

COUNCIL
118th session
Agenda item 17(d)

C 118/WP.2
25 July 2017
Original: ENGLISH

DISCLAIMER

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

EXTERNAL RELATIONS

(d) Relations with non-governmental organizations

Report of the group of Council Members

1 As instructed by the Council, a group of Council Members met on 24 and 25 July 2017, with Ms. Andrea Ahlberg (Sweden) as its Chair, to review and advise the Council on new applications for consultative status submitted by the following organizations:

- .1 Union of African Shippers' Councils (UASC);
- .2 International Ship Engineering Service Association Ltd. (ISES);
- .3 Project Developer Forum (PD-Forum);
- .4 International Association of Technical Survey and Classification Institutions (TSCI);
- .5 Active Shipbuilding Experts' Federation (ASEF);
- .6 The Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew);
- .7 The International Grain Trade Coalition (IGTC); and
- .8 Stop Illegal Fishing (SIF).

as annexed to document C 118/17(d).

2 The group was also instructed to advise the Council in the context of the periodic review of organizations already in consultative status with IMO, as contained in document C 118/17(d)/1.

3 The group was composed of representatives from the delegations of Chile, Indonesia, Italy, Liberia, Morocco, Sweden and Turkey. Representatives from the delegations of China, Japan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Spain, the United States of America and the observer delegation of Ghana also participated in the discussions of the group.

4 The group reviewed the applications and the information provided, in accordance with the Rules and Guidelines for Consultative Status of Non-Governmental International Organizations with the International Maritime Organization ("the Rules and Guidelines"). The views of the group are given below.

New applications for consultative status

Union of African Shippers' Councils (UASC)

5 The group was of the opinion that, although there were some links between the work of UASC and IMO (e.g. facilitation matters), there was not sufficient evidence that UASC could make a substantial contribution to the work of IMO. Moreover, the group expressed concerns that this was not a truly international organization. In addition, when it came to its structure, the group was of the view that it was unclear whether this was a non-governmental or an intergovernmental organization.

6 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council not to grant consultative status to UASC.

International Ship Engineering Service Association Ltd. (ISES)

7 The group was of the view that ISES could contribute to the work of IMO as its activities were linked to those of IMO. However, the group concluded that ISES's activities and expertise were already represented at IMO by other organizations (e.g. Comité International Radio-Maritime (CIRM)) and, therefore, granting it consultative status would lead to duplication.

8 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council not to grant consultative status to ISES.

Project Developer Forum (PD-Forum)

9 The group was of the opinion that PD-Forum might not be able to contribute to the work of IMO as its experience in shipping was unclear and, although the issue of climate change was important, its proposals to address this issue relied entirely on market-based financial mechanisms.

10 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council not to grant consultative status to PD-Forum.

International Association of Technical Survey and Classification Institutions (TSCI)

11 Some members of the group were of the view that TSCI could add value in the field of classification and certification of inland and river-sea vessels, and that having consultative status with IMO could have a positive impact on ship inspections and flag State implementation. Other group members, however, were of the view that TSCI could not make a substantial contribution to the work of IMO, as its area of expertise was not directly related to the main purposes of IMO; it did not have a large number of members; it was not truly international; and its area of expertise might overlap with that of the International Association of Classification Societies (IACS).

12 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council to refer the application of TSCI for further screening by the Maritime Safety Committee.

Active Shipbuilding Experts' Federation (ASEF)

13 The group was of the opinion that ASEF's activities were directly related to those of IMO and that it could substantially contribute to the work of IMO, adding value to the Organization. The group looked carefully at its membership and, as its members build more than 90% of the world's new tonnage, it was satisfied that this was a truly international organization. In addition, the group was not concerned that there might be duplication with other organizations, as their expertise was different to that of ASEF.

14 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council to grant consultative status to ASEF.

15 The group recommended that, within the classification of organizations in consultative status by interests/activity¹, ASEF be placed under Shipbuilding.

The Pew Charitable Trusts (Pew)

16 The group was of the view that Pew could substantially contribute to the work of IMO and add value to the Organization, in particular by promoting the ratification of the 2012 Cape Town Agreement, by advocating against Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated (IUU) fishing, highlighting issues on Arctic marine pollution and pursuing Sustainable Development Goal 14.

17 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council to grant consultative status to Pew.

18 The group recommended that, within the classification of organizations in consultative status by interests/activity, Pew be placed under Environment.

The International Grain Trade Coalition (IGTC)

19 The group was of the opinion that, although there might be some links between the work of IGTC and that of IMO (e.g. bauxite liquefaction issues), they might not be sufficiently strong for IGTC to be able to substantially contribute to the work of IMO.

20 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council not to grant consultative status to IGTC.

Stop Illegal Fishing (SIF)

21 The group was of the opinion that IUU fishing was an important matter and SIF was carrying out significant work in trying to stop illegal fishing. However, as the link between the work of SIF and that of IMO was not clear, and there were other organizations which might be better placed to support and be supported by SIF to address IUU fishing, the group concluded that it could not substantially contribute to the work of the Organization.

22 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council not to grant consultative status to SIF.

¹ Current categories are: Cargo and Ports, Environment, Insurance, Legal, Navigation, Professional and Representative Bodies, Rescue, Security, Shipbuilding, Shipowners/Ship operators, Standards, Trade and Training/Education/Welfare. A list of organizations grouped according to interests/activities was approved by C 108 (see C 108/15(d)/1 and C 108/D) with a request for the Secretariat to keep it updated.

Periodic review of organizations in consultative status

23 As instructed by the Council, the group carried out a preliminary review of the organizations currently in consultative status with IMO, in accordance with the Rules and Guidelines. The views of the group are given below.

24 The group noted with appreciation that all organizations in consultative status had submitted a report for the Council's consideration outlining their interest in, and contribution to, the work of the Organization during the period under review, as well as explaining how they disseminated information on, and promoted the work of IMO to their membership and other stakeholders. The information provided was valuable and assisted the group in completing its task.

25 The group noted that there were three organizations that did not attend any IMO meetings or submit any documents during the period under review, namely Greenpeace International, the International Maritime Health Association (IMHA) and the International Association of Airport and Seaport Police (IAASP).

26 The group also noted that the Council had in the past been concerned about Greenpeace International's lack of contribution to the work of IMO. The group examined the information contained in the report and noted that it had gone through a major review of its global strategies and that this had reduced its capacity to actively engage at IMO on specific issues. The group also noted that Greenpeace International had already attended two meetings and co-sponsored one document in the next review period and welcomed this positive signs of re-engagement with IMO.

27 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council to maintain Greenpeace International's consultative status and to advise the Assembly accordingly. The group also agreed to recommend to the Council that a new letter be sent to Greenpeace International to encourage it to further the steps already taken to fulfil its obligations under the Rules and Guidelines.

28 With regard to IMHA, the group noted that the Council had once in the past been concerned about its lack of contribution to the work of IMO. The group examined the information contained in the report and noted that it had carried a number of activities other than attending IMO meetings or submitting IMO documents which were related to seafarers' health and welfare. The group was of the view that it might be useful if IMHA submitted regularly an information document to the Sub-Committee on Human Element, Training and Watchkeeping (HTW) reporting on its activities.

29 The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council to maintain IMHA's consultative status and to advise the Assembly accordingly. The group also agreed to recommend that a letter be sent to encourage IMHA to actively participate in IMO meetings in line with its obligations under the Rules and Guidelines.

30 Concerning IAASP, the group noted that this was the first time it had not attended any IMO meetings or submitted any documents during a review period. The group, therefore, agreed to recommend to the Council to maintain IAASP's consultative status and to advise the Assembly accordingly. The group also agreed to recommend that a letter be sent to remind IAASP of its obligations under the Rules and Guidelines and inform it that, should there be no improvement in its performance during the next review period, its status may be withdrawn.

31 Finally, the group noted that the International Ocean Institute (IOI) had only attended one meeting during the period under review. However, the group also noted that IOI had contributed to IMO's work through workshops, training, conferences and similar activities. Therefore, the group agreed to recommend to the Council not to take action regarding IOI.

32 There were no objections for the remaining organizations with consultative status retaining that status with the Organization.

Action requested of the Council

33 The Council is invited to:

- .1 note the group's recommendations with respect to the new applications for consultative status and decide as it may deem appropriate;
 - .2 note the group's recommendations with respect to the non-governmental organizations in consultative status and decide as it may deem appropriate; and
 - .3 emphasize the requirement for all non-governmental organizations in consultative status to contribute substantially to the work of IMO.
-