall lifeboats being launched from heights greater than 20 metres by falls in lieu of free-fall launching, provided that a simulated free-fall launch is conducted at least every six months, and MSC/Circ.1137 provides guidelines for simulated launching of free-fall lifeboats. It was, therefore, agreed that Administrations should also be permitted to accept during drills, all free-fall lifeboats, irrespective of their launching heights, be launched by falls in lieu of free-fall launching, provided that a simulated free-fall launch is conducted at least every six months in accordance with the Organization’s guidelines and this view should be referred to DE 48 for consideration.

7.11 The Committee was aware that this advice was in conflict with the existing provisions of SOLAS regulation III/19.3.3.4. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee invited the Committee, subject to its endorsement, to instruct the DE Sub-Committee to consider the need to amend the SOLAS Convention when addressing this issue.

7.12 The delegation of the Republic of Korea recalled its proposal to DE 47 that the requirements for basic safety training be amended to include a provision that seafarers serving on ships with free-fall lifeboats have training which included participation in a free-fall launch. In their view, every seafarer should have the knowledge of safety precautions to be taken when aboard free-fall launch lifeboats and, should have participated in an actual free fall launch before being permitted to join ships fitted with free-fall launch lifeboats. The delegation advised the Sub-Committee that an appropriate proposal, either to amend the STCW Convention or to issue guidance in the form of an MSC circular, would be submitted to STW 37.

7.13 The Sub-Committee agreed, in light of the revised work plan of the DE Sub-Committee, to invite the Committee to extend the target completion date to 2007 (see agenda item 14).

8 MEASURES TO ENHANCE MARITIME SECURITY

8.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 75 (MSC 75/24, paragraph 22.9) had decided to include in the work programme of the Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for STW 34, a high-priority item on “Measures to enhance maritime security” and had also instructed STW 34 (MSC 75/24, paragraph 17.109) to address the issue of training of shipboard personnel in the use of AIS equipment.

8.2 The Sub-Committee further recalled that MSC 77 had decided that the Sub-Committee should develop training and certification requirements for Ships’ Security Officers (SSOs), considering all possible options for implementation in the longer term (MSC 77/26, paragraph 6.82).

8.3 The Sub-Committee also recalled that STW 35 had instructed the Secretariat (STW 35/19, paragraph 9.1) to take necessary steps to develop a new model course to impart training in the operational use of AIS for mariners on board ships and that the Secretariat provided an update on the progress on the development of this model course when considering agenda item 3 (Validation of Model Training Courses).
8.4 The Sub-Committee finally recalled that STW 35 (STW 35/19, paragraph 9.6) had:

.1 approved the competence, knowledge, understanding and proficiency, methods for demonstrating competency and criteria for evaluation of SSOs;

.2 agreed that the minimum mandatory training and certification requirements for persons to be designated as SSOs should be included in chapter VI of the STCW Convention;

.3 agreed that documentary evidence to be issued on satisfactory completion of an approved SSO training programme in accordance with the minimum training requirements to be included in the STCW Convention and the STCW Code should be in the form of a certificate of proficiency;

.4 agreed that such certificates of proficiency should not be subject to periodic revalidation and should be treated in the same manner as other certificates or documentary evidence issued under the provisions of chapter VI of the STCW Convention;

.5 noted the discussions in connection with the current practices of Member States relating to the training and certification of SSOs;

.6 agreed that there was a need to determine whether certain minimum requirements additional to those relating to the minimum mandatory training, have to be met by those wishing to obtain a certificate of proficiency as SSOs and the need to discuss appropriate transitional arrangements with respect to those seafarers who may be trained as SSOs prior to entry into force of any mandatory requirements;

.7 agreed that those who may be designated as SSOs were employed or engaged on board a ship for the business of that ship and as such formed part of the shipboard personnel and, consequently, were to be considered as seafarers;

.8 approved the establishment of a correspondence group on minimum mandatory training and certification requirements for persons to be designated as ship security officers, under the co-ordination of India; and

.9 agreed that the interim measure recommended by MSC 77 regarding certification of the training of shipboard personnel should be maintained and, until the issue of introduction of minimum mandatory requirements for SSOs had been resolved, the International Ship Security Certificate (ISSC) should be accepted as prima facie evidence to indicate that SSOs and ship’s security personnel had received training in accordance with the guidance provided in section B/13 of the ISPS Code (paragraphs 18 and 19 of the annex to MSC/Circ.1097).

8.5 The Sub-Committee noted that MSC 78 (STW 36/2 and STW 36/8/1) had:

.1 agreed that the use of the term “minimum mandatory” in relation to training and certification requirements for ship security officers was redundant and decided that the term “minimum mandatory” should not be used;
.2 concurred with the view of STW 35 that the interim measure recommended by MSC 77 regarding certification of the training of shipboard personnel, should be maintained; and

.3 noted that the General Conference of the International Labour Organization adopted, on 19 June 2003, during its 91st session, the Seafarers’ Identity Documents Convention (Revised), 2003 (No.185) and had urged Member States to become parties to the ILO Convention No.185 as soon as possible.

8.6 The Sub-Committee considered the instructions of the Committee (STW 36/2, STW 36/2/1 and STW 36/8/2) to:

.1 identify the various instruments under the responsibility of the Sub-Committee which may need to be reviewed and amended so as to include appropriate security-related provisions; and

.2 consider the request from DSC 9 to consider those aspects within the purview of the Sub-Committee on the draft revised recommendation on the safe transport of dangerous cargoes and related activities in Port areas,

and agreed to refer them to the working group to be established to consider measures to enhance maritime security, for detailed consideration.

8.7 The Sub-Committee having considered, in general, the report of the correspondence group (STW 36/8), referred it to the above working group for detailed consideration, with a view to finalizing the training and certification requirements for persons to be designated as ship security officers.

8.8 The delegation of Norway was of the opinion that SSOs should either be a deck or an engineer officer. In response, the delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by others, advised the Sub-Committee that, while it was envisaged that training for SSOs may be subsumed into the training for officers of the watch, it was not necessary for all SSOs to be deck or engineer officers and stand alone training requirements would therefore also be essential.

8.9 The observer of ICCL advised the Sub-Committee that on cruise ships, ship security officers were required to primarily have a law enforcement background, as the security perceptions were different in the cruise industry.

Establishment of the working group

8.10 The Sub-Committee, in agreeing in principle to the views expressed in paragraphs 8.8 and 8.9 above, established a working group (WG 1) to consider measures to enhance maritime security with the following terms of reference:

Taking into account the comments and decisions made in the plenary, the Working Group should:

.1 consider the report of the correspondence group (STW 36/8) and finalize the training and certification requirements for persons to be designated as ship security officers;
.2 consider the instructions of the Committee (STW 36/2 (part)) including identifying the various instruments under the responsibility of the Sub-Committee, which may need to be reviewed and amended, so as to include appropriate security-related provisions;

.3 consider the request from DSC 9 (STW 36/2 (part) and STW 36/8/2) and advise the Sub-Committee accordingly; and

.4 submit its report to the plenary on Thursday, 13 January 2005.

On receipt of the working group's report

8.11 On receipt of the report of the working group (STW 36/WP.2), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SHIP SECURITY OFFICERS

Proposed amendment to the STCW Convention

8.12 In considering the proposed amendments to the STCW Convention, the Sub-Committee:

.1 concurred with the recommendation that an appropriate period of sea-going service as determined by the Administration, coupled with knowledge of ship operations, should be accepted in lieu of 12 months approved seagoing service;

.2 agreed that, given that the appointment of an SSO was dependant upon relevant experience, setting a minimum age requirement was not appropriate;

.3 after further deliberation, in particular relating to the inclusion of the term “accountable to the master” and mindful of the possible need for the inclusion of further, consequential definitions of “ship security plan”, “company security officer” and “port facility security officer”, agreed to include, in the “definitions” section, the full definition of “ship security officer” as it appears in section A/2.1.6 of the ISPS Code; and

.4 endorsed the draft amendments to the STCW Convention on requirements for the issue of certificates of proficiency as Ship Security Officers, including transitional provisions until 2009, as amended and set out in annex 5 and invited the Committee to approve them with a view to adoption at MSC 81.

Proposed amendments to the STCW Code

8.13 The Sub-Committee endorsed the draft amendments to part A of the STCW Code on training requirements for the issue of certificates of proficiency as Ship Security Officers, including transitional provisions, as set out at annex 6, and invited the Committee to approve them with a view to adoption at MSC 81.

8.14 In considering the proposed amendments to part B the STCW Convention, the Sub-Committee agreed that in cases where there was not an appropriate common language between parties needing to communicate security information, English would be the appropriate fallback language to use. After considerable discussion on the stage in the process of training the SSO that the English language training should take place, the Sub-Committee decided to include
the provision that “On completion of training, a ship security officer should have adequate knowledge of English to correctly interpret and communicate messages relevant to ship security” in the amendment to part B.

8.15 The Sub-Committee endorsed the amendments to part B of the STCW Code on guidance regarding training for Ship Security Officers, as amended, and the associated draft STCW.6 circular, as set out in annex 7, and invited the Committee to adopt the amendments, at its eighty-first session, in accordance with its Rules of Procedure.

AMENDMENTS TO OTHER INSTRUMENTS

8.16 In considering the need to review or amend the provisions of the instruments under its responsibility, the STW Sub-Committee noted that the instruments were:

1. International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, as amended (STCW 78);

2. International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel, 1995 (STCW-F); and

3. Principles on Safe Manning (Resolution A.890(21) as amended by resolution A.955(23)).

8.17 In this context, the Sub-Committee:

1. recalled that the special measures to enhance maritime security contained in SOLAS chapter XI-2 and in the ISPS Code did not apply to fishing vessels and agreed that there was no need to embark on any revisions of the STCW-F Convention;

2. agreed that, at this stage, it was premature to make any firm or definite recommendations on the revision of either the 1978 STCW Convention or the Principles of Safe Manning; and

3. invited submission of specific proposals on the actions which needed to be taken in relation to the revision of the 1978 STCW Convention and the Principles of Safe Manning, in order to enable the Sub-Committee to have an in-depth discussion of the issue during its next session with a view to providing the Committee with a holistic proposal on the issues which need to be addressed.

SAFE TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS CARGOES AND RELATED ACTIVITIES IN PORT AREAS

8.18 The Sub-Committee agreed to advise the DSC Sub-Committee to delete the references to the resolutions of the 1978 STCW Conference from the draft revised Recommendations on the Safe Transport of Dangerous Cargoes and related activities in Port Areas (annex 7 to document DSC 9/15) and replace them with a reference to the requirements of sections A/VIII - 4.1 and A/VIII - 4.5 of the STCW Code and invited the Committee to endorse this advice and instruct the Secretariat to forward it to DSC 10.

8.19 The Sub-Committee agreed, to invite the Committee to extend the target completion date to 2006 (see agenda item 14).
9 EDUCATION AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR FATIGUE PREVENTION, MITIGATION AND MANAGEMENT

9.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that, in considering the report of the Joint MSC/MEPC Working Group on the Human Element (MSC 75/10), MSC 75 had considered the issue of education and training for fatigue prevention, mitigation and management to be very important and of some urgency and had agreed to include in the Sub-Committee’s work programme and provisional agenda for STW 34, a high priority item on “Mandatory education and training requirements for fatigue prevention, mitigation and management”.

9.2 The Sub-Committee further recalled that, STW 34 had decided that it was premature to develop mandatory education and training requirements and that training in fatigue management should be addressed through voluntary guidance rather than mandatory requirements.

9.3 The Sub-Committee also recalled that, STW 34 had invited Member Governments to submit information to STW 35 on their experience with the application of the Guidelines on fatigue, set out in MSC/Circ.1014 and the hours of work and rest provisions in STCW chapter VIII and ILO Convention 180.

9.4 The Sub-Committee finally recalled that, STW 35 had decided that, in light of no submissions from Member Governments related to their experiences with the application of the above provisions, it was premature to develop a model course, as proposed by the United States, and had invited Member Governments to submit information on their experiences with the application of these instruments to STW 36 to assist the Sub-Committee in developing voluntary training guidance.

9.5 Denmark (STW 36/9) advised the Sub-Committee of their experience in the utilization of MSC/Circ.1014. In accordance with Danish law, a Working Environment Board for furthering health and safety of employees on board ships had been established. The guidelines had been translated into Danish and distributed to their national maritime educational institutions, including those providing degrees in naval architecture and also to the Working Environment Board. These guidelines were now a part of maritime education and training curriculum and their application was monitored through the quality standards system pursuant to STCW regulation I/8. Danish ships were required to maintain a Safety Committee on board. Members of this Committee must have passed a training course on health and safety in working environment which included these guidelines.

9.6 The delegation of Lebanon, appreciating the efforts of Denmark, was of the opinion that the Working Environment Board should include a representative from the maritime administration and also expressed concern that the introduction of any new committees on board would create additional workload on the seafarers.

9.7 The delegation of the United Kingdom advised the Sub-Committee that the approach to fatigue mitigation should be addressed by ensuring that the work pattern on board ships was such that it did not lead to fatigue. In their view, the issue of fatigue could not be addressed through additional training requirements. The delegation also informed the Sub-Committee that it would be proposing a new work programme item to MSC 80 to ensure that ships were adequately manned, so that seafarers on board were not fatigued.

9.8 The ICFTU observer agreed with the views of the United Kingdom that the issue of fatigue was not being addressed in its right perspective and manning levels needs to be
considered to address this issue properly. He was also of the opinion that the establishment of safety committees along with safety officers and safety representatives would be in some way provide positive measures to address this issue.

9.9 The ISF observer agreed that more need to be done to address the issue of fatigue, but not necessarily by changing the manning levels, as was being proposed by the United Kingdom.

9.10 The Sub-Committee agreed that, since only one submission related to experiences with the application of the Guidelines in MSC/Circ.1014 and the hours of work and other provisions in STCW chapter VIII and ILO Convention 180 had been received, it was still premature to decide on this issue and invited Member Governments to submit their experiences gained relating to these provisions and instruments to STW 37, to enable the Sub-Committee to decide on the further course of action to address the issue of fatigue.

10 REQUIREMENTS FOR KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND TRAINING FOR OFFICERS ON WIG CRAFT

10.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 76 had decided to include, in the Sub-Committee’s work programme, a high priority item on “Requirements for knowledge, skills and training for officers on WIG craft”, with a target completion date of 2005, and had instructed STW 34 to give preliminary consideration to the matter and to include the item in the provisional agenda for STW 35.

10.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that STW 35 had agreed that it was premature to prepare an MSC circular, providing guidance on the training and certification required for officers on WIG, and had invited Member States to submit additional information to assist in developing appropriate training and certification requirements at this session.

10.3 The Sub-Committee considered the proposal by the Russian Federation (STW 36/10) and the comments by Australia (STW 36/10/1), for an MSC circular on guidance on training and certification requirements for officers on WIG crafts. The delegation of the Republic of Korea supported the proposal.

10.4 The United States supported by the United Kingdom expressed their reservations on the Organization developing guidance on training and certification required for officers on WIG craft, since these craft operated in an airborne mode for which the Sub-Committee did not have the requisite experience. Training and certification requirements for aviators were under the scope of ICAO and it might therefore be appropriate to develop the anticipated guidance jointly with that organization.

10.5 The Sub-Committee noting the above concerns but recalling the instructions of MSC 76, established a drafting group and instructed it, taking into account decisions and comments made in the plenary, to prepare a draft MSC circular providing guidance for knowledge, skills and training requirements for officers on WIG crafts using documents STW 36/10 (Russian Federation) and STW 36/10/1 (Australia) with a view to approval at MSC 80.

Report of the drafting group

10.6 The Sub-Committee considered the report of the drafting group (STW 36/WP.5). There was some discussion on the title of the draft MSC circular and also on the criteria of the base qualification of a seafarer with regard to the general principles, recommendations and
requirements for qualification on Wing-in-Ground (WIG) craft. The majority of the delegations were of the opinion that the title of the draft MSC circular should be amended to reflect the operation of WIG craft, both in the displacement and ground-effect modes. In aligning the terminology in paragraphs 2.1 and 3.5 of the annex to document STW 36/WP.5, the Sub-Committee agreed that officers on a WIG craft should “preferably” have the required base qualification. The title of the draft MSC circular and paragraph 2.1 (annex) were amended accordingly.

10.7 The delegation of the United Kingdom stated that it continued to harbour the same concerns it had when the DE Sub-Committee developed the guidelines for the design, construction and equipment of WIG craft. Specifically, the United Kingdom did not believe that the risks associated with operating these craft had been suitably addressed, and that in the event of an accident the consequences were likely to be so severe that traditional maritime mitigation thinking and procedures might not be feasible. The United Kingdom Government therefore urged anyone considering to operate one of these craft in United Kingdom waters or under the United Kingdom flag to contact them as soon as possible, as such requests would be considered on a case-by-case basis and the criteria for acceptance might not be those which had been developed by the Organization.

10.8 The delegation of the United States expressed its concerns with the development of training requirements for the qualifications of officers operating wing-in-ground craft, as they believed that the proper balance of maritime and aviation training was paramount for the operation of these craft. All control and operation of these craft required “aviation” related skills, knowledge and abilities. The United States therefore believed that a seaplane operator would be better prepared to operate a WIG craft than a mariner.

10.9 The delegation of Greece expressed concern regarding the safety of navigation in those areas where the WIG craft would be operating, and was of the opinion that the base qualification of the officer on the WIG craft should be at least maritime qualifications in accordance with the relevant provisions of the STCW Convention.

10.10 The delegation of Liberia expressed the view that the term ‘base qualifications’ referred to in the draft circular should be defined.

10.11 The Sub-Committee endorsed the draft MSC circular on general principles and recommendations for knowledge skills and training for officers on Wing-in-Ground (WIG) craft operating in both displacement and ground effect modes, with the amendments outlined above and invited the Committee to approve the circular as set out in annex 8.

10.12 The Sub-Committee agreed, as the work thereon had been completed, to invite the Committee to delete this item from its work programme (see agenda item 14).

11 DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONTROL AND MANAGEMENT OF SHIP’S BALLAST WATER AND SEDIMENTS

11.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 71 (MSC 71/23, paragraph 20.55) had included the development of training requirements for ballast water management as an item in the Sub-Committee’s work programme.

11.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that MSC 78 had changed the title of this work programme item to “development of training requirements for the control and management of
ship’s ballast water and sediments” and had extended the target completion date of this item to 2007.

11.3 The Sub-Committee further recalled that STW 35 had invited Member Governments and non-governmental organizations to submit proposals on developing the training requirements for the control and management of ship’s ballast water and sediments, to STW 36 for consideration.

11.4 The Sub-Committee noted that MEPC 52, recalling MEPC 49’s concurrence with the decision of MSC 77 to include the “Development of requirements for training in ballast water management” in the agenda of the Sub-Committee as a high-priority item, had encouraged delegations and observers to submit relevant proposals for consideration by the Sub-Committee (STW 36/2/2).

11.5 The Sub-Committee considered the proposal by India (STW 36/10) that, it would be premature to develop mandatory training requirements within the STCW Convention before the entry into force of the Convention for the Control and Management of Ship’s Ballast Water and Sediments and it would be more appropriate if voluntary guidance in the form of model courses for both shipboard and port ballast water management officers could be developed at this stage.

11.6 The delegation of the Ukraine advised the Sub-Committee that it had participated extensively in the IMO Ballast Water programme and was providing ballast water management training courses to Ukrainian seafarers. It offered to co-operate with India in developing the proposed model courses.

11.7 The delegation of the United Kingdom supported by others, agreed that development of voluntary guidance in the form of a model course was the way forward at this point in time. However, in the longer term they felt that it should form part of the STCW training requirements for officers at management and operational levels.

11.8 The delegation of China also offered to co-operate with India to develop the model courses as they also had extensive experience in ballast water management through the IMO ballast water management programme.

11.9 The Sub-Committee agreed to recommend to the Committee, to refer the proposal for the development of the model course for Port Ballast Water Management officer to the Facilitation Committee for its advice on the need thereof, as suggested by the United Kingdom.

11.10 The Sub-Committee agreed that it would be appropriate at this stage to develop voluntary guidance in the form of a model course for shipboard ballast water management and thanked India for its offer and invited it to provide the draft model courses to the Secretariat as soon as possible to enable the Secretariat to circulate the same to the validation panel with a view to validation by the Sub-Committee at its next session.

12 DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENCES FOR RATINGS

12.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that STW 34, while noting the outcome of discussions at ILO related to the consolidation of ILO maritime conventions and the possible future transfer of some current ILO training provisions to the STCW Convention, had invited MSC 77 to add a new work programme item in the Sub-Committee’s work programme on ‘Development of competences for ratings’ and to instruct the Sub-Committee to develop competences for ratings
based on existing STCW provisions (STW 34/14, paragraphs 11.11 and 13.16 to 13.22). MSC 77 had concurred with the request of STW 34 (MSC 77/26, paragraph 23.40).

12.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that MSC 77 had agreed that STW 35 should consider:

.1 the outcome of the ILO discussions on the Certification of the Able Seamen Convention, 1946 (No.74);

.2 the existing ILO provisions and the specific competences for training and certification of able seamen which might be included in the STCW Convention, in order that a fuller analysis of the situation could be made; and

.3 to report the outcome of its discussions to MSC 78.

12.3 The Sub-Committee further recalled that MSC 78 had (MSC 78/26, paragraphs 15.11 to 15.14):

.1 noted that STW 35 had deferred consideration of preliminary proposals for the development of competences for ratings until the outcome of the Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference of ILO which would be made available and instructed the Secretariat to report the outcome of the Conference to STW 36;

.2 in considering the advice of STW 35 that competences for ratings could be included within the STCW Convention and the request to instruct the Secretariat to convey this view to ILO for their consideration and comments, recognized that currently there were no international standards for competences for ratings other than for able-bodied seaman;

.3 agreed that IMO was the appropriate body to deal with standards related to competences for ratings, excluding the ship’s cook, and had instructed the Secretariat to convey this decision to ILO; and

.4 noted that MSC 79, on receipt of the outcome of the respective Preparatory Technical Conference confirmation from ILO, would then be in a position to instruct STW 36 to consider the issue and the possible implications arising from the standards for training related to ratings being regulated by the Organization; and to suggest the best way forward.

12.4 The Sub-Committee was informed by the Secretariat (STW36/12) that:

.1 as instructed by MSC 78, the Secretariat had attended the meeting from 14 to 17 September 2004 and had participated in the proceedings of the relevant Tripartite Technical Committee of the Conference;

.2 the Technical Committee reviewed the communication from the Organization regarding competences for ratings, and, noting the exclusion of the ships’ cook from the transfer, had agreed to recommend the transfer of responsibility for training to IMO, as follows:

.1 the development of training requirements for seafarers, excluding the ship’s cook, was relevant to the International Maritime Organization (IMO), particularly with regard to the International Convention on
Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), 1978, as amended;

.2 the principles of the ILO Convention on Certification of Able Seamen, 1946 (No.74) should be transferred to IMO;

.3 training and qualification requirements for ratings should be transferred to IMO for inclusion in the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, as amended; and

.4 in light of the use of the term ‘Able Seaman’ in various ILO instruments, it would be appropriate that IMO made the relevant reference/definition to this term when developing appropriate training requirements for ratings;

.3 the Technical Committee also recommended that the issues, as set out in subparagraphs .1 to .3 below, should be considered by IMO when developing training and qualification requirements for ratings for inclusion into the STCW Convention;

.1 training requirements that would ensure that the rating had reached the level of competence to perform his/her duties and responsibilities required of his/her position on board ship;

.2 assessment to ensure that the training imparted ensures that the rating had reached the desired level of competence; and

.3 certification or other documentary evidence by the relevant competent authority indicating that the rating had been trained, assessed and found competent to perform the duties and responsibilities related to his/her position on board ship;

.4 the Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference Committee had noted the importance of ensuring that appropriate arrangements were in place while the relevant requirements were being developed by IMO and had adopted a recommendation, requesting that the International Labour Office examine the legal situation regarding the Certification of Able Seamen Convention, 1946 (No.74) during this transition.

12.5 The Sub-Committee was advised that, MSC 79 (STW 36/2 (part)) had considered the outcome of the ILO Preparatory Technical Conference and had instructed the Sub-Committee to consider the issue and the possible implications arising from standards for training related to ratings being regulated by the Organization, and to suggest the best way forward to MSC 80.

12.6 The Sub-Committee considered the proposal from the United Kingdom (STW36/12/1) that:

.1 the scope could be expanded to cover the certification of both deck and engine ratings which could be included in the STCW Convention and be applicable to seagoing ships of 500 gross tonnage or more;
consideration could be given to defining a rating grading structure that builds upon the requirements for a watch rating certificate;

the structure of the ILO Convention should be maintained as the basis of a discussion document and consideration should be given to define a progressive career path for new entry ratings;

a proposed grading structure should define the training, qualifications and experience for certification for a Rating Grade 2 based on the watchrating certificate(s); and Rating Grade 1 based on the requirements for Able Seaman/Motorman;

to be considered as Rating Grade 1, a seafarer should satisfy the criteria given in paragraph 8 of their proposal; and

to be considered as Rating Grade 2, a seafarer should satisfy the criteria given in paragraph 9 of their proposal.

12.7 The United Kingdom also proposed that guidance for administrations on the implementation of the above mentioned obligations should also be developed.

12.8 The delegation of Cyprus, while agreeing with the proposal by the United Kingdom, noted that it did not provide for training and certification requirements for ratings other than those involved in watchkeeping duties. It also advised that the Sub-Committee should consider the implications emanating from the transfer of the training requirements for able seaman from ILO Convention No.74 to the 1978 STCW Convention and, in particular, to the recognition of certificates issued in accordance with ILO Convention No.74 by Parties to the STCW Convention, which are not Parties to the ILO Convention. The delegation stated that the Government of Cyprus was not prepared to recognize such certificates.

12.9 The delegation of Denmark, supported by others, was in favour of the inclusion of standards of competences for ratings in the STCW Convention as the present requirements in ILO Convention No.74 were outdated. It also advised that the proposed standards to be developed should follow the present structure of the STCW Convention and focus on the tasks to be carried out on board ships. Some delegations supported this view.

12.10 The delegation of the Republic of Korea expressed the view that, while transferring the provisions related to able seaman from ILO Convention No.74 to the STCW Convention, the scope should be expanded to include both deck and engine-room ratings and that the recognition procedure, as proposed by the United Kingdom, was not necessary, as STCW regulation I/10 required recognition arrangements only for the master, officer and radio operator.

12.11 The delegation of the Netherlands supported the development of competences for ratings for inclusion in the STCW Convention which should also include provisions for general purpose ratings in addition to the traditional deck and engine-room ratings.

12.12 The delegation of Greece expressed the opinion that the ILO principles which did not contradict the principles of the STCW Convention should be maintained. In its opinion, the term able seaman referred to a deck rating, who formed a part of the navigational watch, and the delegation, therefore, did not support the proposal by the United Kingdom, as it would affect the rights of the existing seafarers. The delegation was also of the opinion that the proposed development of competences for ratings should not create additional requirements for those
ratings already certified as ‘rating forming part of navigational/engineering watch’ under existing STCW regulations II/4 or III/4.

12.13 The delegation of Canada informed the Sub-Committee that there was a need to consider the legal status of those countries that had ratified ILO Convention No.74 and also of those seafarers who had been issued with certificates in accordance with that Convention.

12.14 The delegation of Brazil informed the Sub-Committee that there was a need to establish a career path for ratings and they would be providing more details on this subject to STW 37.

12.15 The delegation of Ukraine advised the Sub-Committee that as per definition, rating meant any crew member who was not an officer and that it had developed national standards for issuing certificates to all crew members, even though this was not a requirement of the STCW Convention.

12.16 The delegation of China, supported by others, expressed the opinion that the proposed standards should, in addition to deck and engine-room watchkeepers, also include non-watchkeepers.

12.17 The ILO observer advised the Sub-Committee that there was a need to retain the term ‘able seaman’. This was important within the ILO system, as this term was used by their Sub-Committee within the Joint Maritime Commission which is setting the basic minimum wage standard.

12.18 The observers of ISF and ICFTU informed the Sub-Committee that in line with the decision of the ILO Preparatory Technical Maritime Conference Committee, they were supportive of the proposal, as explained by the United Kingdom.

12.19 The Sub-Committee agreed that:

.1 there was a need for ILO to consider the legal status of those countries that had ratified ILO Convention No.74;

.2 there was a need to provide for transitional arrangements for seafarers holding certificates issued under the provision of ILO Convention No.74;

.3 the term ‘able seaman’ needed to be retained as it had implications within the ILO regulatory framework, in particular to basic wage recommendations;

.4 the proposed standards to be developed should include both deck and engine-room ratings, with a possibility of also addressing general purpose ratings;

.5 the proposed standards should follow the structure of the present STCW Convention namely:

.1 competence;

.2 knowledge, understanding and proficiency;

.3 methods of demonstrating competence; and

.4 criteria for evaluating competence,
and invited the Committee to endorse this decision and to instruct the Secretariat to inform ILO accordingly.

12.20 The Sub-Committee also agreed that in order to facilitate the development of competence for ratings, it would be appropriate to establish a correspondence group under the co-ordination of the United Kingdom* to continue the work intersessionally, subject to the Committee endorsing the decisions referred to in paragraph 12.19 above with the draft terms of reference set out in annex 9.

12.21 The Sub-Committee also considered whether it would be necessary for STCW Parties to re-submit information pursuant to STCW regulation I/7, demonstrating compliance whenever an amendment to the Convention was adopted and agreed that STCW Parties pursuant to regulation I/8, had to ensure that all training, assessment of competence, certification, endorsement and revalidation activities were continuously monitored through a quality standards system. The quality standards system had to be independently evaluated once every five years and its report communicated to the Secretary-General. Any amendments during this five-year cycle would be covered by this evaluation to demonstrate that the STCW Parties continue giving ‘full and complete effect’ to the provisions contained in the Convention and therefore, it was not necessary to re-submit information, as and when the Convention was amended. The Sub-Committee invited the Committee to approve this decision.

12.22 In light of the decision of the ILO Preparatory Technical Conference to transfer the responsibility for training and certification related to ratings, excluding the ship’s cook, to the Organization and its above discussions and decisions, the Sub-Committee invited Member Governments and non-governmental organizations to submit comments and proposals for consideration at STW 37 and requested the Committee to extend the target completion date to 2007 (see agenda item 14).

13 TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR COMPANY AND PORT FACILITY SECURITY OFFICERS

13.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 77 had agreed to include in the Sub-Committee’s work programme and agenda of STW 35 a new item ‘Training and certification requirements for company and port facility security officers’ (MSC 77/26, paragraphs 6.81 and 6.82).

13.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that STW 35 had agreed that neither the STCW Convention nor the STCW Code were appropriate instruments for including training and certification requirements for company security officers (CSOs) and had invited Member
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Governments to submit comments and proposals relating to training and certification of CSOs with a view of reaching a decision at STW 36.

13.3 The Sub-Committee further recalled that STW 35 noted that in view of the fact that company and port facility security officers were shore-based, the inclusion of any mandatory training and certification requirements for them in the STCW Convention was inappropriate and, therefore, invited the Committee to clarify and to provide additional guidance to the Sub-Committee with respect to the Committee’s instruction (MSC 77/26, paragraph 6.82) relating to the development of training and certification requirements for company and port facility security officers.

13.4 The Sub-Committee was advised that MSC 78 had:

1. noted the discussions at STW 35 concerning the development of mandatory training and certification requirements for company security officers;

2. instructed the Sub-Committee that the instructions contained in paragraph 6.82 of document MSC 77/26 should not be pursued and instead to develop guidelines on training and certification of CSOs. These guidelines should take into account the duties and responsibilities of CSOs, the knowledge and training specified in parts A and B of the ISPS Code and IMO model course 3.20 on company security officers and should address, *inter alia*, issues relating to competence, knowledge, understanding and proficiencies; methods for demonstrating competence; and criteria for evaluating competence; and

3. noting that no submissions had been received by STW 35, so as to enable the Sub-Committee to consider the issues related to training and certification of port facility security officers, decided that at this stage, the Sub-Committee should not pursue the issue further.

13.5 In light of the MSC 78 instructions to STW 36 to develop guidelines on the training and certification of CSOs, the United States (STW 36/13/1) advised the Sub-Committee that they had updated the proposed competence tables submitted to STW 35 (STW 35/15). The revision was undertaken to ensure that the competences:

1. were based on the duties and responsibilities in part A of the ISPS Code and the guidance contained in part B;

2. reflected the information contained in IMO Model Course 3.20; and

3. were consistent with the language used in the SSO competence tables agreed at STW 35 (STW 35/WP.4/Rev.1, annex 1).

13.6 ISF (STW 36/13/2), noting the decision of MSC 78 that the Sub-Committee should not develop mandatory training and certification requirements for CSOs, but should develop guidance only, expressed the view that it would be inappropriate for the Sub-Committee to develop further requirements for CSOs as the Sub-Committee deals with training issues related to seafarers and that the Sub-Committee should not develop certification requirements for shore-based personnel as it did not have the necessary remit or the experience. ISF further expressed the view that companies should be allowed the flexibility to set up their ISPS security arrangements and training ashore. The Sub-Committee agreed that the ISF proposal contradicted the Committee’s instructions and could, therefore, not be entertained.
13.7 In considering the instructions by MSC 78, as to whether the proposed guidelines should include any guidance with respect to any requirements other than those relating to training, which CSOs should meet, as well as the form of certification of the training, the Sub-Committee agreed that there was no need to include any certification requirements in the proposed guidance but to have only documentary evidence as proof of training. It further agreed to develop guidance only related to training for duties and responsibilities referred to within the ISPS Code.

13.8 The Sub-Committee agreed to refer documents (STW 36/13 and STW 36/13/1) to the working group established to consider issues related to maritime security for detailed consideration and instructed it to take into account the comments and decisions made in the plenary and to develop appropriate guidance for training and documentation of CSOs as instructed by MSC 78.

**On receipt of the working group's report**

13.9 On receipt of the report of the working group (STW 36/WP.2), the Sub-Committee took action as summarized in the ensuing paragraphs.

**Training and certification requirements for company security officers**

13.10 The Sub-Committee noted the deliberations of the working group on the proposed knowledge, understanding and proficiencies (KUP) relevant to CSOs and agreed to use document STW 36/13/1 (United States) as the basis for further development.

13.11 The Sub-Committee considered the need for the KUP entitled “knowledge of the proper procedures to ensure inspection, testing, calibration and maintenance of security equipment or systems, if any” within the proposed guidance and agreed that it should be deleted.

13.12 The Sub-Committee agreed that that existing CSO courses covering the contents of the IMO Model Course 3.20 should be deemed to meet the relevant KUP.

13.13 The Sub-Committee recommended that SOLAS Contracting Governments setting requirements for the training and assessment of SSOs and CSOs should note that many of the model course training objectives in IMO Model Courses 3.19 and 3.20 are common to both CSO and SSO and further, that many of the KUPs in the competence tables are similarly common and should therefore be taken into account when setting criteria for the re-training and assessment of those SSOs moving toward CSO qualifications and vice versa.

13.14 The Sub-Committee agreed that those completing CSO training should provide documentary evidence to this effect to the relevant SOLAS Contracting Government when requested to do so.

13.15 The Sub-Committee endorsed the draft MSC circular providing guidance on training and documentation for CSOs set out at annex 10, and invited the Committee to approve the circular.

13.16 The Sub-Committee agreed to delete this item from the work programme when considering item 14 (Work Programme), and to propose considering all items related to maritime security under one agenda item (Measures to enhance maritime security) (see agenda item 14).
14 WORK PROGRAMME AND AGENDA FOR STW 37

Terms of reference for the Sub-Committee

14.1 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 76 had instructed the Sub-Committees to review and update, as necessary, their own terms of reference and to prepare updated terms of reference for consideration by MSC 78 and MEPC 50 (MSC 76/23, paragraph 19.6).

14.2 The Sub-Committee also recalled that STW 34 had instructed the Secretariat to prepare the provisional terms of reference in consultation with the Chairman and that STW 35 had reviewed the revised terms of reference and had invited MSC 78 to approve the revised terms of reference (STW 35/19, annex 10).

14.3 The Sub-Committee finally recalled that due to lack of time, MSC 78 had deferred the consideration of the terms of reference for all Sub-Committees to MSC 79.

14.4 The Secretariat advised the Sub-Committee (STW 36/14) that MEPC 52 had noted that at the Chairmen’s meeting, it had been agreed that the following points should be highlighted in the terms of reference of the sub-committees:

1. uniformity of format and generic work items should be introduced, possibly using as a basis the terms of reference of the DE Sub-Committee;

2. the mandate to the sub-committees should include explicit references to marine environment issues;

3. the terms of reference should be aligned to the Strategic Plan and Goals for the Organization once they are finalized; and

4. the responsibilities of each sub-committee should be clearly defined in the terms of reference to assist the Secretariat in ensuring that submissions relating to new work items are assigned to the appropriate sub-committees.

14.5 The Secretariat further advised the Sub-Committee (STW 36/14/Add.1) that, MSC 79 had instructed the Secretariat, to revise the terms of reference of the Sub-Committees in consultation with their respective Chairmen, taking into account the points agreed by the Chairmen’s Meeting (MSC 78/WP.9, paragraph 5), the views of MEPC 52, as well as its own views, and submit them to MSC 80 and, as a consequence, to the next Chairman’s Meeting for final consideration and approval by that session of the Committee and by MEPC 53.

14.6 The Sub-Committee noted that the Secretariat, as instructed by MSC 79, in co-operation with the Chairman will review the Terms of Reference and submit them to MSC 80 for approval.

Work programme and agenda for STW 37

14.7 Taking into account the progress made at this session and the provisions of the agenda management procedure contained in paragraphs 3.11 to 3.23 of the Guidelines on the organization and method of work (MSC/Circ.1099 – MEPC/Circ.405), the Sub-Committee revised its work programme (STW 36/WP.1) based on that approved by MSC 78 (STW 36/2, annex) and invited the Committee to approve the proposed revised work programme and provisional agenda for STW 37, set out in annex 11.
14.8 The Chairman, in addressing the current workload of the Sub-Committee, invited it to consider at this point in which areas of IMO’s scope, training and human element related issues might need to be discussed by the Sub-Committee in future, subject to the Committee’s approval. In an attempt to initiate a preliminary discussion on this matter he expressed the opinion that in the future the Sub-Committee might wish to address the following:

1. seafarer issues;
   - shortage of manpower;
   - criminalization of seafarers; and
   - shore leave;

2. other training matters;
   - competences for ratings;
   - tanker training matters;
   - training for LNG tankers;

3. harbour pilot training; and

4. training related emerging new regulations.

14.9 The delegation of Saudi Arabia informed the Sub-Committee that in their opinion there was a need to include training and certification requirements for harbour pilots and VTS operators within the STCW Convention. It also advised that Saudi Arabia had developed local standards and would be submitting this information to the Committee.

14.10 The delegation of Belgium indicated that presently there was no requirement to provide for updated training relating to new technological developments within the STCW Convention which the Sub-Committee might need to address in future. It further advised the Sub-Committee that there was no familiarization requirement for deck officers on ‘automation of instruments and the associated stress factor’ within the STCW Convention.

14.11 The delegation of Canada indicated that there was a need to analyse and explore the possibility to provide for a second career ashore for mariners.

14.12 The delegation of the United Kingdom, while welcoming and thanking the Chairman for his initiatives, reminded the Sub-Committee of the Committee’s guidelines on the organization and method of work which laid down strict rules for including new work programme items. It also recalled that there were two issues which had been discussed by the Sub-Committee under ‘any other business’ – agenda item 16, which would need further consideration at STW 37 and should be included in the present work programme.

14.13 In responding to the intervention of Saudi Arabia, the delegation of United States, supported by a number of other delegations, expressed the view that it would be inappropriate to consider training and certification requirements for harbour pilots as they were national issues rather than international ones.

14.14 The delegation of the United States, supported by others, expressed, however, the view that additional training requirements for LNG tankers would need to be developed, in addition to the development of tables of competence for seafarers serving on tankers.
14.15 The observer of ICFTU stressed that human element issues should be given the necessary prominence and that there were many issues that would need consideration in this area.

14.16 Whilst recognizing the appropriateness of the Sub-Committee to embark on this discussion regarding issues which might warrant future work, the Director, Maritime Safety Division, reminded the Sub-Committee that it was necessary to submit proposals for any new work programme item in accordance with the Committee’s guidelines.

14.17 The delegation of Vanuatu advised the Sub-Committee that there was a need to include exemption provisions for engineer officers in part A of the STCW Code, similar to those for deck officers.

14.18 The delegation of Norway informed the Sub-Committee that for more than four years, the Norwegian Administration, during radio surveys, had investigated systematically the competency of radio operators certified for GMDSS. The results of the investigation indicated that more than 80% of the radio operator lacked the competence necessary to operate the equipment correctly, in all respects including distress, urgency and safety. Recognizing that GMDSS is a vital part of safety of life at sea and noting this lack of competency, in their opinion the STW Sub-Committee would need to consider whether or not the present requirements were adequate. In this context, taking into account the discussion under agenda item 16 (paragraphs 16.18 to 16.22) and recalling the request by COMSAR 8 on this matter which had been endorsed by MSC 78, the Sub-Committee agreed to recommend to the Committee to add a new work programme item ‘Performance of GMDSS operator’s certificate holders’ as a new work programme item and to include it in the agenda for STW 37.

14.19 The Sub-Committee recalled that while considering the proposal from Norway for a new work programme item ‘Review of the STCW Code requirements for demonstration of competence’, as instructed by MSC 78, it had decided to advise the Committee that more time was required to provide appropriate advice thereon and had accordingly invited Member Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to submit comments and proposals thereon to STW 37. In this context, the Sub-Committee invited the Committee to consider including this item on its work programme and include it in the agenda of STW 37.

14.20 The delegation of France indicated that in light of the current workload, the Sub-Committee may consider meeting at intervals of eighteen months, instead of every year.

Arrangements for the next session

14.21 The Sub-Committee noted that its thirty-seventh session had been tentatively scheduled to take place from 23 to 27 January 2006.

15 ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR 2006

15.1 In accordance with the Rules of Procedure of the Maritime Safety Committee, the Sub-Committee unanimously re-elected Rear Admiral Peter Brady (Jamaica), as Chairman and Mr. A.H. Kayssi (Lebanon) as Vice-Chairman respectively for the year 2006.
16 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Review of the STCW Code requirements for demonstration of competence

16.1 The Secretariat (STW 36/16/1) informed the Sub-Committee that MSC had:

.1 considered document MSC 78/24/6 (Norway) proposing to conduct a review of requirements regarding demonstration of competence in STCW Chapter VI by way of receiving a refresher course ashore, with the aim of clearly specifying minimum requirements; and

.2 taken into account the comments made by the Russian Federation, supported by others, that the proposed refresher training ashore would be in conflict with the existing provisions of regulation I/11 of the STCW Convention and section A-I/11 of the STCW Code (which require refresher training and revalidation of competence only for holders of certificates for masters, officers and radio operators and specifically exclude from revalidation of all the certificates issued under the STCW Code chapter VI requirements), and decided that STW 36 should only consider the need for a review of the STCW chapter VI requirements and advise MSC 80 as appropriate (MSC 78/26, paragraph 24.57).

16.2 The Secretariat also drew the attention of the Sub-Committee to the fact that MSC 72 had adopted amendments to part B of the STCW Code which included a new table B-I/11, providing information on the differences between STCW 78 and STCW 95 certification requirements (STCW.6/Circ.5) and also the revalidation requirements for certificates.

16.3 Norway (STW 36/16/4) explained why it was essential to review the STCW Code regarding demonstration of competence as provided in the relevant regulations chapter VI. Norway advised that seafarers on board ships regularly received training and would be able to demonstrate competence on various safety and emergency situations during shipboard trainings or drills; there were vital practical limitations to the possibilities of realistic training and demonstrating competence without endangering the ship and crew, in particular regarding fire-fighting. Consequently, Norway was of the opinion that the requirements of chapter VI could only be fulfilled by requiring seafarers to attend a limited refresher course ashore every fifth year. They also informed the Sub-Committee that some Administrations interpret these requirements differently and do not require seafarers to attend refresher courses ashore.

16.4 Norway also noted the viewpoints expressed during MSC 78 on a perceived conflict between the proposed refresher training ashore and other provisions in the STCW Convention. In their opinion, regulation I/11 of the STCW Convention and section A-I/11 of the STCW Code regulated specific certificates i.e. certificates of competency, while chapter VI of the STCW Convention and Code regulated a completely different issue i.e. requirements on familiarization applicable to all seafarers. Since the two sets of regulations referred to two separate subjects, it was the opinion of Norway that the provisions of STCW regulation A-I/11 and STCW Code section A-I/11 did not conflict with the provisions of chapter VI of the STCW Convention and the Code.

16.5 ISF (STW 36/16/5) expressed the opinion that there was no need to review or change the training requirements in STCW chapter VI, as this would lead to an unnecessary burden on seafarers and an inflexible restriction on shipowners abilities to maintain a well trained crew. ISF believed that proper compliance with the ISM Code was the best way to ensure good training levels.
16.6 The delegation of Germany, supported by others, expressed the opinion that there was no need to review the requirements of STCW Code Chapter VI, as STCW regulation I/11 explicitly excluded that chapter from the revalidation requirements. It also reiterated that the training provisions of regulation 6.5 of the ISM Code placed an obligation on the shipowner to establish procedures for identifying any training requirements and to ensure that such training is provided to all concerned.

16.7 The delegation of the United Kingdom agreed that, whilst ISF had a valid point wherein it reminded the Sub-Committee that the provision of adequate, timely and appropriate training was an important principle included in the ISM Code, it was also important that this principle was endorsed and not undermined by what is prescribed by the STCW Convention and Code. In particular, the delegation recognized that the following issues need to be considered:

.1 that many elements of initial training like navigation in congested waters and starting and stopping of engines was used on a day to day basis, while some elements like fighting oil fires were not used on a regular basis;

.2 the need for seafarers to keep abreast of the latest technological and methodological developments; and

.3 the benefits of undertaking such updating and revalidation of knowledge and skills against the additional burdens that may be placed on the individual seafarer and the industry,

and taking these into account, it supported Norway in their proposal to review the requirements of Chapter VI of the STCW Code.

16.8 The delegation of the Republic of Korea, supported by others, agreed to the proposal by Norway and indicated that on board drill requirements did not cover all aspects of fire-fighting and personal survival techniques.

16.9 The delegation of the United States expressed the opinion that there was no need to review the present requirements of Chapter VI of the STCW Code, however, there was a need to align the requirements within the STCW Convention and parts A and B of the STCW Code to remove any inconsistencies and that it would be submitting a proposal thereon to the next session.

16.10 The delegation of the Netherlands agreed with Norway that there were some training aspects such as those related to fire-fighting which prevented such training from being carried out on board. It also agreed that there was a need to align the requirements of the STCW Convention and parts A and B of the STCW Code to remove any inconsistencies, as proposed by the United States, in order not to undermine the importance of the ISM Code.

16.11 The delegation of Norway reiterated that there was no conflict between the requirements of STCW regulation I/11 and Chapter VI of the Code and that such a review would not undermine the provisions of the ISM Code.

16.12 The delegation of Canada expressed the view that the Legal Division of the Organization should be requested to undertake a legal review of the regulations related to the demonstration of competence.
16.13 A small majority was not in support of the proposal by Norway.

16.14 The Sub-Committee, however, noting that this was a complex issue and required further discussions, decided to advise the Committee that more time was required to provide appropriate advice and accordingly invited Member Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to submit comments and proposals thereon to STW 37.

Performance of GMDSS operator’s certificate holders

16.15 The Sub-Committee recalled that MSC 78, noting COMSAR 8’s concern on the performance of GMDSS operator’s certificate holders on board ships, had instructed the Sub-Committee to further consider revalidation matters in line with the existing provisions of the STCW Code.

16.16 In this context, at STW 33, the Russian Federation (STW 33/5/6) had identified similar problems and noted that practical GMDSS implementation constantly required changes in regulatory documents, both nationally and internationally, including amendments to ITU Radio Regulations, the IAMSAR manual, etc. and proposed an amendment to section A-IV/2.4 of the STCW Code to make examinations mandatory for renewal or endorsement of GMDSS certificates every five years.

16.17 STW 33 had noted that the proposed amendment duplicated to some extent the requirements of regulation I/11 - Revalidation of certificates, where radio operators holding certificates were required to establish continued professional competence in accordance with section A-I/11 of the STCW Code, which included the options of passing an approved test or successfully completing an approved course, and Administrations could, therefore, require a mandatory examination, if they so decided.

16.18 Noting the options available to Administrations under STCW regulation I/11, STW 33 had agreed that an amendment to the STCW Code to make examinations mandatory for renewal or endorsement of GMDSS certificates every five years was unnecessary (STW 33/17, paragraph 5.17). MSC 75 had noted the STW 33 decision (MSC 75, paragraph 9.12).

16.19 ISF (STW 36/16/6) expressed the opinion that the Sub-Committee should not reconsider GMDSS certificate revalidation issues, as these were discussed at STW 33 and it was agreed that any change to the requirements of the Convention was unnecessary.

16.20 The delegation of Norway advised the Sub-Committee of the results of an investigation during radio survey, indicating that more than 80% of GMDSS certificate holders lacked the competence in all aspects of radiocommunications including handling of emergency, urgency and distress situations. The delegations of Germany and the United Kingdom reported similar experiences.

16.21 The delegation of Greece, supported by others, expressed the view that there was no need to revise the existing provisions for revalidation and that any such issue should be addressed during the initial training and could be reinforced by conducting regular drills.

16.22 The delegation of the Netherlands reminded the Sub-Committee that GMDSS certificates were issued under the provisions of the Radio regulations and only endorsements were issued under the provisions of the STCW Convention. It also advised that the Paris MOU would be conducting a three month concentrated PSC campaign to establish the extent of this problem.
16.23 The delegation of Japan advised the Sub-Committee that a concentrated inspection campaign on GMDSS compliance was carried out by the Tokyo MOU in 1999 and the report on its outcome would be made available to the Sub-Committee.

16.24 The Sub-Committee noted that the majority was of the opinion that the existing regulations were sufficiently effective and that there was no need to change the revalidation requirements within the STCW Convention. Nevertheless the request by COMSAR 8 and the statistical evidence provided by the delegation of Norway, supported by anecdotal evidence from Germany and the United Kingdom, indicated that there was a problem related to the performance of GMDSS operator’s certificate holders.

16.25 The Sub-Committee, also noting that the Paris MOU extensive PSC campaign in this area would provide additional information and further data, agreed that this matter should be considered again at the next session. Accordingly, the Sub-Committee invited Members to submit results of data available, and proposals to address this issue including the effectiveness of the methodology of revalidation used by Member States.

**Casualty analyses information referred to the Sub-Committee by FSI 12**

16.26 The Sub-Committee considered results of casualty analyses related to training matters forwarded by FSI 12 (STW 36/16/7), and agreed that in the case of:

.1 Other Aratere (Operational failure): Training manuals were a part of carriage requirements under SOLAS regulation III/35 and were not training issues under the STCW Convention and the results would need to be considered by the DE Sub-Committee;

.2 Norwegian Dream/Ever Decent (Collision): the results would need to be considered by the NAV Sub-Committee before the Sub-Committee was able to decide on any additional training requirements; and

.3 Spirit of Tasmania (Fire): the results would need to be considered by the FP Sub-Committee before the Sub-Committee was able to decide on any additional training requirements,

16.27 The Sub-Committee agreed, since FSI 12 had not referred these results to other relevant Sub-Committees, to forward results of casualty analyses of: Other Aratere to DE; Spirit of Tasmania to FP; and Norwegian Dream/Ever Decent to NAV Sub-Committees for further consideration and invited the Committee to endorse this decision.

16.28 In respect of the analysis related to the Sun Vista, the Sub-Committee noted that STW 34 had already dealt with this issue and MSC 77 had adopted an amendment to part B of the STCW Code (STCW.6/Circ.6) providing guidance regarding training of seafarers on large passenger ships related to fire fighting and damage control. The delegation of Norway expressed the view that the results of this analysis should be borne in mind when considering the need to review STCW Code requirements for demonstration of competence in chapter VI.

**Flag State endorsement**

16.29 Japan recalled that at STW 34, the Secretariat had developed a matrix indicating which Parties' certificates are recognized by other STCW Parties, with a view to approval by MSC as an
MSC circular. STW 35 had invited STCW Parties to submit information on recognition arrangements to the Secretariat at an early date.

16.30 Japan also informed the Sub-Committee that during PSC inspections, it had emerged that some Administrations had recognized certificates issued by other Parties and subsequently, issued flag State endorsements to attest recognition, without the necessary undertaking. Currently PSC authorities had no means of confirming whether flag State endorsements had complied with the requirements of regulation I/10.

16.31 Japan suggested that this information should be made public as soon as possible. They were also of the opinion that this should be on the IMO website and continuously updated as and when information was received from STCW Parties.

16.32 The Sub-Committee agreed that if an MSC circular was to be issued, it would require to be updated at every session of MSC and as a result, the information available for PSC inspectors would generally be out of date.

16.33 The Sub-Committee agreed that information related to recognition arrangements should be posted on the website and updated as and when any information is received by the Secretariat from STCW Parties. The Sub-Committee invited the Committee to endorse this decision and instruct the Secretariat accordingly.

**Dispensations issued under article VIII of the STCW Convention**

16.34 The Sub-Committee considered and noted the information (STW 36/16) on the submissions made by Parties in accordance with article VIII of the Convention on the dispensations granted by them in the year 2003. The Sub-Committee agreed with the proposal from the Republic of Korea to include propulsion power (3,000 kW) for reporting dispensations related to Engineer Officers.

**Seafarers’ Work Hours**

16.35 The Sub-Committee noted the information provided by ISF (STW 36/INF.3/Rev.1) related to a software program, *ISF Watchkeeper v2.0*, to assist shipowners and States to verify that work hours on board ships complied with IMO STCW ‘95 and ILO Convention 180.

16.36 The ISF informed the Sub-Committee that BIMCO/ISF were in the process of updating the 2000 BIMCO/ISF manpower study and would be sending questionnaires to Member Governments to ascertain the manpower supply numbers. The ISF observer requested Member Governments to support this effort and to respond to the questionnaire.

**Expressions of appreciation**

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

1. Mr. Frans Kammam, Policy Adviser, Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, Directorate General for Freight Transport (Netherlands) on retirement; and
2 Capt. David L. Scott, Chief, Office of Operating and Environmental Standards, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security (United States) on transfer.

17 ACTION REQUESTED OF THE COMMITTEE

17.1 The Committee, at its eightieth session, is invited to:

.1 approve the draft STCW.6 circular on amendments to part B of the STCW Code on guidance on engine-room resource management (paragraph 5.10 and annex 2);

.2 approve the draft amendments to part A of the STCW Code along with the draft MSC resolution on additional training requirements for the launching and recovery operations of fast rescue boats, with a view to adoption at MSC 81 (paragraph 6.12 and annex 3);

.3 approve the draft MSC circular on guidance on training for fast rescue boats launch and recovery teams and boat crews (paragraph 6.13 and annex 4);

.4 endorse the views expressed and the action taken by the Sub-Committee in advising DE 48 to consider the need to amend SOLAS regulation III/19.3.3.4. when considering measures to prevent accidents with lifeboats (paragraphs 7.10 and 7.11);

.5 approve the draft amendments to the STCW Convention along with the associated draft MSC resolution on requirements for the issue of certificates of proficiency for ship security officers, including transitional provisions until 2009, with a view to adoption at MSC 81 (paragraph 8.12 and annex 5);

.6 approve the draft amendments to part A of the STCW Code on training requirements for issue of certificates of proficiency for ship security officers, including transitional provisions, with a view to adoption at MSC 81 (paragraph 8.13 and annex 6);

.7 approve the draft STCW.6 circular on amendments to part B of the STCW Code, on guidance regarding training for ship security officers at MSC 81 (paragraph 8.15 and annex 7);

.8 endorse the advice provided by the Sub-Committee on the draft revised Recommendations on the Safe Transport of Dangerous Cargoes and related activities in Port Areas and instruct the Secretariat to convey it to DSC 10 (paragraph 8.18);

.9 approve the draft MSC circular on general principles and recommendations for knowledge, skills and training for officers on Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft operating in both displacement and ground effect modes (paragraph 10.11 and annex 8);

.10 refer the proposal for the development of the model course for Port Ballast Water Management Officer to the Facilitation Committee for its advice on the need thereon (paragraph 11.9);
11 endorse the Sub-Committee’s decision related to the development of competence for ratings and instruct the Secretariat to inform ILO accordingly (paragraph 12.19);

12 approve the Sub-Committee’s decision that it was not necessary for STCW Parties to resubmit information pursuant to STCW regulation I/7, each time the Convention was amended, as this would be covered by the report of independent evaluation communicated to the Secretary-General pursuant to STCW regulation I/8 and (paragraph 12.21);

13 approve the draft MSC circular providing guidance on training and documentation for company security officers (CSOs) (paragraph 13.15 and annex 10);

14 approve the draft revised work programme and the provisional agenda for STW 37 and include therein the following new work programme items:

   1 performance of GMDSS operator’s certificate holders; and
   2 review of the STCW Code requirements for demonstration of competence; (paragraphs 14.7, 14.18, 14.19 and annex 11);

15 endorse the decision of the Sub-Committee to refer results of casualty analyses of: Other Aratere to DE; Spirit of Tasmania to FP; and Norwegian Dream/Ever Decent to NAV Sub-Committees for further consideration (paragraph 16.27);

16 instruct the Secretariat to post the information related to the recognition of arrangements received from STCW Parties on the IMO website and update it as and when any information is received by the Secretariat form STCW Parties (paragraph 16.33); and

17 approve the report in general.

***
ANNEX 1

AGENDA FOR THE THIRTY-SIXTH SESSION AND LIST OF DOCUMENTS

Agenda item 1 - Adoption of the agenda

| STW 36/1 | Secretariat | Provisional agenda |
| STW 36/1/1 | Secretariat | Annotated agenda |

Agenda item 2 - Decisions of other IMO bodies

| STW 36/2 and Add.1 | Secretariat | Outcome of MSC 78 and MSC 79 |
| STW 36/2/1 | Secretariat | Decisions of other Sub-Committees |
| STW 36/2/2 | Secretariat | Outcome of MEPC 51 and MEPC 52 |

Agenda item 3 - Validation of model training courses

| STW 36/3 | Secretariat | Report on the model course programme |
| STW 36/3/1 | Secretariat | IBS Model Course |
| STW 36/3/2 | Secretariat | Safety in fishing operations (Support level) |
| STW 36/WP.4 | Secretariat | Report of the drafting group |

Agenda item 4 - Unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency

| STW 36/4 | Secretariat | Information on current national databases’ standards, record systems and anti-fraud measures |
| STW 36/4/1 | Secretariat | Revised reporting format on fraudulent Certificates |
Agenda item 5 - Large passenger ship safety

- STW 36/5 and Add.1 Secretariat Decisions of MSC 78 - Action required by the Sub-Committee
- STW 36/5/1 Singapore Proposed amendments to Part B of the STCW Code
- STW 36/WP.3 Secretariat Report of the working group (see also agenda items 6 and 7)

Agenda item 6 - Training of crew in launching/recovering operations of fast rescue boats and means of rescue in adverse weather conditions

- STW 36/6 United Kingdom Additional training guidelines for launching/recovering operations of fast rescue boats
- STW 36/WP.3 Secretariat Report of the working group (see also agenda items 5 and 7)

Agenda item 7 - Measures to prevent accidents with lifeboats

- STW 36/7 Secretariat Basic safety training and updated work plan from DE 47
- STW 36/WP.3 Secretariat Report of the working group (see also agenda items 5 and 6)

Agenda item 8 - Measures to enhance maritime security: training and certification requirements for ship security officers

- STW 36/8 India Report of the correspondence group
- STW 36/8/1 Secretariat Outcome of MSC 78
- STW 36/8/2 Secretariat Outcome of DSC 9
- STW 36/WP.2 Secretariat Report of the working group (see also agenda item 13)

Agenda item 9 - Education and training requirements for fatigue prevention, mitigation and management

- STW 36/9 Denmark Experiences in the utilization of MSC/Circ.1014
Agenda item 10 - Requirements for knowledge, skills and training for officers on WIG craft

STW 36/10 Russian Federation Requirements for knowledge, skills and training for officers on WIG craft
STW 36/10/1 Australia Requirements for knowledge, skills and training for officers on WIG craft
STW 36/WP.5 Secretariat Report of the drafting group

Agenda item 11 - Development of training requirements for the control and management of ship’s ballast water and sediments

STW 36/11 India Voluntary guidelines in the form of a model course

Agenda item 12 - Development of competence for ratings

STW 36/12 Secretariat Outcome of ILO Preparatory Technical Conference
STW 36/12/1 United Kingdom Development of competences for deck and engineering ratings for inclusion within the STCW Convention
STW 36/WP.7 Secretariat Draft Terms of reference for a proposed correspondence group

Agenda item 13 - Training and certification requirements for company and port facility security officers

STW 36/13 Secretariat Outcome of MSC 78
STW 36/13/1 United States Training and certification requirements for Company and Port Facility Security Officers
STW 36/13/2 ISF Comments of STW 36/13/1
STW 36/WP.2 Secretariat Report of the working group (see also agenda item 8)
Agenda item 14 - Work programme and agenda for STW 37

STW 36/14 and Add.1 Secretariat Provisional terms of reference for the Sub-Committee
STW 36/WP.1 Chairman Work programme and agenda for STW 37

Agenda item 15 - Election of chairman and vice-chairman for 2006

No documents submitted

Agenda item 16 – Any other business

STW 36/16 Secretariat Dispensations issued under Article VIII
STW 36/16/1 Secretariat Review of the STCW Code Requirements for demonstrating competency
MSC 78/24/6 Norway Review of the STCW Code Requirements for demonstrating competency
STW 36/16/2 Secretariat Performance of GMDSS operations certificate holders
STW 36/16/3 Japan Flag State Endorsement
STW 36/16/4 Norway Review of the STCW Code requirements regarding demonstration of competence
STW 36/16/5 ISF Review of the STCW Code requirements regarding demonstration of competence
STW 36/16/6 ISF Performance of GMDSS operator’s certificates holders
STW 36/INF.3/Rev.1 ISF Seafarers’ Work Hours
STW 36/16/7 Secretariat Outcome of FSI 12

Agenda item 17 – Report to the Maritime Safety Committee

STW 36/WP.6 Secretariat Draft Report to the Maritime Safety Committee

***
ANNEX 2

DRAFT STCW.6 CIRCULAR

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

1 The Maritime Safety Committee, [at its eightieth session (11 to 20 May 2005)], adopted amendments to part B of the STCW Code regarding engine-room resource management, as set out in annex.

2 STCW Parties and all others concerned are invited to note the annexed amendments and take action as appropriate.
ANNEX

AMENDMENTS TO THE SEAFARERS’ TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE

PART B

RECOMMENDED GUIDANCE REGARDING PROVISIONS OF THE STCW CONVENTION AND ITS ANNEX

Section B-VIII/2 - Guidance regarding watchkeeping arrangements and principles to be observed

Part 3-2 – Guidance on keeping an engineering watch

1 The following new sub-title “Engine-room resource management” and paragraphs 8-1 and 8-2 are inserted after the existing paragraph 8:

“Engine-room resource management

8-1 Companies should issue guidance on proper engine-room procedures and promote the use of check lists appropriate to each ship, taking into account national and international guidance.

8-2 Companies should also issue guidance to chief engineers and officers in charge of the engineering watch, manned or unmanned, on each ship concerning the need for continuously reassessing how engineering watch resources are being allocated and used based on engine-room resource management principles such as the following:

.1 a sufficient number of qualified individuals should be on watch to ensure all duties can be performed effectively;

.2 all members of the engineering watch should be appropriately qualified and fit to perform their duties efficiently and effectively or the officer in charge of the engineering watch should take into account any limitation in qualifications or fitness of the individuals available when making engineering and operational decisions;

.3 duties should be clearly and unambiguously assigned to specific individuals, who should confirm that they understand their responsibilities;

.4 tasks should be performed in a clear order of priority;

.5 no member of the engineering watch should be assigned more duties or more difficult tasks than can be performed effectively;

.6 individuals should be assigned at all times to locations at which they can most efficiently and effectively perform their duties, and individuals should be reassigned to other locations as circumstances may require;
.7 members of the engineering watch should not be assigned to different tasks or locations until the officer in charge of the engineering watch is certain that adjustments can be accomplished efficiently and effectively;

.8 instruments and equipment considered necessary for effective performance of duties should be readily available to appropriate members of the engineering watch;

.9 communications among members of the engineering watch and between members of the engineering and navigational watches should be clear, immediate, reliable and relevant to the business at hand;

.10 non-essential activity and distractions should be avoided, suppressed or removed;

.11 all engine-room equipment should be operating properly and, if not, the officer in charge of the engineering watch should take into account any malfunction or inoperable equipment due to maintenance, which may exist when making operational decisions;

.12 all essential information should be collected, processed and interpreted and made conveniently available to all for the performance of their duties;

.13 non-essential materials should not be placed so as to hinder engine-room operations;

.14 members of the engineering watch should at all times be prepared to respond efficiently and effectively to changes in circumstances;

.15 clear and effective data monitoring to identify possible areas of concern in equipment or systems should be ensured so as to prevent breakdowns/accidents/incidents; and

.16 effective methods of cross-checking information, data and indications should be developed to obviate the need for total reliance on any specific type of equipment, system or component.”

***
ANNEX 3

DRAFT RESOLUTION MSC. [ ]
(adopted on [... May 2006])

ADOPTION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE SEAFARERS' TRAINING,
CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE

THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE,

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

RECALLING FURTHER article XII and regulation I/1.2.3 of the International
Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW),
1978, hereinafter referred to as "the Convention", concerning the procedures for amending Part A
of the Seafarers' Training, Certification and Watchkeeping (STCW) Code,

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

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

2. DETERMINES, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(vii)(2) of the Convention, that the
said amendments to the STCW Code shall be deemed to have been accepted on [1 July 2007],
unless, prior to that date, more than one third of Parties or Parties the combined merchant fleets
of which constitute not less than 50% of the gross tonnage of the world’s merchant shipping of
ships of 100 gross tonnage or more, have notified their objections to the amendments;

3. INVITES Parties to the Convention to note that, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(ix) of
the Convention, the annexed amendments to the STCW Code shall enter into force on
[1 January 2008] upon their acceptance in accordance with paragraph 2 above;

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

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

AMENDMENTS TO THE SEAFARER’S TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE

PART A

MANDATORY STANDARDS REGARDING PROVISIONS OF THE ANNEX TO THE STCW CONVENTION

In chapter VI, section A-VI/2, replace existing table A-VI/2-2 with the following new table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Methods for demonstrating competence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criteria for evaluating competence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the construction, maintenance, repair and outfitting of fast rescue boats</td>
<td>Construction and outfit of fast rescue boats and individual items of their equipment, Knowledge of the maintenance, emergency repairs of fast rescue boats and the normal inflation and deflation of buoyancy compartments of inflated fast rescue boats</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from practical instruction</td>
<td>The method of carrying out routine maintenance and emergency repairs, Identify components and required equipment for fast rescue boats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take charge of the launching equipment and appliance, as commonly fitted; during launch and recovery</td>
<td>Assessment of the readiness of launch equipment and launch appliance of fast rescue boats for immediate launch and operation, Understand the operation and limitations of the winch, brakes, falls, painters, motion compensation and other equipment as commonly fitted, Safety precautions during launch and recovery of a fast rescue boat, Launching and recovery of fast rescue boat in prevailing and adverse weather and sea conditions</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from practical demonstration of ability to control safe launching and recovery of fast rescue boat, with equipment as fitted</td>
<td>Ability to prepare and take charge of the launch equipment and appliance during launching and recovery of fast rescue boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</strong></td>
<td><strong>Methods for demonstrating competence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Criteria for evaluating competence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take charge of the fast rescue boat as commonly fitted during launch and recovery</td>
<td>Assessment of the readiness of fast rescue boats and related equipment for immediate launch and operation</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from practical demonstration of ability to conduct safe launching and recovery of fast rescue boat, with equipment as fitted</td>
<td>Ability to take charge of the fast rescue boat during launching and recovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety precautions during launch and recovery of a fast rescue boat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Launch and recovery of fast rescue boat in prevailing and adverse weather and sea conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take charge of a fast rescue boat after launch</td>
<td>Particular characteristic, facilities and limitations of fast rescue boats</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from practical demonstration of ability to:</td>
<td>Demonstration of operation of fast rescue boats within equipment limitations in prevailing weather conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures for the righting of a capsized fast rescue boat</td>
<td>.1 Right a capsized fast rescue boat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How to handle a fast rescue boat in prevailing and adverse weather and sea conditions</td>
<td>.2 Handle a fast rescue boat in prevailing weather and sea conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navigational and safety equipment available in a fast rescue boat</td>
<td>.3 Swim in special equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search patterns and environmental factors affecting their execution</td>
<td>.4 Use communications and signalling equipment between the fast rescue boat and helicopter and a ship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate a fast rescue boat engine</td>
<td>Methods of starting and operating a fast rescue boat engine and its accessories</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from practical demonstration of ability to start and operate a fast rescue boat engine</td>
<td>Engine is started and operated as required for manoeuvring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 4

DRAFT MSC CIRCULAR

GUIDANCE ON TRAINING FOR FAST RESCUE BOATS LAUNCH AND
RECOVERY TEAMS, AND BOAT CREWS

1 The Maritime Safety Committee, at its [eightieth session (11 to 20 May 2005)], approved
amendments to Part A of the Seafarer’s Training, Certification and Watchkeeping (STCW) Code
for launching/recovery operations of fast rescue boats.

2 The Committee agreed that there is a need for seafarers involved with launching and
recovering fast rescue boats to be appropriately trained in the use of the equipment on board.
The initial onboard training requirements of seafarers involved with the launching and recovery
of fast rescue boats are set out at annex 1.

3 The Committee also agreed that limitations of shore-based training should be
supplemented by regular onboard training. This training would include, but not be limited to,
drills when weather conditions permit such exercises to be carried out safely. The ongoing
training requirements for fast rescue boat launch and recovery teams and boat crews are set out at
annex 2.

4 Member Governments are invited to bring this guidance to the attention of shipping
companies, shipowners, ship operators, shipmasters and all parties concerned.
ANNEX 1

GUIDANCE ON TRAINING FOR FAST RESCUE BOATS LAUNCH AND RECOVERY TEAMS AND BOAT CREW

Initial onboard training of seafarers involved with the launching and recovery of fast rescue boats

1 Every person involved in the operation of launching and recovery equipment and appliances of fast rescue boats should be required to demonstrate competence to undertake the tasks and responsibilities which should include but not be limited to:

.1 assessment of the readiness of fast rescue boats, related launch equipment and launch appliance as fitted, for immediate launch and operation;

.2 understand the operation of the winch, brakes, falls, painters, motion compensation and other equipment as fitted;

.3 safety precautions during launching and recovery of a fast rescue boat; and

.4 procedures for launching and recovery of fast rescue boat in varying conditions.

2 The level of knowledge of the tasks and responsibilities detailed above should be sufficient to enable the seafarer to perform launching and recovering duties in emergency situations.

3 Records should be kept on the ship to show which crew members are proficient in the launch and recovery of fast rescue boats.
ANNEX 2

GUIDANCE ON TRAINING FOR FAST RESCUE BOATS LAUNCH AND RECOVERY TEAMS AND BOAT CREW

Ongoing training for fast rescue boat launch and recovery teams and boat crews

1 Every person involved in the operation of launching and recovery equipment and appliances of fast rescue boats or is a member of a fast rescue boat team should participate in regular onboard training which would include, but not be limited to, drills when weather conditions permit such exercises to be carried out safely.

2 The factors listed below are to be taken into account when conducting drills:

.1 The frequency and regularity of training is important and as far as is reasonable and practicable, fast rescue boat systems and crews should be exercised weekly. The interval between a complete launch and recovery drill should not exceed 3 months.

.2 To achieve maximum effectiveness it is important that both the launch and recovery team, and the boat crew are aware of the limitations of the equipment as fitted and are confident in its use. This can only be achieved by ongoing training in varying conditions.

.3 So as not to expose the fast rescue boat crew to undue risk, the Masters/operators of ships, in conjunction with the trainers, should take the following into account while undertaking training in the launch and recovery of such craft:

.3.1 Master and person in charge of the fast rescue boat should consult prior to any launch and give due consideration to:

.1 reliability, type and complexity of the fitted equipment;
.2 the proven level of expertise of the fast rescue boat crew as demonstrated during exercises; and
.3 prevailing weather conditions.

3 Records should be kept on the ship with respect to fast rescue boat training on board including the dates and time of drills, operational status of the ship, sea and weather conditions, also together with names and duties of those participating in the drill.
ANNEX 5

DRAFT RESOLUTION MSC ... (....)  
(adopted on [.....May 2006])

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

THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE,

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

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

HAVING CONSIDERED, at its [eightieth] session, amendments to the Convention proposed and circulated in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(i) of the STCW Convention,

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

2. DETERMINES, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(vii)(2) of the STCW Convention, that the amendments to the STCW Convention shall be deemed to have been accepted on [1 July 2007], unless, prior to that date more than one third of Parties or Parties the combined merchant fleets of which constitute not less than 50% of the gross tonnage of the world's merchant shipping of ships of 100 gross register tons or more, have notified their objections to the amendments;

3. INVITES Parties to note that, in accordance with article XII(1)(a)(viii) of the STCW Convention, that the amendments to the STCW Convention, shall enter into force on [1 January 2008] upon their acceptance in accordance with paragraph 2 above;

4. REQUESTS the Secretary-General, in conformity with article XII(1)(a)(v) to transmit certified copies of the present resolution and the text of the amendments contained in the Annex to all Parties to the STCW Convention;

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

***
ANNEX

AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON STANDARDS OF TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING FOR SEAFARERS, 1978, AS AMENDED

Chapter I

General provisions

Regulation I/1- Definitions and clarifications

1  The full stop “.” at the end of paragraph 1 sub-paragraph .25 is replaced by a semicolon “;”.

2  The following new definitions are inserted at the end of paragraph 1 after the existing sub-paragraph .25 as follows:


   .27  Ship security officer means the person on board the ship, accountable to the master, designated by the Company as responsible for the security of the ship including implementation and maintenance of the ship security plan and liaison with the Company Security Officer and port facility security officers.

Chapter VI

Emergency, occupational safety, medical care and survival functions

3  The existing title to chapter VI is amended to read as follows:

   “Emergency, occupational safety, security, medical care and survival functions”

4  The following new regulation is inserted at the end of chapter VI after the existing regulation VI/4.

   “Regulation VI/5

   Requirements for the issue of certificates of proficiency for Ship Security Officers

   1  Every candidate for a certificate of proficiency as ship security officer shall:
have approved seagoing service of not less than 12 months or appropriate seagoing service and knowledge of ship operations; and

meet the standard of competence for certification of proficiency as ship security officer set out in section A-VI/5, paragraphs 1 to 4 of the STCW Code.

2 Administrations shall ensure that every person found qualified under the provisions of this regulation is issued with a certificate of proficiency.

3 Every Party shall compare the standards of competence which it required of ship security officers who hold or can document qualifications before the entry into force of this regulation with those specified for the certificate of proficiency in section A-VI/5, of the STCW Code, and shall determine the need for requiring these personnel to update their qualifications.

4 Until 1 July 2009 a Party may continue to recognize personnel who hold or can document qualifications as ship security officers before the entry into force of this regulation.”
ANNEX 6

DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE SEAFARERS’ TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE

PART A

MANDATORY STANDARDS REGARDING PROVISIONS OF THE ANNEX TO THE STCW CONVENTION

Chapter VI

Standards regarding emergency, occupational safety, medical care and survival functions

1 The existing title to chapter VI is amended to read as follows:

“Standards regarding emergency, occupational safety, security, medical care and survival functions”

2 The following new section and table is inserted at the end of chapter VI after the existing table VI/4-2:

“Section A-VI/5

Requirements for the issue of certificates of proficiency for Ship Security Officers

Standard of competence

1 Every candidate for a certificate of proficiency as a ship security officer shall be required to demonstrate competence to undertake the tasks, duties and responsibilities listed in column 1 of table A-VI/5.

2 The level of knowledge of the subjects listed in column 2 of table A-VI/5 shall be sufficient to enable the candidate to act as the designated ship security officer.

3 Training and experience to achieve the necessary level of theoretical knowledge, understanding and proficiency shall take into account the guidance in section B-VI/5 of this Code.

4 Every candidate for certification shall be required to provide evidence of having achieved the required standard of competence in accordance with the methods for demonstrating competence and the criteria for evaluating competence tabulated in columns 3 and 4 of table A-VI/5.

Transitional Provisions

5 Determining professional competence for existing ship security officers who hold or can document qualifications before the entry into force of this regulation shall be established by:
.1 approved seagoing service as a ship security officer, for a period of at least six months in total during the preceding three years; or

.2 having performed security functions considered to be equivalent to the seagoing service required in paragraph 5.1; or

.3 passing an approved test; or

.4 successfully completing approved training.

6 Every person who has been found competent under section A-VI/5, paragraph 5, shall be issued a certificate of proficiency as a ship security officer.
Table A-VI/5

Specifications of minimum standards of proficiency for ship security officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</td>
<td>Methods for demonstrating competence</td>
<td>Criteria for evaluating competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and supervise the implementation of a ship security plan</td>
<td>• Knowledge of international maritime security policy and responsibilities of Governments, Companies and designated persons</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS as amended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the purpose for and the elements that make up a ship security plan, related procedures and maintenance of records</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative requirements relating to security are correctly identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of procedures to be employed in implementing a ship security plan and reporting of security incidents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in maritime security levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of maritime security levels and the consequential security measures and procedures aboard ship and in the port facility environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications within the ship security officer’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the requirements and procedures for conducting internal audits, on-scene inspections, control and monitoring of security activities specified in a ship security plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</td>
<td>Methods for demonstrating competence</td>
<td>Criteria for evaluating competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge of risk assessment and assessment tools</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training, or approved experience and examination, including practical demonstration of competence to:</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of security related contingency plans and the procedures for responding to security threats or breaches of security including provisions for maintaining critical operations of the ship/port interface</td>
<td>.1 conduct physical searches</td>
<td>Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Working knowledge of maritime security terms and definitions</td>
<td>.2 conduct non-intrusive inspections.</td>
<td>Communications within the ship security officer’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of risk assessment and assessment tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of security assessment documentation including the Declaration of Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of techniques used to circumvent security measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge enabling recognition, on a non-discriminatory basis, of persons posing potential security risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge enabling recognition of weapons, dangerous substances, and devices and awareness of the damage they can cause</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of crowd management and control techniques, where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge in handling sensitive security related information and security related communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of implementing and co-ordinating searches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the methods for physical searches and non-intrusive inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</td>
<td>Methods for demonstrating competence</td>
<td>Criteria for evaluating competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake regular inspections of the ship to ensure that appropriate security measures are implemented and maintained</td>
<td>• Knowledge of the requirements for designating and monitoring restricted areas</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of controlling access to the ship and to restricted areas on board ship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of methods for effective monitoring of deck areas and areas surrounding the ship</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications within the ship security officer’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of security aspects relating to the handling of cargo and ship’s stores with other shipboard personnel and relevant port facility security officers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of methods for controlling the embarkation, disembarkation and access while on board of persons and their effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that security equipment and systems, if any, are properly operated, tested and calibrated</td>
<td>• Knowledge of the various types of security equipment and systems and their limitations</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the procedures, instructions, and guidance on the use of ship security alert systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the methods for testing, calibrating, and maintaining security systems and equipment, particularly whilst at sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage security awareness and vigilance</td>
<td>• Knowledge of training, drill and exercise requirements under relevant conventions and codes</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the methods for enhancing security awareness and vigilance onboard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</td>
<td>Methods for demonstrating competence</td>
<td>Criteria for evaluating competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of the methods for assessing the effectiveness of drills and exercises</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications within the ship security officer’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 7

DRAFT STCW.6 CIRCULAR

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

1 The Maritime Safety Committee, [at its eighty-first session ([… to … May 2006])], adopted amendments to part B of the STCW Code regarding training for Ship Security Officers, as set out in annex.

2 STCW Parties and all others concerned are invited to note the annexed amendments and take action as appropriate.
ANNEX

AMENDMENTS TO THE SEAFARERS’ TRAINING, CERTIFICATION AND WATCHKEEPING (STCW) CODE

PART B

RECOMMENDED GUIDANCE REGARDING PROVISIONS OF THE STCW CONVENTION AND ITS ANNEX

Chapter VI

Guidance regarding emergency, occupational safety, medical care and survival functions

1 The existing title to chapter VI is amended to read as follows:

“Guidance regarding emergency, occupational safety, security, medical care and survival functions”

2 The following new section is inserted at the end of chapter VI after the existing section VI/4:

“Section B-VI/5

Guidance regarding training for Ship Security Officers

1 The training should be relevant to the provisions of the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention, as amended.*

2 On completion of training, a ship security officer should have adequate knowledge of the English language to correctly interpret and communicate messages relevant to ship or port facility security."

***

* IMO Model Course 3.19 – Ship Security Officer may be of assistance in the preparation of courses.
ANNEX 8

DRAFT MSC CIRCULAR

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND TRAINING FOR OFFICERS ON WING-IN-GROUND (WIG) CRAFT OPERATING IN BOTH DISPLACEMENT AND GROUND EFFECT MODES

1 The Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping, at its thirty-sixth session (10 to 14 January 2005), recalled that Interim Guidelines for Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft had been issued through MSC/Circ.1054 and that amendments to the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972, as amended, had been adopted through resolution A. 910(22) to reflect the operational aspects of Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft.

2 The Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping, at its thirty-sixth session (10 to 14 January 2005) noting that these documents were intended for craft primarily engaged in maritime operations and did not contain the knowledge, skills and training required for officers manning such craft, developed General principles and recommendations for knowledge skills and training for officers on Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft to primarily assist Member governments in developing their national requirements for qualification and certification of officers on a WIG craft operating in both displacement and ground-effect modes.

3 The Maritime Safety Committee at its [eightieth session (11-20 May 2005)], having considered the recommendations made by the Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping at its thirty-sixth session, endorsed the General principles and recommendations for knowledge, skills and training requirements for officers on Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft, as set out in the annex.

4 Member Governments are invited to bring this circular to the attention of all concerned.
1 Preamble

Recommendations for qualification and certification of officers on a WIG craft were developed taking into account the unique features of this new means of transport, combining ship and aircraft features. The understanding of such unique complexity of a WIG craft was needed to use different combinations of maritime and aviation qualifications and relevant knowledge, skills and training methods. Since WIG craft operate mainly in marine environment, officers have to be provided with knowledge, skills and training, equivalent to those established in the STCW Convention for officers on conventional ships.

These recommendations are intended to assist Member governments to develop their national requirements for qualification and certification of officers on a WIG craft operating in both displacement and ground-effect modes.

2 General principles, recommendations and requirements for qualification of officers on Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft

.1 Officers on a WIG craft should preferably have a base qualification attained under either the international maritime or aviation qualification systems.

.2 In addition to the base qualification, officers on a WIG craft should undertake training and have demonstrated appropriate knowledge and skills in accordance with these Recommendations, to the satisfaction of the Administration or a body authorized to act on behalf of the Administration.

.3 Completion of these requirements should be signified by issue of a special qualification which takes into account the particular features of a WIG craft, in general and specifically the WIG craft models for which the officer is type-rated, together with any geographic limitations on the officer’s operation of a WIG craft.

.4 Where a particular aspect of these Recommendations is not relevant to the WIG craft or operational area for which an officer is certificated, the Administration may waive that aspect provided that details of the waiver are shown on the special qualification issued to the officer.

3 General requirements regarding base qualification

.1 A maritime base qualification referred to in paragraph 2.1 should meet the requirements listed in the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, as amended. Similarly, an aviation base qualification should meet the requirements of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), listed in the Chicago Convention on International Civil Aviation, 1944, as amended.
.2 Base qualification(s) recognized for issue of a special qualification should certify the officer for performance of functions on a ship or aircraft, having approximately equal or higher characteristics of weight, engine power, passenger capacity, range, etc., as the WIG craft for which the officer is certificated. The special qualification should not certify the officer for a higher rank on board a WIG craft than that corresponding to the base qualification(s).

.3 The Administration may reduce the period of seagoing service on conventional ships required for obtaining a certificate of marine base qualification if the candidate is to work only on a WIG craft.

.4 For the purposes of these recommendations, WIG craft may be classified by maximum take-off weight (displacement) as follows:

- up to 10 tonnes (small);
- from 10 tonnes up to 500 tonnes (medium); and
- more than 500 tonnes (large).

.5 The base qualifications of officers on WIG craft of Types A and B (as defined in the Interim Guidelines for a WIG craft (MSC/Circ.1054)) should preferably be marine qualifications e.g. as master, chief mate, officer in charge of a navigational watch etc.

.6 Aviation base qualifications are non-preferred for officers on Type A WIG craft but can be accepted where the Administration is satisfied that the candidate possesses the required knowledge and skills. It should be noted that IMO and ICAO (MSC 77/21/1) have agreed that operations in fly-over mode rest within joint maritime/aviation jurisdiction, while those in flight mode are within aviation jurisdiction.

.7 For service on WIG craft of Types A and B, officers having an aviation base qualification should have satisfactorily completed an approved course of marine training and received a certificate, according to the requirements of the 1978 STCW Convention, at least in following areas of marine knowledge:

- GMDSS Radio (GOC or ROCP as appropriate);
- ARPA;
- ECDIS;
- AIS
- Basic and/or Advanced Fire fighting;
- Survival;
- First aid and/or medical training;
- Human Factors /Bridge Resource Management;
- High-Speed Craft operations;
- Passenger handling; and
- Planning and conduct of local pilotage.
4 General requirements for a special qualification taking into account the specific features of a Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft

.1 The quantity and content of training provided for the officer and the special qualification reflecting the knowledge and skills attained should cover all aspects of the officer’s performance of operational and safety functions on a WIG craft.

.2 The required period of seagoing service on a WIG craft for the candidate to obtain the special qualification for officer on a WIG craft should be sufficient to ensure his satisfactory performance of the safety functions on a WIG craft and should be commensurate with aviation standards.

.3 To obtain the special qualification, an officer should be trained and assessed on at least the following areas of special knowledge:

- WIG craft aerodynamics and hydrodynamics;
- WIG craft structure, construction and maintenance;
- WIG craft seamanship;
- High-speed, low altitude navigation;
- Displacement, transitional and planning modes;
- Take-off and landing in various conditions;
- Cruise flight in ground effect mode;
- Ramping and amphibian mode (for amphibious WIG craft);
- Berthing and towing;
- Distribution of weight (passengers/ cargo, inertia, and stability);
- Extreme situations;
- Propulsors, engines and machinery of WIG craft;
- WIG craft instrumentation (flight, navigation, communications, engines, etc.);
- WIG craft systems (fuel, electrics, hydraulics, air conditioning, plumbing, etc.);
- WIG craft life-saving and emergency systems and procedures;
- Human factors in WIG craft operation (alertness, anticipation, risk awareness, etc.);
- Rules relating to crew qualifications and their validity;
- Rules relating to medical fitness and its validity;
- Operational rules;
- Departure checks;
- Crew personal human factor checks;
- Refueling/bunkering;
- Loading and unloading of passengers and cargo; and
- Documentation.

.4 Details of these requirements, presented as an example for the officer in charge of a navigational watch for Types A and B medium size WIG craft operating in both displacement and ground-effect modes are given in the attached table. It should also be noted that the corresponding requirements for small and large WIG craft have not yet been developed.
# TABLE

**Specification of minimum standard of competence for officers in charge of a navigational watch on Wing-In-Ground (WIG) craft of takeoff weight from 10 tonnes up to 500 tonnes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function: Navigation at the operational level</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Column 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPETENCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerodynamic and hydrodynamic principles applicable to WIG craft</td>
<td>Knowledge of theoretical base of aero- and hydro-dynamic theory of WIG craft. Classification of supporting forces, aero-hydro static and dynamic forces. Understanding of physics of planning, formation of a lift force on a wing, static and dynamic air cushion, the phenomenon of a ground effect and the effect of altitude on its action. Knowledge of operational modes of a WIG craft and the forces acting on structural elements of WIG craft in the various modes. Knowledge of basics of buoyancy, stability, subdivision, resistance, seaworthiness, maneuverability, roll and motion stability of WIG craft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure, construction and maintenance of WIG craft</td>
<td>Knowledge of all structural elements of a WIG craft and of the factors influencing their maintenance in working condition. Knowledge of the general arrangement of a WIG craft, including the location and function of significant components and accessibility / maintenance requirements. Knowledge and operation of WIG craft engines, machinery and systems including fuel, electrics, hydraulics, air conditioning, steering, control surfaces and, where fitted, air cushion supplementation. Knowledge of refueling/bunkering operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features of planning and conduct of a voyage and position determination</td>
<td>Navigation of a WIG craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within the framework of present laws, skill to plan a voyage and to conduct local pilotage taking account of the features of a WIG craft, including operational modes, controllability in each mode, high speed, capability of movement on shallow water and outside of shipping lanes established for conventional ships, seaworthiness and weather limitations, WIG craft-specific hazards (e.g. bird strike), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skill in a cruise mode to quickly determine the position using all methods of position-fixing and navigation for which the WIG craft is fitted, both traditional and electronic, including terrestrial, celestial and satellite-based types.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of legal status of WIG craft relative to conventional craft within both maritime and aviation jurisdictions and of operational precautions in place to cover the jurisdictional interface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control systems on a WIG craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of control systems of engines and propulsors, and control surfaces for attitude, altitude and heading including rudders, flaps, ailerons, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of automatic control systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of operational procedures and change-over from manual to automatic control and vice-versa. Adjustment of controls for optimum performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meteorology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMPETENCE</strong></td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a safe navigational watch</td>
<td><strong>Watchkeeping</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thorough knowledge of the content, application and intent of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, the rights and responsibilities of a WIG craft in relation to other vessels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of features of watchkeeping on a WIG craft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of effective procedures of WIG craft bridge team work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of capabilities of WIG craft to diverge from traditional patterns of ships operations and operational areas. Skill to assess a situation and to decide upon an acceptable solution. Knowledge of the dangers of, or associated with, manoeuvres unique to WIG craft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The use of routeing in accordance with the General Provisions on Ships’ Routeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of use of radio for safe operations under the GMDSS, including VHF as available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of radar and ARPA (Automatic Radar Plotting Aids), Electronic Charts Display and Information Systems (ECDIS) and Automatic Identification of Systems (AIS)</td>
<td>Radar and electronic navigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of the fundamentals of radar, ARPA, ECDIS and AIS as installed on a WIG craft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to operate such aids and to interpret and analyse information obtained from this equipment, including the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1 factors affecting performance and accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.2 setting up and maintaining displays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3 detection of misrepresentation of information, false echoes, sea return, etc., racons and SARTs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. range and bearing; course, speed and identity of other ships; time and distance of closest approach of crossing, meeting, overtaking ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. identification of critical echoes; detecting course and speed changes of other ships; effect of changes in own craft’s course or speed or both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. application of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. plotting techniques and relative and true motion concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. parallel indexing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of principal types of ARPA/ECDIS/AIS on a WIG craft, their display characteristics, performance standards and the dangers of over reliance on ARPA/ECDIS/AIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to operate and to interpret and analyse information obtained from displays, including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. system performance and accuracy, tracking capabilities and limitations, and processing delays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. use of operational warnings and system tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. methods of target acquisition and their limitations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. true and relative vectors, graphic representation of target information and danger areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. deriving and analysing information, critical echoes, exclusion areas and trial manoeuvres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to emergencies</td>
<td>Emergency procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of precautions to be taken for the protection and safety of WIG craft passengers in emergency situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of action to be taken in emergency landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of arrangements for towing and being towed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of initial action to be taken following a collision or a grounding; initial damage assessment and control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appreciation of the procedures to be followed for rescuing persons from the sea, assisting a ship in distress, responding to emergencies which arise in port</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to a distress signal at sea</td>
<td><em>Participation of a WIG craft in search and rescue</em>&lt;br&gt;Appreciation of assistance that a WIG craft can provide in a search and rescue incident&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of the contents of the International Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue (IAMSAR) Manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmit and receive information by visual signalling</td>
<td><em>Visual signalling</em>&lt;br&gt;Ability to transmit and receive signals by Morse light&lt;br&gt;Ability to use the International Code of Signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoeuvre the WIG craft</td>
<td><em>WIG craft manoeuvring and handling</em>&lt;br&gt;Knowledge of:&lt;br&gt;1. methods of a WIG craft control and maneuvering in displacement, transitional and planing modes in various weather conditions&lt;br&gt;2. methods of WIG craft control during takeoff and landing in various weather conditions&lt;br&gt;3. methods of WIG craft control and maneuvering in cruise flight under ground effect in various weather conditions&lt;br&gt;4. methods of WIG craft control and manoeuvring over land, landing on water and while returning from water to shore (for amphibious WIG craft only)&lt;br&gt;5. influence of displacement (takeoff weight), center of gravity position, wind, sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state, methods of control by propulsors and by control surfaces during takeoff /landing, on turning circle diameter and on stopping distance of WIG craft in various operational conditions</td>
<td>6. manoeuvres and procedures for the rescue of person overboard and rendering assistance to a survival craft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Function: Passenger operations, cargo handling and stowage at the operational level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>METHODS FOR DEMONSTRATING COMPETENCE</th>
<th>CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Monitor the safety of passengers during embarkation, seating, conduct of voyage and disembarkation. Monitor the loading, stowage, securing, care during the voyage and the unloading of cargoes | **Embarkation, accommodation and disembarkation of passengers. Cargo handling, stowage and securing**  
Knowledge of the rules of embarkation, accommodation and disembarkation of passengers on a WIG craft  
Knowledge of human factors relating to passengers.  
Knowledge of the effect of passengers and cargo, including heavy items, on the air- and sea-worthiness and stability of the craft on the water.  
Knowledge of the safe handling, stowage and securing of cargoes on a WIG craft including bulk cargoes and dangerous, hazardous and harmful cargoes and their effect on the safety of life and of the craft.  
Ability to establish and maintain effective communications during embarkation, seating and disembarkation of passengers and the loading, securing and discharging of cargoes. | Examination and assessment of evidence obtained from one or more of the following:  
1. approved in-service experience  
2. approved training WIG craft experience  
3. approved simulator training, where appropriate | Passengers and cargo operation are carried out in accordance with the cargo plan or other documents and established safety rules/regulations, equipment operating instructions and shipboard stowage limitations  
The handling of dangerous, hazardous and harmful cargoes complies with international regulations and recognized standards and codes of safe practice  
Communications are clear, understood and consistently successful |
**Function: Controlling the operation of the craft and care for persons on board at the operational level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>METHODS FOR DEMONSTRATING COMPETENCE</th>
<th>CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspect and report defects and damages to WIG craft, including structure, external and internal openings and their means of closure, cargo spaces, machinery, systems and equipment</td>
<td>Ability to conduct pre-departure checks. Knowledge of, and ability to explain where to look for damage and defects most commonly encountered due to: 1. loading and discharging operations 2. corrosion and other structural degradation and 3. severe weather conditions</td>
<td>Examination and assessment of evidence obtained from one or more of the following: 1. approved in-service experience 2. approved training WIG craft experience</td>
<td>The inspections are carried out in accordance with laid down procedures and defects and damage are detected and properly reported. Where no defects or damages are detected, the evidence from testing and examination clearly indicates adequate competence in adhering to procedures and ability to distinguish between normal and defective or damaged parts of the WIG craft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ability to state which parts of the WIG craft are to be inspected each time in order to cover all parts within a given period of time

Ability to identify those elements of the craft structure which are critical to the safety of the WIG craft.

State the causes of corrosion and other structural degradation in components of WIG craft and how such degradation can be identified and prevented.

Knowledge of procedures on how the inspections shall be carried out.

Ability to explain how to ensure reliable detection of defects and damages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>METHODS FOR DEMONSTRATING COMPETENCE</th>
<th>CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain seaworthiness of the WIG craft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The stability conditions comply with the intact stability criteria applicable to the WIG craft under the Interim Guidelines for WIG craft under all conditions of loading. Actions to ensure and maintain the watertight integrity of the WIG craft are in accordance with accepted practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain seaworthiness of the WIG craft</td>
<td><strong>WIG Craft stability</strong></td>
<td>Examination and assessment of evidence obtained from one or more of the following: 1. approved in-service experience 2. approved training WIG craft experience 3. approved simulator training, where appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain seaworthiness of the WIG craft</td>
<td>Working knowledge and application of stability, trim and stress tables, diagrams and stress calculating equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain seaworthiness of the WIG craft</td>
<td>Understanding of fundamental actions to be taken in the event of partial loss of intact buoyancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain seaworthiness of the WIG craft</td>
<td>Understanding of the fundamentals of watertight integrity <strong>WIG Craft construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain seaworthiness of the WIG craft</td>
<td>General knowledge of the principal structural members of a WIG craft and the proper names for the various parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure compliance with pollution prevention requirements</td>
<td><strong>Prevention of pollution of the marine environment and anti-pollution procedures</strong></td>
<td>Examination and assessment of evidence obtained from one or more of the following: 1. approved in-service experience 2. approved training WIG craft experience</td>
<td>Procedures for monitoring WIG craft operations and ensuring compliance with MARPOL requirements are fully observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure compliance with pollution prevention requirements</td>
<td>Knowledge of the precautions to be taken to prevent pollution of the marine environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure compliance with pollution prevention requirements</td>
<td>Anti-pollution procedures and all associated equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent, control and fight fires on board</td>
<td><strong>Fire prevention and fire-fighting appliances</strong></td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved fire-fighting training and experience in accordance with STCW Code A-VI/3.1 to 3.4.</td>
<td>The type and scale of the problem is promptly identified and initial actions conform with the emergency procedure and contingency plans for the WIG craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent, control and fight fires on board</td>
<td>Knowledge of fire prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evacuation, emergency shut-down and isolation procedures are appropriate to the nature of the emergency and are implemented promptly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent, control and fight fires on board</td>
<td>Ability to organize fire drills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent, control and fight fires on board</td>
<td>Knowledge of classes and chemistry of fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETENCE</td>
<td>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</td>
<td>METHODS FOR DEMONSTRATING COMPETENCE</td>
<td>CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING COMPETENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Operate life-saving appliances | Knowledge of fire-fighting systems on a WIG craft  
Knowledge of action to be taken in the event of fire including fires involving oil and fuel systems | Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training and experience in accordance with STCW Code A-VI/2.1 to 2.4. | The order of priority, and the levels and timescales of making reports and informing personnel on board, are relevant to the nature of the emergency and reflect the urgency of the problem |
| Life-saving | Ability to organize abandon WIG craft drills and knowledge of the operation of survival craft and their launching appliances and arrangements, and their equipment including radio life-saving appliances, satellite EPIRBs, SARTs, immersion suits and thermal protective aids  
Knowledge of survival at sea techniques | Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training and experience in accordance with STCW Code A-VI/2.1 to 2.4. | Actions in responding to abandon WIG craft and survival situations are appropriate to the prevailing circumstances and conditions and comply with accepted safety practices and standards |
| Apply medical first aid | Knowledge of fire-fighting systems on a WIG craft  
Knowledge of action to be taken in the event of fire including fires involving oil and fuel systems | Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training in accordance with STCW Code A-VI/4.1 to 4.3. | The identification of probable cause, nature and extent of injuries or conditions is prompt and treatment minimizes immediate threat to life |
| Medical aid | Ability to organize abandon WIG craft drills and knowledge of the operation of survival craft and their launching appliances and arrangements, and their equipment including radio life-saving appliances, satellite EPIRBs, SARTs, immersion suits and thermal protective aids  
Knowledge of survival at sea techniques | Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training in accordance with STCW Code A-VI/4.1 to 4.3. | The identification of probable cause, nature and extent of injuries or conditions is prompt and treatment minimizes immediate threat to life |
| Monitor compliance with legislative requirements | Basic working knowledge of the relevant IMO Conventions concerning safety of life at sea protection of the marine environment  
Knowledge of the crew qualification, medical and validity requirements  
Knowledge of the operational rules for WIG craft  
Knowledge of the documentation required for WIG craft operation | Assessment of evidence obtained from examination or approved training | Legislative requirements relating to safety of life at sea and protection of the marine environment are correctly identified |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
<th>KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCY</th>
<th>METHODS FOR DEMONSTRATING COMPETENCE</th>
<th>CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING COMPETENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Ensure the security of WIG craft operations both on board the WIG craft and at bases and embarkation points</td>
<td>Examination and assessment of evidence obtained from examination or approved training in accordance with ISPS Code requirements for Ship Security Officer (SSO)</td>
<td>Security is ensured on operations both on board the WIG craft and at bases and embarkation points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand and apply Human Factors for WIG craft operations</td>
<td>Understanding and application of Human Factors for WIG craft operations including: 1. Fatigue management and maintaining alertness 2. Need for anticipation in high-speed operation 3. Risk awareness and assessment 4. Application of Bridge Resource Management with other officers, crew and personnel involved in WIG craft operation 5. Crew personal Human Factor checks</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from examination or approved training</td>
<td>An understanding of both the existence and underlying causes of Human Factors and of the appropriate operating principles and procedures that will enable the WIG craft officer to minimize their effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***
ANNEX 9

DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE
FOR THE CORRESPONDENCE GROUP FOR DEVELOPMENT
OF COMPETENCES FOR RATINGS

1 The STW Sub-Committee at its thirty-sixth session recommended that MSC 80 endorse the establishment of a correspondence group to develop training requirements for ratings excluding the ship’s cook. The correspondence group, taking into account the deliberation and decisions of STW 36 and MSC 80 should:

.1 consider all appropriate options and develop draft amendments to the STCW Convention and consequential amendments to Part A and Part B of the STCW Code for the training and certification of ratings except the ship’s cook, including standards of competence which contain the knowledge, understanding and proficiencies; methods for demonstrating competence; criteria for evaluating competence; and service requirements as applicable;

.2 examine the need for transitional provisions/arrangements and develop them, where appropriate, for;

.1 persons who may hold an AB certificate under the ILO Convention 74; and

.2 any other persons who may be affected by the proposed draft amendments;

.3 examine the method of integration of the term Able Seamen (AB) within the STCW Convention and STCW Code; and

.4 submit draft proposals for consideration by STW 37.

2 In its deliberations, the correspondence group should note:

.1 the ILO’s requirements to retain the term and definition of an “AB” within the STCW Convention and STCW Code in order to meet certain existing ILO provisions; and

.2 the decision taken by the Sub-Committee that training and certification for ratings should follow the existing framework of the STCW Convention and STCW Code.

***
ANNEX 10

DRAFT MSC CIRCULAR

GUIDANCE ON TRAINING AND DOCUMENTATION
FOR COMPANY SECURITY OFFICERS

1 The Maritime Safety Committee (the Committee) at its seventy-seventh session (28 May to 6 June 2003), instructed the Sub-Committee on Standards of Training and Watchkeeping (STW) to develop training and certification requirements for company security officers.

2 The STW Sub-Committee at its thirty-fifth session (26 to 30 January 2004) agreed that neither the STCW Convention nor the STCW Code were appropriate instruments for including training and certification requirements for company security officers. STW 35, in view of the fact that company security officers were shore-based, invited the Committee to clarify its instruction relating to development of training and certification requirements for company security officers.

3 The Committee at its seventy-eighth session (12 to 21 May 2004) advised the STW Sub-Committee that instead of developing mandatory requirements, the Sub-Committee should develop guidelines on training and certification requirements.

4 The STW Sub-Committee at its thirty-sixth session (10 to 14 January 2005) developed guidance for training and documentation for company security officers.

5 The Committee at its [eightieth session (11 to 20 May 2005)] approved the guidance, as set out in annex.

6 Member Governments are invited to bring the attached guidance to the attention of shipping companies, shipowners, ship operators and all other parties concerned.
ANNEX

GUIDANCE ON TRAINING AND DOCUMENTATION
FOR COMPANY SECURITY OFFICERS

1 Every person designated as a Company security officer (CSO) should be able to demonstrate competence to undertake the tasks, duties and responsibilities listed in column 1 of the annex to this Circular.

2 The level of knowledge of the subjects listed in column 2 of the annex to this Circular should be sufficient to enable the person to act as the designated Company security officer.

3 Persons who have satisfactorily completed an approved course based on IMO Model Course 3.20 on Company security officer, or who have attended a course based on the attached knowledge, understanding and proficiency (KUP), should be considered to have met the requirements for service as a Company Security Officer.

4 As many of the training objectives in IMO Model Courses 3.19 and 3.20 are common to both CSO and SSO and further, that many of the KUPs in the competence tables are similarly common, SOLAS Contracting Governments should therefore take them into account when setting criteria for the re-training and assessment of those SSOs moving toward CSO qualifications.

5 Those completing CSO training should provide documentary evidence to this effect to the relevant SOLAS Contracting Government, and to the satisfaction of that Government when requested to do so.
ANNEX

KNOWLEDGE, UNDERSTANDING AND PROFICIENCIES (KUPS) RELEVANT TO THE COMPANY SECURITY OFFICER

Note – Under the “References” column
ISPS – Means the items listed under paragraph 13.1 of Part B of the ISPS Code.
Course – Means IMO Model Course 3.20 learning objective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>References(^1)</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</td>
<td>ISPS Code, Course 3.20 Learn Objective</td>
<td>Methods for demonstrating competence</td>
<td>Criteria for evaluating competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, maintain and supervise the implementation of a Ship Security Plan</td>
<td>• Knowledge of international maritime security policy and responsibilities of Governments, Companies and designated persons</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.1, 13.1.3 Course 2.1-2.6 and 3.1-3.11</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS as amended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the purpose for and the elements that make up a ship security plan</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.1, 13.1.3 Course 6.1 &amp; 6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Legislative requirements relating to security are correctly identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of procedures to be employed in developing, maintaining, and supervising the implementation of, and the submission for approval of a ship security plan</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.3 Course 6.4 and 6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in maritime security levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the procedures for the initial and subsequent verification of the ship’s compliance</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.6 and 13.1.7 Course 6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of maritime security levels and the consequential security measures and procedures aboard ship and in the port facility environment</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.1 Course 6.3.2 and 8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the requirements and procedures involved with arranging for internal audits and review of security activities specified in a ship security plan</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.5 &amp; 13.1.6 Course 6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the requirements and procedures for acting upon reports by the SSO to the CSO concerning any deficiencies or non-conformities identified during internal audits, periodic reviews, and security inspections</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.5 &amp; 13.1.20 Course 6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the methods and procedures used to modify the ship security plan</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.4 Course 6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Note that the column entitled “References” was included for the guidance of the Sub-Committee, agreed to retain it in square brackets until the document is finalized by the Committee as an MSC Circular, if appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Methods for demonstrating competence</th>
<th>Criteria for evaluating competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>ISPS Code, Course 3.20 Learn Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring security equipment and systems, if any, are properly operated</td>
<td>• Knowledge of security related contingency plans and the procedures for responding to security threats or breaches of security including provisions for maintaining critical operations of the ship/port interface</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.9 &amp; 13.12</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge of security assessment tools, and procedures for conducting security assessments</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.2 Course 4.1-4.4</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge of security assessment documentation including the Declaration of Security</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.8 Course 4.4 and 8.3</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from examination and practical demonstration of ability to: .1 conduct physical searches .2 conduct non-intrusive inspections</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge of techniques used to circumvent security measures</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.15 Course 7.5</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge enabling recognition, on a non-discriminatory basis, of persons posing potential security risks</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.14 Course 7.4</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge enabling recognition of weapons, dangerous substances, and devices and awareness of the damage they can cause</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.13 &amp; 13.1.18 Course 7.1</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge of crowd management and control techniques, where appropriate.</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.8 &amp; 13.1.9 Course 7.6</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess security risk, threat, and vulnerability</td>
<td>• Knowledge in handling sensitive security related information and security related communications</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.11 Course 2.5</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
<td>Procedures and actions are in accordance with the principles established by the ISPS Code and SOLAS Convention. Procedures achieve a state of readiness to respond to changes in the maritime security levels. Communications within the CSO’s area of responsibility are clear and understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>References</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td>Knowledge, understanding and proficiency</td>
<td>ISPS Code, Course 3.20</td>
<td>Learn Objective</td>
<td>Methods for demonstrating competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge of methods for</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.6 &amp; 13.1.8</td>
<td>Course 7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementing and co-ordinating</td>
<td></td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.8</td>
<td>Course 7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>searches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Knowledge of the methods for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical searches and non-intrusive inspections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure appropriate security</td>
<td>• Knowledge of the requirements and methods for designating and monitoring restricted areas</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.5</td>
<td>Course 10.3.1</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures are implemented and</td>
<td>• Knowledge of methods for controlling access to the ship and to restricted areas on board ship</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.8</td>
<td>Course 8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintained</td>
<td>• Knowledge of methods for effective monitoring of deck areas and areas surrounding the ship</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.8 &amp; 13.1.16</td>
<td>Course 8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of security aspects relating to the handling of cargo and ship’s stores with other shipboard personnel and relevant port facility security officers</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.8</td>
<td>Course 8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of methods for controlling the embarkation, disembarkation and access while on board of persons and their effects</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.8</td>
<td>Course 8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage security awareness and</td>
<td>• Knowledge of training, drill and exercise requirements under relevant conventions and codes</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.10 &amp; 13.1.19</td>
<td>Course 9.2, 9.3 and 11.1</td>
<td>Assessment of evidence obtained from approved training or examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vigilance</td>
<td>• Knowledge of the methods for enhancing security awareness and vigilance on board</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.19</td>
<td>Course 9.2 and 9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of the methods for assessing the effectiveness of drills and exercises</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.20</td>
<td>Course 9.3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of instructional techniques for security training and education</td>
<td>ISPS 13.1.10</td>
<td>Course 11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***
# ANNEX 11

**DRAFT REVISED WORK PROGRAMME AND PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR STW 37**

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF TRAINING AND WATCHKEEPING (STW)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target completion date/number of sessions needed for completion</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Validation of model training courses</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Casualty analysis (co-ordinated by FSI)</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.1</td>
<td>Unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.2</td>
<td>Passenger ship safety</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.3</td>
<td>Training of crew in launching/recovering operations of fast rescue boats and means of rescue in adverse weather conditions</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. "H" means a high priority item and "L" means a low priority item. However, within the high and low priority groups, items have not been listed in any order of priority.
2. Items printed in bold letters have been selected for the provisional agenda for STW 37.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H.4</th>
<th>Measures to prevent accidents with lifeboats (co-ordinated by DE)</th>
<th>2005-2007</th>
<th>MSC 74/24, paragraph 21.34; STW 35/19, section 8; STW 36/17, section 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.5</td>
<td>Measures to enhance maritime security</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>MSC 75/24, paragraphs 22.9 and 22.45; STW 35/19, section 9; STW 36/17, sections 8 and 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.6</td>
<td>Education and training requirements for fatigue prevention, mitigation and management</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>MSC 75/24, paragraph 22.48; STW 35/19, section 10; STW 36/17, section 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.7</td>
<td>Requirements for knowledge, skills and training for officers on WIG craft</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MSC 76/23, paragraph 20.55; STW 35/19, section 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.8</td>
<td>Development of training requirements for the control and management of ship’s ballast water and sediments</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>MSC 71/23, paragraph 20.55.3; STW 35/19, section 12 and paragraph 16.5; STW 36/17, section 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.9</td>
<td>Development of competences for ratings</td>
<td>2005-2007</td>
<td>MSC 77/26, paragraph 23.40.1; STW 35/19, section 13; STW 36/17, section 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.10</td>
<td>Training and certification requirements for company and port facility security officers</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MSC 77/26, paragraphs 6.82 and 23.41; STW 35/19, section 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.8</td>
<td>Performance of GMDSS operator's certificate holders</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>STW 36/17, sections 14 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.9</td>
<td>Review of the STCW Code requirements for demonstration of competence</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>STW 36/17, sections 14 and 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.1</td>
<td>Review of the implementation of STCW chapter VII</td>
<td>2 sessions</td>
<td>MSC 72/23, paragraph 21.56; STW 35/19, section 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.2</td>
<td>Clarification of the STCW-F Convention provisions and follow-up action to the associated Conference resolutions</td>
<td>2 sessions</td>
<td>STW 34/14, paragraph 11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR STW 37*

Opening of the session

1 Adoption of the agenda

2 Decisions of other IMO bodies

3 Validation of model training courses

4 Unlawful practices associated with certificates of competency

5 Passenger ship safety

6 Measures to prevent accidents with lifeboats

7 Measures to enhance maritime security

8 Education and training requirements for fatigue prevention, mitigation and management

9 Development of training requirements for the control and management of ship’s ballast water and sediments

10 Development of competences for ratings

11 Casualty analysis

[12 Performance of GMDSS operator's certificate holders]

[13 Review of the STCW Code requirements for demonstration of competence]

14 Work programme and agenda for STW 38

15 Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2007

16 Any other business

17 Report to the Maritime Safety Committee

* Agenda item numbers do not necessarily indicate priority.