



AD HOC COUNCIL WORKING GROUP  
ON THE ORGANIZATION'S STRATEGIC  
PLAN  
Agenda item 3

CWGSP 1/3/1  
2 September 2002  
ENGLISH ONLY

## PREPARATION OF THE ORGANIZATION'S STRATEGIC PLAN

**Submitted by the Netherlands**

### SUMMARY

- Executive summary:** The text of this document was originally posted on the IMO Intranet Discussion Page and contains proposals and comments on the preparation of the Organization's Strategic Plan.
- Action to be taken:** Paragraph 4
- Related documents:** C 88/D

1 At Council 88, the Netherlands intervened on the IMO strategy. By now, a number of proposals from that intervention have found their way into the terms of reference for the *ad hoc* working group. Taking into account the responses during Council 88, we agree that not all elements from our intervention are still relevant. However several other elements from the intervention may still be relevant for the discussion to be held during the working group and for further development of the IMO strategy. For that reason the full text of the speaking note is annexed to this submission.

2 Further consideration of the issue of strategy has convinced us of the necessity of a proper description of the present situation with respect to safety at sea and the protection of the marine environment. This raises several questions. The first is whether or not we find the present levels of safety and environmental protection satisfactory and, if not, what they should be instead. The second question then is: "How can the present situation with respect to safety at sea and the protection of the marine environment be described accurately and reliably?" What we look for is a method to define the goals of the Organization in terms of outcome. To that end we should start defining parameters that may serve as useful tools to measure the results of the organization and its members states. Once established, such a tool may provide us with better insight in trends in safety and environmental issues. The tool would also serve as an analytical instrument to find the source of problems and -therefore- also in developing policies, including setting priorities for the issues to be addressed.

3 It is expected that a desk study of limited scope, presently undertaken by the Netherlands, will provide useful information for the purpose of future discussions on the subject. That study aims to identify suitable sources and indicators for the efficacy of policy, while at the same time

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.

aiming to find some benchmark or  $T_0$ -situation (year 2000) as reference values for the initial situation. Among these sources are fleet and casualty statistics, while the number of incidents, the number of major pollutions etc. may serve as indicators. It might be envisaged that this kind of information, in a condensed version, would be part of periodical information to be published by IMO.

#### **Action requested of the Working Group**

- 4 The Working Group is invited to consider the proposals and take action as appropriate.

\*\*\*

## ANNEX

**Speaking note Council 88, agenda item 13**

1 Agenda item 13 is a result of discussions related to the Marnet report and in particular to recommendation 31 thereof. The Netherlands has expressed before, during Council and Assembly meetings, that this recommendation is viewed as the basis for the future and needs input not only from the Secretary General, as indicated in recommendation 31, but also from the member states.

2 The Marnet recommendation leads to reflections on what IMO's strategy should be. These in turn lead to reflections on a Member State's own strategy.

3 In simple words: we have asked ourselves the question: "What do we expect from IMO in the coming years and what should we, as Member States within IMO, do to that end"?

4 Allow me to make a number of observations of a more general nature first. We believe that the process we should endeavour should be top down and based on the adage "structure follows strategy". Therefore we should:

Step 1: (re-) establish IMO's vision and mission

Step 2: develop IMO's strategy for the period 2003-2013; agree on strategic imperatives and set priorities regarding:

- ▶ new and outstanding issues
- ▶ policy-setting, ensuring of implementation, compliance, enforcement etc. and translation into a short time workplan for the period 2003-2008

Step 3: translate strategy and workplan into a structure for the Organization that efficiently and effectively reflects its' objectives and goals, i.e. in the following order:

- ▶ the structure for committees and sub-committees; this structure should primarily reflect the efficacy requirements for the primary process, in terms of result-orientation and coherence;
- ▶ the structure of the secretariat; this structure should primarily reflect the efficiency requirements for the primary process, in terms of support and servitude to that process.

Step 4: use the strategy and the workplan to review and renew IMO's working methods, such as

- ▶ the establishment of working groups, drafting groups, correspondence groups etc.;
- ▶ the administrative organisation and procedures;
- ▶ the workflow- and agenda-management.

Step 5: translate the outcome of steps 1-4 into a business plan 2003-2008 for the secretariat, including a gap-analysis to indicate the required budget, personnel and other resources to successfully accomplish the transformation-process following from steps 3 and 4.

5 Our next point is that we would need a working group to develop these ideas and that Council itself should formulate the terms of reference for this group. Some of the items I just mentioned may contribute to the development of those terms. In addition to this, as an

elaboration of new issues to be addressed, the working group should identify trends that may be important for the development of the Organization and its work. Although there may be many more, I'll just give three examples: those that may be derived from accident investigation, the increasing size of passenger ships and the trend towards faster ships may create new challenges for the organisation, assuming it wishes to retain its mission "safe ships on clean seas"

6 Having said this, let me focus on a number of issues that are important to the Netherlands, as a Member State of this Organization. These issues may, at some stage, fit into the process we are contemplating.

7 We have identified three issues that, although not new, are considered very important:

- .1 We, that is IMO, should concentrate on the effectiveness of existing rules, rather than on developing new rules.
- .2 We should evaluate existing instruments, irrespective if they are in force or not.
- .3 We should consider what are the possible consequences for the Organization, including the structure, of IMO.

8 Allow me to elaborate a little:

**We should concentrate on the effectiveness of existing rules, rather than developing new rules.**

9 The constant development of new rules and changes of existing rules put an increasing burden on the shipping community, for which we make these rules *and* on the legislative and administrative resources of the Member States.

10 It is our view that, before developing or amending any instruments, added value should be clear and the compelling need should be well documented. The piecemeal amendments to many instruments often do not contribute to safety and protection of the marine environment in a fair proportion to the effort needed for their development and implementation.

11 New rules, which also emanate from other rule making sources, create increasing tensions within our own Administration. The organizations tasked with enforcement have to absorb the new rules in what is essentially a zero growth situation. These organizations therefore face the necessity to re-examine their priorities every time they are tasked with the enforcement of new regulations. Moreover, they need properly qualified personnel to carry out these tasks. This personnel has to be fished out of a pond in which many other parties are also fishing. Once-or rather if-found, the personnel has to be trained to carry out the new inspection tasks. This takes time, which we do not have. Be that as it may, as long as we achieve a higher level of safety and environmental protection, we can accept this. But unfortunately we see a widening gap between the rules we must enforce and those we actually can enforce. And as you know, here in London we should "mind the gap". We should therefore not assist in creating false safety.

12 Having said this I must admit that we face a dilemma. We *are* involved in the development of new rules almost continuously, most of the time reactive. A strategy should change this in a way that we act more proactive and less incident-driven.

**We should start to evaluate existing instruments, whether already in force or not yet in force.**

13 First question is: why do some Conventions or part of it not yet meet the entry into force criteria? Second is the evaluation of instruments already into force? There is a need to confront the goals of an instrument with its effects on maritime safety and the protection of the marine environment. Choices should be made with respect to the instruments - or even parts thereof – to be scrutinized. We suggest to start this process in the form of a pilot. The evaluation of Annex VI of MARPOL is necessary anyway and would fit in nicely. Another suggestion might be for instance the tonnage measurement convention. Then, once the evaluation has taken place, we should have a better idea of the effectiveness of some of the conventions and be able to decide on appropriate consequential actions.

**Consequences for the Organization including the structure**

14 As expressed during MSC, we think that the order in which events should take place is first to have a look at the strategy and policy of the Organization, then to consider organization and working method of Council, then consider procedures and finally take any consequential measures, including possible restructuring of Committees and/or Sub-Committees.

15 Finally the question is: How should we go about this? We think that for the items we have mentioned a working group should be tasked to develop these – and possible other notions further, on the basis of terms of reference that should be developed by this body. In these terms of reference we believe the agenda items 11 through 14 of this session should somehow be linked or reflected.