



COUNCIL - 89th session

C 89/SR.5
27 November 2002
Original: ENGLISH

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTH MEETING

**held at IMO Headquarters, 4 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7SR
on Wednesday, 27 November 2002, at 9.30 a.m.**

Chairman: Mr. CHEN TZE PENN (Singapore)
Vice-Chairman: Mr. J. FRANSON (Sweden)
Secretary-General: Mr. W.A. O'NEIL

A list of participants is given in document C 89/INF.1.

N.B. Corrections to the summary record should be submitted in writing, preferably on a copy of the summary record, to the Conference Division, IMO Secretariat, 4 Albert Embankment, London SE1 7SR not later than 23 May 2003.

Corrections to all summary records of the session will be issued in a consolidated corrigendum.

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

CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 2 - Report of the Secretary-General on Credentials (continued)	3
Agenda item 12 - Consideration of the strategy and policy of the Organization, including the report of the Working Group (continued)	3
Agenda item 13 - Proposed IMO Model Audit Scheme (resumed)	10

**AGENDA ITEM 2 - REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON CREDENTIALS
(continued) (C 89/2)**

The SECRETARY-GENERAL reported that, in accordance with rule 9 of the Council's Rules of Procedure, the credentials of all delegations attending the session had been examined and found to be in order.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Council to note the Secretary-General's report that the credentials of delegations attending the session were in order.

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 12 - CONSIDERATION OF THE STRATEGY AND POLICY OF THE ORGANIZATION, INCLUDING THE REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP (continued) (C 89/12, Add.1 and Add.2; C 89/12/1, C 89/12/2)

Mr. MOREIRA (Brazil) supported the proposal by the Bahamas and Greece in document C 89/12/1. The determination of standards for new ships merited inclusion in the Organization's Strategic Plan, at least until the first revision of the Plan, to enable the Council to decide on the appropriateness and feasibility of drawing up such standards. He also supported the proposal by Cyprus, the Philippines and ICFTU in document C 89/12/3, that the Council should instruct the Committees to ensure compatibility between new legal instruments developed by IMO and existing instruments, and that the Council Working Group should consider ways of ensuring that the human rights of seafarers were safeguarded in the Organization's work to enhance maritime security.

Mr. EUN LEE (Republic of Korea) noted with appreciation the progress being made by the Council Working Group and supported the proposed Strategic Plan in general. He agreed that the Group should convene a further meeting in early 2003 to complete the Plan.

Concerning the strategic directions set out in the annex to document C 89/12/Add.1, he proposed that the Strategic Plan should take into account two further trends. The first was the increase in hazardous factors in port areas. His country's research into ships' accidents had revealed that during the past five years about 50 per cent of marine accidents had occurred in the waters of ports and at port boundaries. The port authority or administration concerned should not be solely responsible for establishing a safe environment in port areas: IMO should develop safety standards for such areas covering navigational aids, port operation and management and port facilities, to eliminate hazardous factors. The second trend was the growing use of sophisticated shipboard equipment, software and systems, the malfunctioning or misuse of which could result in serious accidents. Such equipment needed to be examined at the design stage according to ergonomics-based rules, which would supplement prescriptive rules. His country would provide relevant information on which the Working Group could base further discussions at its next meeting.

Referring to document C 89/12/1, he shared the concerns expressed that ships built to minimum scantlings and without regard to ease of maintenance and survey posed a serious obstacle to the achievement of maritime safety. The Organization should not, however, pursue the development of regulations concerning the structural integrity and maintenance of ships,

unless compelling need were demonstrated, for two reasons. First, the IACS and other non-governmental organizations already possessed considerable knowledge and technical expertise on the matter, and secondly developing such regulations would be a very costly and time-consuming task, making it difficult for IMO to respond promptly to crises involving maritime safety.

Ms. MOETZEL (Germany) said that the development of a Strategic Plan for the Organization was one of the primary responsibilities of the Secretariat, and especially of the Secretary-General, and she would therefore be reluctant to agree to any substantial expenditure of resources on consultants for such an exercise so long as the Organization's budget still suffered from constraints. She would, however, support the convening of another meeting of the Working Group if the majority of Council Members so desired.

While she shared the concern of Bahamas and Greece over the structural strength of ships and accessibility for ships' maintenance, the long-established relationship between Member States and classification societies should be used to encourage the latter to address those problems. Any recommendations on the matter could be brought to the attention of IMO's technical committees and included in their work programme, if appropriate. In regard to document C 89/12/3, Germany accorded high priority to the human rights of seafarers, and believed it was important that any new security regulations should not conflict with international human rights law. However, she agreed with France that a balance needed to be struck in that respect.

Mr. NDEMO (Kenya) said he was concerned that a recommendation by Kenya's National Maritime and Port Security Committee that persons, cargoes and vessels at ports and other entry points and vessels sailing in Kenya's territorial waters should be subject to prior inspection might be in direct conflict with the provisions relating to innocent passage in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and with human rights instruments. He therefore supported the proposal made in paragraph 4.3 of document C 89/12/3, and suggested that IMO should advise Member States on measures to be developed which would avoid conflict not only with national laws but also with the regulations of national security agencies.

Mr. ALLARD (Panama) said he too endorsed the proposal by the Bahamas and Greece. The Organization had a responsibility to ensure the safety of ships throughout their lives, from the design stage to the dismantling stage. He also agreed that it was essential to respect the human rights of seafarers when developing maritime security measures. He shared the view of Brazil that it was essential to identify the criteria to be used in developing the Strategic Plan and therefore supported the convening of a further session of the Working Group, the main purpose of which would be to lay down basic principles, thus enabling the Secretariat to develop the Plan in more detail.

Mr. HORIKE (Japan) supported the convening of another session of the Group, but suggested that it be shortened from five to three days, since consideration of the planning methodology had already been completed. He was inclined towards Germany's view that the preparation of the Plan should primarily be the responsibility of the Secretariat.

Mr. PACHA (Spain), commending the Group for its efforts, said Spain was greatly concerned over the problem of neglected ships that were incapable of complying with IMO's regulations and over the problem of classification societies that were subject to pressures that

prevented them from conducting proper surveys. He therefore endorsed the proposal set out in document C 89/12/1 that the MSC should discuss the extent to which standards relating to means of access should be set. In regard to shipbuilding standards, Spain was also concerned over the problem of loss of design resistance and strength, which had given rise to recent accidents. Such matters affected maritime safety directly and should therefore be dealt with by the Organization, notably by establishing criteria by which to define the operational limit of a ship's life. However, IMO had neither the technical nor the financial capacity to deal fully with comprehensive legislation on shipbuilding. Classification societies played an important role in that area, although it was essential that they act in strict compliance with existing SOLAS regulations. He supported the suggested text for IMO's policy and mission set out in annex 2 to document C 89/12/2.

Finally, he endorsed the requests contained in document C 89/12/3. It was obvious that non-compliance with the provisions of international law, which was a crime, or at least an offence, should be avoided. The Organization should ensure that there was no conflict between its legislation and that developed by other international organizations. Spain had always treated the protection of the human rights of seafarers as a priority issue, and that was reflected in its legislation.

Mr. SUÁREZ-VALLEJO (Mexico) fully endorsed the proposal by the Bahamas and Greece. Provision should be made for adequate scantlings in the design stage of vessels to enable proper inspections and maintenance to be carried out.

Mr. PAPACHRISTODOULOU (Greece) expressed appreciation of the Group's work and supported the convening of at least one further meeting, preferably of five days. He urged all Member States to participate in the Group's deliberations and contribute to the formulation of the Strategic Plan. He endorsed the proposal by Cyprus, the Philippines and IFCTU relating to the human rights of seafarers.

Mr. RAHMAN (Egypt) said that the Strategic Plan should be sufficiently flexible to allow other subjects to be included in it if developments so dictated. Priority should be given to the effectiveness of current conventions and their implementation. He supported the convening of a further meeting of the Group of five days' duration, and endorsed the proposals set out in document C 89/12/3. The proposals by Brazil in document C 89/12/2 should be referred to the Group and taken fully into consideration in the preparation of the Strategy.

Mr. HAIDONG Luo (China) also supported the convening of another meeting of the Group. He fully endorsed the proposal by the Bahamas and Greece that the important issue of the development of shipbuilding standards should be referred to MSC for study.

Mr. ASUQUE (Philippines) said that policy formulation involved a complex web of stakeholder interests which had to be reflected in the Strategic Plan, and he therefore supported the suggestion that the Group should hold another meeting to consider the matter further. Establishing basic design standards for ships would help to create a safe working environment for seafarers, particularly by increasing the likelihood of the ship's survival in the event of an accident. He therefore endorsed the proposal by the Bahamas and Greece and agreed that it should be referred to the MSC. That initiative would help to strike a proper balance between the purpose defined in Article 1(a) of the Convention, namely to provide machinery for co-operation among Governments in the field of governmental regulation and practices relating to technical

matters of all kinds affecting shipping engaged in international trade, and the purpose defined in Article 1(b), namely to remove discriminatory action and unnecessary restrictions by Governments affecting shipping so as to promote the availability of shipping services. Referring to document C 89/12/3, he said that Article 1 of the Convention should also be taken into account when developing measures which would uphold the human rights of seafarers at the same time as promoting maritime security.

Mr. VASSALLO (Malta) said he could accept the allocation of more time to the Group if that was the wish of the majority. He endorsed the views expressed by Germany regarding consultants. In regard to document C 89/12/1, he pointed out that the proposal's sponsors had merely suggested that the list of areas to be covered by IMO standards, which was not an exhaustive one, should be referred to MSC for in-depth discussion. It was imperative that IMO should retain its regulatory role, thus ensuring ships' long-term safety as well as permitting innovation in ship design.

Mr. GENNÉ (Argentina) shared the view that the strategic planning process should be carried out by the Secretariat on the basis of broad strategic guidelines approved by the Council. He supported the convening of a further meeting of the Group to define those guidelines and also to discuss the proposals submitted by Brazil in document C 89/12/2, which he endorsed. In regard to document C 89/12/1, he agreed with the proposal by the Bahamas and Greece that the MSC should determine the scope of IMO's role in setting shipbuilding standards, so that it would not act as a brake on shipbuilding activities.

Mr. McDONALD (Canada) said that while he too supported the convening of an intersessional meeting of the Group to refine the Strategic Plan, he considered there was insufficient justification for requesting MSC to discuss IMO's role in determining shipbuilding standards, particularly since it already had a heavy agenda. He endorsed the proposals submitted by Cyprus, the Philippines and ICFTU, pointing out that Canada had long supported the human rights of seafarers. However, as had been pointed out, there was need to strike a new balance to deal with the new challenges posed by terrorism, and to ensure that maritime transport did not become a soft target for terrorist attack.

Mr. FROLOV (Russian Federation) supported the view that the Group should have another one-week meeting to further consider the issue, and that MSC should consider the draft documentation on strategic planning. Regarding document C 89/12/1, the Russian Federation believed that ship construction standards should remain within the competence of the classification societies.

Mr. PINTO (India) endorsed the proposal put forward in document C 89/12/1. India was aware that competition between classification societies could impinge on construction quality, and agreed that IMO should develop initial standards that would permit innovation in design. It also associated itself with document C 89/12/2, submitted by Cyprus, the Philippines and ICFTU. India was concerned, however, that IMO's involvement in too wide a range of issues might weaken its effectiveness.

Mrs. SEET-CHENG (Singapore) agreed that there was need for a further meeting of the Working Group. Regarding document C 89/12/1, she shared Denmark's view that IMO should tackle the issue from the standpoint of basic design philosophy and not become involved in the

details of technical standards, which should remain the responsibility of industry. Concerning document C 89/12/3, she agreed on the need to comply with international law and to ensure a balance between implementing maritime security measures and respecting the human rights of seafarers.

Mr. BELL (Bahamas) agreed that there should be a further five-day meeting of the Working Group in 2003 and that document C 89/12/2, submitted by Brazil, should be forwarded to the Group for consideration. He shared the concerns expressed in document C 89/12/3, particularly with respect to the human rights of seafarers, which had been highlighted by recent incidents.

Mr. DAVIDSON (Australia) endorsed the suggestion that the Secretariat prepare a discussion draft to facilitate a speedy conclusion of the Group's work, preferably in a three-day meeting. Although he fully understood the concerns behind document C 89/12/1, he believed that the best way forward was for Administrations to ensure that classification societies fulfilled all their responsibilities. As for document C 89/12/3, Australia associated itself with the comments made by the United Kingdom, Germany and Canada.

Mr. SAN MIGUEL (Venezuela) said that another meeting of the Working Group would be useful to establish a basis for developing the IMO Strategic Plan. Venezuela shared the views contained in documents C 89/12/1 and C 89/12/2, and suggested that they be taken into account at the Working Group's next meeting. Regarding document C 89/12/3, it agreed that the human rights of seafarers should be borne in mind when considering the IMO Strategic Plan.

Mr. AHMED (Bangladesh), Mr. SOEHARTO (Indonesia), Mr. CZERWINSKI (Poland) and Mr. EL-WALI (Lebanon) joined in expressing support for the proposals contained in document C 89/12/1.

Mr. JÓHANNESON (observer, Iceland) strongly supported the development of a long-term Strategic Plan, which would be an effective tool for the Council and the Secretariat in furthering IMO's general goals. He therefore endorsed the suggestion that the Group should hold a further meeting.

Co-operation with relevant United Nations agencies and other interested parties, such as the insurance sector, should be strengthened. One important challenge in the context of IMO's long-term strategy was how to improve information about the operating environment of ships in order to aid decision-making and reduce risks at sea. He suggested that the Organization should team up with the World Meteorological Organization and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, which operated the Global Ocean Observing System, to improve the availability to ships of real time weather and sea state forecasting.

Regarding document C 89/12/1, he considered that the technical committees would be better equipped to deal with the proposal than the Council. For IMO to undertake the development of standards would duplicate work already carried out by the classification societies and Iceland could not see its merits, given the enormous amount of expertise, manpower and time required, with no guarantee of any improvement. The Council should not at the present stage take any decision as to whether standard-setting should be incorporated into the Strategic Plan. The matter should be referred to MSC for in-depth discussion, and MSC should report back to Council on how best to progress.

Iceland supported the actions requested of the Council in document C 89/12/3.

Mr. KILVINGTON (observer, New Zealand) strongly supported the proposals contained in document C 89/12/3, but did not support those contained in document C 89/12/1, for the reasons already stated. New Zealand found much merit in document C 89/12/2, submitted by Brazil, and in particular endorsed the action requested of the Council in paragraph 10, action which it considered long overdue.

He suggested that an addition be made to paragraph 3 of document C 89/12/Add.1 requesting that a draft Strategic Plan be presented to Council at its ninetieth session for approval, that the Plan then be incorporated as far as possible within the Work Programme and Budget for 2003, and that the Plan be submitted for comment and endorsement to the twenty-third Assembly.

Mr. MOUZOUROPOULOS (observer, Belize) said IMO should concern itself with the setting of general objectives, broad minimum standards, and umbrella guidelines, in consultation with flag States and industry. It should not attempt to usurp the current responsibilities of IACS and other classification societies or to duplicate their work. It was not enough to legislate: there was also need to ensure enforcement, and in that respect he referred to document C 89/13/1 concerning the proposed IMO Model Audit Scheme, which was relevant to the proposal put forward in document C 89/12/1.

Mr. MALAVER (observer, Colombia) endorsed the views expressed in documents C 89/12/1, C 89/12/2 and C 89/12/3, in particular with reference to human rights, and agreed that another three-day meeting of the Working Group would be appropriate. Colombia supported the position of Germany regarding the role of the Secretariat in formulating a Strategic Plan.

Ms. MARTINS DE OLIVEIRA (observer, Portugal) favoured a further five-day meeting of the Working Group. She agreed that document C 89/12/1 should be referred to the MSC, and supported documents C 89/12/2 and C 89/12/3.

Mr. De ROSE (observer, IACS), speaking at the invitation of the CHAIRMAN and referring to the proposal contained in document C 89/12/1 submitted by the Bahamas and Greece, said IACS did not consider that there was any need for the Council to incorporate the development of ship construction standards into the Strategic Plan, or to request the MSC to consider it further.

On the issue of access for ship inspection, he said that IACS surveyors addressed that problem on a daily basis, and surveys were not carried out unless there was safe and adequate access available to them. He questioned the suggestion that classification societies might compete over the quality of construction of ships, and pointed out that a system of qualification with which to assess, monitor and control societies' performance had been brought into existence with the adoption of Assembly resolutions A.739(18) and A.789(19). IACS also operated an independent system of quality management certification that subjected each member society to regular audits on a continuing basis. While they were not infallible, classification societies were subjected to significant overview and their admirable record stood as evidence of their dedication to deliver quality service in a professional and transparent manner. They were continually refining comprehensive, detailed standards and criteria with which to assess ships, and the standards they employed were universally recognized as suitable. IMO should not underestimate the very large intellectual and financial capital needed to develop, maintain and improve such standards.

Referring to the comments by Denmark and Cyprus, he noted that IACS had recently submitted a paper entitled “Design philosophy aimed at achieving a higher structural standard”, to the DE Sub-Committee. The achievement of that goal was the primary work of the classification societies, and it was essential for that work to continue in order not to stifle innovation.

Mr. FINLEY (Panama) thanked IACS for a clear, concise and realistic intervention, and acknowledged its past and current contributions, which had been a crucial technical resource for IMO.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL noted that there appeared to be consensus that a further Working Group meeting should be held. Members could, if they wished, submit papers to Group for detailed consideration. The Secretariat would be at the disposal of the Council to participate in any way required.

He confirmed that the linguistic difficulties noted at the Council’s previous session regarding the theme proposed for the Organization - namely, “Safe, secure and efficient shipping on clean oceans” - had been satisfactorily resolved.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Council to take note, with appreciation, of the progress report of the Working Group and the summary of decisions provided on page 10 of the annex to document C 89/12/Add.1; to broadly note the summary of decisions taken by the Group at its first meeting and to agree that the framework of the Plan should be further developed at a five-day meeting of the Group, to be convened between the eighty-ninth and ninetieth sessions of the Council, and that the Group should submit a further progress report to the Council’s ninetieth session; to take note of document C 89/12/2 submitted by Brazil, and to ask the Working Group to consider it in depth and take appropriate action; to agree that document C 89/12/1, submitted by the Bahamas and Greece, be referred to MSC 77, scheduled to meet in May/June 2003, for in-depth discussion, and to request that MSC 77 report to the Council at its ninetieth session on the outcome of its considerations; and to further request the Bahamas, Greece and IACS to submit documents to MSC 77 to assist in its consideration of the matter.

He further invited the Council to take note of the document submitted by Cyprus, the Philippines and ICFTU (C 89/12/3) and to approve paragraph 4 of the document; and finally to note with satisfaction the Secretary-General’s report that the linguistic considerations relating to the new theme for the Organization, namely “Safe, secure and efficient shipping on clean oceans” had been resolved and, accordingly, to re-affirm its approval of the theme to reflect the Organization’s direction as evolved in the light of recent developments.

It was so decided.

Mr. ISHIHARA (Japan) pointed out that a significant number of concerns had been expressed by both Members and observers in regard to document C 89/12/1, submitted by the Bahamas and Greece. He requested that when the matter was considered by the MSC the concerns of Japan should be stated in detail.

Mr. KORAN (United States) said his delegation wished to associate itself with the comments made by Japan.

**AGENDA ITEM 13 - PROPOSED IMO MODEL AUDIT SCHEME (resumed)
(C 89/WP.1)**

Mr. ALLAN (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Maritime Safety Committee, said document C 89/WP.1 concerned the draft terms of reference for the proposed joint MSC/MEPC/TCC working group on the IMO Model Audit Scheme. A small working group consisting of the Chairman of MSC, the Chairman-elect of MEPC and the Chairman of TCC had met on 26 November 2002, as instructed by the Council, and had discussed and developed the draft terms of reference set out in the annex to the document. In addition, the group had recommended that extracts from the reports of MEPC 48, TCC 52 and MSC 76 relating to the discussions and decisions of those committees on the proposed IMO Model Audit Scheme should be annexed to the draft terms of reference.

Mr. CHARALAMBOUS (Cyprus) requested clarification as to the meaning of the terms “clear objectives” and “clear principles” in paragraph 1 of the draft terms of reference. In his view, paragraph 2 should be placed either first or last on the list. He asked what was meant by “amenable” in paragraph 4.2, and, with reference to paragraph 5, whether the Organization was developing an audit scheme or the framework for an audit scheme.

Concerning paragraph 1.1 of the list of issues for consideration, he asked whether it was intended to develop an audit manual or an outline audit manual, and whether it had been agreed that there should be a memorandum of understanding between the audit team and the State to be audited, as suggested in paragraph 2.2.2. Referring to paragraph 2.2.5, he asked whether the omission of “Member” before “State” was an oversight, and noted that in paragraph 2.2.6 there was a reference to procedures for a follow-up audit, although the procedure for carrying out the actual audit had not been discussed. He suggested that the paragraphs should be rearranged in a more logical order.

His biggest fear was that the annex to document C 89/WP.1 in its present form would require extensive discussion on how the terms of reference were to be interpreted. A clear understanding and clear instructions were needed if the Joint Working Group was to work efficiently.

Mr. BELL (Bahamas) endorsed the comments made by Cyprus. He was particularly concerned about the phrase, “Substantive issues might include”, which would leave the Working Group’s agenda open-ended.

Mr. MOREIRA (Brazil), supported by Mr. GENNÉ (Argentina), Mr. ASUQUE (Philippines), Mr. AZUMA (Ghana), Mr. OLIVA (Italy), Mr. EL-WALI (Lebanon), Mr. LEE (Singapore) and Mr. HU Jinglu (China), pointed out that the Council had agreed that the audit scheme should be voluntary in character. He suggested that the word “voluntary” should be added before the expression “Model Audit Scheme” throughout.

Mr. FINLEY (Panama) said that in his view the word “meaningful” in paragraph 4.1 of the draft terms of reference was unnecessary and even a little offensive. In paragraph 4.2, it would not appear to be necessary to identify IMO instruments, since the Secretariat already provided the Council on a regular basis with documents listing the Member States which had

acceded to its conventions, and the obligations under those conventions were clear. The word “amenable” was inappropriate, and the phrase “substantive issues might include” was too vague. Referring to paragraph 1.1.1 of the list of issues, he suggested that a separate paragraph on resource consequences should be added.

Mr. PACHA (Spain), referring to the proposal by Brazil, said that although Spain had originally suggested that the scheme should be voluntary, the **Prestige** incident had somewhat changed the situation. He therefore proposed that the technical committees should discuss the question of whether the scheme should be voluntary or mandatory before the Council came to a decision. Spain was preparing a document on the subject for submission to the Maritime Safety Committee.

Mr. RASMUSSEN (Denmark), supported by Mr. FRANSON (Sweden) and Mr. STUITJE (Netherlands), said that in his view the Council was going into too much detail. On balance, paragraph 3 of the draft terms of reference gave sufficiently clear instructions to the Working Group, namely to develop a work plan to address the substantive issues raised. In his opinion the document, with some editing, would provide a good basis for the work of the Working Group.

The CHAIRMAN said it was true that the Council had already decided that the Model Audit Scheme should be implemented on a voluntary basis, and thus the terms of reference for the Joint Working Group should not contradict that decision. He agreed that the word “voluntary” should be inserted before “Model Audit Scheme”.

Mr. MOUZOUROPOULOS (observer, Belize), referring to the phrase “amenable to an auditing process” in paragraph 4.2 of the draft terms of reference, asked whether that process would also cover recognized organizations acting on behalf of flag States. In his opinion, to restrict an audit to the flag State itself would be equivalent to looking at only one side of the coin.

Mr. BRADY (observer, Jamaica) said that his delegation wished to associate itself with the view expressed by Denmark that the Council should not become too involved in the details of the working paper. He could accept the words “substantive issues might include”, which indicated that the list was subject to further development.

Mr. PINTO (India) said that it was clear that paragraph 4.2 referred to the auditing of those IMO instruments amenable to an auditing process. He suggested that the audit scheme should note whether the State concerned had acceded to all of the IMO Conventions and Protocols, and if it had not, what might be the reasons for its failure to do so.

Mr. FINLEY (Panama) said that a document giving instructions from the Council to its main committees should be absolutely clear and watertight. If the Council was not in a position to give definitive instructions covering all important aspects, the simple solution would be to use paragraph 3 of the draft terms of reference as instructions for the MSC, and allow the MSC to convene a working group.

Mr. ALLAN (United Kingdom), speaking as Chairman of the Maritime Safety Committee, endorsed the Chairman's comments with regard to the use of the word “voluntary”. The omission of the word “Member” before “State” in paragraph 2.2.5 had been an oversight. The use of the term “substantive issues” was intended to allow for the possibility that other issues might be added as work progressed.

He would try to find a word to replace “amenable” in paragraph 2 if it was causing confusion. In his opinion, the matter referred to by India would be an expected consequence of the audit, rather than forming part of the terms of reference. In reply to the point raised by Belize, he said that recognized organizations were not statutory bodies: however, the audit should include an assessment of how a Member State delegated its responsibilities to a recognized organization.

He would prepare a revised working paper for consideration by the Council on Friday 29 November.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.