

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SHIP DESIGN AND
EQUIPMENT
56th session
Agenda item 3

DE 56/3/2
19 December 2011
Original: ENGLISH

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

Draft performance standard for recovery capability

**Submitted by Dominica, Liberia, the Marshall Islands, ICS, BIMCO, CLIA,
INTERCARGO, INTERTANKO, IFSMA, IMCA, IPTA,
the Nautical Institute and OCIMF**

SUMMARY

Executive summary: This document comments on the revised proposal for recovery capability in document DE 56/3 (Australia, Iceland, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, the United Kingdom and IMRF)

Strategic direction: 5.1

High-level action: 5.1.2

Planned output: 5.1.2.4

Action to be taken: Paragraph 7

Related documents: MSC 81/25; COMSAR 10/11/1; DE 50/21, DE 50/21/1, DE 50/21/2, DE 50/21/3; DE 52/13; DE 53/6, DE 53/6/1; DE 54/7, DE 54/7/1, DE 54/7/2, DE 54/23 (paragraph 7); MSC.1/Circ.1182; DE 55/4, DE 55/4/1, DE 55/4/2, DE 55/WP.7, DE 55/22 (section 4), DE 55/INF.5 and DE 56/3

Introduction

1 This document comments on document DE 56/3 in which Australia et al. provide a view on the background to and proposed requirements for recovery systems at sea and is submitted in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 6.12.5 of MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.4 on Guidelines on the organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their Subsidiary Bodies.

2 In document DE 55/4/1, the shipping industry explained the limitations and constraints that apply to ships when conducting rescue operations at sea. This submission was strongly supported by a significant majority of Administrations that spoke on the matter. Document DE 55/4/1 represents the best advice from the shipping industry on rescue at sea and most importantly from those in the best position to understand the practicalities of this

matter; the owners, masters and crews of ships that may be called upon to carry out rescue at sea.

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

Comment

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

- .1 paragraph 7: "Recovery of persons from the water should be the focus of the proposed recovery capability since recovery from a wide and unpredictable variety of survival craft is beyond the capabilities of many currently available recovery systems". In all submissions by the shipping industry on this topic the point has been made that in addition to legal (SOLAS/UNCLOS) requirements the industry has a long tradition of assisting those in need of recovery. The shipping industry seeks to maintain the flexibility of adapting existing shipboard equipment to meet the challenge of any particular rescue operation without being constrained by the limitations of the capabilities of "currently available recovery systems".
- .2 paragraph 8: the shipping industry has not sought to limit its rescue provision to "better able to recover small numbers of people in distress" the shipping industry has previously and will continue to seek to respond to the recovery of those in danger at sea without consideration to the specific number involved.
- 3 paragraph 9: clarification is requested as to how the functional capability will be "demonstrated".
- .4 paragraph 10: advises that, "should a ship require fitting of dedicated recovery equipment to provide the required capability, then equipment suitable for that particular ship is widely available in the market". No evidence is provided to support the assertion that equipment suitable for all ships is available. Various manufacturers have in previous sessions of the Sub-Committee sought to demonstrate the function of particular "rescue equipment". Such demonstrations (DE 55/INF.5, et al.) have at best been unconvincing and in general show equipment only suitable for smaller ships including for fishing vessels. The adaptability of such equipment to an international fleet of increasingly large vessels has not been verified or satisfactorily demonstrated.
- .5 paragraph 12: refers to the, "spirit of UNCLOS and SOLAS". The co-sponsors agree that, all ships will in addition to addressing their UNCLOS and SOLAS legal responsibilities seek to offer within their capabilities such assistance as may be required to those in distress.

-
- .6 paragraph 14: refers to assisting in a recovery operation. The nature of assistance offered as well as the role that some ships may be able to undertake in a rescue operation will vary. These circumstances as advised in document DE 50/21/3 (ICS, et al.) are due to factors including vessel size, construction, freeboard and/or manoeuvrability.
- .7 paragraph 16: the need to refer this matter to the STW Sub-Committee is questioned. Document DE 56/3 proposes that training requirements should be limited to familiarization with the equipment provided, integrated with routine man-overboard drills, the co-sponsors of this submission can support this proposal but do not support referral of the matter to the STW Sub-Committee.
- .8 annex 2, paragraph 4.5: it is considered inappropriate to specify the significant wave height (Hs) for which the recovery standard should be established. As advised in document DE 50/21/3 (ICS, et al.) 3.0 metre Hs is a functional requirement used to differentiate between the use of recovery systems in the North Sea Offshore Industry, it is not and should not be considered an appropriate functional requirement for application to general SOLAS vessels.
- .9 annex 2, paragraph 4.6: this allows the lifting appliance to be placed where a survivor may be obscured either by the flare of the bow or the curvature of the stern. It would be preferably to have the equipment placed, clear of the propellers and within the vessel's parallel mid-body.
- .10 annex 2, paragraph 4.7: it is considered inappropriate to require shipboard equipment that may, at the discretion of the Administration, be used in recovering casualties to be tested in accordance with resolution MSC.81(70). To require this would effectively require all shipboard equipment with planned use in recovery to be tested as required for LSA equipment, whether or not this was its original function.

Proposal

5 Regarding annex 1 of document DE 56/3, the co-sponsors propose deletion of the word "demonstrated" in the second line of paragraph 1 of annex 1.

6 Regarding annex 2 of document DE 56/3, the co-sponsors conclude that much of this section is narrative and does not constitute a performance standard to be followed. Consequently the following subparagraphs should be deleted: 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, [4.1], 4.5, 4.7 and 4.9. Also, paragraphs below need amending, as follows:

- .1 paragraph 1.3: deletion in the first line of, "cannot be demonstrated" and substitution with "is not" and in the second line deletion of "that an acceptable level of capability is achieved";
- .2 paragraph 2.1: deletion in the first line of, "all";
- .3 paragraph 4.1: clarification of the phrase, "either manually or mechanically". To avoid confusion, it may be appropriate to delete the entire phrase.

- .4 paragraph 4.2: deletion in the first line of, "safest possible";
- .5 paragraph 4.3: deletion in the first line of, "to the extent possible" and substitution with, "where practicable". Deletion is also proposed in the last line of, "whenever possible as it risks cardiac arrest in hypothermic casualties";
- .6 paragraph 4.6: amend section to read, "Recovery equipment installed in a fixed location should be capable of operating clear of the ship's propellers and as far as practicable within the vessel's parallel mid-body length"; and
- .7 paragraph 4.8: deletion in the first line of, "necessary" and substitution with, "required".

Action requested of the Sub-Committee

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