

MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE  
110th session  
Agenda item 21

MSC 110/WP.1/Rev.1  
4 July 2025  
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.

**DRAFT REPORT OF THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE  
ON ITS 110TH SESSION<sup>1</sup>**

**1 INTRODUCTION – ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

1.1 The 110th session of the Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) was held from 18 to 27 June 2025, chaired by Mrs. Mayte Medina (United States). The Vice-Chair of the Committee, Mr. Theofilos Mozas (Greece), was also present.

1.2 The session was attended by Members and Associate Members; representatives from the United Nations Programmes, specialized agencies and other entities; observers from intergovernmental organizations with agreements of cooperation; and observers from non-governmental organizations in consultative status, as listed in document MSC 110/INF.1.

**Use of hybrid meeting capabilities**

1.3 The Committee noted that the plenary sessions would be conducted in person, supplemented by hybrid meeting capabilities, taking into account the relevant decisions of C 133 (C 133/D, paragraph 3.8).

1.4 In this regard, the Committee agreed that, as per the current rules of procedure of the Committee and the *Interim guidance to facilitate remote sessions of the Committees during the COVID-19 pandemic* (MSC-LEG-MEPC-TCC-FAL.1/Circ.1), a Member State would be considered "present" for the purposes of rule of procedure 28(1) if they were either physically

<sup>1</sup> Delegations wishing to comment on this draft report should submit their comments to [info@imo.org](mailto:info@imo.org) no later than 11 July 2025, 23.59 (UTC). Comments should only address editorial corrections and improvements, including finalizing individual statements, and should not reopen discussion on decisions taken during the session. Comments should also state the specific paragraphs of the draft report to which they relate. If a Member State has no comments on this draft report, there is no need to provide a response. After review, the Chair will provide a summary of the comments received, if any, and how they have been addressed.

present in the Main Hall, or were registered and participating remotely online using the hybrid system.

### **Opening address of the Secretary-General**

1.5 The Secretary-General welcomed participants and delivered his opening address, the full text of which can be downloaded from the IMO website at the following link:

<https://www.imo.org/en/MediaCentre/SecretaryGeneral/Pages/Secretary-GeneralsSpeechesToMeetings.aspx>

### **Adoption of the agenda and related matters**

1.6 The Committee adopted the agenda (MSC 110/1) and agreed to be guided in its work, in general, by the annotations contained in document MSC 110/1/1 and by the provisional timetable (MSC 110/1/1, annex, as amended).

### **Credentials**

1.7 The Committee noted that the credentials of [110] delegations attending the session were in due and proper form.

### **Statements**

1.8 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran strongly condemned the aggression of Israel, initiated on 13 June 2025, which has carried out a coordinated aerial and missile attacks against several cities across the Islamic Republic of Iran, with hundreds of civilians, including senior officials, scientists, women and children, have been killed and injured (in one horrific incident, at least 20 children were killed when a residential building was deliberately bombed), and called on the international community to unequivocally condemn the actions of Israel, demanding the immediate cessation of hostilities, otherwise the risk of escalation at sea becomes imminent. Some of the main points highlighted by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran included, inter alia:

- .1 expresses sincere appreciation to those Member States that have condemned the Israeli regime's recent aggression and expressed solidarity with the Iranian nation;

- 
- .2 the crisis not only endangers the sovereignty of the country but also jeopardizes international peace and security, including the maritime and ports sector;
  - .3 the operations, planned and executed with the support of a certain State, deliberately struck peaceful nuclear facilities, economic infrastructure, civilian people and national assets;
  - .4 the attacks on the Natanz nuclear facility, a safeguarded installation operating under continuous monitoring by the IAEA, presents a serious and unacceptable risk of radiological catastrophe, constitutes a violation of the IAEA Statute, and undermines the global non-proliferation regime;
  - .5 the Islamic Republic of Iran is a responsible State which is party in full compliance with the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while Israel refuses to accede to this global Treaty, and continues to operate a vast and undeclared arsenal of nuclear weapons beyond any international supervision;
  - .6 the attacks are a direct assault on the credibility and integrity of the international Legal Order and non-proliferation architecture;
  - .7 Israel has extended its unlawful attacks to include Iran's vital petrochemical and gas infrastructure in Asalouyeh, a strategic zone located on the northern shores of the Persian Gulf. These actions directly endanger international maritime security and the global energy supply chain;
  - .8 recall previous attacks attributed to Israel, such as the 12 Iranian oil tankers that occurred between 2019 and 2021, as well as the acts of maritime sabotage – including the placement of magnetic mines – particularly in the Red Sea and the Mediterranean Sea, and the 2020 cyberattack on Shahid Rajaei Port's infrastructure in southern Iran, which severely disrupted maritime and port operations;

- .9 the actions of Israel constitute grave breaches of international humanitarian law, amounting to war crimes and crimes against humanity, with the killing of children underscoring the systematic nature of the violations;
- .10 despite the various sanctions imposed on the Islamic Republic of Iran, the country is very active in search and rescue (SAR) operations in the Persian Gulf region and plays a significant role in reducing the negative environmental impacts caused by oil pollution by collecting advanced equipment to combat oil spills and conducting regular drills to address these issues;
- .11 the attacks are violating the IMO Convention (Article 1), the ISPS Code, the SOLAS Convention, and resolution A.924(22), which calls on States to protect the safety of maritime navigation against unlawful acts;
- .12 Israel has admitted that the objective of the attacks was to "wreck" diplomatic negotiations, to sabotage dialogue and provoke wider conflict, a conduct incompatible with the principles of international peace and security; and
- .13 the Islamic Republic of Iran has exercised its legitimate right of self-defense enshrined in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter and will respond firmly and proportionately to these acts of aggression – at a time, by means, and in a manner of its choosing.

1.9 As requested, the full text of the statement by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran is set out in annex [...].

1.10 In response to this statement, the delegation of Israel highlighted the following points:

- .1 the Islamic Republic of Iran is not merely violating international norms. It is actively dismantling them;
- .2 the Islamic Republic of Iran has spent years building a strategic infrastructure of chaos – not just within its borders, but across the entire Middle East and beyond;

- .3 the Islamic Republic of Iran has enriched uranium to unprecedented levels for a non-nuclear weapons State, obstructed international inspectors, and openly vowed repeatedly to annihilate a fellow Member State of the United Nations; and has armed itself with thousands of ballistic missiles, worked towards a nuclear trigger mechanism, and destabilized the whole region by activating for decades a coordinated terror axis stretching from Lebanon to Yemen;
- .4 through its political, financial and military backing of the Houthi rebels, the Islamic Republic of Iran has enabled a campaign of maritime terrorism against civilian vessels since late 2023, where dozens of commercial ships have been attacked with Iranian-supplied drones, anti-ship missiles, and naval mines, and several seafarers have been killed; international shipping has been forced to reroute, raising costs, delaying supplies, and threatening the stability of global trade; intelligence has exposed direct coordination between Tehran and Houthi commanders;
- .5 the Islamic Republic of Iran seeks to weaponize the world's busiest sea lanes, hold international shipping hostage, and impose its will through violence;
- .6 urged the Committee to:
  - .1 clearly and unequivocally condemn the Iranian regime for its direct role in destabilizing maritime security;
  - .2 call for stricter enforcement of arms embargoes and sanctions related to Houthi forces and Iranian arms transfers; and
  - .3 support international maritime patrols and coordinated responses in high-threat zones.

1.11 As requested, the full text of the statement by the delegation of Israel is set out in annex [...].

1.12 The Committee noted the statement by the delegation of India concerning the four recent incidents within three weeks of container vessels in SAR waters under the responsibility of India (Liberian flagged **MSC ELSA 3**, Singaporean flagged **Wan Hai 503**, Singaporean flagged **Interasia Tenacity** and Liberian flagged **Wan Hai 613**), and expressed the need to take measures regarding cargo carriage on containerships. In particular, the delegation of India urged a global review of packaging, stowage and monitoring protocols of containerized cargoes, especially lithium-ion batteries and plastic nurdles and called IMO to develop stronger regulatory mechanisms for the safety of containerships, cargo management and crew protection. The full text of this statement is set out in annex [...].

1.13 The delegation of Singapore expressed its deep gratitude to the Indian authorities for the successful rescue operations and, having expressed its commitment to cooperate with other authorities affected by the incident, reported on the initiation of the investigation, of which they would submit a report to IMO in due course. The delegation of China also expressed its deep appreciation to the authorities of India and Sri Lanka for the rescue operations and expressed its confidence that the conclusions of the casualty investigation would be useful in preventing similar incidents in future.

1.14 The Committee noted the statement of the delegations of Antigua and Barbuda and Liberia regarding the collision without casualties of two tanker ships on 17 June 2025 that occurred 24 nautical miles off the port of Khor Fakkan (United Arab Emirates), the Antigua and Barbuda flagged **Adalynn** and the Liberian flagged **Front Eagle**; both delegations expressed their deep appreciation to the United Arab Emirates for the rescue assistance, and their commitment to cooperate with others to identify the root causes; the delegations also informed about the initiation of the casualty investigations.

## **2 DECISIONS OF OTHER IMO BODIES**

2.1 The Committee, having agreed that the outcome of other committees would be further considered, as appropriate, under the respective agenda items of this session, considered the relevant decisions of FAL 49 and LEG 112 (MSC 110/2/Rev.1), MEPC 83 (MSC 110/2/1) and TC 75, as described hereunder.

## **Outcome of FAL 49**

### ***IMO strategy on maritime digitalization and the draft work plan for its development***

2.2 The Committee recalled that MSC 108 and MEPC 82 had agreed to become associated organs to the new output on "Development of a comprehensive strategy on maritime digitalization", approved by FAL 48, with a target completion year of 2027.

2.3 The Committee noted:

- .1 that FAL 49 had agreed to name the strategy as the "IMO Strategy on Maritime Digitalization";
- .2 the view of the FAL Committee that the development of the strategy should rely on Member States and international organizations providing to the FAL Committee their input to the strategy from all perspectives including the safety and environmental protection perspectives; and
- .3 the draft work plan for the development of the IMO Strategy on Maritime Digitalization approved by the FAL Committee.

2.4 Subsequently, the Committee encouraged Member States and international organizations to join the Correspondence Group on the Development of the IMO Strategy on Maritime Digitalization<sup>2</sup>, to ensure the involvement of all the organizations at an early stage in the elaboration of the IMO digitalization strategy.

### ***Guidelines for the use of electronic certificates***

2.5 The Committee recalled that:

- .1 LEG 111, MSC 108 and MEPC 82 had agreed to become associated organs to the new output on "Development of joint FAL-LEG-MEPC-MSC guidelines on electronic certificates", approved by FAL 48, with a target completion year of 2026; and

---

<sup>2</sup> **Coordinator:**  
Ms. Maryanne Adams  
Deputy Commissioner Maritime Affairs Marshall Islands  
Email: [ismd@register-iri.com](mailto:ismd@register-iri.com)

- .2 MSC 108 had invited FAL 49 to prepare the joint circular, for consideration at a future session of the Committee.

2.6 The Committee, having noted that FAL 49 and LEG 112 had approved the joint *Guidelines for the use of electronic certificates*, concurrently approved the joint *Guidelines for the use of electronic certificates* (FAL-LEG-MEPC-MS.C.1/Circ.1), as set out in document FAL 49/22, annex 6.

***Revised guidelines for the prevention and suppression of the smuggling of drugs, psychotropic substances and precursor chemicals on ships engaged in international maritime traffic (resolutions FAL.9(34) and MSC.228(82))***

2.7 The Committee recalled that MSC 108 had agreed to become the associated organ to the new output on "Development of amendments to the Revised guidelines for the prevention and suppression of the smuggling of drugs, psychotropic substances and precursor chemicals on ships engaged in international maritime traffic (resolutions FAL.9(34) and MSC.228(82))", approved by FAL 48, with a target completion year of 2027.

2.8 The Committee encouraged Member States and international organizations to join the Correspondence Group on the Revised Guidelines for the Prevention and Suppression of the Smuggling of Drugs, Psychotropic Substances and Precursor Chemicals on Ships Engaged in International Maritime Traffic (resolutions FAL.9(34) and MSC.228(82))<sup>3</sup>, established by FAL 49.

## **Outcome of LEG 112**

***Inclusion of an additional operative paragraph in resolution A.1192(33) concerning dark fleet operations***

2.9 The Committee recalled that:

- .1 MEPC 81 had invited MSC and the Legal Committee to consider document MEPC 81/2/5 (India) proposing the inclusion of an additional operative paragraph in resolution A.1192(33) on *Urging Member States and all relevant stakeholders to promote actions to prevent illegal operations in the maritime sector by the "dark fleet" or "shadow fleet" to prevent inadvertent*

---

<sup>3</sup>

**Coordinator:**

Mr. Jan De Spiegeleer  
Head of Service Ports and Intermodality  
Email: [jan.despiegeleer@mobiliteit.fgov.be](mailto:jan.despiegeleer@mobiliteit.fgov.be)



criminalization of seafarers in dark fleet operations, and to take action as appropriate, taking into account the discussion and views expressed at MEPC 81 and that amendments to resolution A.1192(33) would require adoption by the Assembly;

- .2 LEG 111 had noted the discussion and views expressed by MEPC 81 and had referred the matter for further consideration to LEG 112 before transmitting the proposal to the Assembly at its thirty-fourth session in 2025; and
- .3 MSC 108 had agreed to wait for the outcome of LEG 112 before considering this further.

2.10 The Committee, having noted that LEG 112 did not recommend to the Assembly the inclusion of the additional operative paragraph 7 in resolution A.1192(33), agreed not to amend resolution A.1192(33), and to inform MEPC of this decision accordingly.

***Reporting requirements in the case of loss or observation of freight container(s)***

2.11 In relation to the invitation of MSC 108 to the LEG Committee to consider the question of whether any reporting made pursuant to the new SOLAS requirements under regulations V/31 and 32 on the loss or observation of freight containers drifting at sea adopted by resolution MSC.550(108) would also satisfy the reporting obligations under the Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks, 2007 (Nairobi WRC) (MSC 108/20, paragraphs 3.11.3 and 20.7.2), the Committee noted that LEG 112 had concluded that this was not the case because some of the reporting requirements under SOLAS and the Nairobi WRC were materially different.

***Matters raised related to fraudulent registration and fraudulent registries***

2.12 The Committee, having recalled that LEG 112 had invited MSC to consider and to address the matters raised in document LEG 112/6/2 under the purview of MSC and relevant sub-committees, took the following actions:

- .1 instructed the III Sub-Committee at its eleventh session to consider the proposed measures to prevent unlawful practices as associated with

fraudulent registration and fraudulent registries of ships, as contained in paragraphs 10 to 12 of document LEG 112/6/2, in particular in relation to:

- .1 Procedures for PSC regarding SOLAS regulation XI-1/5 on continuous synopsis record (CSR) under the current work of "Measures to harmonize port State control (PSC) activities and procedures worldwide" (output 1.11);
  - .2 the need for capacity-building related to corrective action plans agreed under the IMO Member State Audit Scheme, associated with the implementation of the CSR requirements under the current work of "Analysis of consolidated audit summary reports" (output 1.4); and
  - .3 MSC/Circ.1140 – MEPC/Circ.424 on *Transfer of Ships between States* under the current work of "Updated Survey Guidelines under the Harmonized System of Survey and Certification (HSSC)" (output 7.27);
- .2 regarding the Long-Range Identification and Tracking (LRIT) issues relevant to the outcome of the LEG Committee referred to in paragraph 13 of document LEG 112/6/2, the Committee noted that the matter was going to be considered under item 18, with the new outputs concerning the LRIT system (MSC 110/18/7 and MSC 110/18/13) (see paragraph 18.[...] to 18.[...]).

### **Outcome of MEPC 83**

2.13 The Committee noted that MEPC 83 had concurrently decided, as invited by MSC 109, to:

- .1 instruct the III Sub-Committee to consider the consolidated audit summary reports (CASRs) containing lessons learned from nine mandatory audits completed in 2022 and 2023 (Circular Letter No.4919) and to report to the Committees on the outcome of its consideration; and

- .2 approve the *Revised guidelines for formal safety assessment (FSA) for use in the IMO rule-making process* (MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.12/Rev.3).

2.14 The Committee noted also that MEPC 83 had concurred with the decisions of MSC 109 with regard to the outcome of III 10, including the issuance of III.3/Circ.13; the agreement to forward the proposals to develop a methodology to integrate the reporting communication channels so that non-GISIS information could be submitted through the GISIS platform to the Council for further consideration under its agenda item "Enhancement of GISIS"; and the consideration of the outcome of the consideration of the six consolidated audit summary reports (CASRs).

### **Outcome of TC 75**

2.15 The Committee was informed on the outcome of TC 75, which was held from 6 to 10 June 2025, which considered matters related to the Committee (MSC 109/22, paragraph 22.9) and took action accordingly. In particular, TC 75 had approved the ITCP for the 2026-2027 biennium, including the thematic priorities (see paragraph 20.[...]).

### **Statements**

2.16 Under the general statements, further to the instructions from the Chair, the delegation of the Russian Federation requested that the Secretariat reflect their statement made under agenda item 2 under the report of agenda item 8 (paragraph 8.7).

## **3 AMENDMENTS TO MANDATORY INSTRUMENTS**

### **General**

3.1 Contracting Governments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention were invited to consider and adopt proposed amendments to:

- .1 SOLAS chapters II-1, II-2 and V, in accordance with the provisions of article VIII of the Convention;
- .2 the International Code of Safety for High-Speed Craft, 1994 (1994 HSC Code), in accordance with the provisions of article VIII and regulation X/1.1 of the Convention;

- .3 the International Code of Safety for High-Speed Craft, 2000 (2000 HSC Code), in accordance with the provisions of article VIII and regulation X/1.2 of the Convention;
- .4 the International Code for the Construction and Equipment of Ships Carrying Liquefied Gases in Bulk (IGC Code), in accordance with the provisions of article VIII and regulation VII/11.1 of the Convention; and
- .5 the International Maritime Solid Bulk Cargoes (IMSBC) Code, in accordance with the provisions of article VIII and regulation VI/1-1.1 of the Convention.

3.2 More than one third of the Contracting Governments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention were present during the consideration and adoption of the aforementioned amendments by the expanded Committee, in accordance with articles VIII(b)(iii) and VIII(b)(iv) of the Convention. The proposed amendments to the Convention and Codes mandatory under it had been circulated, in accordance with SOLAS article VIII(b)(i), to all IMO Members and Contracting Governments to the Convention by Circular Letters No.4925 of 20 November 2024 and No.4953 of 17 December 2024.

3.3 The Committee was also invited to consider and adopt the draft MSC resolution on performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements in connection with the adoption of the proposed amendments to SOLAS chapter V, which would make the performance standards mandatory.

3.4 In conjunction with the adoption of the aforementioned amendments, the Committee was invited to consider and adopt/approve, as appropriate:

- .1 the draft MSC resolution on amendments to the Code of Safety for Special Purpose Ships, 2008 (2008 SPS Code);
- .2 draft amendments to the Code of Safety for Fishermen and Fishing Vessels, 2005; and

- .3 draft MSC circulars on:
- .1 Required pilot transfer arrangements for pilots and other personnel (MSC.1/Circ.1428/Rev.1);
  - .2 Voluntary early implementation of the amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 on pilot transfer arrangements, adopted by resolution MSC.572(110);
  - .3 Carriage of dangerous goods (MSC.1/Circ.1266/Rev.1);
  - .4 Revised recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships (MSC.1/Circ.1358/Rev.1);
  - .5 Revised recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships applicable to the fumigation of cargo holds (MSC.1/Circ.1264/Rev.1); and
  - .6 Lists of solid bulk cargoes for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system may be exempted or for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system is ineffective (MSC.1/Circ.1395/Rev.7).

**Proposed amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention (expanded Committee under SOLAS article VIII)**

***Draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1***

3.5 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 in relation to the application of the IGF Code, with a view to adoption at this session and entry into force on 1 January 2027, having relaxed the four-year amendment cycle (MSC.1/Circ.1481) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 6.27).

3.6 In this regard, the Committee considered the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/3/5 (Marshall Islands and IACS), proposing the inclusion of "gaseous fuels" in addition to "low-flashpoint fuels" in regulation II-1/56.1, in line with the amendments approved by MSC 109;

- .2 MSC 110/3/13 (Japan), in particular paragraphs 3 and 4, proposing editorial modifications to the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation II-1/2 to reflect the recent amendments to said regulation adopted by resolution MSC.532(107);
- .3 MSC 110/3/15 (Oman):
  - .1 in paragraphs 2 and 3, proposing the inclusion of "gaseous fuels" in addition to "low-flashpoint fuels" in regulation II-1/56.1, in line with the amendments approved by MSC 109;
  - .2 in paragraphs 4 to 6, containing proposals concerning the definition of "low-flashpoint fuel" and consequential amendments to relevant instruments; and
  - .3 in paragraphs 7 and 8, proposing the development of a unified interpretation or the inclusion of a footnote clarifying the terms "conversion" and "undertaking to use" used in the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation II-1/56; and
- .4 MSC 110/6/6 (China et al.) and MSC 110/6/10 (China), containing proposals concerning the definitions of "low-flashpoint fuel" and "IGF Code", and consequential amendments to relevant instruments, in particular the IGF Code.

3.7 Having noted the need to ensure that any changes introduced in the definitions for "low-flashpoint fuel" and "IGF Code" would not have unintended consequences, the Committee:

- .1 agreed to the inclusion of "gaseous fuels" in addition to "low-flashpoint fuels" in regulation II-1/56.1, in line with the amendments approved by MSC 109;
- .2 agreed to the editorial proposals in document MSC 110/3/13 (Japan);
- .3 did not agree to the proposal for the development of a unified interpretation or the inclusion of a footnote clarifying the terms "conversion" and

"undertaking to use" used in the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation II-1/56;

- .4 agreed to the proposed amendments to the definition of "low-flashpoint fuel" in SOLAS regulation II-1/2.29 and the addressing of "gaseous" fuels independently; and
- .5 requested the Secretariat to identify potential consequential amendments to other instruments, taking into account document MSC 110/6/10, in consultation with interested delegations, and consider how to address them with a view to advising the Committee at a future session.

3.8 Subsequently, the Committee confirmed the contents of the draft amendments, as set out in annex 1 of document MSC 110/WP.5, subject to editorial improvements, if any.

*Date of entry into force of the proposed amendments*

3.9 The Committee agreed that the aforementioned draft amendments should be approved at this session with a view to adoption at MSC 112. The Committee also agreed to apply section 4 (Exceptional circumstances) of the four-year amendments cycle (MSC.1/Circ.1481), with an entry-into-force date for these amendments on 1 July 2028.

***Draft amendments to SOLAS chapters II-2 and V***

3.10 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved draft amendments to SOLAS:

- .1 regulation II-2/11, for consistent implementation of this provision for passenger ships and cargo ships, as a minor correction (MSC 109/22, paragraph 12.30); and
- .2 regulation V/23 and the appendix (Certificates) in relation to pilot transfer arrangements (MSC 109/22, paragraph 13.14.1),

with a view to adoption at this session and entry into force on 1 January 2028.

3.11 Having noted that no comments on the draft amendments had been submitted, the Committee confirmed their contents, as set out in annex 2 of document MSC 110/WP.5, subject to editorial improvements, if any.

*Date of entry into force of the proposed amendments*

3.12 The Committee agreed that the aforementioned draft amendments proposed for adoption at this session should be deemed to have been accepted on 1 July 2027 and enter into force on 1 January 2028, in accordance with the *Guidance on entry into force of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments* (MSC.1/Circ.1481).

**Proposed amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes, the IGC Code and the IMSBC Code; and MSC resolution on performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements, mandatory under the 1974 SOLAS Convention (expanded Committee under SOLAS article VIII)**

***Draft amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes***

3.13 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved:

- .1 draft amendments to paragraph 8.3.5 (Personal life-saving appliances) and annex 1 (Record of Equipment) of the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes, for the harmonization of the lifejacket carriage requirements in both Codes with the relevant requirements in SOLAS chapter III, with a view to adoption at this session and entry into force on 1 January 2028 (MSC 109/22, paragraph 12.9); and
- .2 consequential draft amendments to annex 1 (Record of Equipment) of the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes, in relation to pilot transfer arrangements, with a view to adoption at this session and entry into force on 1 January 2028, in conjunction with the adoption of the associated amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 (see paragraph 3.10.2 above) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 13.14.3).

3.14 Having noted that no comments on the draft amendments had been submitted, the Committee confirmed their contents, as set out in annexes 3 and 4 of document MSC 110/WP.5, subject to editorial improvements, if any.



*Date of entry into force of the proposed amendments*

3.15 The Committee agreed that the aforementioned draft amendments proposed for adoption at this session should be deemed to have been accepted on 1 July 2027 and enter into force on 1 January 2028, in accordance with the *Guidance on entry into force of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments* (MSC.1/Circ.1481).

***Draft amendments to the IGC Code***

3.16 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved draft amendments to the IGC Code, with a view to adoption at this session and entry into force on 1 January 2028 (MSC 109/22, paragraph 14.9).

3.17 In connection with these draft amendments, the Committee considered the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/3/2 (Japan), proposing modifications to the draft amendments;
- .2 MSC 110/3/6 (Belgium et al.), proposing amendments concerning the application scope of the draft amendments;
- .3 MSC 110/3/7 (Belgium et al.), proposing amendments concerning the position of a non-return valve in the double block and bleed valves' design and the application to existing ships;
- .4 MSC 110/3/8 (Japan et al.), proposing amendments to section 16.9 (Alternative fuels and technologies), consequential to the amendments adopted by resolution MSC.566(109);
- .5 MSC 110/3/9 (Belgium et al.), proposing amendments to the model form of certificates of fitness of the IGC Code emanating from the draft amendment to the model form to divide products suitable for carriage as cargo and as fuel;
- .6 MSC 110/3/10 (Japan et al.), emphasizing the necessity of voluntary early implementation of the amendments to the IGC Code, and providing a draft MSC circular on voluntary early implementation; and

- .7 MSC 110/3/11 (China), seeking clarification on the application scope, design and implementation of the draft amendments to paragraph 5.11.6.1 relating to flanges, valves, bellows expansion joints and other fittings, and proposing different possible amendments based on the clarifications provided by the Committee.

3.18 Following consideration, the Committee agreed:

- .1 to refer the editorial proposed modifications in document MSC 110/3/2 to the Drafting Group for further progress of the draft amendments;
- .2 to refer to CCC 11 the proposals identified as substantial in documents MSC 110/3/2, MSC 110/3/6, MSC 110/3/7, MSC 110/3/8, MSC 110/3/9 and MSC 110/3/11 concerning the IGC Code (consolidated in document MSC 110/WP.7, annex 14), for consideration and finalization, with a view to approval at MSC 111 and subsequent adoption at MSC 112. In this connection, the Committee agreed that only these substantial proposals should be considered by the Sub-Committee;
- .3 that draft amendments to the IGC Code to be finalized by the CCC Sub-Committee, should be circulated, after approval by MSC 111, in accordance with SOLAS article VIII(b)(i) with a view to adoption; and
- .4 that Contracting Governments to the SOLAS Convention should be encouraged to implement voluntarily the draft amendments to the IGC Code upon their adoption.

*Date of entry into force of the proposed amendments*

3.19 In this connection, the Committee also agreed to the application of section 4 (Exceptional circumstances) of the four-year amendments cycle (MSC.1/Circ.1481) and entry into force of these amendments on 1 July 2028, if adopted at MSC 112.

***Draft amendments to the IMSBC Code***

3.20 The Committee recalled that the draft amendments (08-25) to the IMSBC Code had been agreed by CCC 10, finalized by E&T 41 and subsequently circulated in accordance with

SOLAS article VIII(b)(i) and the agreed amendment procedure for the IMSBC Code (MSC 86/26, paragraph 7.2), for consideration with a view to adoption at this session.

3.21 The Committee recalled also that amendments to the IMSBC Code were exempted from the four-year amendments cycle (MSC.1/Circ.1481, paragraph 3.4).

3.22 Having noted that no comments on the draft amendments had been submitted, the Committee confirmed their contents, as set out in annex 6 of document MSC 110/WP.5 and Circular Letter No.4925, subject to editorial improvements, if any.

*Date of entry into force of the proposed amendments*

3.23 The Committee agreed that the draft amendments, proposed for adoption at this session, should be deemed to have been accepted on 1 July 2026 and shall enter into force on 1 January 2027, and that Contracting Governments to the SOLAS Convention could apply the amendments from 1 January 2026 on a voluntary basis.

***Draft MSC resolution on performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements***

3.24 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved the associated draft MSC resolution on performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements with a view to adoption at this session in conjunction with the adoption of the associated draft amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23, which would make the performance standards mandatory under the 1974 SOLAS Convention (see paragraph 3.10.2 above) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 13.14.2).

3.25 In this regard, the Committee considered documents MSC 110/3/4 (IMPA), MSC 110/3/13 (Japan), in particular its paragraphs 5 to 20, and MSC 110/3/14 (IMPA), commenting on the draft performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements and proposing modifications.

3.26 Having agreed with the proposals in general, the Committee confirmed the contents of the draft MSC resolution, as set out in annex 7 of document MSC 110/WP.5, subject to editorial improvements, if any.

*Effective date of the proposed performance standards*

3.27 The Committee agreed that the aforementioned draft MSC resolution on performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements, proposed for adoption at this session, should take

effect on 1 January 2028, in conjunction with the entry into force of the associated amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 adopted at this session.

## **Non-mandatory instruments**

### ***Draft amendments to the 2008 SPS Code***

3.28 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved, in principle, consequential draft amendments to the forms of the Record of Equipment for certificates in the Code of Safety for Special Purpose Ships, 2008 (2008 SPS Code), concerning pilot transfer arrangements, with a view to adoption at this session together with the adoption of the associated amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 (see paragraph 3.10.2 above) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 13.16.1).

3.29 Having noted that no comments on the draft amendments had been submitted, the Committee confirmed their contents, as set out in annex 8 of document MSC 110/WP.5, subject to editorial improvements, if any.

### ***Effective date of the proposed amendments***

3.30 The Committee agreed that the aforementioned draft amendments, proposed for adoption at this session, should become effective on 1 January 2028, in conjunction with the entry into force of the associated amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 adopted at this session.

### ***Draft amendments to the Code of Safety for Fishermen and Fishing Vessels, 2005***

3.31 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved, in principle, consequential draft amendments to the *Code of Safety for Fishermen and Fishing Vessels, 2005*, concerning pilot transfer arrangements, with a view to approval at this session, together with the adoption of the associated amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 (see paragraph 3.10.2 above) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 13.16.2).

3.32 In this regard, the Committee:

- .1 noted that, according to the established procedures for the approval of amendments to this Code, FAO had already concurred with the consequential draft amendments; however formal approval by the ILO Governing Body was still pending and expected to take place at its November session of 2025; and

- .2 requested the Secretariat to report any developments to the Committee in due course.

3.33 Subsequently, the Committee confirmed their contents, as set out in annex 9 of document MSC 110/WP.5, subject to editorial improvements, if any.

*Effective date of the proposed amendments*

3.34 The Committee agreed that the aforementioned draft amendments, proposed for approval at this session, should become effective on 1 January 2028, in conjunction with the entry into force of the associated amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 adopted at this session.

***Associated draft MSC circulars***

3.35 The Committee noted that, as instructed by CCC 10, E&T 41 had finalized:

- .1 the draft revised MSC circular on Carriage of dangerous goods to replace the words "Code of Safe Practice for Solid Bulk Cargoes (BC) Code" and its associated footnote with "International Maritime Solid Bulk Cargoes (IMSBC) Code" in standard formats for the document of compliance, with a view to approval at this session for dissemination as MSC.1/Circ.1266/Rev.1;
- .2 draft revised recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships applicable to the fumigation of cargo holds, to add a new recommendation for the use of sleeves rather than using loose tablets when a cargo was to be fumigated with phosphine used as a fumigant, with a view to approval at this session for dissemination as MSC.1/Circ.1264/Rev.1; and
- .3 draft consequential amendments to the revised *Recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships* (MSC.1/Circ.1358), emanating from the revision of MSC.1/Circ.1264 (see paragraph 3.35.2 above), with a view to approval at this session for dissemination as MSC.1/Circ.1358/Rev.1.

3.36 The Committee also noted that E&T 41 had identified consequential amendments to MSC.1/Circ.1395/Rev.6 on *Lists of solid bulk cargoes for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system may be exempted or for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system is ineffective*, emanating from the draft amendments (08-25) to the IMSBC Code (see paragraph 3.20 above),

and had finalized draft amendments to MSC.1/Circ.1395/Rev.6, with a view to approval at this session, for dissemination as MSC.1/Circ.1395/Rev.7, in conjunction with the adoption of the draft amendments (08-25) to the IMSBC Code.

3.37 In addition, the Committee recalled that MSC 109 had agreed to the:

- .1 draft MSC circular on required pilot transfer arrangements for pilots and other personnel, revising MSC.1/Circ.1428, with an effective date to be determined at this session; and
- .2 draft MSC circular on voluntary early implementation of the amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 on pilot transfer arrangements,

with a view to approval at this session, together with the adoption of the associated amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 (see paragraph 3.10.2 above) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 13.18).

3.38 In this connection, the Committee considered document MSC 110/3/3 (IMPA), proposing modifications to the annex to the draft revised MSC circular on Required transfer arrangements for pilots and other personnel.

3.39 Having agreed with the proposed modifications in document MSC 110/3/3 (IMPA) in general, the Committee confirmed the contents of all the draft MSC circulars, as set out in annexes 10 to 15 of document MSC 110/WP.5, as appropriate, subject to editorial improvements, if any.

### **Consequential update of the footnotes in SOLAS**

3.40 The Committee noted that E&T 41, when preparing the draft amendments to the IMSBC Code and related circulars, with regard to the draft revised MSC.1/Circ.1266 (see paragraph 3.35.1 above), had requested the Secretariat to inform MSC 110 of the necessity of a consequential amendment to the footnote to SOLAS regulation II-2/19.4 (CCC 11/5, paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12, and annex 5).

3.41 The Committee also noted that E&T 41, when preparing the draft revised MSC.1/Circ.1264 (see paragraph 3.35.2 above), had agreed, as a consequence, to amend the references in the footnote to SOLAS regulation VI/4, as follows (CCC 11/5, paragraph 4.2 and annex 4):

- .1 Revised recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships (MSC.1/Circ.1358, as revised);
- .2 Recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships applicable to the fumigation of cargo holds (MSC.1/Circ.1264, as revised); and
- .3 Revised recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships applicable to the fumigation of cargo transport units (MSC.1/Circ.1361, as revised).

3.42 Consequently, the Committee requested the Secretariat to update the footnotes to SOLAS regulations II-2/19.4 and VI/4 in the next consolidated version of the SOLAS publication, as appropriate.

#### **Proposal for the drafting of application dates of mandatory instruments**

3.43 The Committee considered the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/3/12 (China), proposing draft amendments to resolution A.911(22) and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3 to establish a systematic approach for drafting the application provisions when revising mandatory codes; and
- .2 MSC 110/INF.26 (China), providing the results of a comprehensive review of application provisions of amendments to the FSS, FTP and LSA Codes and the main issues identified.

3.44 Following consideration, the Committee, noting the relevance of this matter for the regulatory process:

- .1 agreed that further consideration of the proposals in these documents was needed under this agenda item before amending MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3; and

- .2 invited interested Member States and international organizations to submit relevant proposals to MSC 111, taking into account the decision of the Committee on the matter of application provisions of the LSA Code considered under agenda item 14.

**Assessment of capacity-building and technical cooperation and assistance implications of the draft amendments to mandatory instruments**

3.45 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had endorsed the assessment of capacity-building implications related to the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 and associated instruments, provided in document MSC 109/13/4 (Australia et al.) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 13.19).

3.46 Having noted that, due to the recent approval of the *Organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies* (Committees' method of work) (MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.6), including revised *Procedures for assessing capacity-building requirements when developing new, or amending existing, mandatory instruments*, no assessment had been provided by the SSE and CCC Sub-Committees in relation to the draft amendments to considered for adoption at this session, the Committee instructed the Drafting Group to:

- .1 consider the assessment of capacity-building implications related to the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 and associated instruments contained in the annex to document MSC 109/13/4, and advise the Committee with a view to endorsement of the assessment, as appropriate;
- .2 assess the implications for capacity-building and technical cooperation and assistance of the amendments to the following mandatory instruments submitted for adoption at this session, against the revised procedures and criteria for identification of capacity-building implications set out in annex 2 of the Committees' method of work:
  - .1 draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-2 (MSC 110/WP.5, annex 2);
  - .2 draft amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes (MSC 110/WP.5, annexes 3 and 4, respectively); and



- .3 draft amendments to the IMSBC Code (MSC 110/WP.5, annex 6);  
and
- .3 if applicable, provide a description of the potential capacity-building implications of new or amended instruments along with recommendations for a course of action, for consideration and action by the Technical Cooperation Committee, as appropriate.

### **Establishment of the Drafting Group**

3.47 Subsequently, the Committee established the Drafting Group on Amendments to Mandatory Instruments and instructed it, taking into account the comments made and decisions taken in plenary, to:

- .1 prepare, for consideration by the Committee with a view to adoption or approval, as appropriate, the final text of the:
  - .1 draft amendments to SOLAS chapters II-2 and V, including the associated MSC resolutions;
  - .2 draft amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes, including the associated MSC resolutions;
  - .3 draft amendments to the IMSBC Code, including the associated MSC resolution;
  - .4 draft performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements, including the associated MSC resolution;
  - .5 draft amendments to the 2008 SPS Code, including the associated MSC resolution;
  - .6 draft amendments to the Code of Safety for Fishermen and Fishing Vessels, 2005; and
  - .7 draft MSC circulars on:

- .1 Required pilot transfer arrangements for pilots and other personnel, to be disseminated as MSC.1/Circ.1428/Rev.1;
  - .2 Voluntary early implementation of the amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 on pilot transfer arrangements, adopted by resolution MSC.572(110);
  - .3 Carriage of dangerous goods, to be disseminated as MSC.1/Circ.1266/Rev.1;
  - .4 Revised recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships, to be disseminated as MSC.1/Circ.1358/Rev.1;
  - .5 Revised recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships applicable to the fumigation of cargo holds, to be disseminated as MSC.1/Circ.1264/Rev.1; and
  - .6 Lists of solid bulk cargoes for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system may be exempted or for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system is ineffective, to be disseminated as MSC.1/Circ.1395/Rev.7;
- 
- .2 further progress draft amendments to the IGC Code, and the draft associated MSC resolution, in line with the decisions made earlier, based on annex 5 of document MSC 110/WP.5, taking into account editorial proposals in document MSC 110/3/2;
  - .3 prepare draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 in relation to the definitions of "low-flashpoint fuel" and "IGF Code", and regulations 55 and 56 and consequential draft amendments to the IGF Code, taking into account document MSC 110/6/6, and MSC 110/J/12, with a view to approval at this session (see paragraph 3.6 above);
  - .4 consider the assessment of capacity-building implications related to the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 and associated instruments

contained in the annex to document MSC 109/13/4, and advise the Committee with a view to endorsement of the assessment, as appropriate;

- .5 assess the implications for capacity-building and technical cooperation and assistance of the amendments to the following mandatory instruments submitted for adoption at this session, against the revised procedures and criteria for identification of capacity-building implications set out in annex 2 of the Committees' method of work:
  - .1 draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-2 (MSC 110/WP.5, annex 2);
  - .2 draft amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes (MSC 110/WP.5, annexes 3 and 4, respectively); and
  - .3 draft amendments to the IMSBC Code (MSC 110/WP.5, annex 6); and
- .6 if applicable, provide a description of the potential capacity-building implications of new or amended instruments along with recommendations for a course of action, for consideration and action by the Technical Cooperation Committee, as appropriate.

### **Report of the Drafting Group**

3.48 Having considered the report of the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7), the Committee approved it in general and took action as outlined below.

### **Adoption of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention**

3.49 The expanded Committee, including delegations of 111 Contracting Governments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention, considered the final text of the proposed amendments to chapters II-2 and V of the Convention, prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 1), and unanimously adopted them by resolution MSC.572(110), as set out in annex 1.

3.50 In adopting resolution MSC.572(110), the expanded Committee determined, in accordance with article VIII(b)(vi)(2)(bb) of the 1974 SOLAS Convention, that the adopted amendments should be deemed to have been accepted on 1 July 2027 (unless, prior to that

date, objections are communicated to the Secretary-General, as provided for in article VIII(b)(vi)(2) of the Convention) and enter into force on 1 January 2028, in accordance with the provisions of article VIII thereof and the *Guidance on entry into force of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments* (MSC.1/Circ.1481).

## **Adoption of amendments to relevant instruments mandatory under the 1974 SOLAS Convention**

### ***Amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes***

3.51 The expanded Committee, including delegations of 111 Contracting Governments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention, considered the final text of the proposed amendments to paragraph 8.3.5 (Personal life-saving appliances) and annex 1 (Record of Equipment) of the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes, prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annexes 2 and 3), and unanimously adopted them by resolutions MSC.573(110) and MSC.574(110), as set out in annexes 2 and 3, respectively.

3.52 In adopting resolutions MSC.573(110) and MSC.574(110), the expanded Committee determined, in accordance with article VIII(b)(vi)(2)(bb) of the 1974 SOLAS Convention, that the adopted amendments should be deemed to have been accepted on 1 July 2027 (unless, prior to that date, objections were communicated to the Secretary-General, as provided for in article VIII(b)(vi)(2) of the Convention) and would enter into force on 1 January 2028, in accordance with the provisions of article VIII thereof and the *Guidance on entry into force of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments* (MSC.1/Circ.1481).

### ***Amendments to the IMSBC Code***

3.53 The expanded Committee, including delegations of 111 Contracting Governments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention, considered the final text of the proposed amendments to the IMSBC Code, prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 4), and unanimously adopted them by resolution MSC.575(110), as set out in annex 4.

3.54 In adopting resolution MSC.575(110), the expanded Committee determined, in accordance with article VIII(b)(vi)(2)(bb) of the 1974 SOLAS Convention, that the adopted amendments should be deemed to have been accepted on 1 July 2026 (unless, prior to that date, objections were communicated to the Secretary-General, as provided for in article VIII(b)(vi)(2) of the Convention) and would enter into force on 1 January 2027, in accordance with the provisions of article VIII of the Convention.

3.55 The Committee agreed, as stated in operative paragraph 4 of resolution MSC.575(110), that Contracting Governments could apply the aforementioned amendments in whole or in part on a voluntary basis from 1 January 2026, pending their entry into force on 1 January 2027.

#### **Adoption of the MSC resolution on performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements**

3.56 The expanded Committee, including delegations of 111 Contracting Governments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention, considered the final text of the proposed MSC resolution, prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 5), and unanimously adopted the *Performance standards for pilot transfer arrangements* by resolution MSC.576(110), as set out in annex 5.

3.57 In adopting resolution MSC.576(110), the expanded Committee:

- .1 determined that the adopted instrument should become effective on 1 January 2028, in line with the date of entry into force of the amendments to regulation V/23 of the 1974 SOLAS Convention adopted by resolution MSC.572(110) (see paragraph 3.50 above); and
- .2 invited the Assembly to revoke resolutions A.1045(27) and A.1108(29) as of 1 April 2030, taking into account the gradual implementation dates of the amendments to regulation V/23 of the 1974 SOLAS Convention adopted by resolution MSC.572(110).

#### **Adoption/approval of amendments to non-mandatory instruments**

3.58 Having considered the final text of the proposed draft MSC resolution on amendments to the Code of Safety for Special Purpose Ships, 2008 (2008 SPS Code) prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 6), the Committee adopted resolution MSC.577(110) on *Amendments to the Code of Safety for Special Purpose Ships, 2008 (2008 SPS Code)*, as set out in annex 6.

3.59 Having also considered the final text of the proposed draft amendments to the Code of Safety for Fishermen and Fishing Vessels, 2005, prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 7), the Committee approved the amendments to the Code of Safety

for Fishermen and Fishing Vessels, 2005, as set out in annex 7, noting the information in paragraph 3.32.

3.60 Having further considered the final text of the proposed draft MSC circulars prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annexes 8 to 13), the Committee approved:

- .1 MSC.1/Circ.1428/Rev.1 on *Required pilot transfer arrangements for pilots and other personnel*;
- .2 MSC.1/Circ.1690 on *Voluntary early implementation of the amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 on pilot transfer arrangements, adopted by resolution MSC.572(110)*;
- .3 MSC.1/Circ.1266/Rev.1 on *Carriage of dangerous goods*;
- .4 MSC.1/Circ.1264/Rev.1 on *Recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships applicable to the fumigation of cargo holds*;
- .5 MSC.1/Circ.1358/Rev.1 on *Recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships*; and
- .6 MSC.1/Circ.1395/Rev.7 on *Lists of solid bulk cargoes for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system may be exempted or for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system is ineffective*.

#### **Draft amendments to the IGC Code**

3.61 Having considered the draft amendments to the IGC Code, further progressed by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 15), the Committee noted the progress made and endorsed the list of substantial proposals to the draft amendments to the IGC Code for further consideration by the CCC Sub-Committee, with a view to reporting to MSC 111 for approval (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 14). In this regard, the Committee agreed that an experts group could be established at CCC 11 to consider the aforementioned list of substantial proposals concerning the draft amendments to the IGC Code; and that this group could start its work on the first morning of the session, taking into account that there would not be any new related documents to be submitted to CCC 11.

3.62 In this context, the Committee agreed that MSC.1/Circ.1543, MSC.1/Circ.1559, MSC.1/Circ.1590, MSC.1/Circ.1606, MSC.1/Circ.1617, MSC.1/Circ.1625, MSC.1/Circ.1651, MSC.1/Circ.1669 and MSC.1/Circ.1679 would be superseded, with an effective date being when the draft amendments to the IGC Code entered into force, and notwithstanding that they would remain in effect for existing ships constructed prior to the entry into force of the draft amendments (MSC 110/WP.7, paragraph 20).

#### **Draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 and the IGF Code**

3.63 The Committee considered the draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 and the IGF Code, prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annexes 16 and 17).

3.64 Having noted that there might be unintended consequences emanating from the draft amendments in the referred annexes, particularly in relation to the one ship one code policy provisions for gas carriers (see paragraphs 6.26 to 6.41), and that the draft amendments were expected to be adopted together with the draft amendments to the IGC Code at MSC 112, the Committee agreed that the draft amendments to SOLAS chapter II-1 and the IGF Code should be further considered with a view to approval at MSC 111.

#### **Assessment of capacity-building implications**

3.65 Having considered the parts of the Drafting Group's report (MSC 110/WP.7, paragraphs 28 to 31) addressing the implications of the amendments adopted at this session for capacity-building and technical cooperation and assistance, the Committee:

- .1 endorsed the assessment of capacity-building implications related to the draft amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 and associated instruments contained in the annex to document MSC 109/13/4;
- .2 agreed that there might be capacity-building implications and a need for technical cooperation or assistance in relation to the draft amendments to SOLAS chapters II-2 and V, the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes and the IMSBC Code;
- .3 in relation to the above, invited the Technical Cooperation Committee to note the outcome of the aforementioned assessment; and

- .4 encouraged those Member States in need of capacity-building assistance in relation to the implementation of the aforementioned amendments to contact the Organization with requests for assistance, as appropriate.

#### **Draft amendments to the LSA Code**

3.66 Having considered the draft amendments to the LSA Code in relation to the application provisions therein, together with the associated draft MSC resolution, prepared by the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7, annex 18) (see paragraph 14.7), the Committee:

- .1 approved the draft amendments, as set out in annex 16, with a view to adoption at MSC 111;
- .2 requested the Secretary-General to circulate them in accordance with SOLAS article VIII, with a view to adoption at MSC 111; and
- .3 requested the Secretariat to prepare the table on application provisions in accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3 before the circulation of the draft amendments (see paragraph 14.6).

#### **Authorization of the Secretariat**

3.67 The Committee authorized the Secretariat, when preparing the authentic texts of the amendments adopted at this session, to make any editorial corrections that might be identified, including updating references to renumbered paragraphs, and to bring to the attention of the Committee any errors or omissions which required action by the Contracting Governments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention.

3.68 The Committee requested the Secretariat to ensure that the final text of the amendments contained in the annexes to this report be presented as clean text (i.e. not showing track changes).



## **4 GOAL-BASED NEW SHIP CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS**

### **Current status of GBS verification audits and the GBS Trust Fund**

4.1 The Committee considered document MSC 110/4 (Secretariat), providing an updated report on:

- .1 the current status of Goal-based standards (GBS) verification audits and the GBS Trust Fund, including information on the completion of the combined GBS audit, including initial verification of Biro Klasifikasi Indonesia (BKI) and audit of IACS Rec.34 on Standard Wave Data;
- .2 the start of the fourth GBS maintenance audit;
- .3 preparation for rectification of BKI non-conformities; and
- .4 convening of the third GBS Workshop.

4.2 The Committee noted, in particular, that:

- .1 the third GBS Workshop had been scheduled on 8 December 2025 at the IMO Headquarters, with hybrid participation enabled. The workshop would bring together GBS auditors and representatives of recognized organizations (ROs) that had been confirmed as being compliant with the GBS standards, as referenced in MSC.1/Circ.1518/Rev.2 on *Promulgation of rules for the design and construction of bulk carriers and oil tankers confirmed by the Maritime Safety Committee to be in conformity with the Goal-based Ship Construction Standards for bulk carriers and oil tankers (resolution MSC.287(87))*; and
- .2 individual email invitations would be sent to the relevant representatives in due course.

4.3 Subsequently, the Committee also noted:

- .1 a statement by the observer from IACS that the timeline for the revision of the IACS Common Structural Rules, previously reported to MSC 109, had

been adjusted. The revised timeline allowed additional time to receive and incorporate feedback from the industry on the newly developed wave loads, in order to refine the rule change proposal accordingly, and to develop the associated technical background documents and consequence assessment reports. As a result, the publication of the rule change proposal had been deferred from 1 July 2025 to 1 July 2027, with formal adoption by IACS being scheduled on 30 June 2027. Under this updated schedule, IACS intended to submit the full package to IMO in the second half of 2027 to initiate the GBS audit, with a view to enabling the audit report to be considered by MSC 115 in December 2028, as appropriate. The revised IACS Common Structural Rules were tentatively expected to enter into force on 1 July 2029. IACS would continue to keep the Committee informed of progress, in line with the decision taken at MSC 109; and

- .2 a statement by the delegation of Indonesia, noting the recognition of conformity of BKI with the goal-based ship construction standards, subject to the rectification of identified non-conformities. The delegation expressed its appreciation for the Secretariat's proposal to combine the rectification audit with the fourth GBS maintenance audit; reaffirmed its commitment to the GBS framework; and confirmed its support to the timely implementation of corrective actions. The delegation also stated its readiness to contribute constructively to the upcoming third GBS Workshop, particularly on rule change reporting and to the consideration of the *Revised guidelines for verification of conformity with goal-based ship construction standards for bulk carriers and oil tankers* (resolution MSC.454(100)).

4.4 In this context, the Committee requested the Secretariat to report on the outcome of the upcoming third GBS Workshop to MSC 111 and encouraged all participants in the workshop to engage in a constructive approach towards improvement of the GBS auditing process, notably through the streamlining and simplification of the communication of rule changes.

### **Status report addressing GBS audit observations**

4.5 The Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.7 (IACS), containing the updated status reports addressing IACS "common" observations, as on 28 February 2025.

### **Pool of GBS Auditors**

4.6 The Committee, having recalled that MSC 109 had invited interested Member States to nominate GBS experts, with a view to reinforcing the existing pool of GBS auditors, noted that a single nomination had been received by the Secretariat since the above-mentioned invitation.

4.7 Having reaffirmed that the effectiveness of the GBS audit process was contingent upon the availability of a sufficiently diverse and qualified pool of experts, the Committee reiterated its invitation to interested Member States to nominate GBS experts.

## **5 DEVELOPMENT OF A GOAL-BASED INSTRUMENT FOR MARITIME AUTONOMOUS SURFACE SHIPS (MASS)**

### **Background**

5.1 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had:

- .1 agreed to the revised road map for developing a goal-based code for Maritime Autonomous Surface Ships (MASS), subject to further revision, when necessary, having noted, in particular, the proposal of the MASS Working Group to move the target for finalization and adoption of a non-mandatory International Code of Safety for Maritime Autonomous Surface Ships (MASS Code) to MSC 111;
- .2 noted that the next meeting of the Intersessional MASS Working Group was planned, in principle, to take place between MSC 110 and MSC 111, subject to further consideration at MSC 110 (see paragraph 5.78.1); and
- .3 not been able to consider certain chapters of the draft MASS Code and the potential gap in the draft MASS Code on delegation of the master's tasks and duties, owing to time constraints.

5.2 The Committee noted that:

- .1 FAL 49 had agreed not to discuss a new reporting declaration for MASS before the completion of the non-mandatory MASS Code;
- .2 LEG 112 had agreed to hold the work on the development of the proposed draft guidelines on the implementation of LEG instruments with respect to MASS in abeyance, as contained in the annex to document LEG 112/9/1 (China), and to include the above-mentioned document in the road map on MASS; and
- .3 FAL 49 and LEG 112 had approved the revised road map for developing a goal-based code for MASS, taking into account the decision made at MSC 109.

5.3 The Committee also noted that the MASS Symposium 2025 "Maritime Autonomous Surface Ships as a reality: the need for the IMO MASS Code", co-organized by IMO and Norway, was held on 17 June 2025. In this respect, the Committee extended its appreciation to Norway for co-organizing the event.

#### **Correspondence Group report and associated documents**

5.4 While considering the report of the MASS Correspondence Group (MSC 110/5), the Committee noted the progress made on the development of chapters 1 to 5, 8, 14 and 15 of the draft MASS Code.

5.5 Subsequently, while noting, and expressing appreciation for, the work undertaken by the Correspondence Group, the Committee noted the following general comments on the development of the non-mandatory MASS Code:

- .1 while the decision on the supplementary nature of the MASS Code under SOLAS guides its development, there should be more clarity on the relationship of the Code with UNCLOS, and on how MASS could comply with the provisions of the latter with greater degrees of autonomy;
- .2 careful consideration should be given to the liability regime of MASS, with a particular focus on cases where higher degrees of autonomy were in place;

- 
- .3 proper record keeping and data logging should be considered as a fundamental element in the development of the MASS Code. Comprehensive data collection and logging mechanisms were crucial, not only for compliance and enforcement purposes, but also for facilitating accident investigation, amongst other areas;
  - .4 potential future engagement of MASS in SAR operations should continue to receive careful consideration. In relation to this, no exemption should be granted to MASS from the obligation to comply with SOLAS regulation V/33 on rendering assistance to ships in distress. Any future SAR framework for MASS should be based on the SAR Convention and UNCLOS;
  - .5 connectivity between MASS and remote operations centres (ROCs) remained a point of concern. Unless clear requirements for continuous connectivity were established in the MASS Code, there might be operational and safety implications, particularly where critical functions might be affected; and
  - .6 the MASS Working Group, if established, should focus on those chapters, which were not considered as being finalized, rather than reopening the discussions on the finalized ones.

#### ***Alert management framework in the MASS Code***

- 5.6 In relation to further development of chapter 14 (Alert management), the Committee:
- .1 considered document MSC 110/5/5 (Republic of Korea), proposing improvements to the existing alert management framework in the draft MASS Code, along with considerations requiring further discussion, to align it better with the unique operational requirements of MASS; and
  - .2 agreed, in principle, to establish the MASS Working Group and instructed it to consider further document MSC 110/5/5 (see paragraph 5.69).

***Basic concept for further developing the MASS Code***

5.7 The Committee considered the relevant part of document MSC 110/5/13 (Japan), on the distinction between the concepts of Operational Envelope (OE) and Operational Design Domain (ODD), as well as between the concepts of "fallback state" and "degraded state", for further development of the MASS Code.

5.8 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/13.

***Definition of "override"***

5.9 The Committee considered the remaining part of document MSC 110/5/13 (Japan) and the relevant part of document MSC 110/5/16 (China), both commenting on document MSC 110/5, and proposing a definition of "override".

5.10 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to further consider the proposals in documents MSC 110/5/13 and MSC 110/5/16.

***Chapter 16 (Maintenance and repair)***

5.11 In relation to the further development of chapter 16 (Maintenance and repair), the Committee considered document MSC 110/5/15 (United Kingdom), commenting on document MSC 110/5, regarding further work on chapter 16 (Maintenance and repair) of the draft MASS Code to ensure that it does not duplicate SOLAS requirements and focuses on specific MASS requirements that are new to these innovative ships.

5.12 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/15.

***Chapter 8 (Operational context)***

5.13 In relation to the further development of chapter 8 (Operational context), the Committee considered document MSC 110/5/17 (China), commenting on document MSC 110/5, specifically on chapter 8 (Operational context) of the draft MASS Code.

5.14 Subsequently, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/17.

---

***Supervisory control***

5.15 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/18 (Norway), commenting on document MSC 110/5, on the issue of "supervisory control", and proposing a way forward, with definition and categorization of the term, for further development of the draft MASS Code.

5.16 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further the proposals in document MSC 110/5/18.

***Cybersecurity***

5.17 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/21 (Russian Federation), commenting on document MSC 110/5 and providing modifications to the draft MASS Code regarding cybersecurity issues and terminologies.

5.18 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 cybersecurity was an issue of great importance, especially for MASS with higher degrees of autonomy. In relation to this, the issue of terminology was very important for a unified understanding of requirements;
- .2 notwithstanding its particular relevance for MASS, the topic of cybersecurity was already considered under agenda item 7 (Revision of the Guidelines on maritime cyber risk management (MSC-FAL.1/Circ.3/Rev.2) and identification of next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity). It was important to avoid duplication of work and the risk of developing conflicting concepts; and
- .3 cybersecurity was an important element throughout the MASS Code. It would be preferable to perform a thorough cybersecurity review/check at a later stage of the MASS Code development, instead of focusing the work on specific terminology at this stage, as otherwise suggested in document MSC 110/5/7 (Canada et al.).

5.19 Following discussion, the Committee agreed that cybersecurity should be addressed through a holistic and coordinated approach, within the context of the Organization's ongoing work on a generic framework for maritime cybersecurity, followed by a later review of the MASS

Code in alignment with that framework. Subsequently, the Committee did not support the proposal in document MSC 110/5/21.

### ***Chapter 15 (Human element)***

5.20 In relation to the further development of chapter 15 (Human element), the Committee considered the relevant part of document MSC 110/5 on chapter 15 of the draft MASS Code, and the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/5/1 (France et al.), proposing a draft text and restructuring of chapter 15 (Human element) of the draft MASS Code, to be used as the base text to be further developed by the MASS Working Group, if established; and
- .2 MSC 110/5/14 (One Sea ry), commenting on documents MSC 110/5 and MSC 110/5/1, regarding whether a master should always be located onboard a MASS whenever there are persons onboard.

5.21 During consideration, the Committee noted the following views expressed:

- .1 with respect to the proposals in document MSC 110/5/1, the possibility of a master being responsible for multiple MASS should not be the focus of the development of the MASS Code at this stage. Instead, such a possibility should be explored only after the finalization and adoption of the non-mandatory MASS Code, during the experience-building phase (EBP);
- .2 it was important to avoid unintended placement of regulatory barriers to new or novel application of remote control or autonomous technology on ships;
- .3 the proposal in document MSC 110/5/14 was not supported, recalling the outcome of MSC 108 where it was agreed that if there were persons on board a vessel, the master must also be on board to ensure the safety of the persons and to exercise the master's overriding authority;
- .4 not allowing a master of a MASS with crew onboard to operate the ship remotely would likely limit the full exploration of possible MASS concepts; and



- .5 the referral of document MSC 110/5/1 to the MASS Working Group was supported for further consideration.

5.22 In view of the above, the Committee:

- .1 instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/1; and
- .2 did not support the proposals in document MSC 110/5/14.

***MASS issues related to the STCW Convention***

5.23 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/4 (Belgium et al.), highlighting:

- .1 the possibility for a mandatory MASS Code to contain training and certification requirements for remote operators who currently fall outside the scope of the STCW Convention; and
- .2 that provisions laid out in the draft MASS Code should allow for watchkeeping concepts to be performed using alternative arrangements while proposing that, as a short-term solution, the non-mandatory MASS Code contain the principles for alternative watchkeeping.

5.24 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 including training and certification standards, or specific watchkeeping requirements, within the MASS Code would risk creating a two-tier system between seafarers and remote operators within a non-mandatory Code;
- .2 while the application of the STCW Convention was limited to seafarers on board, the integration of remote operator standards within the STCW framework should be explored further, whether through interim guidance, amendments, or supplementary mechanisms. For this reason, training and certification requirements for remote operators should be considered, as a priority item, by the HTW Sub-Committee; and

- .3 prior to the consideration of the certification and training requirements for remote operators by the HTW Sub-Committee, the MASS Code should first be finalized, defining which roles and responsibilities the remote operators must be able to perform.

5.25 Following discussion, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/4.

***Remote operator training, certification and watchkeeping standards***

5.26 The Committee considered documents:

- .1 MSC 110/13/3 (Republic of Korea et al.), highlighting the need for a harmonized approach between the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code and the development of the MASS Code when considering standards of training, certification and watchkeeping for remote operators; and
- .2 MSC 110/INF.12 (United Kingdom), providing an update on the United Kingdom's domestic development of remote operator training and certification frameworks.

5.27 In this regard, the Committee recalled that:

- .1 MSC 108 had agreed to develop high-level training provisions for the MASS Code, whereby the detailed competence and knowledge, understanding and proficiency (KUPs) requirements might be developed by the HTW Sub-Committee at a later stage, when the Code had been finalized;
- .2 MSC 109 had noted the invitation by the MASS Working Group to relevant sub-committees to review the non-mandatory MASS Code after its finalization and adoption. The results of such a review, as well as the experience-building phase, should be considered when developing the mandatory MASS Code; and
- .3 the Chair had made a statement at MSC 109, highlighting the importance of concluding the non-mandatory MASS Code prior to the identification of

MASS personnel as seafarers or not, for the purpose of the 1978 STCW Convention and the Maritime Labour Convention (MLC), 2006.

5.28 In view of the above, the Committee:

- .1 reiterated its previous decisions taken at MSC 108 and MSC 109 (see paragraph 5.27); and
- .2 confirmed that the work on the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code should be undertaken after the MASS Code has been finalized.

#### ***Interim certification***

5.29 While noting that a new section 5.5 on "Interim Certification" had been added to chapter 5 of the Code (Surveys and certificates), the Committee considered the relevant part of document MSC 110/5/16, commenting on document MSC 110/5, regarding interim certification.

5.30 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 given the fact that MASS would be undergoing tests under specific operational conditions, it was important that the operational area intended for the testing of the ship and the remote operations centre were specified and approved by the Administration when the interim MASS certificate was issued;
- .2 the relation between the SOLAS certificate and the Interim MASS Certificate, and their certification procedures should be clarified further and explicitly provided in the draft Code, notably whether the Interim MASS Certificate could only be issued after the ship had a valid SOLAS certificate, or whether it was allowed to be issued in advance;
- .3 the deletion of the requirement to approve the preliminary design before the interim certificate was issued, was not supported; and

- .4 a clear distinction should be made between certification of physical systems, that is the hardware; and certification of operational systems governed by the ISM and ISPS Codes.

5.31 Following discussion, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further the relevant proposal in document MSC 110/5/16.

***Additional modifications to chapters 9 and 15 of the draft MASS Code***

5.32 The Committee noted the following actions taken by the Correspondence Group:

- .1 the "key principles on the role of the master", as had been previously included in section 1.2 of the Code, had been incorporated, as appropriate, into chapter 15 (Human element); and
- .2 the matter of a master being required to be on board if there are crew or other persons on board, was retained within square brackets in paragraph 15.2.4 of the Code.

5.33 Additionally, the Committee agreed with the proposal of the Correspondence Group to move the previous section 15.6 (Application of Human Centred Design) to chapter 9 (System design).

***Data logging***

5.34 Having noted that the proposed new section 9.8*bis* (Proper record keeping (Data logging)) could not be finalized at this stage and should be taken forward for consideration during the finalization of chapter 9, the Committee considered the remaining part of document MSC 110/5/16, commenting on document MSC 110/5, regarding data logging.

5.35 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further the relevant part of document MSC 110/5/16.

5.36 Subsequently, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to develop further the draft MASS Code, based on document MSC 110/5 and taking into account the above-mentioned documents that have been agreed for referral to the MASS Working Group for further consideration.

## **Other documents related to the draft MASS Code**

### ***Review of chapters of part 3 of the draft MASS Code***

5.37 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/2 (Norway), proposing amendments on specific chapters of part 3 of the draft MASS Code, with a view to accelerating the finalization of these chapters.

5.38 Subsequently, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/2.

### ***Connectivity, radiocommunications and remote operations***

5.39 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/6 (Canada), proposing to establish a clear and secure framework for connectivity in the draft MASS Code, focusing on the link between ROC and ship for control and monitoring, while distinguishing it from broader communication requirements. It also suggests aligning the connectivity chapter with a goal-based structure and considering significant changes to chapter 13 (Radiocommunications).

5.40 Subsequently, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/6.

### ***Chapter 22 (Special measures to enhance maritime security)***

5.41 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/7 (Canada et al.), proposing a new draft text and restructuring of chapter 22 (Special measures to enhance maritime security) in the draft MASS Code.

5.42 During consideration, the Committee noted the view expressed that the ISPS Code was inherently risk-based and already provided a flexible framework capable of accommodating a wide range of operational contexts.

5.43 Following discussion, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/7.

***Framework for the Concept of Operations***

5.44 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/8 (China), providing the revised preliminary framework for the Concept of Operations (ConOps) to be included in the MASS Code and highlighting different issues to be discussed in the finalization of the framework, including the relationship between ODD and OE.

5.45 Having noted a view that, with regard to fallback modes and ODD, these parameters should be explicitly reflected in the MASS certificate to ensure clarity and enforceability of operational limits under the relevant statutory instruments, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/8.

***Chapter 24 (Cargo handling)***

5.46 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/9 (China), including an analysis of the text of chapter 24 (Cargo handling) in the draft MASS Code and proposing a revision to the title and text of the chapter, so as to enhance the subsidiary functional requirements and to improve the guidance of the text.

5.47 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/9.

***Chapter 19 (Structure, subdivision, stability and watertight integrity)***

5.48 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/10 (China), proposing the functional topology of systems and functions specified in chapter 19 (Structure, subdivision, stability and watertight integrity) of the draft MASS Code, to establish a consensus to facilitate subsequent adjustments and improvements to this chapter.

5.49 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further document MSC 110/5/10.

***Remaining documents from MSC 109***

5.50 The Committee noted that, due to time constraints, document MSC 109/5/9 (Belgium), building on the proposal for Remote Operation Management (ROM) and providing comments and proposals on chapter 11 of the draft MASS Code, was not considered in full by MSC 109. In this context, the Committee instructed the MASS Working Group to consider further

document MSC 109/5/9, taking into account the outcome of the consideration of chapter 5 by the MASS Correspondence Group.

## **Operational matters**

### ***Issues concerning remote operations centres***

5.51 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/19 (CMI), summarizing the results of a survey carried out by the CMI MASS International Working Group in relation to practical issues faced by States in the operation of ROCs.

5.52 Following discussion, the Committee noted the content of document MSC 110/5/19, together with the view expressed that the ISM Code did not require bilateral agreements for audit companies located outside the flag State's jurisdiction and that introducing such a requirement for MASS could set a precedent inconsistent with existing IMO instruments that could create unnecessary regulatory barriers.

### ***Automatic tugs in port areas and their interaction with MASS***

5.53 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/11 (Russian Federation), describing developments in the Russian Federation related to automatic tugs to be used at ship mooring operations, including interactions with autonomous ships.

5.54 During consideration, the Committee noted the following views expressed:

- .1 the content of the document should be noted but not forwarded to the MASS Working Group, since the assumptions in the proposal did not justify urging States to drastically change pilotage and port services, especially since it portrayed current practices as unsafe, simply because they relied on human involvement and were not fully automated;
- .2 the document provided specific proposals and it was too early to discuss this document at this stage, before the draft Code had been finalized; and
- .3 the proposals might be referred to the FAL Committee for further consideration, given its relevance to ship-port interface.

5.55 In view of the above, the Committee agreed that it would be premature to discuss mooring operations involving automatic tugs at this stage, while the Code was still under development.

***MASS trials with a sole look-out in periods of darkness***

5.56 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/3 (Mexico et al.), highlighting safety- and human element-related factors intended to contribute to the deliberations of the Committee, regarding the proposed resumption of trials in which the officers of the navigational watch may act as the sole look-out during periods of darkness, in parallel with their other watchkeeping duties.

5.57 In this regard, the Committee recalled that MSC 108 had instructed HTW 11 to consider documents MSC 107/5/5 (Germany et al.) and MSC/ISWG/MASS 2/6 (Liberia), concerning MASS trials with a sole look-out in periods of darkness.

5.58 The Committee also recalled that HTW 11 had agreed to advise the Committee that STCW regulation I/13 applied to the conduct of MASS trials.

5.59 The Committee further recalled that the *Interim guidelines for MASS Trials* (MSC.1/Circ.1604) already included provisions requiring that compliance with the intent of mandatory instruments should be ensured (MSC.1/Circ.1604, paragraph 2.2.1) and the scope of application of mandatory instruments, including provisions for exemptions and equivalencies, should be determined by flag State Administrations in accordance with those instruments.

5.60 Prior to the discussion, the Committee noted the Chair's statement that:

- .1 the current provisions in the *Interim guidelines for MASS Trials* already established the framework for consideration/approval of any possible "sole look-out" situation in MASS trials by the approving flag State Administrations;
- .2 the HTW Sub-Committee would be instructed to work further and to assess human element aspects of the MASS Code only after the finalization of the non-mandatory instrument; and



- 
- .3 the focus of the MASS Working Group should be on the finalization of the draft MASS Code.

5.61 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 the revision of MSC.1/Circ.566 on *Provisional Guidelines on the conduct of trials in which the officer of the navigational watch acts as the sole look-out in periods of darkness*, was not supported at this stage;
- .2 the revision of MSC.1/Circ.566 could be considered as part of the comprehensive revision of the STCW Convention and Code, in accordance with the road map outlined in document MSC 110/13/1 (Secretariat);
- .3 recalling the earlier discussions on the risks, the general view was reiterated that allowing such operations, particularly during trial periods, could significantly compromise navigational safety. The proposed precautions in the document were not sufficient to justify the necessity of such trials and the Chair's statement (see paragraph 5.60) calling for a more detailed analysis of the issue was supported;
- .4 trials involving sole look-out operations during periods of darkness should be approached with caution and robust safeguards, particularly in regions with limited access to advanced technology, maritime surveillance and trained personnel. Such trials must be internationally supervised, time-bound, and supported by independent data collection, with at least two awake personnel on duty, to ensure navigational safety in high-density and low-tech coastal areas;
- .5 the Interim Guidelines (MSC.1/Circ.1604) could still address the need. MSC.1/Circ.566 was not meant for MASS and the proposals could better be reflected in a different circular, which would require a new output proposal; and
- .6 the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code involved an overwhelming number of work items. Tasking the HTW Sub-Committee with an additional item emanating from this document could compromise the work

on the review of the instruments; therefore, the document should be held in abeyance for the moment.

5.62 Following consideration, the Committee agreed to keep document MSC 110/5/3 in abeyance until the draft MASS Code has been finalized and instructed the MASS Working Group to advise the Committee on how to address, at a later stage, the proposals which had been put in abeyance.

### ***Framework for an experience-building phase for MASS***

5.63 The Committee considered document MSC 110/5/20 (One Sea ry), providing comments on the report of the MASS Correspondence Group (MSC 110/5) regarding the development of a framework for an experience-building phase after the adoption of the non-mandatory MASS Code.

5.64 Having noted that the timeline for the finalization of the draft MASS Code was very tight and that this document could be given consideration at a later stage, the Committee:

- .1 agreed to keep document MSC 110/5/20 in abeyance;
- .2 instructed the MASS Working Group to advise the Committee on how to address the proposals in the document at a later stage; and
- .3 invited interested Member States and international organizations to continue providing the Committee with their experience in the application and the uptake of the non-mandatory MASS Code during the EBP.

### ***Outcome of MASS trials in the Russian Federation***

5.65 With respect to the outcome of MASS trials, the Committee considered document MSC 110/5/12 (Russian Federation), reporting on MASS trials that have been conducted from 2020 to 2025 on ships flying the flag of the Russian Federation.

5.66 Following consideration, the Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/5/12, and invited interested Member States and international organizations to continue providing the Committee with their experience on MASS trials and operations.

---

**Information documents submitted**

5.67 The Committee noted the information contained in the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/INF.5 (Italy), presenting the results of the 5G MASS Project carried out in the port of Livorno (Italy) and demonstrating a showcasing phase on Maritime Innovation: Ship-to-Shore Connectivity and autonomous ship's functions;
- .2 MSC 110/INF.16 (Republic of Korea), providing information on major hazards and corresponding mitigation measures associated with autonomous navigation functions, identified through high-level risk assessments of multiple preliminary designs of MASS;
- .3 MSC 110/INF.17 (Republic of Korea), sharing key technical considerations gained from a remote operation demonstration for an 8,000 TEU large commercial ship utilizing multiple ROCs, conducted by the Republic of Korea, that should be addressed to enhance the practical applicability of the MASS Code and to support future discussions within the EBP;
- .4 MSC 110/INF.18 (Republic of Korea), providing information on the achievements of the Republic of Korea in training and assessing remote operators in the field of navigation using remote operation simulators for MASS; and
- .5 MSC 110/INF.25 (China), providing information on the results from the sea trial verification and application of the MASS Navigation and Remote Operation System (MAROS) developed in China.

5.68 The Committee, having noted that all these information documents might be beneficial when developing the MASS Code, instructed the MASS Working Group to take them into account in its work, as appropriate.

**Establishment of the MASS Working Group**

5.69 Recalling the draft terms of reference prepared by the MASS Correspondence Group (MSC 110/5, paragraph 55), the Committee established the MASS Working Group and instructed

it, taking into account comments and decisions made in plenary, as well as the following documents:

MSC 110/5, MSC 110/5/1, MSC 110/5/2, MSC 110/5/4, MSC 110/5/5, MSC 110/5/6, MSC 110/5/7, MSC 110/5/8, MSC 110/5/9, MSC 110/5/10, MSC 110/5/13, MSC 110/5/15, MSC 110/5/16, MSC 110/5/17, MSC 110/5/18, MSC 110/13/3, MSC 110/INF.5, MSC 110/INF.12, MSC 110/INF.16, MSC 110/INF.17, MSC 110/INF.18, MSC 110/INF.25 and MSC 109/5/9, to:

- .1 develop further the draft MASS Code, and to consider, in particular:
  - .1 chapters 1 to 5, 8, 14 and 15 of the draft MASS Code, based on annex 1 of document MSC 110/5, and taking into account the information provided in the body of the report;
  - .2 chapters 6, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 16 in part 2 of the draft MASS Code, based on the annex to document MSC 109/WP.8, including principles, application and necessary definitions, to confirm alignment and consistency with part 3; and
  - .3 chapters 17*bis*, 19 and 21 to 27 in part 3 of the draft MASS Code, based on the annex to document MSC 109/WP.8, taking into account the *Generic guidelines for developing IMO goal-based standards* (MSC.1/Circ.1394/Rev.2) for Tier I and Tier II, and to ensure consistency and that all necessary IMO instruments are addressed, as appropriate.
- .2 if time permits, consider the potential gap in the draft MASS Code on delegation of the master's tasks and duties, taking into account paragraph 17 of document MSC 109/5;
- .3 update the revised road map, based on annex 3 of document MSC 109/22/Add.1, if necessary;

- .4 consider intersessional working arrangements, if necessary, and to prepare terms of reference for intersessional working group and/or correspondence group, as appropriate;
- .5 advise the Committee on how to consider, in the future, the documents MSC 110/5/3 on sole look-out and MSC 110/5/20 on EBP framework, which are to be kept in abeyance; and
- .6 submit a written report to plenary by Thursday, 26 June 2025.

### **Report of the MASS Working Group**

5.70 Having considered the report of the MASS Working Group (MSC 110/WP.8), the Committee approved it in general and took action as described hereunder.

### ***Progress made on the development of the MASS Code***

5.71 The Committee noted the progress made on the development of the draft MASS Code, in particular the finalization of the following chapters (see MSC 110/WP.8, annex 1 for corresponding chapter titles): 1 to 3, 6, 11, 14, 16, 17*bis*, 19 and 21 to 26.

5.72 The Committee noted also that (see MSC 110/WP.8, annex 1 for corresponding chapter titles):

- .1 chapter 4 should be kept open for further development until all other chapters were finalized, including the need to define "resilience"; and
- .2 finalization of chapters 5, 8, 9 and 10 would still be subject to further consideration in conjunction with chapter 15 regarding human element matters.

### ***ROC security plan***

5.73 As regard to measures to enhance maritime security, in particular with a focus on the Remote Operations Centre (ROC) and possible provisions for a "ROC Security Plan", the Committee noted that the Working Group agreed that it was premature to include any provision in this regard, at this stage, and that this matter should be further considered during the EBP.

5.74 Furthermore, the Committee noted that the Working Group had also considered which shore-based personnel should be required to undergo training, drills and exercises as laid out in the ISPS Code, and had similarly agreed that it was premature and should be considered during the EBP.

### ***Forms of certificates***

5.75 While noting that, due to time constraints, the Working Group had not been able to consider the forms of Certificates, the Committee invited interested parties to submit proposals to the next session, with a view to the forms of Certificates being integrated into the draft MASS Code.

### ***GBS review***

5.76 The Committee noted that consideration of the GBS review of part 3 of the MASS Code was planned to take place at MSC 111, based on the decision taken at MSC 108 and following coordination of the Secretariat for a GBS expert(s) review of the draft MASS Code.

### ***Experience-building phase***

5.77 The Committee requested the Secretariat to develop a list of topics to be addressed during the EBP, following the expected adoption of the non-mandatory MASS Code. Such elements, currently identified during the development of the Code, should be kept for future consideration together with knowledge and experience gained during the EBP, to be used when developing a mandatory instrument for MASS operation.

### ***Intersessional working arrangements***

5.78 With respect to intersessional working arrangements, for further development of the draft MASS Code, the Committee:

- .1 agreed to hold the fourth session of the Intersessional MASS Working Group (ISWG/MASS 4) tentatively scheduled from 29 September to 3 October 2025, with draft terms of reference prepared by the Group (MSC 110/WP.8, annex 3); and
- .2 endorsed that the scope of submissions to ISWG/MASS 4 should be limited to matters pertaining to chapter 15 (Human Element) and certain other topics due to their close link to human element (MSC 110/WP.8, paragraph 96), for a holistic and consistent approach.

### ***Revised road map***

5.79 To progress further the work on the development of the MASS Code, the Committee agreed to the revised road map for developing a goal-based code for MASS, subject to further revision, when necessary, as set out in annex [...]. In this respect, in addition to the GBS review and the holding of ISWG/MASS 4 (see paragraphs 5.76 and 5.78, respectively), the Committee noted, in particular, that:

- .1 the target for finalization and adoption of the non-mandatory MASS Code was kept for MSC 111;
- .2 the invitation to relevant sub-committees to review the MASS Code would take place after finalization and adoption of the non-mandatory MASS Code, as already planned in the road map; and
- .3 development of a framework for an EBP, post adoption of the non-mandatory MASS Code, would start at MSC 111.

5.80 In this respect, the Committee invited FAL 50 and LEG 113 to review their respective MASS-related road maps in light of the above-mentioned agreed revision of the road map.

### ***Documents kept in abeyance***

5.81 The Committee agreed to the list of documents kept in abeyance, subject to further update when necessary, including documents MSC 110/5/3 (Mexico et al.) on sole look-out, and MSC 110/5/20 (One Sea ry) on EBP framework, and others from previous sessions, for future consideration (MSC 110/WP.8, annex 4).

### ***Secretariat support***

5.82 The Committee requested the Secretariat to support the development of the draft MASS Code, with the following tasks:

- .1 preparation of a facilitation document with respect to human element matters (chapter 15) to support the ISWG/MASS 4 meeting, including relevant information from previous decisions of the Committee and/or the Joint MSC/FAL/LEG Working Group;

- .2 editorial work in part 2 of the draft MASS Code, with a view to checking consistency of the GBS structure of the text and proposed modifications, as appropriate; and
- .3 development of a list of topics to be addressed during the EBP (see paragraph 5.77).

### ***Delegation of the master's tasks and duties***

5.83 The Committee noted that, due to time constraints, the Working Group could not consider the potential gap in the draft MASS Code on delegation of the master's tasks and duties, taking into account paragraph 17 of document MSC 109/5.

## **6 DEVELOPMENT OF A SAFETY REGULATORY FRAMEWORK TO SUPPORT THE REDUCTION OF GHG EMISSIONS FROM SHIPS USING NEW TECHNOLOGIES AND ALTERNATIVE FUELS**

### **Background**

6.1 The Committee recalled that MSC 108 had established the Correspondence Group on Development of a Safety Regulatory Framework to Support the Reduction of GHG Emissions from Ships Using New Technologies and Alternative Fuels (GHG Safety) and considering the limited time available between MSC 108 and MSC 109, the Correspondence Group was instructed to provide an interim oral report on the status of its work to MSC 109, and to submit a final written report to MSC 110.

6.2 The Committee also recalled that MSC 109 had established the Working Group on Development of a Safety Regulatory Framework to Support the Reduction of GHG Emissions from Ships Using New Technologies and Alternative Fuels (GHG Safety) and, while considering part 1 of its report (MSC 109/WP.9), took action (MSC 109/22, paragraphs 6.23 to 6.28) and agreed to consider part 2 of the report at MSC 110.



## **REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ESTABLISHED AT MSC 109 (PART 2)**

6.3 As agreed by MSC 109 (MSC 109/22, paragraph 6.29), the Committee considered document MSC 109/WP.9/Add.1 containing part 2 of the report of the Working Group on GHG Safety established at MSC 109. The document presented draft criteria for the assignment of work to sub-committees and a work plan including timelines, tasks and priorities for development of a safety regulatory framework to support the reduction of GHG emissions from ships using new technologies and alternative fuels.

### **Draft criteria for the assignment of work to sub-committees**

6.4 The Committee approved the criteria for the assignment of work to sub-committees as contained in annex 1 of document MSC 109/WP.9/Add.1 and invited interested Member States and international organizations to submit information that would be useful in applying the criteria "based on demand by stakeholders" and "that address alternative fuels or technologies already in use onboard ships".

### **Work plan on GHG safety-related matters**

6.5 The Committee noted the work plan, including associated timelines, tasks and priorities on GHG safety-related matters, as presented in annex 2 of document MSC 109/WP.9/Add.1 and requested the Working Group on GHG Safety to consider and to update it, as necessary.

## **REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDENCE GROUP ON GHG SAFETY AND COMMENTING DOCUMENTS**

6.6 The Committee considered document MSC 110/6, which contains the report of the Correspondence Group on GHG Safety, and approved it in general.

6.7 The Committee noted the identification and analysis of 51 existing barriers and gaps within current IMO regulations that may delay the use of alternative fuels (e.g. fatty acid methyl esters (FAME), methanol, ammonia, dimethyl ether (DME), hydrogen, liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) and fuel blends) and emerging technologies (e.g. fuel cells, battery energy storage, air lubrication and onboard carbon capture).

6.8 The Committee also noted the 32 specific recommendations to address barriers and gaps for alternative fuels and new technologies, as set out in annex 1 of document MSC 110/6. The Correspondence Group reported that some of the above-mentioned recommendations had already been addressed (ongoing work) or completed. Document MSC 110/6 contained

the indication that some ongoing work was being carried out by other IMO bodies related to the development of amendments to existing IMO instruments, or new guidelines, and consideration of proposals for new codes. The Committee further noted the opinion of the Correspondence Group regarding the need for harmonized, flexible and technology-neutral regulations, referencing international standards where applicable, and that the Correspondence Group had highlighted the urgency to revise outdated instruments such as the Code of Safety for Nuclear Merchant Ships (Nuclear Code).

6.9 The delegation of Saudi Arabia made a statement, as set out in annex [...], stressing the importance of considering the safety implications of adopting alternative fuels, particularly given that the maritime industry operated under exceptionally challenging conditions, including long voyages, extreme weather, and extended fuel storage durations, and that such fuels should be thoroughly validated for safety, stability and compatibility with onboard systems.

#### **Various technologies for GHG emissions reduction**

6.10 The Committee considered document MSC 110/6/3 (Japan), proposing a way forward to enable adoption of various technologies for GHG emissions reduction presenting the "Wind Hunter" concept, for reducing GHG emissions from ships. The project involved ships producing green hydrogen at sea, using wind energy and storing it onboard as Liquid Organic Hydrogen Carrier (LOHC), specifically methyl-cyclo-hexane (MCH). The submitter proposed updating the list of regulatory barriers and encouraged flexible prioritization to support progress in decarbonization.

6.11 The Committee agreed to refer document MSC 110/6/3 to the Working Group on GHG Safety for consideration and update of the list of regulatory barriers, if appropriate, and advice to the Committee.

#### **Battery energy storage systems (BESS) for ships focused on lithium-ion battery energy storage systems (LIBESS) and supercapacitor energy storage systems (SCESS)**

6.12 The Committee considered document MSC 110/6/5 (China), commenting on the report of the Correspondence Group, in particular, regarding the safety barriers and gaps related to the ventilation, emergency exhaust, flammable gas detection and fire-extinguishing agent requirements for shipboard battery energy storage systems. In this context, the Committee noted that the submitter proposed assigning the SDC or CCC Sub-Committees to develop further appropriate interim guidelines.

6.13 The Committee noted the views that the proposal to classify BESS compartments as category A machinery spaces should be considered further, given the fundamental differences between batteries and combustion-based machinery. In this context, it was suggested to consider a separate category for BESS, based on battery size and hazard analysis.

6.14 Subsequently, the Committee agreed to refer document MSC 110/6/5 to the Working Group on GHG Safety for consideration and advice to the Committee on an appropriate way forward.

#### **Revision of the Interim guidelines for the safety of ships using methyl/ethyl alcohol as fuel (MSC.1/Circ.1621)**

6.15 The Committee considered document MSC 110/6/7 (Brazil and IBIA), highlighting the need to amend MSC.1/Circ.1621 to address appropriately, differences in properties between methanol and ethanol. The document also highlighted key differences in energy density, flammability, toxicity, spill behaviour and material compatibility that have implications for fire safety, storage, handling and crew protection.

6.16 Several delegations expressed support to document MSC 110/6/7, proposing amendments to the *Interim guidelines for the safe use of ethanol as a marine fuel* (MSC.1/Circ.1621), based on the differences between methanol and ethanol. The delegations emphasized the importance of addressing issues such as flammability, corrosion, toxicity and safety measures (e.g. fire safety, gas detection and crew training). Therefore, taking into account the comments made, the Committee decided to refer this document to CCC 11 for further consideration and revision of the above-mentioned Guidelines.

#### **Ammonia as shipping fuel**

6.17 The Committee also considered the following documents related to ammonia as shipping fuel:

- .1 MSC 110/6/1 (Pacific Environment and EDF), informing about safety concerns regarding GHG emissions from ammonia as shipping fuel and advocating a coordinated and comprehensive regulatory framework to ensure the safe and effective use of ammonia, as shipping fuel. The document called for stringent measures in order to minimize nitrogen releases, to improve monitoring and reporting systems, and to integrate

emerging scientific understanding into the regulatory framework, as ammonia-fuelled ships begin operation;

- .2 MSC 110/6/8 (Pacific Environment, CSC and EDF), providing information on the potential impacts of ammonia spills on the marine environment and climate. The document highlighted that ammonia spills were highly toxic to aquatic life, could spread widely in marine environments, and posed direct health hazards to humans; and
- .3 MSC 110/6/12 (International Fertilizer Association), informing that the fertilizer industry, as the leading producer of ammonia, supported the adoption of ammonia, as a marine fuel, and the related interim safety guidelines. The importance of adopting equivalent safety standards at sea, including rigorous risk assessments, structured operational protocols and robust crew training, was also emphasized.

6.18 In this context, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 the valuable contribution of these submissions was recognized and the potential impact of ammonia spills on the marine environment and climate was highlighted, as well as the broader impact of ammonia release and nitrogen pollution;
- .2 concerns were raised about emissions and their environmental impacts, stressing that MEPC was the most suitable IMO body for discussing ways to address matters of spills and emissions from ships;
- .3 the development and refinement of ammonia safety guidelines was supported while emphasizing that seafarers' safety remains paramount;
- .4 regulatory development should be balanced, risk-based, and inclusive, in particular, in the interest of Member States with limited related capacities;
- .5 caution should be observed with regard to measures that may delay safe deployment where safety systems and training are robust;

- .6 ammonia is an alternative fuel with a significant potential to contribute to decarbonizing the maritime sector. However, the inherent toxicity of ammonia requires stringent measures ensuring safe use on board;
- .7 in order to minimize any possible risks of slip or leaks, it would be necessary to have an integrated regulatory framework, which would cover both safety and health issues related to the use of ammonia as shipping fuel;
- .8 it would be necessary to develop emergency protocols and to standardize onboard and port side emergency response protocols, specifically for ammonia-related incidents, including spills containment and medical response; and
- .9 in order to implement a real-time environmental monitoring system, the installation of real-time sensors to monitor ammonia, NO<sub>x</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions on board and in port areas with automatic alerts for threshold breaches would be required.

6.19 After discussion, the Committee agreed to invite MEPC to consider documents MSC 110/6/1 and MSC 110/6/8, as appropriate.

6.20 With regard to document MSC 110/6/12, the Committee, having noted that it related to MSC.1/Circ.1621, recently approved by MSC 109, agreed not to reopen the discussion on the above-mentioned Interim Guidelines. The Committee also noted that the information provided could be considered in future, when experience has been gained from their implementation.

### **Onboard carbon capture system (OCCS)**

#### ***Hazard identification (HAZID) study***

6.21 The Committee noted document MSC 110/INF.19 (Republic of Korea), informing on a hazard identification (HAZID) study for the installation of onboard carbon capture systems (OCCS) on the containership **HMM Mongla**. The document reflects that, in the absence of international safety regulations for such systems, the study aimed to identify and to assess risks associated with OCCS operations and to develop appropriate safety measures.

***Generic safeguards and recommendations for amine-based OCCS***

6.22 The Committee noted document MSC 110/INF.27 (Netherlands, Kingdom of the), describing generic safeguards and recommendations for amine-based OCCS and informing that the EverLoNG project, a 3.5-year initiative, focused on demonstrating the use of amine-based OCCS on ships.

**Supercapacitor energy storage technology**

6.23 The Committee noted document MSC 110/INF.22 (China), presenting the latest application cases of supercapacitor energy storage technology as the application and advantages of supercapacitor energy storage technology in China's maritime sector, following its inclusion, as an alternative energy technology.

**Safety Management System for ammonia-fuelled ships**

6.24 The Committee noted document MSC 110/INF.28 (Singapore et al.), providing information and guidelines for developing and implementing a safety management system (SMS) for ammonia-fuelled ships and addressing the need for structured safety practices given the toxicity and corrosiveness of ammonia, and its limited operational experience in the maritime industry.

**Training measures for crew of hydrogen ships**

6.25 The Committee noted document MSC 110/INF.30 (ZESTAs), highlighting the importance of developing training measures for the crew of hydrogen ships and outlining ongoing efforts by various IMO bodies, including the Committee and the HTW and CCC Sub-Committees, to develop training provisions for seafarers operating ships using alternative fuels, specifically hydrogen. It also highlighted the need for specific training guidelines addressing the characteristics of hydrogen.

6.26 The Committee agreed to refer documents MSC 110/INF.19, MSC 110/INF.27, MSC 110/INF.28 and MSC 110/INF.30 to the Working Group on GHG Safety for information purposes and reference if appropriate.

### **Alternative fuels on gas carriers and "one ship, one code" policy**

6.27 The Committee recalled that CCC 10 had endorsed the principle that ships covered by the IGC Code, using liquefied gases as fuel, including liquefied gases not carried as cargo, were subject to the requirements of the IGC Code in lieu of the IGF Code (CCC 10/4, paragraph 19).

6.28 The Committee also recalled that MSC 95 had made a policy decision that the IGF Code should not apply to ships covered by the IGC Code, even when the ships covered by the IGC Code were using low-flashpoint fuels that were not cargo.

6.29 The Committee recalled further that MSC 109 had invited interested Member States and international organizations to submit proposals to MSC 110, with a view to finding regulatory solutions for using alternative fuels on gas carriers, taking into account the policy decision made at MSC 95.

6.30 In this regard, the Committee considered the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/6/2 (Republic of Korea), proposing a revision to the "one ship, one code" policy to address regulatory challenges faced by gas carriers using alternative low-flashpoint fuels - such as methanol, ammonia or hydrogen – as fuel rather than cargo;
- .2 MSC 110/INF.20 (Republic of Korea), challenging the "one ship, one code" policy when applied to dedicated CO<sub>2</sub> carriers using low-flashpoint fuels such as LNG, in dispute that it led to design inefficiencies and regulatory inconsistencies;
- .3 MSC 110/6/9 (SIGTTO), commenting and explaining why the Committee had established and had consistently applied the "one ship, one code" policy for more than a decade; and
- .4 MSC 110/16/1 (Belgium, Germany, Marshal Islands, SIGTTO, ICS and WSC), outlining a proposed regulatory approach for the safe use of alternative low-flashpoint fuels, such as LNG, LPG, ammonia, methanol and hydrogen, on gas carriers governed by the IGC Code.

6.31 During consideration, the Committee, having recalled that MSC 95 had made a policy decision on that the IGF Code should not apply to ships that are covered by the IGC Code, using dedicated low-flashpoint fuels, which are not vapour or boil-off gas, from their cargo, noted:

- .1 the importance of the term "that are not cargo", so that the plain reading of the relevant text could only mean "fuels that are not cargo" but are IGC Code products. Therefore, it could be implied that the "one ship, one code" policy decision meant to apply to fuels that are not IGC Code products;
- .2 SOLAS regulation II-1/56, paragraph 4 (existing and amendments) establishes an exclusion from the IGF Code for gas carriers, provided they meet the established criteria:
  - .1 the ship is using its cargo as fuel, and complies with the requirements of the IGC Code, while the fuel must be listed in the IGC Code; and
  - .2 using other low-flashpoint gaseous fuels, provided that the fuel storage and distribution system design and storage arrangements for such gaseous fuels complies with the requirements of the IGC Code for gas as cargo;
  - .3 regarding the applicability in SOLAS regulation II-1/56, the conclusion could be drawn that, since paragraph 4.2 allows for IGF Code compliance as an option to the ship, that paragraph does not, therefore, align with the "one ship, one code" policy;
  - .4 while the policy is named "one ship, one code", in reality, the discussion is about the application of the fuel system requirements to a ship covered by the IGC Code; and
  - .5 there may be some gaps that must be addressed to ensure that the appropriate requirements are applied to the fuel system of a ship covered by the IGC Code and ensure there is compatibility with the cargo requirements in the IGC Code.



6.32 During the discussions, the following views were expressed:

- .1 the proposed amendments to the IGC Code were developed, with the "one ship, one code" policy in mind, nevertheless, in certain cases, applying this principle may lead to complexities, such as the use of LNG fuel on an LCO<sub>2</sub> carrier;
- .2 prior to any decision to change the policy, a clear understanding of the risks would be necessary and any future change should be consistent, practical, and aligned with the realities of the ship design and operations in order to avoid compromising safety;
- .3 allowing the application of the IGC Code to the fuel system on gas carriers, when these systems are clearly segregated from the cargo systems, offers a more rational, risk-based and technically sound approach;
- .4 the "one ship, one code" approach sits with the safety concept that any substance in chapter 19 of the IGC Code has to be stored within the confines of the cargo space, be it as a cargo or for the purposes of being used as fuel;
- .5 in cases where gas carriers are equipped with completely segregated fuel systems, for alternative fuel not used as cargo, rigid adherence to the IGC Code may lead to regulatory inconsistency and, noting the increasing demand of alternative fuels, such as methanol, ammonia and hydrogen, a flexible risk-based regulatory approach would be convenient;
- .6 the importance of developing safety guidelines on IGF compatible fuel cell, tailored for gas carriers, was emphasized;
- .7 when liquefied gas is carried on a gas carrier, whether it is as cargo or as fuel, it does represent a risk that should be mitigated through the provisions of the IGC Code;
- .8 considerable work has been undertaken in the past to segregate conflicting elements within the IGC and IGF Codes, and the outcome resulted in the establishment of the IGF Code;

- .9 the IGC Code is a prescriptive code and, as such, mandates certain requirements considered safety critical for ships covered by the IGC Code. The introduction of the risk-based IGF Code into the IGC Code would diminish the standards applicable to ships covered by the IGC Code, which are inherently higher risk ships, owing to the cargoes they carry;
- .10 the IGF Code was developed on a goal-based approach using the goals of MSC.1/Circ.1394, as revised, and the IGC Code adopted a prescriptive approach;
- .11 design and the operation of ships, bunkering operations and training of crew are all matters to be taken into account when taking the decision;
- .12 the updating of these directives, depending on the type of ship, should be an IMO priority in order to ensure a safe rollout of these new fuels in the maritime industry, while bearing in mind that these ships are currently being built and some of them are in operation;
- .13 no matter what kind of alternative fuels the ships use or how their systems are designed, applying the IGC Code to all ships that carry or use gases does not properly reflect the technical and operational differences between cargo and fuel systems, and results in unnecessary regulatory burden;
- .14 relaxing the "one ship, one code" policy could introduce significant risks of regulatory confusion and inconsistent implementation across flag, coastal, and port States responsibilities that may complicate approval, survey, enforcement and oversight, as well as crew training and certification;
- .15 the existing text in SOLAS regulation II-1/56 does not support the intent of the relevant policy decision made at MSC 95, due to the fact that such text is an exclusion, and not an exemption; and
- .16 CCC 10 had noticed and had recognized that there was a problem in the regulation, and that it needed to be resolved by the Committee.

6.33 Following the discussion, the Committee considered the three options presented by the Chair in MSC 110/J/9, with a view to determining the most appropriate way forward and agreeing on a corresponding course of action regarding the policy. Each option included a proposed action related to amendments to SOLAS regulation II-1/56.4, and the IGC Code and a corresponding action concerning development of fuel-specific guidelines.

6.34 Having considered the comments received, the Committee noted the overwhelming support for options 1 to "Strictly apply the policy of one-ship one-code policy" and 3 to "Apply the policy of one-ship one-code" (MSC 110/J/9). However, given the closely balanced and divided preferences, and with a view to reaching a decision, the Committee suspended its consideration of the matter and instructed the Working Group on GHG Safety (see paragraph 6.48) to consider the above-mentioned two options and to determine important related pros and cons, in order to advise the Committee, for it to resume its consideration of the best way forward regarding the application of the "one ship, one code" policy. In this context, the Committee also agreed that, irrespective of the option chosen, amendments to the IGC Code will be required and corresponding fuel-specific guidelines will need to be developed.

6.35 In reviewing the outcome of the consideration by the Working Group on GHG Safety (MSC 110/J/9), the Committee noted the following elements of the Working Group's discussion:

- .1 several delegations had expressed the view that the title of option 3 "Apply the policy of one ship, one code" could be misleading, as this option only applies the policy to IGC products listed in chapter 19, and not to other fuels, such as hydrogen or methanol. Accordingly, they recommended that the title of option 3 be revised to reflect more accurately this scope and understanding;
- .2 regarding STCW training gaps, the majority of the Working Group was of the view that arguments, both pros and cons, should not be included in the table, based on the understanding that the HTW Sub-Committee, as the competent subsidiary body of the Committee, had already been tasked to address these gaps in the context of the safe use of alternative fuels and technologies;

- .3 the Working Group acknowledged that the STCW Convention was undergoing a comprehensive review and revision. Nonetheless, the majority of the Working Group agreed that factual considerations related to the STCW Convention, such as the potential need for dual crew training and certification, should be reflected in the table; and
- .4 the Group was unable to make a clear choice between the two options. Consequently, no recommendation could be provided to the Committee.

6.36 The Committee noted that, in order to address the issue, retained the following three applicable scenarios needed to be considered:

- .1 ships covered by the IGC Code using as fuel, a product listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code, currently being addressed by SOLAS regulation II-1/56.4.1 and the IGC Code agreed amendments;
- .2 ships covered by the IGC Code using as fuel, a product listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code not carried as cargo, being also addressed by SOLAS regulation II-1/56.4.1 and the IGC Code agreed amendments; and
- .3 ships covered by the IGC Code using as fuel a product that is not listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code ships using a fuel that is not an IGC Code fuel, not addressed through SOLAS regulations.

6.37 In this context, the Committee noted that addressing the third scenario would require merging requirements from both the IGC and IGF Codes to ensure the safety of the fuel system and the cargo. In addition, considering that, being still in the process of working with new fuels under this scenario, it would be necessary to address it through guidance in order to ensure flexibility.

6.38 The Committee, having considered the three scenarios and options, and the associated pros and cons, agreed to amend SOLAS regulation II-1/56, as follows:

- .1 amend paragraph 4.1 to specify that the IGF Code does not apply to ships covered by the IGC Code using products listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code; and

- .2 include a new paragraph to address the third scenario when ships covered by the IGC Code are using fuels not listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code, taking into account the available guidance developed by the Organization.

6.39 The Committee also noted that guidance is necessary to address the different fuels. In this context, the Committee also noted that a number of agreed interim guidelines for alternative fuels only apply to ships subject to the IGF Code, and not to those covered by the IGC Code, e.g. the interim guidelines for ammonia. These guidelines would, therefore, need to be revised, with two possible approaches to be considered by the CCC Sub-Committee: either by adding a new section, specific to ships covered by the IGC Code within the existing IGF Code-based guidelines; or by developing a separate, stand-alone guidance document, applicable solely to ships covered by the IGC Code. Subsequently, the Committee agreed that CCC should develop guidance applicable to ships subject to the IGC Code.

6.40 The Committee further noted that the timeline for this process would be progressive and dependent on the emergence of new fuels. However, considering the interim guidelines that have already been approved, these could serve as a basis for initiating adjustments applicable to the IGC Code. As new fuels may be introduced, specific guidance would need to be developed accordingly, making this an ongoing and interactive process. Consequently, the CCC Sub-Committee was instructed to amend its work plan to include the development of this new guidance, giving priority to the guidelines for ships covered by the IGC Code using as fuel that is not listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code, and to fuels for which interim guidelines have already been approved.

6.41 In this context, the Committee instructed the Drafting Group on Mandatory Instruments to prepare draft amendments to SOLAS regulation II-1/56.4, the relevant paragraphs of the IGC Code (paragraphs 1.1.1.1 and 2.1.4), along with any consequential amendments, as necessary. In this connection, the Committee recalled that relevant parts of the report of the Drafting Group and related actions had been considered under agenda item 3 (see paragraphs 3.63 and 3.64; MSC 110/WP.7, paragraphs 22 to 27, and annexes 16 and 17).

6.42 In this context, the Committee agreed that:

- .1 gas carriers using products listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code, as fuel, would be subject to the IGC Code requirements;

- .2 gas carriers using gaseous or low-flashpoint fuels other than products listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code, as fuel, would be subject simultaneously to relevant parts of the IGF Code and the IGC Code;
- .3 the aforementioned coexistence of application of both Codes should be addressed by means of guidelines to be developed by the Organization; and
- .4 as a consequence, the CCC Sub-Committee should develop two sets of guidelines: one concerning products listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code, used as fuel; and another concerning gaseous or low-flashpoint fuels other than products listed in chapter 19 of the IGC Code, used as fuel.

**Revision of the Code of Safety for Nuclear Merchant Ships (Nuclear Code) (resolution A.491(XII))**

6.43 The Committee noted that the report of the Correspondence Group on GHG Safety (MSC 110/6, paragraphs 34 to 36 and annex 1) provided specific recommendations related to nuclear power to address the safe use of new technologies in the context of decarbonization.

6.44 In this context, the Committee considered the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/6/11 (Russian Federation), commenting on the report of the Correspondence Group (MSC 110/6), in particular on matters related to the potential revision of the Nuclear Code, as recommended in the relevant section of, and the annex to, the report; and
- .2 MSC 110/6/4 (Republic of Korea et al.), supporting the revision of the 1981 Nuclear Code and proposing a high-priority revision of the outdated instrument under the existing output.

6.45 The Committee agreed that only those parts of document MSC 110/18/16 related to the revision of the Nuclear Code would be considered under this agenda item, while the matters of extending the application of the Nuclear Code to "non self-propelled nuclear floating power units", and amendments to SOLAS chapter VIII, would be discussed under agenda item 18.

6.46 During the discussion, the Committee noted the expression of the following views:

- .1 nuclear power has already been identified (MSC 110/6) as one of the options, among alternative fuels and new technologies, which could be used for decarbonization;
- .2 the Nuclear Code was considered considerably outdated and the gap between current technology and regulatory guidance needed urgent modernization of the Nuclear Code to adopt a goal-based and technology-neutral approach, while observing IAEA safety standards;
- .3 concerns about the use of the term "safeguards" (MSC 110/6) were raised, since the term seems to have different meanings for IMO and IAEA and in the context of engineering safety measures, versus non-proliferation controls, under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In order to avoid confusion and legal overreach, the Russian Federation recommended removing references to IAEA "safeguards" from IMO documents, suggesting alternative terminology such as "protection", and emphasized that matters related to IAEA safeguards should remain outside the scope of IMO's mandate. On the other hand, the United Kingdom and other delegations noted that, as IAEA instruments would apply to maritime applications of nuclear technologies, it would be appropriate to retain the word "safeguards" in the IAEA context. The delegation of France made a related intervention, the statement of which is set out in annex [...];
- .4 the delegation of Japan was of the opinion that in reviewing the Nuclear Code, operational experience of nuclear merchant ships should be accumulated to ensure an informed decision, and comprehensive security measures should be considered as ships were constantly exposed to risks of terrorism and piracy.; and
- .5 there may be aspects related to the use of nuclear power on board ships that fall within the purview of other IMO bodies. As appropriate, these bodies, such as the FAL Committee, the LEG Committee and the MEPC would need to be involved.

6.47 Following the discussion, the Committee noted general support for moving this matter forward, recalling that the Working Group on GHG Safety had an established process for prioritization, and, therefore, this matter would be considered within that framework.

6.48 In this context, the Committee agreed to refer this matter with documents MSC 110/6, MSC 110/6/11, MSC 110/6/4 and MSC 110/18/16 (related part only, see paragraph 6.44) to the Working Group on GHG Safety (see paragraph 6.48).

#### **ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON GHG SAFETY**

6.49 The Committee agreed to establish the Working Group on Development of a safety regulatory framework to support the reduction of GHG emissions from ships using new technologies and alternative fuels (Working Group on GHG Safety), taking into account the comments made, and decisions taken, in plenary, and instructed it to:

- .1 taking into consideration annex 1 of document MSC 110/6 and the relevant comments contained in documents MSC 110/6/3, MSC 110/6/5, MSC 110/INF.19, MSC 110/INF.27, MSC 110/INF.28 and MSC 110/INF.30 update the list of recommendations to address existing barriers and gaps related to alternative fuels and new technologies;
- .2 based on document MSC 109/WP.9, progress on the development of recommendations to address the 14 additional gaps identified by MSC 109 in the areas of hydrothermal liquefaction (HTL) fuel, pyrolysis fuel, Fischer-Tropsch (FT) diesel, and swappable traction lithium-ion battery containers;
- .3 based on the 32 recommendations provided in annex 1 of document MSC 110/6, and taking into account the criteria for the assignment of work to sub-committees (MSC 109/ WP.9/Add.1), develop a list of priorities to be used as a guide to instruct the appropriate sub-committees to initiate work on specific identified alternative fuels or new technologies;
- .4 considering documents MSC 110/6 (specifically paragraphs 34 to 36 and annex 1), MSC 110/6/11, MSC 110/6/4 and MSC 110/18/16 (relevant sections pertaining to nuclear propulsion), prepare draft clear instructions for sub-committees to initiate the revision of SOLAS chapter VIII, in conjunction with the Nuclear Code (resolution A.491(XII));



- .5 discuss as necessary the work plan for development of a safety regulatory framework to support the reduction of GHG emissions from ships using new technologies and alternative fuels based on document MSC 109/WP.9/Add1;
- .6 consider the need to establish a correspondence group and, if deemed necessary, prepare draft terms of reference accordingly; and
- .7 submit a written report by Thursday, 26 June 2025.

#### **REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON GHG SAFETY**

6.50 Having considered the report of the Working Group on GHG Safety (MSC 110/WP.9), the Committee approved it in general and took action as described hereunder.

#### **MSC.1/Circ.1621 on Interim guidelines for the safety of ships using methyl/ethyl alcohol as fuel**

6.51 The Committee agreed to refer document MSC 110/6/7 (Brazil and IBIA) to the CCC Sub-Committee for consideration when developing amendments to the *Interim guidelines for the safety of ships using methyl/ethyl alcohol as fuel to address gap G-3 under the category methyl/ethyl alcohol fuels (MSC.1/Circ.1621)*.

#### **List of recommendations to address existing barriers and gaps related to alternative fuels and new technologies**

6.52 The Committee endorsed the recommendations on addressing existing barriers and gaps related to alternative fuels and new technologies (MSC 110/WP.9, annex 1). In this context, the Committee noted that the above-mentioned recommendations contained separate instructions for sub-committees, as well as information to be provided to other Committees and other organizations.

#### ***Assignment to sub-committees***

6.53 While considering instructions to be referred to specific sub-committees (MSC 110/WP.9, annexes 3 to 5), the Committee agreed to give them flexibility on how to arrange and organize their work, taking into account their workload.

6.54 The Committee also agreed that, by referring the tasks to sub-committees, the output on "Development of a safety regulatory framework to support the reduction of GHG emissions

from ships using new technologies and alternative fuels" would be included in the agendas of those sub-committees, which have already been identified, as well as in the agendas of any other sub-committees, which may also be tasked in the future.

6.55 The Committee, having noted that the recommended tasks need to be considered by the sub-committees according to the Committees' method of work when defining the scope of relevant outputs, instructed the sub-committees to develop a holistic work plan to assess the gaps and barriers, and to identify the instruments that may need to be amended, with a view to reporting back to the Committee in order to seek relevant instructions prior to the development of such amendments.

***Instructions to the Sub-Committee on Carriage of Cargoes and Containers (CCC)***

6.56 The Committee agreed to the proposed instructions to the CCC Sub-Committee (MSC 110/WP.9, paragraphs 19 to 22, and annex 3).

***Instructions to the Sub-Committee on Ship Systems and Equipment (SSE)***

6.57 The Committee agreed to the proposed instructions to the SSE Sub-Committee (MSC 110/WP.9, paragraphs 23 to 25, and annex 4).

***Instructions to the Sub-Committee on Ship Design and Construction (SDC)***

6.58 The Committee agreed to the proposed instructions to the SDC Sub-Committee (MSC 110/WP.9, paragraphs 26 and 27, and annex 5).

***Information to the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC), the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) and the Sub-Committee on Pollution Prevention and Response (PPR)***

6.59 The Committee agreed to bring to the attention of the MEPC and the PPR Sub-Committee the information on Barrier B-1 regarding Fatty-acid methyl ester (FAME) (MSC 110/WP.9, annex 2).

6.60 The Committee agreed to inform ISO about existing gaps related to Hydrothermal Liquefaction (HTL) fuel, Pyrolysis fuel, Fischer-Tropsch (FT) diesel, and Ammonia, within the framework of "ISO/TC 8 on Ships and Marine Technology" (MSC 110/WP.9, annex 6).

### **Code of safety for nuclear merchant ships**

6.61 The Committee noted the deliberations of the Group in addressing matters related to the Code of safety for nuclear merchant ships (MSC 110/WP.9, paragraph 35, and annexes 1 and 5).

### **Work plan update for the GHG Safety Working Group**

6.62 The Committee noted the deliberations regarding the work plan of the Group, if established (MSC 110/WP.9, paragraphs 36 and 37).

### **List of information documents on GHG matters**

6.63 The Committee endorsed the decision of the Group to compile a list of those information documents that could be useful for reference purposes (MSC 110/WP.9, paragraphs 38 and 39, and annex 8)

### **Establishment of a correspondence group**

6.64 The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the Group not to establish a correspondence group at this session.

## **7 REVISION OF THE GUIDELINES ON MARITIME CYBER RISK MANAGEMENT (MSC-FAL.1/CIRC.3/REV.2) AND IDENTIFICATION OF NEXT STEPS TO ENHANCE MARITIME CYBERSECURITY**

7.1 The Committee recalled that MSC 108 and FAL 49 had approved the draft revised *Guidelines on maritime cyber risk management* (MSC-FAL.1/Circ.3/Rev.3), which were issued on 4 April 2025.

7.2 The Committee also recalled that MSC 109 had agreed to extend the target completion date of this output "Revision of the Guidelines on maritime cyber risk management (MSC-FAL.1/Circ.3/Rev.2) and identification of next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity" to 2026, and invited Member States and international organizations to submit proposals on the next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity for consideration.

**Proposal for next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity**

7.3 The Committee considered the following documents MSC 110/7 (Canada et al.) and MSC 110/7/2 (United States):

- .1 MSC 110/7, proposing the development of goal-based Maritime Digital-Ecosystem Cybersecurity Standards based on the proposed framework in the annex to the document, and inviting Member States to submit guidance to the Secretariat to support adherence to globally agreed standards; and
- .2 MSC 110/7/2, proposing an approach to identify the next steps for enhancing maritime cybersecurity, including suggested terms of reference for a working group at MSC 110, as shown in the annex to the document.

7.4 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 consideration of maritime cybersecurity standards should take into account the work of the FAL Committee on maritime digitalization;
- .2 there was support from some delegations for the proposed framework of Maritime Digital-Ecosystem Cybersecurity Standards in the annex to document MSC 110/7 (Canada et al.) and for the establishment of a working group on maritime cybersecurity as proposed in document MSC 110/7/2 (United States);
- .3 consideration could be given to the expansion of the ISM and ISPS Codes to include maritime cybersecurity, a new stand-alone maritime cybersecurity code or a new chapter of the SOLAS Convention;
- .4 maritime cybersecurity standards would support Member States in developing national maritime cybersecurity frameworks;
- .5 national flexibility in the implementation of maritime cybersecurity standards was highlighted, and the importance of technical assistance; and

- .6 increasing maritime digitization meant the need for maritime cybersecurity standards was both essential and urgent.

7.5 Several delegations expressed the view that maritime cybersecurity standards should initially be voluntary and allow for an experience-building phase with a subsequent transition to a mandatory framework, which would allow the maritime industry to gradually adapt and increase capacity.

7.6 The Committee considered document MSC 110/7/3 (Türkiye), which proposed the establishment of a review and course developer group for the development of a new IMO model course on specialized cybersecurity training.

7.7 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 the rapid evolution of maritime cybersecurity threats, the revised *Guidelines on maritime cyber risk management* (MSC-FAL.1/Circ.3/Rev.3) and standards such as ISO 27001 all supported the need for a specialized, stand-alone model course on maritime cybersecurity as it required highly specialized expertise which differed from the physical security focus of the ISPS Code;
- .2 a training needs analysis was required, as well as clarity on what the new model course was intended to achieve, and any training should be practical and not just involve guidance material;
- .3 there was no need to await any revision involving maritime cybersecurity in the STCW Convention, but the development of such a model course should await the finalization of maritime cybersecurity standards; and
- .4 consideration should be given to whether the requirement to undertake a cybersecurity course and any subsequent certification would be a prerequisite to employment in certain roles in the maritime industry.

7.8 The delegation of Türkiye stated that the early development of a stand-alone, specialized model course on maritime cybersecurity could help the development of maritime cybersecurity standards, that the revised *Guidelines on maritime cyber risk management*

(MSC-FAL.1/Circ.3/Rev.3) provided a sufficient basis to begin the development of such a course, and that a proactive regulatory agenda to avoid further delay was an important consideration.

7.9 Following discussion, the Committee agreed that it was premature to develop such maritime security training at this time.

7.10 The Committee considered document MSC 110/7/1 (IAPH), which informed the Committee of new Cyber Resilience Guidelines for Emerging Technologies in the Maritime Supply Chain containing key considerations, best practices and regulatory recommendations. In the ensuing discussion, there was support from several delegations to refer the IAPH Cyber Resilience Guidelines for Emerging Technologies to the Working Group to assist with its work.

7.11 Following the discussion, the Committee:

- .1 noted the IAPH Cyber Resilience Guidelines for Emerging Technologies in the Maritime Supply Chain;
- .2 instructed the Secretariat to disseminate the Guidelines once published; and
- .3 referred document MSC 110/7/1 (IAPH) to the Working Group to assist it with its work.

7.12 Following consideration, the Committee decided to establish the Working Group on Maritime Security to develop the approach on the next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity, based on documents MSC 110/7, MSC 110/7/1 and MSC 110/7/2.

### **Establishment of the Working Group on Maritime Security**

7.13 In order to advance the work on the next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity, the Committee:

- .1 established the Working Group on Maritime Security and instructed it, based on documents MSC 110/7, MSC 110/7/1 and MSC 110/7/2, taking into account comments and decisions made in plenary, to:

- .1 develop the approach on the next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity, i.e. risk-based/goal-based/prescriptive;
- .2 consider if cybersecurity requirements should be made mandatory or voluntary and consider the IMO instrument that would be the most appropriate mechanism for implementing any new requirements;
- .3 consider whether any interim measures are required taking into account existing guidance to enhance maritime cybersecurity while associated requirements are under development;
- .4 develop terms of reference for a correspondence group; and
- .5 submit a written report by Wednesday, 25 June 2025.

### **Report of the Working Group**

7.14 The Committee approved the report in general and:

- .1 noted the Group's discussion on mandatory or voluntary cybersecurity requirements and the mechanism for implementing any new requirements;
- .2 endorsed the Group's conclusion that a non-mandatory cybersecurity Code should be developed and that interested Member States and international organizations are invited to submit proposals on a new output in this regard to MSC 111;
- .3 noted the Group's conclusion that any cybersecurity requirements should be goal-based and include risk management, as opposed to being prescriptive in nature;
- .4 agreed that the establishment of a correspondence group at this stage would not be needed; and
- .5 agreed that the output "Revision of the Guidelines on maritime cyber risk management (MSC-FAL.1/Circ.3/Rev.2) and identification of next steps to enhance maritime cybersecurity" was closed.

## **8 MEASURES TO ENHANCE MARITIME SECURITY**

### **Updates on developments related to maritime security**

8.1 The Committee considered document MSC 110/8 (Secretariat), reporting on developments related to maritime security since MSC 109, and noted in particular the following:

- .1 information on the delivery of maritime security-related activities as part of IMO's Integrated Technical Cooperation Programme (ITCP), including regarding two EU-funded port security projects currently being implemented by the Secretariat;
- .2 agreement by FAL 49 to include API as a new declaration in the FAL Convention, including a transition period to provide flexibility to Member States and industry to adapt their systems, before API declaration replaces the existing Crew List and Passenger List declarations, and to the establishment of the Correspondence Group on Amendments to the Annex of the FAL Convention on API and BRI; and
- .3 ongoing Secretariat support to the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Coordination Compact, including delivery of the maritime and port security elements of the comprehensive visits of the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee, and support to UNOCT workshops on vulnerable target protection.

8.2 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted appreciation to the IMO Secretariat for its efforts in supporting Member States in the implementation of IMO maritime security instruments, and thanked all donors for their generous contributions to IMO maritime security capacity-building initiatives and emphasized the importance of ensuring inclusion of all relevant parties;

8.3 The delegation of Ukraine reiterated that maritime security remains a critical aspect of all IMO comprehensive actions. The delegation regrets that certain Member States continue to flout these principles, noting that this was now the 18th MSC session since the Russian Federation's illegal occupation and attempted annexation of Crimea. Since 2014, the Russian Federation's actions in the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov have aimed to create a grey zone



for international maritime law, marked by the unlawful seizure of Ukrainian offshore drilling platforms and government vessels, in violation of the SUA Convention and Protocol as well as breaches of port facilities security plans, forcing Ukraine to cease operations and close ports indefinitely. The delegation of Ukraine stated that following the full-scale invasion on February 2022, and as highlighted in resolution A.1183(33), the Russian Federation has adopted essentially terrorist tactics, targeting Ukrainian port infrastructure and foreign-flagged vessels at Ukraine's ports. The use of cruise and ballistic missiles and unmanned aerial combat vehicles has escalated dramatically, and on 23 May 2025, an Iskander ballistic missile killed a Ukrainian port worker during routine container handling activity. Ukraine called for an urgent and substantial review of maritime security regulations, such as the one made following the 9/11 attacks, with the introduction of the ISPS Code, and reserved the right to submit proposals to the next MSC meeting. They further condemned the Russian Federation's outright terror against Ukraine's civilian population, including the 17 June 2025 missile strike on Kyiv that killed 28 civilians and injured 140, asserting that collective international action is essential to safeguard maritime workers, maintain critical supply chains, and achieve a just and lasting peace in Ukraine. The full text of the statement made by the delegation of Ukraine is set out in annex [...].

8.4 On behalf of the Member States of the European Union (EU) and European Commission (EC), the delegation of Poland highlighted that the Russian Federation's war of aggression against Ukraine, has led to alarming violations of maritime security norms, threatening navigation safety, port infrastructure and the well-being of seafarers. They stressed that the attacks undermine international safety regulations and regional stability, and that the ongoing disruptions of operations in the Black Sea underscore the need for strict adherence to IMO maritime security framework. The delegation of Poland reiterated that all states must comply with international regulations and ensure the safety of seafarers. And finally, Poland emphasized that the EU stands in full solidarity with Ukraine and supports all efforts to strengthen maritime security and uphold international law. The full text of the statement by the delegation of Poland is set out in annex [...].

8.5 Some delegations expressed support to the statements made by the delegation of Ukraine and Poland. The full text of statements made by the delegations of the United Kingdom, Poland and Estonia are set out in annex [...].

8.6 The delegation of the Russian Federation stated that the political statements go far beyond the scope of document MSC 110/8 (Secretariat) and reserved the right to respond under agenda item 2, as requested by the Chair.

8.7 Under the general statements on agenda item 2, the delegation of the Russian Federation reiterated its aim was not to initiate a discussion but to respond solely to the statements made under agenda item 8. The delegation stressed that once again, the Committee was witnessing the presentation of false information and manipulation of facts by those delegations that have spoken on this issue, first and foremost, the delegation of Ukraine. The delegation of the Russian Federation reiterated that in contrast to the Ukrainian Armed Forces, which have deliberately targeted Russian civilian areas and persons, the Russian Federation's Armed Forces do not target civilian infrastructure in Ukraine, but solely military infrastructure and military-industrial facilities. The delegation of the Russian Federation also expressed concern over Western countries supplying weapons to Ukraine under the guise of civilian shipments, which in turn renders such transport and port facilities legitimate military targets for attacks. Furthermore, they underscored, as on previous occasions, the responsibility of ship owners using commercial vessels for the transport of military supplies and putting seafarers at risk. Lastly, the delegation of the Russian Federation reiterated its views that IMO Assembly resolution A.1183 (33) is the weakest resolution ever adopted by the Organization. The full statement of the delegation of the Russian Federation is set out in annex [...].

8.8 In response to the statement made by the delegation of the Russian Federation, the delegation of Ukraine rejected the continuous attempt made by the delegation of the Russian Federation to manipulate facts and deflect responsibility for their own violations of international law. The delegation of Ukraine emphasized that its intervention under agenda item 8 on measures to enhance maritime security, was both directly relevant and necessary, given the Russian Federation's continued attacks on maritime infrastructure, shipping and freedom of navigation in the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, putting the life of seafarers under threat. The Ukrainian delegation noted that the session was attended by Ukrainian senior representatives and experts with direct experience of Russia's maritime aggression, providing the Committee with a valuable opportunity to hear first-hand accounts from those on the front lines. The delegation of Ukraine rejected the Russian Federation's accusation of politicization and reiterated that resolution A.1183 (33) is fully in line with the organization's mandate. The delegation further condemned Russia's ongoing aggression, reiterating that attacks on civilian vessels and port infrastructure constitute war crimes, and rejected allegations that

humanitarian shipments were used to transport weapons. The Ukrainian delegation reported that during the Committee session, the Russian Federation had carried out multiple attacks on civilian targets in Kyiv, Dnipro, and Odessa, resulting in significant civilian casualties in non-combat areas. The full statement of the delegation of Ukraine is set out in annex [...].

8.9 In response to the statement made by the delegation of Ukraine, the delegation of the Russian Federation referred to its previous statement and requested that it be reflected in the report.

8.10 The Committee received updates from the delegations of El Salvador, the United Republic of Tanzania and Nigeria on their efforts to enhance maritime security, support regional maritime security institutions such as the Djibouti and the Yaoundé Code of Conduct, and capacity-building initiatives in partnership with IMO and other relevant stakeholders. The full text of statements made by the delegations of the United Republic of Tanzania and Nigeria are set out in annex [...].

8.11 The Committee also received an update from the delegation of Portugal on the role of the Atlantic Centre in fostering collaboration and advancing maritime security, as recognized in UNSC resolution 2643 (2022) and the Declaration on Atlantic Cooperation. The delegation of Portugal highlighted the growing complexity of maritime security threats, including piracy, illicit trafficking, attacks on commercial vessels, illegal fishing, and the impacts of climate change, emphasizing that international law, particularly UNCLOS, must underpin collective responses. The delegation stressed the importance of a holistic, cooperative approach and tailored capacity-building. The full statement of the delegation of Portugal is set out in annex [...].

8.12 The delegation of Nigeria announced a contribution of USD 5,000 to the International Maritime Security Trust Fund (IMST), which was welcomed by the Committee.

8.13 The delegation of the European Commission also announced that the European Union and IMO had just signed a new agreement for a Crisis Response Project for the Red Sea and Western Indian Ocean as part of a follow up to the Djibouti Code of Conduct eight points Action Plan. With a total budget of 4 million euros, the project will directly support the Djibouti Code of Conduct, focusing on strengthening its Information-Sharing Network, including through enhanced use of the IORIS platform. It will also provide operational support to the Coast Guards of Yemen and Djibouti. The Committee noted the information with appreciation.

8.14 Following the discussion, the Committee encouraged SOLAS Contracting Governments to:

- .1 review and update the information contained in the Maritime Security Module of GISIS, in particular that related to port facility security plans;
- .2 consider using the option for electronic transfer of information into and from the Maritime Security Module so as to reduce the administrative burden on the nominated national point(s) of contact;
- .3 continue to effectively implement IMO security measures, including the provisions of SOLAS chapter XI-2 and the ISPS Code, taking into account new and emerging security threats, and to request IMO's technical assistance, as appropriate; and
- .4 consider donating to the International Maritime Security Trust (IMST) Fund to support the updates being made by the Secretariat to the global Programme for the Enhancement of Maritime Security, and the continued delivery of global maritime security technical assistance.

#### **Promoting the use and expansion of international maritime information-sharing centres**

8.15 The Committee considered and noted document MSC 110/8/2 (Peru), which informed the Committee about the work of the Information Fusion Centre – Latin American Region (IFC-LATAM), including its mandate, its role as an information hub in the region, and countries with which it had been in collaboration including liaison officers posted to the centre. The delegation of Peru added that the purpose of the document was to pursue coordination at multinational and regional levels. It has a strategy of relying on a functional and interoperable specialized system for the gathering, analysis, collection and dissemination of relevant data in a timely manner to contribute to effective decision-making in the area of maritime security.

8.16 The Committee considered document MSC 110/8/1 (Ecuador et al.), informing the Committee of the importance of international maritime information-sharing centres, which allow for anticipating, preventing, and effectively coordinating efforts in the event of incidents and threats, and invited the Committee, inter alia, to adopt the draft resolution in the annex, which promoted the use of international maritime information-sharing centres to enhance maritime safety and security, and to assist in the fight against organized crime threats in the sector.

8.17 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee, generally supported the proposal to adopt a resolution:

- .1 acknowledged that the expansion of maritime information-sharing centres is essential in strengthening global and regional maritime security and that there must be clarity on the data sharing framework and integration of the emerging technologies and best practices;
- .2 noted that issues with data privacy must be addressed;
- .3 recognized the benefits of international cooperation in the area of safety and security to prevent illicit activities at sea, and protect the coastal marine environment, in line with the objectives set forth in IMO's Strategic Plan;
4. acknowledged that current maritime threats highlight the importance of establishing cooperative and collaborative measures at international level so they can be addressed effectively;
- .5 noted that the international centres for information-sharing, where the collection, analysis and distribution of the data take place, have a key role to play in global maritime security; and
- .6 recognized that, while the centres represent practical tools to enhance maritime security, significant gaps remain, especially in terms of interoperability, data integration, and timely dissemination across the regions.

8.18 The Secretary-General expressed appreciation to the co-sponsors and wished to highlight a few points to be considered by the Committee. He noted that, while the draft refers to the information-sharing centres, there is no IMO instrument that regulates these centres. IMO's support to these centres is provided through the regional organizations or agreements such as the Djibouti Code of Conduct and the Yaoundé Code of Conduct, which are not IMO instruments. Regarding the exchange of information and training, he highlighted that such activities are already undertaken through ongoing maritime security projects. Therefore, the Secretary-General advised that, should the Working Group be convened to consider the draft resolution contained in document MSC 110/8/1, discussions should remain within the scope

of IMO's mandate and the relevant agenda item on maritime security. He also pointed out that the proposal to report to the Assembly, as set out in operative paragraph 6 of the draft, would be problematic, as there is currently no mechanism or instrument within IMO to facilitate such reporting. The Secretary-General concluded by reaffirming IMO's continued support for these activities through its established technical cooperation framework.

8.19 The delegation of the United Arab Emirates noted that the content of the draft resolution could extend beyond the scope of the Organization's mandate, and therefore a resolution might not be the most appropriate vehicle. A circular could be a more suitable alternative, which the Working Group may wish to consider.

8.20 Subsequently, the Committee agreed to instruct the Cybersecurity and Maritime Security Working Group, established under agenda item 7, to consider and finalize the proposed draft resolution in document MSC 110/8/1 on "Promoting the use of International Maritime Information-Sharing Centres to enhance maritime security and to assist in the fight against organized crime threats in the sector", and advise the Committee on the type of instrument to be used, i.e. circular or resolution.

#### **Call for funding to sustain YARIS strengthening maritime safety and security in the Gulf of Guinea**

8.21 The Committee noted with appreciation the information contained in document MSC 110/INF.31 (Austria et al.), providing an overview of the YARIS platform, its contribution to maritime safety and security in the Gulf of Guinea, and the urgent need for sustainable funding to ensure its continued operation and transition to full regional ownership and management.

#### **Report of the Working Group**

8.22 Having considered the report of the Working Group (MSC 110/WP.10, paragraph 22.5 and the annex), the observer from OCIMF suggested that the term "risk" in the preambular paragraph 6 of the draft MSC resolution should be replaced with "threat" as this was the correct terminology in keeping with standard practice for maritime information-sharing centres, which was supported by many delegations.

8.23 The Committee agreed to replace the word "risk" with "threat" in the preambular paragraph 6 of the draft MSC resolution.

8.24 The Committee approved the report in general and:

- .1 adopted the draft MSC resolution on the *Encouragement of maritime information-sharing through the use of national and regional maritime information-sharing centres to enhance maritime safety and security*, as set out in the annex to document MSC 110/WP.10 as amended (see paragraph 8.23), as set out in annex [...]; and
- .2 authorized the Secretariat to effect any minor editorial corrections that may be required.

## **9 PIRACY AND ARMED ROBBERY AGAINST SHIPS**

### **Developments since MSC 109**

9.1 The Committee considered document MSC 110/9 (Secretariat) reporting on developments concerning piracy and armed robbery against ships since MSC 109, including relevant statistics and updates on the implementation of the Djibouti Code of Conduct (DCoC) and the Yaoundé Code of Conduct (YCoC), and noted in particular:

- .1 146 incidents of piracy and armed robbery against ships were reported to the Organization as having occurred or been attempted in 2024, constituting a decrease of approximately 3% at the global level compared to 2023. The areas most affected during 2024 were the Straits of Malacca and Singapore (91), Indian Ocean (19) and West Africa (17). The number of incidents in the Gulf of Guinea (West Africa) decreased in 2024 by 5 compared to 2023, constituting a decrease of approximately 23%;
- .2 in relation to the implementation of the DCoC, the region, with the support of the Secretariat, held a donor meeting at IMO Headquarters in October 2024, renewing commitments from both the Organization and Friends of the DCoC to step up efforts in strengthening maritime security in the Western Indian Ocean and the Gulf of Aden; and held the seventh high-level meeting on the implementation of the DCoC/JA in Tanzania in November 2024, which agreed to establish Working Group 3 on Operational Cooperation and Coordination at Sea which aims to harness the capabilities of national, regional, and international naval forces and develop collaborative operational

mechanisms to address threats to the safety and security of navigation in the region;

- .3 in relation to initiatives in the Gulf of Guinea, the Secretariat remains fully engaged in providing assistance to the region including, inter alia, delivery of workshops to assist the development of national maritime security strategies that leverage the support of regional and international partners; enhanced communication at the Multinational Maritime Coordination Centres (MMCCs) in YCoC Zone D and Zone F; and, under the Germany-funded "Boosting African Implementation of the YCoC" (BAY) project, the organization in close collaboration with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR), the Atlantic Centre, and the German Federal Foreign Office, of the international conference "Maritime Security 2024: innovations and partnerships for the future", held in Cabo Verde in October 2024, which brought together key stakeholders to address pressing global and regional maritime security issues; and
- .4 IMO signed an agreement in December 2024 with the European Union (EU) under which IMO became an implementing partner of the three-year EU-funded (2025-2027) project "Safe Seas for Africa", which aims to enhance maritime security and safety in Africa, particularly in the Gulf of Guinea (€2 million) and the Western Indian Ocean (€1 million), by addressing the root causes of insecurity at sea and strengthening regional cooperation.

9.2 In the ensuing discussion the following views, inter alia, were expressed:

- .1 considerable efforts were being made by many States to eradicate piracy and armed robbery in their waters, but the increased number of attacks in the Straits of Malacca and Singapore was of considerable concern. Whilst recognition was given to the efforts made by the littoral states, the effect on seafarers could not be underestimated;
- .2 the majority of the incidents taking place in the Straits of Malacca and Singapore were robbery and theft, where perpetrators did not harm the crew and escaped upon being sighted, but this, nonetheless, cannot be ignored,



and littoral states have been urged to increase coordinated patrols and create sufficient deterrence;

- .3 recommendations to consider a clear distinction between incidents occurring in the Malacca Strait and those in the Singapore Strait were made, given their differing operational responsibilities and enforcement regimes. Sustained maritime patrols, coordinated enforcement efforts, and ongoing collaboration to enhance maritime domain awareness were also emphasized. The need for continued cooperation among littoral States, as well as support for regional information-sharing initiatives through ReCAAP and the Information Fusion Centre hosted by the Republic of Singapore's Navy, was also underlined;
- .4 information of an interactive dashboard launched by ReCAAP-ISC which enables the shipping industry to gather key insights and correlations of past and present incidents, enabling suitable preventive measures. ReCAAP-ISC has also launched a mobile app, which facilitates quick reporting of incidents to the Maritime Rescue Coordination Centres (MRCC) and focal points with 24-7 access. The platform will enable law enforcement agencies to respond promptly to reports of piracy and armed robbery and theft;
- .5 some of the data in IMO GISIS reports had not been cross-verified with the littoral States and certain incidents reported did not meet the definitions of piracy and armed robbery under international instruments, raising concerns about the accuracy and effectiveness of response. It was suggested that closer consultation with relevant coastal States would help to improve the clarity, consistency and reliability of reporting;
- .6 the report of the 23% decrease in incidents in the Gulf of Guinea in 2024 was a testament to the effectiveness of the Yaoundé Code of Conduct framework and increasing synergies between regional and international partners;
- .7 the support for IMO's whole-of-government approach to maritime security, particularly the development of a national maritime security coordinated strategy, was welcomed;

- .8 the importance of the implementation of the Djibouti Code of Conduct and Yaoundé Code of Conduct and the growing role of the regional mechanisms to enhance coordination were recognized;
- .9 efforts undertaken to address maritime security incidents included regular engagements with the shipping community, the issuance of advisories, the promotion of best management practices, and law enforcement actions within jurisdictions;
- .10 information by the delegation of Saudi Arabia regarding their role in the facilitation of DCoC and the training provided to 318 individuals from 37 Member States in matters relating to vital maritime security functions; and
- .11 information provided by the delegation of Somalia on its efforts to enhance maritime security through international cooperation, including the Djibouti Code of Conduct, EU-supported search and rescue capabilities, and effective use of regional information-sharing platforms.

9.3 The full statements of the delegations of Indonesia, Malaysia and ReCAAP-ISC are in annex [...].

9.4 Speaking as Chair of the Djibouti Code of Conduct/Jeddah Amendments, the delegation of South Africa expressed appreciation to IMO and specifically to the Secretary-General for his strong leadership and support, as well as to the European Union for its continued assistance through the Safe Seas for Africa and the Crisis Response Project. The delegation highlighted ongoing efforts to strengthen regional maritime security, including the establishment of the DCoC Working Group to enhance operational cooperation and coordination at sea, supported by Denmark and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and aligned closely with the African Union's maritime security initiatives. The delegation of South Africa reaffirmed its commitment to ensure that the DCoC delivers practical results for evolving regional threats. The delegation also welcomed continued collaboration with all partners and noted the upcoming high-level DCoC meeting scheduled for 4-6 November 2025, tentatively in Mauritius.

9.5 The delegation of OCIMF, on behalf of ICS, BIMCO, INTERCARGO, INTERTANKO and IMCA, informed the Committee that a new consolidated version of the Best Management

Practices (BMP) for Maritime Security had been issued in April, replacing the previous Global BMP, BMP5, and BMP West Africa. The new interactive BMP is supported by 49 stakeholders and is supplemented by Maritime Industry Threat Overviews (MISTOs), providing current information on global threats. The delegation of OCIMF requested that MSC.1/Circ.1601 be revised to reflect the updated BMP.

9.6 The delegation of the United Arab Emirates expressed concerns over the lack of a document from the industry group containing the new updated BMP at this session, as delegations had not had an opportunity to provide comments. They noted that some delegations had expressed comments and concerns over previous updates of BMP and the High Risk Area, and emphasized the importance of submitting documents in accordance with the Committees' method of work and that the lack of documents at this session should not set a precedent.

9.7 Following the discussion, the Committee:

- .1 requested Member States to report incidents of piracy and armed robbery to the Secretariat ([marsec@imo.org](mailto:marsec@imo.org)), using the reporting form in appendix 5 of MSC.1/Circ.1333/Rev.1 (*Recommendations to Governments for preventing and suppressing piracy and armed robbery against ships*);
- .2 requested Member States to complete and keep updated the *Questionnaire on information on port and coastal State requirements related to privately contracted armed security personnel on board ships (PCASP)* (MSC-FAL.1/Circ.2), to be sent to the Secretariat ([marsec@imo.org](mailto:marsec@imo.org)) for posting on the IMO website;
- .3 noted the efforts undertaken to ensure continued implementation of the DCoC and encouraged Member States to consider making financial contributions to the DCoC Trust Fund;
- .4 called upon Member States, in line with resolution A.1159(32) (*Prevention and suppression of piracy, armed robbery against ships and illicit maritime activity in the Gulf of Guinea*), in cooperation with the Organization and as may be requested by the Member States of the region, to assist YCoC

implementation efforts in the Gulf of Guinea and to consider making financial contributions to the West and Central Africa Trust Fund;

- .5 agreed with the request of the delegation of OCIMF, on behalf of ICS, BIMCO, INTERCARGO, INTERTANKO and IMCA, to request the Secretariat to revise MSC.1/Circ.1601 to reflect the updated BMP;and
- .6 encouraged the industry group to take into account any comments that Member States might have on the updated BMP and to address these directly with the Member States concerned.

9.8 The delegation of the Netherlands informed the Committee of a recent incident involving the **MV ORANGE FROST**, a refrigerated cargo ship under the flag of Curaçao, which was attacked on 30 May approximately 220 nautical miles west-southwest of Port Harcourt, Nigeria. The Nigerian Navy's prompt response led to the pirates abandoning the ship and allowing 16 crew members to be rescued and the ship to proceed to a safe port. However, one crew member, of Russian nationality, was injured and taken hostage. The delegation expressed appreciation to the Government of Nigeria for its swift assistance and noted that the conditions and whereabouts of the crew member taken hostage remained unknown. The full statement of the delegation of the Netherlands is in annex [...].

#### **Nigeria's continued efforts to combat piracy and armed robbery in the Gulf of Guinea**

9.8 The Committee considered document MSC 110/9/1 (Nigeria), commenting on document MSC 110/9 and providing information on Nigeria's continued efforts to combat piracy and armed robbery in the Gulf of Guinea. In particular, the Committee noted Nigeria's comprehensive and ongoing efforts to address piracy and armed robbery in the Gulf of Guinea, acknowledging the continued need for vigilance and support and encouraged expanded joint training, the Combined Maritime Task Force (CMTF) for the Gulf of Guinea, regional task force development, and sustained international engagement in the region.

#### **Progress report by ReCAAP-ISC**

9.9 The Committee noted, with appreciation, the information contained in document MSC 110/INF.8 (ReCAAP-ISC), providing an update on the activities carried out by the Regional Cooperation Agreement on Combating Piracy and Armed Robbery against Ships in Asia – Information Sharing Centre (ReCAAP-ISC) and the situation of piracy and armed

robbery against ships in Asia, and thanked them for their continuous support for the Organization's piracy reporting.

## **10 UNSAFE MIXED MIGRATION BY SEA**

### **MSC-FAL circular on Guidelines concerning the recovery of deceased persons and of death after recovery**

10.1 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved the draft MSC-FAL circular on Guidelines concerning the recovery of deceased persons and of death after recovery and agreed to forward it to the Facilitation Committee for its concurrent approval.

10.2 The Committee considered document MSC 110/10 (Secretariat) informing the Committee the outcome of FAL 49 on the MSC-FAL circular on Guidelines concerning the recovery of deceased persons in migrant boats and of death after recovery, and noted that FAL 49 had not approved the MSC-FAL circular because when it considered a proposal (document FAL 49/14) to amend the MSC-FAL circular approved by MSC 109 that would affect the responsibilities of flag States and RCCs in SAR operations, the FAL Committee recognized that was not competent on SAR matters and agreed to inform MSC 110 of the discussion and invited the Committee to consider the proposed amendment (FAL 49/22, paragraph 14.7).

10.3 The Committee considered document MSC 110/10/1 (Chile et al.) providing in the annex, amendments to the draft MSC-FAL circular on Guidelines concerning the recovery of deceased persons and of death after recovery, as approved by MSC 109, taking into account the views expressed during FAL 49.

10.4 The delegation of Nigeria, while acknowledging the intent of the proposal to refine the Guidelines, emphasized that effective coordination among flag States, coastal States, RCCs, and shipmasters is essential to ensure timely and humane responses in sensitive situations. However, any clarifications must avoid undermining the operational clarity required for SAR responses – particularly in mixed migration contexts, where time is critical and human dignity must be the foremost priority. The delegation of Nigeria further noted that any amendments to the draft guidelines should preserve the delicate balance between legal precision and practical humanitarian considerations. Caution was advised against placing undue emphasis on the role of flag States, as this could unintentionally complicate or weaken existing responsibilities under the SAR and SOLAS Conventions, and detract from the overriding imperative of saving lives during maritime emergencies.

10.5 After many Member States supported the amendment proposal contained in document MSC 110/10/1, the Committee approved the draft MSC-FAL circular on *Guidelines concerning the recovery of deceased persons and of death after recovery*, as set out in annex [...], and agreed to forward them to the Facilitation Committee for its concurrent approval.

### **Rescue at sea: A guide to principles and practice in the context of refugees and migrants movements**

10.6 The Committee recalled that the Secretariat had informed MSC 82 in 2006 of the first version of the *Guidance Leaflet on "Rescue at Sea: a guide to principles and practice as applied to migrants and refugees"* (document MSC 82/INF.13), and MSC 82 had expressed its appreciation to UNHCR and the Secretariat for this initiative and noted the generous offers of industry organizations in assisting in the distribution of the leaflet. This publication had been prepared jointly with UNHCR as part of the inter-agency initiative by the IMO Secretary-General following several incidents where persons rescued at sea subsequently turned out to be undocumented migrants, asylum-seekers or refugees.

10.7 The Committee, having noted that the second version of the leaflet had been produced by UNHCR, IMO and ICS in January 2015, noted the information provided by the Secretariat on the new version of the leaflet finalized by UNHCR, the IMO Secretariat and ICS in 2025, as set out in the annex to document MSC 110/INF.23.

## **11 SHIP DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION (REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE)**

11.1 The Committee approved, in general, the report of the eleventh session of the Sub-Committee on Ship Design and Construction (SDC) (SDC 11/17 and Add.1, and MSC 110/11) and took action as indicated below.

### **Emergency towing arrangements on ships other than tankers**

11.2 Regarding emergency towing arrangements, the Committee approved:

- .1 MSC.1/Circ.[...] on *Interim guidelines for emergency towing arrangements on ships other than tankers*;
- .2 MSC.1/Circ.1175/Rev.2 on *Revised guidance on shipboard towing and mooring equipment*; and

- .3 MSC.1/Circ.1255/Rev.1 on *Revised guidelines for owners/operators on preparing emergency towing procedures*.

### **IP Code and associated guidance**

11.3 With respect to the International Code of Safety for Ships Carrying Industrial Personnel (IP Code), the Committee:

- .1 endorsed the decision of SDC 11 not to develop guidance to accompany the implementation of the IP Code, at this stage; and
- .2 agreed that the work on the output on "Further development of the IP Code and associated guidance" had been concluded.

### ***Amendments to the IP Code***

11.4 The Committee approved the draft amendments to part IV of the IP Code with regard to the industrial personnel weight for stability calculations, as set out in annex [...], and requested the Secretary-General to circulate the approved amendments in accordance with SOLAS article VIII, with a view to adoption at MSC 111.

### **Interim explanatory notes for the assessment of passenger ship systems' capabilities after a fire or flooding casualty (MSC.1/Circ.1369)**

11.5 The Committee noted that SDC 11 had agreed that the revision of *Interim explanatory notes for the assessment of passenger ship systems' capabilities after a fire or flooding casualty* (MSC.1/Circ.1369), could include the introduction of elements relevant to other instruments and regulations, e.g. with respect to training and other operational matters; and that other relevant sub-committees, including the HTW Sub-Committee, should be consulted after finalization of the revision of MSC.1/Circ.1369.

### **Amendments to the 2011 ESP Code**

#### ***Use of remote inspection techniques (RIT)***

11.6 The Committee endorsed the decision of SDC 11 not to have specific provisions on legal liability on the use of remote inspection techniques (RIT), as part of the amendments to the 2011 ESP Code, or the associated draft guidelines.

11.7 Subsequently, the Committee approved the draft amendments to the 2011 ESP Code, to permit the use of RIT, as set out in annex [...], and requested the Secretary-General to circulate the approved amendments in accordance with SOLAS article VIII, with a view to adoption at MSC 111.

### ***Use of portable ladders***

11.8 The Committee noted that SDC 11 had confirmed an inconsistency between resolution MSC.133(76) on *Adoption of technical provisions for means of access for inspections* (as amended by MSC.158(78)) and the 2011 ESP Code, on the use of portable ladders, as the means of access to cargo hold side shell frame of single-side skin bulk carriers, as suggested in document SDC 11/16 (China).

11.9 Following consideration of document SDC 11/16, the Committee confirmed that the proposed amendment to resolution MSC.158(78) could be considered within the scope of the output on "Amendments to the 2011 ESP Code" and instructed SDC 12 to finalize draft amendments to resolution MSC.158(78).

### ***Amendments to MSC.1/Circ.1502***

11.10 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.1502/Rev.1 on *Revised guidance on pressure testing of boundaries of cargo oil tanks under direction of the master*, with a view to aligning the tank pressure testing provisions, with the 2011 ESP Code.

### **Guidelines for construction, installation, maintenance and inspection/survey of means of embarkation and disembarkation (MSC.1/Circ.1331)**

11.11 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.1331/Rev.1 on *Revised guidelines for construction, maintenance and inspection of means of embarkation and disembarkation*, addressing the rigging of safety netting on accommodation ladders and gangways.

### **Steering and propulsion requirements**

11.12 With regard to the revision of SOLAS chapters II-1 (part C) and V, and related instruments regarding steering and propulsion requirements, the Committee noted that SDC 11 had a discussion on the development of manoeuvrability standards and the process to make these mandatory under SOLAS regulations, having agreed to a revised road map, aiming for the entry into force of the mandatory amendments in 2032, as appropriate.



### **Requirement for setting of guard rails on the deck structure**

11.13 The Committee approved draft amendments to regulation 25 of the 1988 Load Lines Protocol, regarding the requirement for setting of guard rails on the deck structure, as set out in annex [...]; and requested the Secretary-General to circulate them in accordance with article VI of the 1988 LL Protocol, with a view to adoption at MSC 111.

### **Unified interpretations (UIs)**

#### ***UI of SOLAS regulation II-1/12.6.2***

11.14 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.[...] on *Unified interpretation of SOLAS regulation II-1/12.6.2*, with a view to clarifying the term "remotely operated valve".

### ***Experience gained in the use of the safeguards***

11.15 The Committee noted the experience gained at SDC 11, where a robust review process for evaluating draft UI proposals had been used, including a structured consideration for applicable safeguards.

### **Guidelines for use of Fibre-Reinforced Plastics (FRP) within ship structures**

11.16 The Committee had for its consideration the scope of the output on "Guidelines for use of fibre-reinforced plastics (FRP) within ship structures", and, in particular, the request of SDC 11 for:

- .1 confirmation on whether FRP load-bearing divisions, and elements contributing to global strength, should be considered as part of the scope of the output; and
- .2 clarification that the scope of the output should be limited to SOLAS chapter II-2 only, or wider, with a view to advising the Correspondence Group on FRP established at that session.

11.17 In this context, the Committee also considered the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/11/1 (IACS), commenting on document MSC 110/11 and proposing that the scope of the output on the revision of the *Interim guidelines for the use of Fibre-Reinforced Plastics (FRP) elements within ship structures: Fire safety issues* (MSC.1/Circ.1574) (Interim FRP Guidelines) be limited to the fire safety aspects in relation to SOLAS regulation II-2/17 on alternative design and not widened to include considerations related to global strength; and
- .2 MSC 110/11/3 (CESA), commenting on document MSC 110/11, while arguing in favour of the application of the FRP Guidelines to elements that are load-bearing, but not contributing to global strength; and further proposing not to exclude the possibility of expanding the scope of the Interim FRP Guidelines to include also elements contributing to global strength.

11.18 Additionally, the Committee noted a statement by the Chair, in particular, that:

- .1 FRP structure in modern shipping was essential and should be balanced based on the need to ensure the integrity of the alternative design process, especially concerning structural elements beyond load-bearing divisions;
- .2 caution should be exercised when attempting to extend fire safety provisions in the Interim FRP Guidelines to structural elements lacking comprehensive guidance on structural design and integrity; and
- .3 while the current work on the revision of the Interim FRP Guidelines should remain focused solely on fire safety, the existing output could include possible development of guidance on structural design and integrity of FRP structural elements, for load-bearing divisions or elements contributing to global strength.

11.19 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 the scope of the revision of the Interim FRP Guidelines (MSC.1/Circ.1574) should remain strictly related to aspects on fire safety within the scope of SOLAS chapter II-2. The experience gained so far with the application of

FRP in ship structures, did not allow for an expansion of the scope of this work;

- .2 the Interim FRP Guidelines were essential in providing guidance under SOLAS regulation II-2/17 focusing on fire safety and ensuring harmonization under the alternative design and arrangements process. The Administrations still had the prerogative to consider under alternative design process, all aspects related to structural strength and integrity in the use of FRP in load bearing divisions and elements contributing to global strength;
- .3 "load-bearing divisions" and "elements contributing to global strength" should be considered separately. While the revised Interim FRP Guidelines could cover the former, its application to the latter would not be possible before further experience has been gained in the use of FRP in primary ship structures;
- .4 the current output on "Guidelines for use of fibre-reinforced plastics (FRP) within ship structures", could be utilized in order to include consideration for FRP load-bearing divisions and elements contributing to global strength, for possible development of complementary guidelines on structural aspects;
- .5 not sufficient experience had been gained in the use of FRP onboard ships, in load-bearing divisions and elements contributing to global strength. Further work on structural design of FRP ship structures could be possible through a new output proposal, which could include greater justification, elaboration and technical analysis, case studies and examples; and
- .6 global strength was a complex topic, which could best be addressed through class rules. Additionally, the recycling of FRP structures needed to have viable methods of recycling before expanding its use. Unless clear requirements were in place with respect to FRP recycling, it would be very difficult to establish a positive cost-benefit.

11.20 Subsequently, given the broad support expressed that the scope of the output should remain limited to fire safety considerations and not include FRP elements contributing to global strength, the Committee:

- .1 confirmed that the scope of the revision of the Interim FRP Guidelines (MSC.1/Circ.1574) should remain limited to fire safety aspects under SOLAS regulation II-2/17, and did not extend to elements contributing to global strength;
- .2 agreed that load-bearing elements not contributing to global strength, might be considered within the scope of the revision; and that a new output would be required for considering such elements contributing to global strength; and
- .3 instructed the FRP Correspondence Group established at SDC 11 to continue to address load-bearing divisions and elements, within the scope of SOLAS chapter II-2 from a fire safety perspective accordingly.

### **Review of the 2009 Code on Alerts and Indicators**

11.21 The Committee concurred with the decision of MEPC 83 (MEPC 83/17, paragraph 11.16) and concurrently approved the draft Code on Alerts and Indicators, 2025, as set out in annex [...], for adoption by A 34.

11.22 In this context, the Committee agreed to the recommendation of the SDC Sub-Committee to update the Code more regularly, due to the continuous updates of the IMO instruments referenced therein.

### **Revised terms of reference of the SDC Sub-Committee**

11.23 The Committee approved the draft revised terms of reference of the Sub-Committee, as set out in annex [...], as a preliminary review outcome, without incorporating any changes related to roles and responsibilities among sub-committees, noting that these changes should be assessed and coordinated at the Committee's level, as necessary.

### **Means of escape from spaces below the bulkhead deck**

11.24 The Committee had for its consideration the following documents related to means of escape from spaces below the bulkhead deck, taken together as they were related to the same topic discussed at SDC 11, regarding divergent interpretation of SOLAS regulation II-2/13.4:

- .1 MSC 110/11/2 (Marshall Islands et al.), commenting on document MSC 110/11 and proposing a revision of MSC.1/Circ.1511/Rev.1 on *Unified*

*interpretations of SOLAS regulations II-2/9 and 13*, to reflect the confirmation by SDC 11 regarding the term "lower part" used in SOLAS regulations II-2/13.4.1 and 13.4.2, in connection with the means of escape from spaces below the bulkhead deck;

- .2 MSC 110/18/8 (Liberia), including a proposal for a new output intended to amend SOLAS regulations II-2/13.4.2.1, for cargo ships; and 13.4.1.1, for passenger ships, with a view to resolving the issue of interpretation through further improvement of the text of the regulation itself; and
- .3 MSC 110/INF.13 (Liberia), providing additional information supporting the proposal in document MSC 110/18/8.

11.25 Having agreed to consider further the assessment of document MSC 110/18/8 as a new output under agenda item 18 (see paragraph 18...), the Committee noted the Chair's statement that:

- .1 while the initiation of a new output would allow a revision of SOLAS regulation II-2/13.4, there was an immediate need to address the current challenges arising from varying interpretations of this regulation in a pragmatic way;
- .2 the proposal in document MSC 110/11/2, suggesting a revision of the UI in MSC.1/Circ.1511/Rev.1, might not fully mitigate the risk of differing interpretations; and
- .3 the issue pertained to the means of escape from machinery spaces, which was a critical safety requirement under SOLAS, emphasizing the importance of providing clear guidance to Administrations and flag States in order to ensure consistent implementation.

11.26 In this context, the Committee noted the following views:

*With respect to revision to MSC.1/Circ.1511/Rev.1 in document MSC 110/11/2*

- .1 the proposal to revise MSC.1/Circ.1511/Rev.1 was supported, as it aligned with the technical confirmation of SDC 11 (SDC 11/17, paragraph 10.18) and

provided much-needed clarity to mitigate detentions caused by differing interpretations;

- .2 notwithstanding the view expressed in paragraph 11.26.1 above, the proposed UI might compromise the intent of the SOLAS regulation and did not provide a robust long-term solution;

*With respect to a new output proposal in documents MSC 110/18/8 and MSC 110/INF.13*

- .3 a new output proposal to address the issue through amendments to SOLAS was supported, nevertheless the scope should be carefully defined and not prejudge the technical outcome (MSC 110/18/8, paragraph 11);
- .4 notwithstanding the view expressed in paragraph 11.26.3 above, careful consideration should be given to revising the regulations without clear evidence of safety issues or technical justifications, noting that such arrangements had been approved and implemented safely over decades;
- .5 there was a need for a precise definition of the problem and a focused scope addressing only the relevant aspects of escape arrangements;

*With respect to an alternative solution*

- .6 an alternative interim solution should be provided by taking a pragmatic approach through means of an MSC circular inviting port State control (PSC) Authorities to accept arrangements approved by flag States until the regulation had been amended, which would allow for an interpretation, accommodating current arrangements on existing ships, pending a more comprehensive review and resolution of the issue.

11.27 In view of the broad support for an MSC circular, as a short-term measure, and a new output, as a long-term measure, the Committee approved:

- .1 a new output on "Review and, if necessary, amendment of SOLAS regulations II-2/13.4.1.1 and 13.4.2.1 to clarify the requirements on escape arrangements from the lower part of machinery spaces", for inclusion in the biennial agenda for 2026-2027 and the provisional agenda for SDC 12, with

a target completion year of 2027, assigning the SDC Sub-Committee as the associated organ (see paragraph 18...); and

- .2 MSC.1/Circ.[...] on *Escape arrangements from the lower part of machinery spaces (SOLAS regulations II-2/13.4.1 and 13.4.2)*, inviting PSC Authorities to take a pragmatic approach during inspections until any amendments had entered into force, or the conclusion of the work under the above-mentioned new output, as appropriate.

11.28 In this context, the Committee agreed that the output envisaged that the SDC Sub-Committee would consider submissions addressing any safety concerns with the regulations and how they had been applied, on the following understanding with respect to the scope of the output:

- .1 should the SDC Sub-Committee manage to provide a solution without amending these regulations, the Sub-Committee would report to MSC 111 accordingly, for consideration; and
- .2 should the SDC Sub-Committee conclude that the SOLAS regulations would require a revision, it should prepare amendments to the regulations, including the applicability of such amendments to new, or new and existing ships.

11.29 Therefore, the Committee invited interested delegations to make substantive submissions to SDC 12, to address fully any potential underlying issues identified and propose concrete action in order for the Committee to finalize the consideration of this matter, as appropriate.

## **12 POLLUTION PREVENTION AND RESPONSE (REPORT OF THE TWELFTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE)**

### **Report of PPR 12**

12.1 The Committee noted that the Sub-Committee on Pollution Prevention and Response (PPR) had held its twelfth session from 27 to 31 January 2025 and that its report on that session had been circulated as documents PPR 12/16 and PPR 12/16/Add.1. In this context, the Committee also noted that there was no action requested of it emanating from PPR 12 (document MSC 110/12).

### **13 HUMAN ELEMENT, TRAINING AND WATCHKEEPING (REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE)**

#### **Report of HTW 11**

13.1 The Committee approved, in general, the report of the eleventh session of the Sub-Committee on Human Element, Training and Watchkeeping (HTW 11/11 and MSC 110/13), and took action as indicated below.

#### ***Enhancing the application of model courses and improving expert participation***

13.2 The Committee endorsed the course of action by the Sub-Committee by means of which it had invited TCC 75 to consider, as part of the Integrated Technical Cooperation Programme (ITCP), activities that could contribute to enhancing the application of model courses and improve expert participation (HTW 11/11, paragraphs 3.5 and 11.3).

#### ***Revision of the Guidelines for the development, review and validation of model courses***

13.3 The Committee approved the draft revision of the *Guidelines for the development, review and validation of model courses* (MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15/Rev.2), to be disseminated as MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.15/Rev.3, subject to the concurrent approval of MEPC 84 (HTW 11/11, paragraph 3.35 and annex 2).

#### ***MASS trials with a sole lookout in periods of darkness***

13.4 With regard to documents MSC 107/5/5 (Germany et al.) and MSC/ISWG/MASS 2/6 (Liberia) concerning MASS trials with a sole lookout in periods of darkness, the Committee noted the advice of the Sub-Committee that STCW regulation I/13 applied to the conduct of MASS trials (HTW 11/11, paragraph 4.8) and that this matter had already been considered under agenda item 5, together with document MSC 110/5/3 (see paragraph [...]).

#### ***Enhancement of the communication of information provisions related to the oversight and verification processes***

13.5 The Committee endorsed the course of action proposed by the Sub-Committee on the matter of enhancement of the communication of information provisions related to the oversight and verification processes and its relationship with IMSAS (HTW 11/11, paragraph 6.17). The Committee also invited the III Sub-Committee to note the possible integration of the STCW oversight system and IMSAS (HTW 11/11, paragraph 6.17.4).



***Comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code***

13.6 The Committee noted the progress made by the Sub-Committee regarding the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code (HTW 11/11, paragraphs 6.34 and 6.35, and HTW 11/WP.4, annex 1), including the concerns expressed by several delegations about the timeline to complete phase 2, as well as the intervention by the Secretary-General during HTW 11 (HTW 11/11, paragraphs 6.36 to 6.38 and annex 13).

13.7 In this context, the Committee had for its consideration document MSC 110/13/1 (Secretariat), providing a road map for this work alternative to the one developed by the Sub-Committee; and considerations concerning the resulting workload and resource implications emanating from the alternative road map.

13.8 Having noted the overwhelming support for the alternative road map set out in document MSC 110/13/1, in particular the Secretary-General's efforts to prioritize the human element and the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code, the Committee:

- .1 noted that HTW 11 had agreed on the list of gaps identified in the STCW Convention and Code, with a view to being addressed in phase 2 of the comprehensive review;
- .2 endorsed the agreement of HTW 11 that phase 1 (review/identification of gaps) had been completed;
- .3 noted that HTW 11 had agreed to the commencement of phase 2 of the comprehensive review; and
- .4 endorsed the alternative road map as set out in the annex to document MSC 110/13/1, and instructed the Sub-Committee to organize phase 2 (revision) of the comprehensive review accordingly, and, in this regard, invited C 134 to approve the budget allocation for a new project-funded technical officer post in the Subdivision for Operational Safety and Human Element (Maritime Safety Division) to support the work on the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code.

13.9 Subsequently, the Committee noted the Secretary-General's intervention, reiterating that the new post would be based on a fixed-term project, aligned with the completion of the comprehensive review. The Committee also noted that the budgetary implications of these decisions had not yet been reflected in the budget considerations submitted to C 134. Finally, the Secretary-General invited delegations of Council Members attending the Committee to inform their respective representatives of these developments (see paragraph 13.8.4), in preparation for C 134, particularly concerning the resource implications and consequent actions arising from the alternative road map.

***Draft MSC resolution on accessibility of information related to medical provisions in the STCW Convention***

13.10 The Committee adopted resolution MSC....(110) on *Accessibility of information on seafarer medical certificates and medical practitioners recognized for the purpose of conducting seafarer medical examinations*, as set out in annex [...].

***Development of generic interim guidelines on training for seafarers on ships using alternative fuels and new technologies***

13.11 The Committee noted the agreement of the Sub-Committee to develop generic interim guidelines on training for seafarers on ships using alternative fuels and new technologies in parallel with several individual sets of fuel/technology-specific interim guidelines (HTW 11/11, paragraph 7.8.3).

13.12 The Committee approved STCW.7/Circ.25 on *Generic interim guidelines on training for seafarers on ships using alternative fuels and new technologies* and invited MEPC 84 to note this action, accordingly (HTW 11/11, paragraph 7.15 and annex 9).

13.13 In this connection, the Committee:

- .1 noted the information in document MSC 110/INF.14 (EC), on the results of a study on the identification of specific competences for seafarers on ships using alternative fuels and energy systems that was commissioned by the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA); and
- .2 requested the Secretariat to refer this document to the Correspondence Group on Development of Training Provisions for Seafarers on Ships Using Alternative Fuels and New Technologies, established by HTW 11, for its

consideration in the ongoing development of the Interim Guidelines (see paragraph 13.11).

### ***Terms of reference of the Sub-Committee***

13.14 The Committee confirmed that there was no need to modify the current terms of reference of the Sub-Committee, as set out in annex 40 of document MSC 92/26 (HTW 11/11, paragraph 8.10).

### **Outcome of the Legal Committee on prevention of fraudulent certificates**

13.15 The Committee recalled that, having considered documents MSC 108/16/3 (Bangladesh) and MSC 108/16/4 (Austria et al.), MSC 108 had invited the Legal Committee (LEG) to consider measures to improve cooperation between Parties to detect and prevent unlawful practices and prosecute anyone responsible for selling and/or issuing fraudulent certificates, including through cooperation between national law enforcement agencies, for advice to the HTW Sub-Committee.

13.16 In this context, the Committee noted LEG 112's views provided on this matter, as follows:

- .1 while understanding and supporting the intentions that underpinned the idea to improve cooperation between Parties to detect and prevent unlawful practices and to prosecute anyone responsible for selling or issuing fraudulent certificates, LEG was of the view that the issue of exchanging information on criminal cases was beyond the remit of IMO; and
- .2 the HTW Sub-Committee should consider measures to improve verification mechanisms of seafarers' certificates under the STCW Convention, including, for example, further digitalization of the certificates, which is in line with and complementary to the instructions already provided by MSC 108 to the Sub-Committee (MSC 108/20, paragraph 16.9.1).

### **Secretary-General's reports pursuant to STCW regulations**

#### ***Secretary-General's report pursuant to STCW regulation I/8***

13.17 The Committee considered the reports for Canada, Cyprus, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Luxembourg and the United Republic of Tanzania, as set out in document MSC 110/WP.3;

confirmed that the information provided demonstrated that these STCW Parties continued to give full and complete effect to the provisions of the STCW Convention; and requested the Secretariat to issue updated information concerning the subsequent reports by means of MSC.1/Circ.1164/Rev.30.

13.18 In this regard, the Committee encouraged Parties to the STCW Convention to submit their subsequent reports, in accordance with sections A-I/7 and A-I/8 of the STCW Code, through the new GISIS STCW module.

13.19 The Committee noted a statement made by the delegation of Kenya, expressing their appreciation of the Secretariat's effort concerning the communication and oversight process, as well as their commitment to the effective implementation of the Convention and contributions to the comprehensive review of the Convention and Code. The full text of the statement is set out in annex [...].

13.20 The Committee also noted a statement made by the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania, expressing their support for the Committee's confirmation above, as well as their commitment and continued efforts towards the implementation of the 1978 STCW Convention, in order to give full and complete effect to its provisions. The full text of the statement is set out in annex [...].

### ***Approval of competent persons***

13.21 The Committee considered document MSC 110/13/2 (Secretariat), containing information provided by STCW Parties regarding experts made available or recommended for inclusion in the list of competent persons, as well as competent persons to be withdrawn from the list.

13.22 Following consideration, the Committee took action as follows:

- .1 approved the inclusion of 18 competent persons in the List of competent persons maintained by the Secretary-General pursuant to section A-I/7 of the STCW Code and requested the Secretariat to issue the revised list by means of MSC.1/Circ.797/Rev.42;
- .2 noted the competent persons who had been withdrawn from the list by four STCW Parties;

- .3 invited STCW Parties to inform the Secretariat of any amendment that the list might require (withdrawals, additions, change of address, etc.), with a view to ensuring that the competent persons listed in the latest revision were available to serve and were readily contactable; and
- .4 having thanked those STCW Parties that had nominated competent persons, encouraged all Parties to nominate more competent persons to ensure the effective implementation of the provisions of the STCW Convention with the support of the new GISIS module.

### **Development of remote operator training, certification and watchkeeping standards**

13.23 The Committee recalled that matters concerning the development of remote operator training, certification and watchkeeping standards, including documents MSC 110/13/3 and MSC 110/INF.12, had been considered under agenda item 5 (see paragraphs 5[...] to 5[...]).

## **14 SHIP SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT (REPORT OF THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE)**

14.1 The Committee approved, in general, the report of the eleventh session of the Sub-Committee on Ship Systems and Equipment (SSE) (MSC 110/14 and SSE 11/20) and took action as indicated below.

### **Ventilation requirements for partially enclosed lifeboats and liferafts**

14.2 The Committee noted that SSE 11, with regard to ventilation requirements for partially enclosed lifeboats, having considered additional supporting evidence, had agreed on the compelling need for ventilation requirements, for inclusion in both the International Life-Saving Appliance Code (LSA Code) and the *Revised recommendation on testing of life-saving appliances* (resolution MSC.81(70)), together with consequential amendments to the *Revised standardized life-saving appliance evaluation and test report forms (survival craft)* (MSC.1/Circ.1630/Rev.3). The Committee also noted that, taking into account the lack of further evidence provided for ventilation requirements for liferafts, SSE 11 had agreed on the absence of compelling need for liferafts.

### **Testing requirements for simulated launch of free-fall lifeboats**

14.3 The Committee had for its consideration the draft new paragraph 4.7.7 of the LSA Code, regarding the design of the arrangements for the simulated launch of free-fall

lifeboats, taking into account the associated check/monitoring sheet and the record format, with a view to approval.

14.4 In connection with the above, the Committee considered also the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/14/1 (Secretariat), providing draft amendments to the LSA Code, containing application provisions emanating from the decision of MSC 109 to take a systematic approach to ensure the insertion of relevant application provisions during the regulatory development and amendment processes;
- .2 MSC 110/14/2 (Japan), commenting on the draft amendments to the LSA Code set out in annex 1 of document SSE 11/20 with regard to the application provision; and
- .3 MSC 110/14/3 (IACS), commenting on document MSC 110/14/1 and proposing that the draft amendments outlined in its annex be considered with regard to their potential long-term impact on the clarity of the LSA Code and other mandatory codes.

14.5 During the consideration, the Committee noted that:

- .1 there was general support for:
  - .1 option 2 in document MSC 110/14/2, which was based on a simplified definition of the installation date of the equipment and was aligned with the decision of MSC 109 to include the application provisions in the regulation text of the LSA Code, rather than in the associated MSC resolution;
  - .2 applying this approach consistently to the full set of amendments to the LSA Code, as contained in document MSC 110/14/1, as well as to those additional regulations, identified in the annex to document MSC 110/14/3, also needing such application provisions; and

- .3 incorporating a table into the LSA Code listing all amended regulations since the adoption of the Code together with application dates and corresponding resolutions (MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3, annex 1, example regulation 1), which would facilitate the implementation of amendments by all parties, in particular by States acting in their capacities as flag States and port States;
2. notwithstanding the views in paragraph 14.5.1 above, some delegations advocated that the LSA Code was not designed, initially, to include application provisions, thereby supporting the previous incorporation of such provisions in the associated MSC resolution, for easier reading of the requirements; and
- .3 given the retrospective nature of some application dates in the LSA Code, transitional arrangements could be explored to mitigate the effects of retroactive implementation, especially for developing States.

14.6 Following consideration, the Committee reiterated its decision from its previous session to incorporate the application provisions in the text of the regulation of the LSA Code; concurred with the views supporting the use of a simplified definition of the installation date of the equipment as proposed in option 2 of document MSC 110/14/2 (see paragraph 14.5.1.1 above) and agreed to include a table compiling all the regulations that have been amended since the adoption of the LSA Code (see paragraph 14.5.1.3 above) in the operative part of the Code, with a view to adoption at MSC 111, together with the draft amendments to be approved at this session (see paragraph 14.8). In addition, the Committee welcomed the proposal made by the delegation of Germany to cooperate with the Secretariat in drafting the table to be incorporated into the Code.

#### ***Further instructions to the Drafting Group***

14.7 In view of the above, the Committee instructed the Drafting Group on Amendments to Mandatory Instruments, established under agenda item 3 (see paragraph 3.[...]) to prepare the application provisions in the draft amendments to the LSA Code in the annex to document MSC 110/14/1 and annex 1 of document SSE 11/20, taking into account documents MSC 110/14/2 (option 2 on defining "installed on or after") and the proposals in paragraphs 12 and 13 of document MSC 110/14/3, and its annex, with a view to approval.

***Report of the Drafting Group***

14.8 Having considered the relevant part of the report of the Drafting Group (MSC 110/WP.7), the Committee took actions as outlined in paragraph 3.66.

***Footnote to SOLAS regulation III/19.3.4.4***

14.9 The Committee requested the Secretariat to amend the footnote to SOLAS regulation III/19.3.4.4 to refer to the *Revised guidelines on safety during abandon ship drills using lifeboats* (MSC.1/Circ.1578/Rev.1) in the next consolidated version of the SOLAS publication, as appropriate.

***Draft amendments to resolution MSC.402 (96)***

14.10 Having approved draft amendments to paragraphs 6.2.3 and 6.2.7 of the *Requirements for maintenance, thorough examination, operational testing, overhaul and repair of lifeboats and rescue boats, launching appliances and release gear* (resolution MSC.402(96)), as set out in annex [...], originating from the draft amendments to the LSA Code on simulated launching of free-fall lifeboats (see paragraph 14.8), the Committee requested the Secretary-General to circulate them in accordance with SOLAS article VIII, with a view to adoption by MSC 111.

***Draft amendments to resolution MSC.81(70)***

14.11 The Committee approved, in principle, the draft amendments to the *Revised recommendation on testing of life-saving appliances* (resolution MSC.81(70)), related to the draft amendments on simulated launching of free-fall lifeboats, as set out in annex [...], with a view to adoption by MSC 111, in conjunction with the adoption of the relevant draft amendments to the LSA Code and resolution MSC.402(96) (see paragraphs 14.8 and 14.10).

***Consequential amendments to existing circulars***

14.12 The Committee agreed to the draft amendments to the following circulars, incorporating consequential amendments on simulated launching of free-fall lifeboats:

- .1 *Revised guidelines for developing operation and maintenance manuals for lifeboat systems* (MSC.1/Circ.1205/Rev.1);



- .2 *Unified interpretations of paragraph 4.4.7.6 of the LSA Code, as amended by resolution MSC.320(89) (MSC.1/Circ.1529);*
- .3 *Guidelines on safety during abandon ship drills using lifeboats (MSC.1/Circ.1578); and*
- .4 *Revised standardized life-saving appliance evaluation and test report forms (survival craft) (MSC.1/Circ.1630/Rev.3),*

with a view to approval by MSC 111, in conjunction with the adoption of the relevant draft amendments to the LSA Code and resolution MSC 402(96)) (see paragraphs 14.8 and 14.10).

**Amendments to SOLAS chapter III and chapter IV of the LSA Code to require the carriage of self-righting or canopied reversible liferafts for new ships**

14.13 Regarding the scope of the output on "Amendments to SOLAS chapter III, and chapter IV of the LSA Code to require the carriage of self-righting or canopied reversible liferafts for new ships", the Committee noted the confirmation by the Sub-Committee that the requirement for automatically self-righting or canopied reversible liferafts would apply to new cargo and passenger ships, and endorsed the continuation of the work on this output.

**Revised code of practice for atmospheric oil mist detectors**

14.14 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.1086/Rev.1 on *Revised code of practice for atmospheric oil mist detectors*.

**Review and update SOLAS regulation II-2/9 on containment of fire to incorporate existing guidance and clarify requirements**

14.15 The Committee was invited to decide whether documents SSE 11/9/1, SSE 11/INF.3 and SSE 11/9/2 could be considered within the existing scope of the output on "Review and update SOLAS regulation II-2/9 on containment of fire to incorporate existing guidance and clarify requirements", and referred to the FP Correspondence Group 1, which had been established at SSE 11.

14.16 During consideration, the Committee recalled that:

- .1 MSC 105 had agreed that the output was to amend SOLAS regulation II-2/9 to incorporate existing guidance and clarify requirements in SOLAS

regulations II-2/9.7.3.1.3 and 9.2.3.3 and tables 9.5 and 9.6, to remove any ambiguities (MSC 105/20, paragraph 18.9.2); and

- .2 with regard to document SSE 11/9/2 (China), MSC 107 had already concurred with the agreement of SSE 9 to consider the proposal related to SOLAS regulation II-2/9.7.4.5 under this output, when appropriate (SSE 9/20, paragraph 14.40; and MSC 107/20, paragraph 14.1).

14.17 In the ensuing discussion the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 taking into account the defined scope of the output by MSC 105, it was difficult to consider the additional proposals in the documents within the scope of the output. Therefore, a new output or a duly justified expansion of the scope of the existing output would be needed;
- .2 document SSE 11/9/1 included historical IACS unified interpretations (UIs) related to SOLAS regulation II-2/9, which had not been submitted formally to IMO for approval and would, therefore, require careful consideration;
- .3 notwithstanding the view presented in paragraph 14.17.2 above, it would be a missed opportunity not to include the established interpretations in documents SSE 11/9/1 and SSE 11/INF.3, as leaving them out could result in unnecessary duality and confusion. The SSE Sub-Committee should, therefore, consider integrating all relevant material in order to ensure regulatory coherence; and
- .4 in accordance with the Committees' method of work, the expansion of an output without proper justification should not be accepted.

14.18 In view of the above, including the above-mentioned decisions of MSC 105 and MSC 107, the Committee agreed that documents SSE 11/9/1, SSE 11/INF.3 and SSE 11/9/2 could not be considered within the existing scope of the output on "Review and update SOLAS regulation II-2/9 on containment of fire to incorporate existing guidance and clarify requirements". Accordingly, the Committee instructed the FP Correspondence Group 1 not to consider these documents and invited Member States and international organizations to consider making relevant submissions.

## **Unified interpretations (UIs)**

### ***UIs of paragraphs 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.2.2 of the LSA Code***

14.19 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.[...] on *Unified interpretations of paragraphs 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.2.2 of the LSA Code*, related to the launching of rescue boats.

### ***Approach to IACS UIs***

14.20 The Committee considered the following agreement of SSE 11, regarding the consideration of UIs, as "IMO UIs" or "IACS UIs":

- .1 IACS UIs, which are not proposed to be approved as IMO UIs, did not need any consideration on whether the safeguards were satisfied or not, nor whether the technical content was agreeable or not, and could, thereby be simply noted; and
- .2 proposals for draft UIs, submitted with a view to being considered for approval by the Organization (IMO UIs), should be subject to both safeguards and technical content verification.

14.21 In connection with the above, the Committee also considered document MSC 110/14/4 (Liberia and United Arab Emirates), commenting on the proposed procedures applicable to IACS UIs.

14.22 In this respect, the Committee noted the Chair's statement that:

- .1 the existing process required formal submission of a UI proposal to the Organization with the aim of obtaining acceptance through an IMO circular; that such UIs could have implications for port State control; and that flag States retained both the responsibility and the sovereign right to collaborate with their recognized organizations in deciding whether to accept IACS UIs;
- .2 the current process for addressing UIs required timely submission and due translation of proposals, which were then considered by the Committee or relevant sub-committees;

- .3 UIs often related to mandatory requirements and might influence the interpretation or application of such requirements, and, therefore, any attempt to bypass the agreed process was inappropriate; and
- .4 with regards to the five documents submitted as "proposals" by IACS to SSE 11 informing of new UIs, and requesting that flag States respond in writing if in disagreement, these submissions did not constitute formal proposals requesting action, and thus, in accordance with the established safeguards, the UIs had not been approved by IMO. In addition, the Committee reaffirmed that in instances where IMO did not consider or approve a UI, responsibility rested with IACS to engage directly with flag States, noting that IMO could not be expected to oversee the internal processes of private entities.

14.23 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views:

- .1 IACS UIs submitted as information documents may be perceived as ROs unilaterally declaring an interpretation, or as an attempt to impose tacit acceptance of their own interpretations onto flag Administrations;
- .2 the above-mentioned statement by the Chair was fully supported (see paragraph 14.22). Additionally, the proposals in document MSC 110/14/4 lacked clarity and did not require any action by the Committee. IACS UIs represented their own interpretations and, as such, did not constitute "unified interpretations", as far as IMO is concerned; and
- .3 IACS documents informing on IACS UIs provided useful information and there was support for those documents to be noted, unless they were proposed to be considered with a view to approval by the Organization.

14.24 In this respect, the delegation of IACS clarified that, while IACS independently developed technical interpretations, flag Administrations were consulted, either through bilateral engagement or within the framework of IMO discussions. IACS UIs were generally agreed by consensus and when consensus could not be achieved or a strong objection existed, the issue was typically subject to further technical consideration, or referral to IMO as a draft UI for resolution in cooperation with the Member States. A draft UI, which would be

subject to major internal objections within IACS, would be submitted to IMO. Furthermore, IACS had internally agreed to apply the IMO safeguards also to IACS UIs, in the interest of alignment with the Organization's agreed procedures. When a sub-committee only "noted" the IACS UIs, it simply acknowledged the existence of the UI. IACS would welcome any feedback from the Member States, which would be duly taken into account with a view to revising or revisiting the matters covered by the UIs.

14.25 Following consideration, the Committee confirmed the action of SSE 11, endorsed the Sub-Committee's agreement regarding the consideration of UIs, as "IMO UIs" or "IACS UIs", and reiterated its instructions to other relevant subsidiary bodies to ensure that:

- .1 only appropriately submitted UIs, requesting formal consideration as an IMO approved UI, were to be reviewed and were subject to the safeguards, in accordance with the Committees' method of work (MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.6, paragraphs 4.44 to 4.46); and
- .2 UIs submitted as information documents or documents requesting to note the information on UIs should simply be noted in the reports.

#### ***UIs relating to fire-extinguishing media restrictions***

14.26 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.[...] on *Unified interpretations of SOLAS chapter II-2, and the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes*, relating to fire-extinguishing media containing PFOS, with the effective date of 1 January 2026.

#### ***UI of the FSS Code***

14.27 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ. [...] on *Unified interpretation of the FSS Code*, related to acceptable spacings of combined smoke and heat detectors, with the effective date of 1 January 2026.

#### ***UI of SOLAS regulation II-1/3-13.2.4***

14.28 The Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.[...] on *Unified interpretation of SOLAS regulation II-1/3-13.2.4*, related to documentation of load testing and thorough examination for existing non-certified lifting appliances, with the effective date of 1 January 2026.

### ***Implementation of UI safeguards***

14.29 The Committee noted the experience gained by the Sub-Committee in the use of UI safeguards (see paragraph 14.20).

### **Revised Model Course 3.05 on Survey of Fire Appliances and Provisions**

14.30 The Committee noted the validation of the revised Model Course 3.05 on Survey of Fire Appliances and Provisions, and the encouragement for active participation of more members in the dedicated Review and Drafting Groups.

### **New energy vehicles**

14.31 The Committee noted the agreement of SSE 11 to regularly update the list of relevant resources on fire risk of ships carrying new energy vehicles, and to forward any pertinent resources to the CCC Sub-Committee, as appropriate.

### **SSE Sub-Committee's workload**

14.32 The Committee noted the analysis of the continuous and annual outputs under the remit of the Sub-Committee, conducted by SSE 11, to be considered further under agenda item 18 (Work programme) (see paragraphs 18.109 and 18.110).

### **Revised terms of reference of the SSE Sub-Committee**

14.33 The Committee approved the draft revised terms of reference of the Sub-Committee, as set out in annex [...], as a preliminary review outcome, without incorporating any changes related to roles and responsibilities among sub-committees, noting that these changes should be assessed and coordinated at the Committee's level, as necessary.

### **Test procedure and acceptance criteria for lifejacket buoyancy test**

14.34 The Committee adopted resolution MSC.[...(110)] on *Amendments to the Revised recommendation on testing of life-saving appliances (resolution MSC.81(70))*, related to the procedure for lifejacket buoyancy test and acceptance criteria, as set out in annex [...].

14.35 In this respect, the Committee approved MSC.1/Circ.1628/Rev.4 on *Revised standardized life-saving appliance evaluation and test report forms (personal life-saving appliances)*, in conjunction with the adoption of the associated draft amendments to resolution MSC.81(70) (see paragraph 14.34).

---

**ISO survival craft equipment standard**

14.36 While noting the outcome of the discussion on revised ISO international standard 18813:2022, the Committee:

- .1 agreed to the draft amendments to the footnotes in the LSA Code, with respect to revised ISO international standard 18813:2022, as a minor correction, to be reflected in the next edition of the LSA Code publication;
- .2 requested the Secretariat to reflect the amendments in the next edition of the LSA Code publication accordingly; and
- .3 invited ISO to note the outcome of the discussion and to update the standard, taking into account document SSE 11/19/1 (IACS).

**Validity of references to EN 54:2001 standards in the FSS Code**

14.37 The Committee noted the agreement that the matter of the validity of EN 54:2001 standards, referenced in the International Code for Fire Safety Systems (FSS Code), should be considered under a new output.

**15 NAVIGATION, COMMUNICATIONS AND SEARCH AND RESCUE  
(URGENT MATTERS EMANATING FROM THE TWELFTH SESSION OF  
THE SUB-COMMITTEE)****Urgent matters emanating from NCSR 12**

15.1 The Committee considered urgent matters emanating from the twelfth session of the Sub-Committee on Navigation, Communications and Search and Rescue (MSC 110/WP.11) and took action as indicated hereunder.

***Dissemination of MSI and SAR related information***

15.2 The Committee approved the draft amendments to SOLAS regulations IV/5, V/4 and V/5 concerning the requirement for dissemination of maritime safety information (MSI) and search and rescue (SAR) related information through all operational recognized mobile satellite services, as set out in annex [...], taking into account the associated check/monitoring sheet for the process of amending the SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments, the record format and the checklist for the identification of capacity-building implications, and

requested the Secretary-General to circulate them in accordance with SOLAS article VIII, with a view to subsequent adoption at MSC 111 and entry into force on 1 January 2028.

15.3 The Committee also approved, in principle, the draft resolution MSC.509(105)/Rev.2 on Provision of Radio Services for the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS), as set out in annex [...], with a view to subsequent adoption at MSC 111 together with the adoption of the aforementioned draft amendments to SOLAS (see paragraph 15.2).

### ***Introduction of the VHF Data Exchange System***

15.4 The Committee approved the draft amendments to SOLAS chapter V and the appendix to introduce the VHF Data Exchange System (VDES), as set out in annex [...], taking into account the associated check/monitoring sheet for the process of amending the SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments, the record format and the checklist for the identification of capacity-building implications, and requested the Secretary-General to circulate them with a view to subsequent adoption at MSC 111 and entry into force on 1 January 2028.

15.5 The Committee also approved the related consequential draft amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes, as set out in annexes [...] and [...], respectively, and requested the Secretary-General to circulate them with a view to subsequent adoption at MSC 111 and entry into force on 1 January 2028, in line with the aforementioned draft amendments to SOLAS (see paragraph 15.4).

15.6 The Committee approved, in principle, the draft MSC resolution on Introduction of VHF data exchange system (VDES) into the IMO regulatory framework and the draft MSC resolution on Performance standards for shipborne VHF data exchange system (VDES) and agreed, in principle, to the draft MSC circular on Guidelines for the operational use of shipborne VHF data exchange system (VDES), as set out in annexes [...] to [...], with a view to subsequent adoption or approval, as appropriate, at MSC 111 together with the adoption of the aforementioned draft amendments to SOLAS (see paragraph 15.4).

15.7 The Committee endorsed the agreement of the NCSR Sub-Committee that:

- .1 amendments to SOLAS chapter IV concerning VDES should not be pursued at this stage and thus invited interested Member States and international organizations to consider submitting proposals for a new output to introduce



VDES as a communication equipment under SOLAS chapter IV, if required in the future; and

- .2 early implementation of the aforementioned draft amendments to SOLAS would not be required provided that the amendments enter into force on 1 January 2028.

### **Information document**

15.8 The Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.24 (IALA) concerning the recently updated IALA recommendation R1007 "the VHF Data Exchange System (VDES) for shore infrastructure", edition 2.0.

### **Statements by delegations**

#### ***GMDSS services***

15.9 The Committee noted the statement by the delegation of the Russian Federation, as set out in annex [...], concerning restrictions imposed by Inmarsat (i.e. an IMO recognized mobile satellite service provider) on ships under the flag of the Russian Federation, as well as ships registered, owned or operated in the Russian Federation, which resulted in the disconnection of over 100 ships from the services of the Inmarsat mobile satellite communication system, being a recognized component of the GMDSS. In view of the risks associated with such actions, the delegation called upon the Committee to take a number of actions as reflected in the statement.

#### ***Incident with a ship***

15.10 The delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands made a statement, as set out in annex [...], concerning an incident with the containership **VEENDIJK** that took place on 2 June 2025 near the coast of Libya.

## **16 CARRIAGE OF CARGOES AND CONTAINERS (REPORT OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE)**

### **Report of CCC 10**

16.1 Having recalled that MSC 109 had considered urgent matters emanating from the tenth session of the Sub-Committee on Carriage of Cargoes and Containers (CCC)

(MSC 109/22, section 14), the Committee approved, in general, the report of CCC 10 (CCC 10/16 and MSC 110/16), and took action as indicated below.

***Draft amendments to the IMSBC Code and associated circulars***

16.2 The Committee recalled that it had considered the draft amendments (08-25) to the IMSBC Code (MSC 110/3/1) and associated circulars, as finalized by E&T 41 directly after CCC 10, under agenda item 3 (see paragraphs 3.53 and 3.60).

***Revision of resolution A.1050(27) on Revised recommendations for entering enclosed spaces aboard ships***

16.3 The Committee considered the draft MSC resolution on Revised recommendations for entering enclosed spaces aboard ships, contained in annex 5 of document CCC 10/16.

16.4 The Committee also considered the following documents:

- .1 MSC 110/16/2 (Germany et al.), proposing a clarification of paragraph 3.2 of the draft Revised recommendations for entering enclosed spaces aboard ships, in order to ensure its alignment with SOLAS and relevant mandatory codes; and
- .2 MSC 110/16/3 (Liberia), proposing amendments to paragraph 3.2 of the draft Revised recommendations.

16.5 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views expressed:

- .1 the proposed clarification of paragraph 3.2 of the draft Revised recommendations could be supported, including the proposed final phrase in document MSC 110/16/3, which highlighted that the authority to make the final decision on acceptance of the cargo lay with the master;
- .2 the proposal in document MSC 110/16/2 concerning paragraph 3.2 of the draft Revised recommendations could be supported. It emphasized that the shipper had the responsibility to provide the master or their representative with appropriate information on the cargo;

- 
- .3 the draft text of paragraph 3.2, as set out in annex 5 of document CCC 10/16, should be retained. It correctly reflected the responsibilities of the shipper, the company and the master;
- .4 inclusion of the proposed final phrase in document MSC 110/16/3 could not be supported. Adding, specifically in paragraph 3.2, a provision on the master's final decision-making authority, which was an overarching principle and might not, therefore, necessarily need to be reiterated in specific provisions, could give rise to misunderstandings;
- .5 the proposed final phrase in document MSC 110/16/3 was problematic and could not be supported. It might not be appropriate to include that phrase in paragraph 3.2 because the master might not have the possibility to act in a situation where the cargo information provided was incorrect; and
- .6 the proposal in document MSC 110/16/2 could be supported. In addition, the report of MSC 110 should reaffirm the final decision-making authority of the master.

16.6 In this context, the Committee agreed to modify the text in paragraph 3.2 of the draft Revised recommendations, as proposed in document MSC 110/16/2. The Committee also agreed to emphasize that the master had no way of knowing whether the cargo information provided was correct or not.

16.7 After consideration, the Committee adopted resolution MSC.581(110) on *Revised recommendations for entering enclosed spaces aboard ships*, as set out in annex 28; requested the Secretariat to make the necessary consequential amendments to the footnotes of relevant IMO instruments; and noted that the work under the output on "Revision of resolution A.1050(27) to ensure the safety of personnel entering enclosed spaces on board ships" had been completed. Subsequently, the Committee invited C 134 to note the aforementioned decisions; and invited A 34 to revoke resolution A.1050(27) on *Revised recommendations for entering enclosed spaces aboard ships* and to endorse the aforementioned action taken, in the context of operative paragraph 3 of resolution A.1050(27) and resolution MSC.581(110).

***Draft UI of paragraph 5.7.1 of the IGF Code***

16.8 The Committee noted the outcome of the consideration of document CCC 10/10 (IACS and SGMF) concerning a draft UI of paragraph 5.7.1 of the IGF Code (CCC 10/16, paragraphs 10.4 to 10.6).

***Proposed regulatory solutions for using alternative fuels on gas carriers***

16.9 The Committee recalled that document MSC 110/16/1 (Belgium et al.), proposing regulatory solutions for using alternative fuels on gas carriers, had been considered under agenda item 6 (see paragraphs 6.26 to 6.41).

***History of amendments to the IGC Code***

16.10 The Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.3 (Secretariat), showing the 2014 IGC Code with all its existing and pending amendments.

***Intersessional meetings***

16.11 The Committee noted that the consideration and approval of intersessional meetings would be conducted under agenda item 18 (see paragraph 18.117).

**17 APPLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S METHOD OF WORK****Rules of Procedure**

17.1 The Committee recalled that:

- .1 MSC 98 had approved the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, harmonizing it with the rules of the other committees; and
- .2 MSC 109 had noted that C 133 had approved the draft Rules of Procedure of the Council, including the matter related to hybrid meeting capabilities, and invited the other organs of the Organization to consider the amendments to the Rules of Procedure with a view to harmonizing their respective Rules of Procedure with the rules of the Council to the extent possible; and that the Secretariat would submit a document to each committee containing draft amendments to their respective Rules of Procedure, specifically the changes to voting and hybrid capabilities, for their consideration.

17.2 The Committee noted that FAL 49 had:

- .1 approved the revised Rules of Procedure of the FAL Committee, including a revision to rule 37, related to the meaning of "Members present and voting" and "Members present";
- .2 invited the Council to revise its rule 40 of its Rules of Procedure to take into account the decision on rule 37 of the Rules of Procedure of the Facilitation Committee; and
- .3 invited the committees to harmonize their relevant rules, including matters related to "Members present and voting" and "Members present".

17.3 The Committee noted also that LEG 112 and MEPC 83 had approved their respective Rules of Procedure, including changes to rule 37, which were identical (i.e. same Rules of Procedure of LEG and MEPC).

17.4 The Committee, having considered document MSC 110/17 (Secretariat), which contains a proposal for a revision of the Rules of Procedure of MSC, approved the revised Rules of Procedure of MSC and authorized the Secretariat to effect any editorial changes to the Rules of Procedures, as necessary, to be issued as MSC.[...]/Circ.[...].

#### **Committees' method of work**

17.5 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved the draft revision of the Committees' method of work, subject to concurrent approval by MEPC 83, and noted that MEPC 83 had concurrently approved MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.6 on *Organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies*.

17.6 The Committee noted that FAL 49 had approved the amendments to the *Organization and method of work of the Facilitation Committee* (FAL.8/Circ.1), including amendments to accommodate hybrid meeting capabilities, in line with the decisions of C 133 (Council.1/Circ.2), particularly to take into account the differences in time zones.

17.7 The Committee considered document MSC 110/17/1 (Secretariat), which contained a proposal to amend paragraph 5.21 of the Committees' method of work, to accommodate hybrid meeting capabilities.

17.8 The Committee, having recalled the discussion held at FAL 49 where one sentence was added to provide flexibility to the working and drafting groups, bearing in mind that hybrid capability was supplementary to in-person meetings, agreed with the revised text of paragraph 5.21 proposed in document MSC 110/17/1 and approved the draft revision of the Committees' method of work, containing amendments related to paragraph 5.21, as set out in annex [...], to be disseminated as MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.7, subject to concurrent approval by MEPC 84.

**Amendments to the Procedural aspects related to the drafting of amendments to safety-related IMO conventions, other than the 1974 SOLAS Convention, and related mandatory instruments (MSC.1/Circ.1587)**

17.9 The Committee noted that, in accordance with the previous decisions and instructions of MSC 108 and MSC 109, the Secretariat had issued MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3 on *Guidance on drafting of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments*, incorporating amendments related to the assessment of capacity-building implications.

17.10 Consequential with these amendments, the Committee approved the revised *Procedural aspects related to the drafting of amendments to safety-related IMO conventions, other than the 1974 SOLAS Convention, and related mandatory instruments*, and authorized the Secretariat to make any necessary editorial adjustments, to be issued as MSC.1/Circ.1587/Rev.1.

## **18 WORK PROGRAMME**

### **ISM CODE-RELATED MATTERS**

#### **General**

18.1 The Committee recalled that, due to time constraints, MSC 109 had postponed the consideration of issues related to the ISM Code (MSC 109/19/7 and MSC 109/INF.3 (Secretariat)), as well as the related proposal for a new output submitted to MSC 107 (MSC 107/17/5 (Norway)), to this session.

## **Recommendations concerning the ISM Code and related instruments**

18.2 The Committee had for its consideration document MSC 109/19/7 (Secretariat), providing all ISM Code-related matters that needed to be considered at this session, together with document MSC 109/INF.3 (Secretariat), providing the report of the Study on the effectiveness and effective implementation of the ISM Code (the Study thereafter), in order to facilitate and streamline the Committees' proceedings.

### ***Comprehensive revision of the guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations and companies***

18.3 The Committee considered the recommendation on a comprehensive revision of all the guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations and companies (MSC 109/19/7, paragraph 6.1).

18.4 The Committee, having:

- .1 noted the concerns expressed regarding the suitability of ISO standards as a reference in the revision of ISM related provisions; and
- .2 highlighted that implementation was a key challenge regarding the effectiveness of the ISM Code,

agreed to carry out a comprehensive revision of the guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations and companies, in particular resolution A.1188(33) on *Guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations* and MSC-MEPC.7/Circ.8 on *Revised guidelines for the operational implementation of the International Safety Management (ISM) Code by Companies*, including the addressing of the elements recommended by the JTWG (MSC 109/19/7, paragraph 6.1), taking into account recommendation 1 in the report of the Study (MSC 109/INF.3, annex) and the analysis of ISM Code implementation set out in relevant parts of document III 9/4; as well as the proposal in document MSC 107/17/5.

18.5 In this context, the Committee also agreed to include in the biennial agenda of the III Sub-Committee for 2026-2027 and the provisional agenda for III 12 an output on "Comprehensive revision of the guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code by Administrations and companies", with a target completion year of 2028, assigning the III Sub-Committee as the coordinating organ, in association with the HTW Sub-Committee, as

and when requested by the III Sub-Committee, and invited MEPC 84 to become a parent organ in this output.

***Review the PSC guidelines in relation to the ISM Code***

18.6 The Committee considered the recommendation on a review of the PSC guidelines in relation to the ISM Code (MSC 109/19/7, paragraph 6.2).

18.7 Having noted that there was a need to ensure that inspections in the context of the ISM Code were consistently carried out by port State control regimes worldwide, the Committee instructed the III Sub-Committee to further consider recommendation 2 in the report of the Study (MSC 109/INF.3, annex), under the existing output on "Measures to harmonize port State control (PSC) activities and procedures worldwide (1.11)" and take action as appropriate, with a view to advising the Committee.

***Review of the ISM Code***

18.8 The Committee considered the recommendation on a review of the ISM Code to identify elements that could be revised to improve its effectiveness and implementation (MSC 109/19/7, paragraph 6.3).

18.9 During the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted:

- .1 the concerns expressed regarding some of the Code provisions proposed for review, as identified in recommendation 3 in the report of the Study;
- .2 that the ISM Code had been widely regarded as a generic, goal-based framework that effectively supported robust safety management in shipping and its flexible structure already enabled the addressing of industry changes, technological advancements, and other developments, which should be preserved by avoiding amendments to the Code at this stage; and
- .3 the overwhelming support for a comprehensive review and revision of the guidelines on implementation as an appropriate first step to improve the effectiveness and effective implementation of the ISM Code before considering any possible review of the Code itself.



18.10 Following consideration, the Committee instructed the III Sub-Committee, when carrying out the work concerning the implementation guidelines (see paragraph 18.5), to take into account the recommendations emanating from the JTWG (MSC 108/16/1, paragraph 2.2); and recommendation 3 in the report of the Study (MSC 109/INF.3, annex).

***Holistic review of instruments dealing with resources and personnel***

18.11 The Committee considered the recommendation on a holistic review of instruments dealing with resources and personnel (MSC 109/19/7 paragraph 6.4).

18.12 During the discussion, diverging views were expressed on this recommendation. While some delegations raised that the compelling need for a holistic review of instruments related to resources and personnel had not been established, other delegations supported such a review to address issues related to onboard resources and personnel, particularly fatigue and seafarers' hours of work and rest.

18.13 In this context, the Committee:

- .1 recalled its decision at MSC 105 to include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Scoping exercise and enhancement of the effectiveness of provisions on fatigue and seafarers' hours of work and rest", with two sessions needed to complete the output, assigning the HTW Sub-Committee as the coordinating organ, in association with the III Sub-Committee as and when requested by the HTW Sub-Committee;
- .2 noted that relevant provisions, such as section A-VIII/1 of the 1978 STCW Convention, SOLAS chapter IX, the ISM Code, the *Guidelines on fatigue* (MSC.1/Circ.1598), and the *Principles of minimum safe manning* (resolution A.1047(27)), had already been included as part of the scoping exercise of that output; and
- .3 noted that recommendation 3 in the report of the Study (MSC 109/INF.3, annex) aligned with the objectives of said output.

18.14 Following consideration, the Committee:

- .1 agreed to move the output on "Scoping exercise and enhancement of the effectiveness of provisions on fatigue and seafarers' hours of work and rest" from its post-biennial agenda to the biennial agenda of the HTW Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium, and the provisional agenda for HTW 12, with a target completion year of 2027; and
- .2 instructed the HTW and III Sub-Committees, when carrying out this work, to consider recommendation 3 in the report of the Study (MSC 109/INF.3, annex).

***Non-technical skills training of those involved in the implementation of ISM provisions***

18.15 The Committee considered the recommendation on the establishment of measures to address non-technical skills training of those involved in the implementation of ISM provisions (MSC 109/19/7, paragraph 6.5). Following consideration, the Committee instructed the HTW Sub-Committee to further consider recommendation 5 in the report of the Study (MSC 109/INF.3, annex) and advise the Committee accordingly and, in this context, invited interested Member States and international organizations to submit relevant proposals to HTW 12.

***Capacity-building on the effective implementation of the ISM Code and its related instruments***

18.16 The Committee considered the recommendation on the enhancement of capacity-building on the effective implementation of the ISM Code and its related instruments (MSC 109/19/7, paragraph 6.6).

18.17 Having noted the linkage of ISM-related capacity-building activities and the work on the revision of the guidelines on the implementation of the ISM Code (see paragraph 18.6), the Committee:

- .1 instructed the III Sub-Committee, taking into account recommendation 6 in the report of the Study (MSC 109/INF.3, annex), to consider measures to enhance the sharing of safety information, including lessons learned developed by the III Sub-Committee and the reports in GISIS (Marine Casualties and Incidents); and

- .2 invited the Technical Cooperation Committee to consider capacity-building activities on the effective implementation of the ISM Code and its related instruments, under the Integrated Technical Cooperation Programme (ITCP), as appropriate.

### ***Endorsement by MEPC***

18.18 The Committee invited MEPC 84 to endorse the actions taken at this session in relation to the ISM Code and related matters, without restricting the work to be initiated by relevant sub-committees in 2026.

### **Hours of work and hours of rest**

18.19 The Committee had for its consideration document MSC 110/18/21 (Bangladesh et al.), providing further considerations on the existing output on "Scoping exercise and enhancement of the effectiveness of provisions on fatigue and seafarers' hours of work and rest" (see paragraph 18.14). In this connection, the Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.10 (Egypt, et al.), regarding a summary of recent research quantifying the challenges related to the implementation of regulations on hours of work and rest.

18.20 In this regard, the Committee recalled that, when MSC 105 had agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda the output on "Scoping exercise and enhancement of the effectiveness of provisions on fatigue and seafarers' hours of work and rest", it had also agreed that coordination with ILO would be necessary to take any follow-up action as a result of the scoping exercise carried out in the context of IMO provisions.

18.21 In this context, the Committee noted that the Fifth meeting of the Special Tripartite Committee of the MLC, 2006 (STC 5), which was held in Geneva from 7 to 11 April 2025, had considered matters related to the hours of work and rest, the outcome of which was expected to be formally reported by ILO to a future session of the Committee.

18.22 The Committee also noted that the first phase of the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code had identified a gap on hours of rest in STCW regulation VIII/1 and section A-VIII/1 of the STCW Code (HTW 11/WP.4, annex 1).

18.23 Having recalled its earlier decision (see paragraph 18.14.1), the Committee instructed the HTW Sub-Committee to consider the elements raised in document MSC 110/18/21, taking into account document MSC 110/INF.10, under the output on "Scoping exercise and

enhancement of the effectiveness of provisions on fatigue and seafarers' hours of work and rest", noting the addressing of an identified gap on hours of rest within the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code.

#### **PROPOSALS FOR NEW OUTPUTS**

18.24 The Committee noted that MEPC 83 had approved MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.6 on *Organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies*, which introduced a new process for the preliminary assessment of proposals for new outputs or the expansion of the scope of existing outputs.

18.25 The Committee recalled that MSC 109 had not extended the moratorium on submissions of proposals for new outputs; had decided to apply the changes introduced in the Committees' method of work starting with submissions to MSC 110; and had agreed to implement the new requirement for the submission of a "road map" linked with proposals for new outputs on a voluntary basis in this interim period until the concurrent approval by MEPC (MSC 109/22, paragraph 19.15).

18.26 The Committee noted that, due to the moratorium applied, in addition to the proposal for a new output on the ISM Code revision, submitted to MSC 107, together with other ISM-related matters, seven new output proposals received at MSC 108 and MSC 109 were still pending consideration.

#### **Observations on the initial implementation of the preliminary assessment process by the Group of Chairs**

18.27 Before considering proposals for new outputs, the Committee considered MSC 110/J/8 (Note by the Chair), containing information on the experience gained, challenges encountered and observations noted by the Group of Chairs during the initial implementation of the new process for the preliminary assessment of proposals for new outputs in accordance with the revised Committees' method of work (MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.6).

18.28 The Committee noted that, despite the considerable commitment of time and expertise required, the new process was widely recognized by the Group of Chairs as a necessary and valuable investment to support more efficient decision-making and better workload management across the Committee and its subsidiary bodies. The Committee

endorsed the recommendations contained in MSC 110/J/8 and invited Member States, in particular, to:

- .1 consider submitting relevant proposals to the next session of the Committee, under the agenda item "Application of the Committees' method of work", with a view to improving the content and usefulness of the capacity-building and human element checklists set out in annex 2, appendices 1 and 2; and annex 5, appendix, of MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.6; and
- .2 be guided by the criteria set out in annex 8 of MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.6 when drafting their proposals for new outputs, with particular attention to the description of "need" and "benefit" in the proposals and the use of SMART terms, in order to ensure appropriate quality of the proposals.

18.29 In this connection, the Secretary-General highlighted the growing burden placed on the Secretariat due to the insufficient quality of some documents submitted to the Organization, which impacted the final result of the outputs, and expressed the need for discipline concerning the recommendation in MSC 110/J/8 inviting the Secretariat to apply greater scrutiny to documents submitted and reject those that do not meet the minimum requirements.

18.30 The Committee expressed its appreciation to the Group of Chairs for the extensive work undertaken on assessing the proposals for new outputs. The Committee extended its appreciation to Mr. Ian Lancaster (New Zealand), who had chaired the Working Group on Workload of the Committee during MSC 108 and MSC 109, for his instrumental role and contribution to this process.

### **Comprehensive analysis of the consistency of the term "bulk carrier"**

18.31 The Committee considered documents MSC 109/19/1 and MSC 110/18/19 (India), proposing a new output for a comprehensive analysis of the consistency of the term "bulk carrier" and its respective definition in all certificates.

18.32 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee did not agree to include the proposed output in the work programme.

18.33 In this regard, India expressed its readiness to revise the proposal and submit it to a future session.

**Development of performance standards for Ranging mode (R-mode) in radionavigation receivers**

18.34 The Committee considered document MSC 109/19/2 (Austria et al.), proposing a new output to develop performance standards for Ranging mode (R-mode) in radionavigation receivers.

18.35 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee agreed to include in the biennial agenda of the NCSR Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium and the provisional agenda for NCSR 13 an output on "Development of performance standards for Ranging mode (R-mode) in radionavigation receivers", with a target completion year of 2027, assigning the NCSR Sub-Committee as the associated organ. In doing so, the Committee agreed with a proposal by the delegation of Japan that the scope of the output should also include consideration of any necessary amendments to resolution A.1046(27) concerning the use of R-mode as part of the worldwide radionavigation system.

**Revision of the Casualty Investigation Code**

18.36 The Committee considered documents MSC 109/19/4 (Australia et al.) and MSC 110/18/9 (Australia), proposing a new output to review the Casualty Investigation Code.

18.37 Having recalled the background leading to this proposal and noting that the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2 recommended that the Committee did not undertake the work, the Committee agreed to include in the biennial agenda of the III Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium and the provisional agenda for III 12 an output on "Review of the Casualty Investigation Code and the associated implementation Guidelines (resolution A.1075(28))", with a target completion year of 2028, assigning the III Sub-Committee as the associated organ; and instructed the III Sub-Committee to keep the scope of the output addressing mainly the quality and timeliness of investigations and reports.

---

**Revision of paragraph 2.1.1.1 of chapter 3 of the FSS Code**

18.38 The Committee considered documents MSC 109/19/5 and MSC 110/18/20 (Republic of Korea), proposing a new output to amend paragraph 2.1.1.1 of chapter 3 of the FSS Code, with a view to clarifying the applicable equipment standards for fire-fighters' outfits.

18.39 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Clarification of applicable equipment standards for fire-fighters' outfits in chapter 3 of the FSS Code", with one session needed to complete the output, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the associated organ.

18.40 In approving the output, the Committee instructed the SSE Sub-Committee to:

- .1 consider whether the required clarification regarding the applicable equipment standards for fire-fighters' outfits should be provided through a non-mandatory footnote or amendments to the main text of the FSS Code; and
- .2 take into account ISO standard 22488:2011 on Ships and marine technology – Shipboard fire-fighters' outfits (protective clothing, gloves, boots, and helmet) when revising the FSS Code.

18.41 If, based on the considerations by the Sub-Committee, a non-mandatory footnote was not appropriate to address the matter, the Committee agreed, in accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1481 on *Guidance on entry into force of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments* and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3 on *Guidance on drafting of amendments to the 1974 SOLAS Convention and related mandatory instruments*, that:

- .1 the instrument to be amended would be the FSS Code, paragraph 2.1.1.1 of chapter 3;
- .2 the amendments would apply to new installation only; and
- .3 the amendments to be developed in the FSS Code should enter into force in accordance with the four-year SOLAS amendment cycle.

**Further review of the Code on Alerts and Indicators to include the consideration of engine control room alert management (ECRAM)**

18.42 The Committee considered documents:

- .1 MSC 109/19/6 (Norway), proposing a new output to expand the scope of the existing output on the Review of the 2009 Code on Alerts and Indicators to include the consideration of engine control room alert management; and
- .2 MSC 110/INF.29 (Denmark), providing information on the study on Alarm Management in the Maritime Industry, volume 1 by the Lloyd's Register, relevant to the proposed new output.

18.43 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee agreed to include in the biennial agenda of the SDC Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium and the provisional agenda for SDC 12 an output on "Development of engine control room alert management (ECRAM) performance standards", with a target completion year of 2028, assigning the SDC Sub-Committee as the coordinating organ, in association with the SSE and HTW Sub-Committees, as and when requested by the SDC Sub-Committee.

18.44 In this respect, the Committee agreed that consequential amendments to the 2025 Code on Alerts and Indicators (expected to be adopted by A 34) (see paragraph 11.21) should be considered at a later stage under the same output, after conclusion of the ECRAM performance standards.

**Development of guidelines addressing risks of falls from height**

18.45 The Committee considered document III 9/19, annex 2, proposing a new output to develop guidelines to address risks of falls from height, consideration of which had been postponed by MSC 108.

18.46 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee:

- .1 noted that the HTW Sub-Committee would not be able to undertake the work on this output until the current work on the comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code was completed; and



- .2 agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Development of guidelines addressing risks of falls from height", with four sessions needed to complete the output, assigning the HTW Sub-Committee as the coordinating organ, in association with the III Sub-Committee, as and when requested by the HTW Sub-Committee.

**Amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes and 1979,1989 and 2009 MODU Codes to ensure the consistent application of resolution MSC.402(96)**

18.47 The Committee recalled that MSC 109, following consideration of document MSC 109/12 (Secretariat), containing the report of SSE 10 including a justification to amend the 1994/2000 HSC Codes and 1979/1989/2009 MODU Codes in order to ensure the consistent application of resolution MSC.402(96), had already agreed to include the corresponding output in the provisional agenda of the appropriate session of the SSE Sub-Committee, upon the completion of the existing output relating to the comprehensive review of resolution MSC.402(96) (MSC 109/22, paragraph 12.24).

18.48 In this connection, the Committee confirmed the agreement of MSC 109 and agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Application of resolution MSC.402(96) to high-speed craft and mobile offshore drilling units in the HSC Codes and MODU Codes", with two sessions needed to complete the output, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the associated organ.

18.49 The Committee also agreed, in accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1481 and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3, as appropriate, that:

- .1 the amendments to be developed should apply to new and existing craft and units subject to the HSC and MODU Codes;
- .2 the output was to amend provisions in the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes and 1979, 1989 and 2009 MODU Codes to apply the requirements in SOLAS regulation III/20.11 and resolution MSC.402(96), as appropriate, to high-speed craft and mobile offshore drilling units; and
- .3 the amendments to be developed in 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes should enter into force in accordance with the four-year SOLAS amendment cycle.

18.50 In this regard, the Committee instructed the SSE Sub-Committee to align the effective date for the application of the amendments to the non-mandatory 1979, 1989 and 2009 MODU Codes with the entry-into-force date of the amendments to the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes.

**Revision of chapter 4 of resolution MSC.81(70) concerning requirements for testing the compliance of pyrotechnics**

18.51 The Committee considered documents:

- .1 MSC 110/18/1 (Austria et al.), proposing a new output on the revision of chapter 4 of resolution MSC.81(70) concerning requirements for testing the compliance of pyrotechnics, with the aim to avoid bad performance and to consider possible measures to support the sharing of information between Administrations on non-compliant equipment; and
- .2 MSC 110/INF.2 (Germany), providing relevant information on the findings of an investigation of the compliance of marine distress signals with resolution MSC.81(70).

18.52 The Committee, having:

- .1 agreed that the proposal to consider measures facilitating the sharing of information on equipment not complying with IMO requirements through GISIS, should not be considered as part of the output as it had not been fully documented in the proposal; and
- .2 considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2,

agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Revision of resolution MSC.81(70) concerning requirements for testing the compliance of pyrotechnics", with two sessions needed to complete the output, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the associated organ.

**Revision of paragraph 5.4.3 of the IMDG Code in order to harmonize the required information on board**

18.53 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/2 (Kingdom of the Netherlands), proposing a new output on the revision of paragraph 5.4.3 of the IMDG Code in order to

harmonize the required information regarding the dangerous goods on board regardless of whether a manifest, special list or stowage plan was used.

18.54 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee did not agree to include the proposed output in the work programme. In this context, the delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands expressed its readiness to review the proposal and resubmit it at a future session.

#### **Mitigation of the risks of fires in the engine-room and provisions for use of thermal imaging cameras**

18.55 The Committee considered the following documents together due to their relevance:

- .1 MSC 110/18/3 (Austria et al.), proposing a new output to amend SOLAS regulation II-2/4 and relevant recommendations (i.e. MSC.1/Circ.1321 on *Guidelines for measures to prevent fires in engine-rooms and cargo pump-rooms*) to mitigate the risks of fires in the engine-room caused by leakages from low-pressure fuel pipes and lubrication oil pipes; and
- .2 MSC 110/18/14 (Canada et al.), proposing a new output to amend MSC.1/Circ.1321 to include provisions for use of thermal imaging cameras.

18.56 Having considered the preliminary assessments of these proposals by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee agreed to merge the two output proposals and include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Mitigation of fire risks caused by leakages from low-pressure fuel pipes and lubrication oil pipes, and use of thermal imaging cameras when inspecting insulations, in engine rooms", with two sessions needed to complete the output, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the associated organ.

18.57 In this context, the Committee agreed, in accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1481 and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3, that:

- .1 the amendments to be developed should apply to new ships;
- .2 the output was to amend:

- .1 SOLAS regulation II-2/4 and MSC.1/Circ.1321 to mitigate the risks of fires in the engine-room caused by leakages from low-pressure fuel pipes and lubrication oil pipes; and
- .2 MSC.1/Circ.1321 to include provisions for use of thermal imaging cameras when inspecting insulation installations; and
- .3 the amendments to be developed to SOLAS should enter into force in accordance with the four-year SOLAS amendment cycle.

**Develop guidance addressing the implementation of recurrent references to mandatory IMO instruments by Member States**

18.58 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/4 (China), proposing a new output to develop guidance addressing the implementation of recurrent references to mandatory IMO instruments by Member States.

18.59 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee did not agree to include the proposed output in the work programme.

**Revision of paragraph 6.1.7 of chapter VI of the LSA Code regarding lowering speed requirements for fast rescue boats**

18.60 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/5 (China), proposing a new output to revise paragraph 6.1.7 of chapter VI of the LSA Code regarding the lowering speed requirements for fast rescue boats.

18.61 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Revision of the LSA Code regarding lowering speed requirements for fast rescue boats", with one session needed to complete the output, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the associated organ.

18.62 In this regard, the Committee agreed, in accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1481 and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3, that:

- .1 the amendments to be developed should apply to new installations;

- .2 the output was to amend regulations in the LSA Code, chapter VI, paragraph 6.1.7, to improve and harmonize the lowering speed requirements for fast rescue boats fully loaded with persons and equipment; and
- .3 the amendments to be developed should enter into force in accordance with the four-year SOLAS amendment cycle.

#### **Develop guidelines for survey, operation and management of offshore personnel transfer baskets**

18.63 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/6 (Brazil et al.), proposing a new output to develop guidelines for survey, operation and management of offshore personnel transfer baskets.

18.64 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee did not agree to include the proposed output in the work programme. In this context, the Committee invited interested Member States and international organizations to consider submitting a revised proposal with a wider scope of application of such personnel transfer baskets to a future session.

#### **Better utilization of the Long-Range Identification and Tracking (LRIT) system**

18.65 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/7 (Liberia et al.), proposing a new output for better utilization of the Long-Range Identification and Tracking (LRIT) system, consisting of several modifications to existing testing and audit procedures and SOLAS Contracting Governments entitlements to receive LRIT information, which could assist in identifying dark-fleet operations, fraudulent registration and registries of ships, and improvement of the search and rescue operations and protection of the marine environment.

18.66 While several delegations recognized the importance of addressing dark-fleet operations and enhancing the use of the LRIT system, in view of the shortcomings identified during the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee did not agree to include the proposed output in the work programme and invited interested Member States to consider resubmitting the proposal to a future session of the Committee.

### **Revision of the financial architecture of the LRIT system**

18.67 The Committee recalled that MSC 106, having considered document MSC 104/15/28 (Brazil et al.), proposing a new output to amend SOLAS regulation V/19-1 to allow coastal States to receive LRIT information at the standard transmission rate (i.e. six hours) free of charge, had concluded that further information was necessary to consider how the cost-related issues would be addressed and invited interested parties to consider re-submitting the proposal to a future session, addressing cost implications (MSC 106/19, paragraphs 16.18 to 16.22).

18.68 In this regard, the Committee considered document MSC 110/18/13 (Brazil), proposing a new output to review the financial architecture of the LRIT system, with a view to amending SOLAS regulation V/19-1 to allow for the provision of regular six-hourly LRIT position reports to coastal States free of charge, taking into account the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2.

18.69 Having noted that the proposed output would require first a policy decision by the Committee, the Committee agreed to take a two-step approach, as follows:

- .1 a technical group, to be established at MSC 111, would consider the review of the financial architecture of the LRIT system, including whether the regular six-hourly LRIT position reports should be provided free of charge to coastal States entitled to receive such information, taking into account the financial impact on the LRIT system; and
- .2 subject to the outcome of discussions at MSC 111, the Committee would decide how to proceed with the development of amendments to SOLAS regulation V/19-1.

18.70 Based on the above, the Committee agreed to include in the biennial agenda of the Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium and in the provisional agenda for MSC 111 an output on "Review of the financial architecture of the LRIT system", with an initial target completion year of 2026. The Committee decided that the output would remain at the Committee's level for the time being and that the NCSR Sub-Committee might be assigned as an associated organ at a later stage.

18.71 In accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1481 and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3, the Committee also agreed that, should amendments to SOLAS be required to be developed as part of this output:

- .1 the amendments to be developed should apply to all ships, new and existing, to which SOLAS regulation V/19-1 applied;
- .2 the output was to amend SOLAS regulation V/19-1; and
- .3 the amendments to be developed should enter into force in accordance with the four-year SOLAS amendment cycle.

### **Clarification of escape arrangements from machinery spaces**

18.72 The Committee recalled that documents MSC 110/18/8 and MSC 110/INF.13 (Liberia), proposing a new output on amendments to SOLAS regulation II-2/13 to clarify escape arrangements from machinery spaces, had been considered under agenda item 11 and the proposed output had been agreed, together with the approval of MSC.1/Circ.[...], providing information to Administrations and port State authorities on the work of the Organization regarding the revision of SOLAS regulations II-2/13.4.1 and 13.4.2, as well as inviting PSC authorities to take a pragmatic approach during inspections until any amendments had entered into force, or the conclusion of the work under the new output, as appropriate (see paragraphs 11.27).

18.73 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee confirmed the inclusion in the biennial agenda of the SDC Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium and the provisional agenda for SDC 12, an output on "Review and, if necessary, amendment of SOLAS regulations II-2/13.4.1.1 and 13.4.2.1 to clarify the requirements on escape arrangements from the lower part of machinery spaces", with a target completion year of 2027, assigning the SDC Sub-Committee as the associated organ (see paragraph 11.27).

**Amendments to section 4.2 of the IMSBC Code regarding the cargo information and sample declaration form to be provided by the shipper**

18.74 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/10 (China), proposing a new output to amend section 4.2 of the IMSBC Code regarding the cargo information and sample declaration form to be provided by the shipper.

18.75 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, and taking into account that there was an existing continuous output on "Amendments to the IMSBC Code and supplements" on the agenda of the CCC Sub-Committee, the Committee instructed CCC 12 to consider this proposal under this output.

**Revision of SOLAS regulation II-2/6 to address testing requirements for the floor covering materials**

18.76 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/11 (Islamic Republic of Iran et al.), proposing a new output to amend SOLAS regulation II-2/6.2.1 to address the testing requirements for the floor covering materials, with a view to ensuring consistent implementation.

18.77 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda an output on "Revision of testing requirements for floor covering materials in SOLAS regulation II-2/6.2.1", with one session needed to complete the output, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the associated organ.

18.78 In this regard, the Committee agreed, in accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1481 and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3 that:

- .1 the amendments to be developed should apply to new ships;
- .2 the output was to amend SOLAS regulation II-2/6.2.1 to enhance consistent application of smoke and toxicity requirements for floor coverings in order to reduce safety hazards during evacuation in case of fire; and
- .3 the amendments to be developed should enter into force in accordance with the four-year SOLAS amendment cycle.



---

**Revision of SOLAS regulation II-2/20.6.1.4 and 20.6.1.5, and chapters 6 and 7 of the FSS Code to provide consistency on fixed fire-extinguishing systems**

18.79 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/12 (Cook Islands et al.), proposing a new output to amend SOLAS regulation II-2/20.6.1, and chapters 6 and 7 of the FSS Code to provide consistency on fixed fire-extinguishing systems in vehicle and ro-ro spaces.

18.80 The Committee, having:

- .1 noted that it might be unnecessary to amend chapter 6 of the FSS Code in order to remove references to special category spaces, as SOLAS permitted the use of fixed foam fire-extinguishing systems in such spaces; and
- .2 considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2,

agreed to include in the post-biennial agenda an output on "Revision of SOLAS regulation II-2/20 and chapter 7 of the FSS Code", with one session needed to complete the output, assigning the SSE Sub-Committee as the associated organ.

18.81 In this regard, the Committee agreed, in accordance with MSC.1/Circ.1481 and MSC.1/Circ.1500/Rev.3, that:

- .1 the amendments to be developed should apply to new ships;
- .2 the output was to amend SOLAS regulation II-2/20.6.1 and chapter 7 of the FSS Code; and
- .3 the amendments to be developed should enter into force in accordance with the four-year SOLAS amendment cycle.

**Revision of MSC-MEPC.3/Circ.4/Rev.1 on casualty-related matters in the context of reports on marine casualties and incidents**

18.82 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/15 (Bahamas et al.), proposing a new output to revise MSC-MEPC.3/Circ.4/Rev.1 on casualty-related matters in the context of reports on marine casualties and incidents.

18.83 Having considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2, the Committee did not agree to include the proposed output in the work programme.

**Amendments to the SOLAS Convention and revision of the Code of Safety for Nuclear Merchant Ships (resolution A.491 (XII))**

18.84 The Committee recalled that relevant parts of document MSC 110/18/16 (Russian Federation), regarding the revision of the *Code of Safety for Nuclear Merchant Ships* (resolution A.491 (XII)), together with the corresponding amendments to SOLAS chapter VIII, had already been considered under agenda item 6 (GHG safety), including document MSC 110/INF.6, containing additional information on the matter.

18.85 The Committee recalled also the decision of the Committee under agenda item 6, in relation to nuclear power for ships (see paragraph 6.47).

18.86 In the light of foregoing, the Committee:

- .1 considered the remaining part of document MSC 110/18/16, proposing the extension of the application of SOLAS chapter VIII and the *Code of Safety for Nuclear Merchant Ships* to non-self-propelled Floating Nuclear Power Units (FNPPs) to regulate the safety of such units; and
- .2 noted a statement by the delegation of the Russian Federation, the full text of which is set out in annex [...], emphasizing the growing importance of FNPPs using low-power nuclear reactors as a means to support net zero goals by supplying clean energy to remote areas and critical infrastructure. The delegation cited some operational examples, highlighted the lack of clarity in the application of the SOLAS Convention and the *Code of Safety for Nuclear Merchant Ships* to FNPPs. It called for the modernization of these instruments to ensure technological neutrality and alignment with International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safety standards, proposing a new output to amend relevant provisions. The delegation expressed flexibility on procedural modalities but stressed the urgency of updating IMO regulations to enable the safe and transparent deployment of FNPPs.

18.87 The Committee, having:

- .1 considered the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2 with respect to FNPPs; and
- .2 noted that a separate set of non-mandatory provisions addressing safety requirements for FNPPs could be developed at a later stage, taking into account that inter-agency work in cooperation with the IAEA might be necessary,

did not agree to include the proposed output in the work programme; and invited interested Member States and international organizations to submit a relevant new output proposal in accordance with the Committees' method of work, for the development of a set of non-mandatory provisions addressing FNPPs.

**Addressing the implementation of provisions left "to the satisfaction of the Administration"**

18.88 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/17 (Russian Federation and United Arab Emirates), proposing a new output to develop guidelines addressing the implementation of provisions left "to the satisfaction of the Administration", or equivalent, in the relevant mandatory IMO instruments with the aim to compile and maintain a comprehensive list of these requirements.

18.89 The Committee recalled that, at its 106th session, it had instructed the III Sub-Committee to develop guidance for Administrations on the documentation/structure that they should provide to demonstrate compliance with provisions that included the term "to the satisfaction of the Administration", or equivalent, taking into account that not all flexibilities provided by various IMO instruments were the same and avoiding imposing an administrative burden on Administrations (MSC 106/19, paragraphs 14.23.1 and 14.24).

18.90 The Committee noted that the work in response to that instruction had been completed with the approval of MSC-MEPC.2/Circ.19 on *Guidance in relation to the IMO Member States Audit Scheme (IMSAS) to assist in the implementation of the III Code by Member States*, containing only generic and principles to deal with the matter, but as agreed by III 9, possible ways of identifying those provisions containing the phrase "to the satisfaction of the Administration", or equivalent, should be explored. In this context, III 10 invited interested

Member States and international organizations to consider submitting proposals for a new output to the Committees for the development of relevant guidelines.

18.91 Following consideration, and having noted that the preliminary assessment of the proposal by the Group of Chairs in document MSC 110/WP.2 had recommended that the Committee did not undertake the work, together with the aforementioned background, the Committee:

- .1 agreed to include in its post-biennial agenda, with a view to inclusion in the biennial agenda of the III Sub-Committee for the 2028-2029 biennium, an output on "Development of guidelines addressing the implementation of provisions left 'to the satisfaction of the Administration', or equivalent, in the relevant mandatory IMO instruments", with the aim to compile and to maintain a comprehensive list of these requirements, with two sessions needed to complete the output;
- .2 invited MEPC to become a parent organ for the output; and
- .3 noting that III 11 had received documents on the matter under the agenda item "any other business", agreed that the III Sub-Committee might initiate preparatory work before undertaking the work on the output in the 2028-2029 biennium.

#### **Development of amendments to resolutions FAL.13(42) and MSC.448(99)**

18.92 Having considered the invitation of the FAL Committee (MSC 110/2, paragraph 1.6) for the Committee to become an associated organ to the new output 5.6 on "Development of amendments to the *Revised guidelines on the prevention of access by stowaways and the allocation of responsibilities to seek the successful resolution of stowaway cases* (resolutions FAL.13(42) and MSC.448(99))", the Committee agreed to become an associated organ to this output.

#### **Endorsement of new outputs**

18.93 The Committee invited the Council to endorse the agreed new outputs, in accordance with resolution A.1173(33) on *Strategic Plan for the Organization for the six-year period 2024-2029*.

---

**BIENNIAL AGENDAS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES AND PROVISIONAL AGENDAS FOR THEIR FORTHCOMING SESSIONS AND INTERSESSIONAL MEETINGS****Biennial agenda of the CCC Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for CCC 11**

18.94 Having recalled that MSC 109 had noted the biennial status report of the Sub-Committee and the provisional agenda for CCC 11, the Committee noted the possible need for extending the target completion year of outputs 7.20 on "Develop measures to prevent the loss of containers at sea"; and 7.40 on "Revision of the Revised guidelines for the preparation of the Cargo Securing Manual (MSC.1/Circ.1353/Rev.2) to include a harmonized performance standard for lashing software to permit lashing software as a supplement to the Cargo Securing Manual", which might be requested at a future session of the Committee.

18.95 Subsequently, the Committee confirmed the Sub-Committee's biennial status report for the 2024-2025 biennium and the provisional agenda for CCC 11, as approved at MSC 109, as revised, as set out in annexes [...] and [...], respectively.

18.96 In this regard, the Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved the revised terms of reference of the CCC Sub-Committee (MSC 109/22, paragraph 19.17), as set out in annex [...].

**Biennial agenda of the HTW Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for HTW 12**

18.97 The Committee:

- .1 noted the biennial status report of the Sub-Committee for the 2024-2025 biennium; and
- .2 approved the biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium, including the change of annual to continuous outputs; and the provisional agenda for HTW 12, as revised, as set out in annexes [...] and [...], respectively.

18.98 In this regard, the Committee recalled that it had confirmed that there was no need to modify the current terms of reference of the HTW Sub-Committee (paragraph 13.14), as set out in annex [...].

### **Biennial agenda of the III Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for III 11**

18.99 The Committee confirmed the Sub-Committee's biennial status report for the 2024-2025 biennium and the provisional agenda for III 11, as approved at MSC 109, as revised, as set out in annexes [...] and [...], respectively.

18.100 In this regard, the Committee recalled that MSC 109 had approved the revised terms of reference of the III Sub-Committee (MSC 109/22, paragraph 19.17), as set out in annex [...].

### **Biennial agenda of the NCSR Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for NCSR 13**

18.101 Having noted that the report of NCSR 12 (NCSR 12/20) would be considered at MSC 111, the Committee considered urgent matters emanating from the Sub-Committee, as set out in document MSC 110/WP.11 (Secretariat), and took action as summarized in the following paragraphs.

#### ***Status of output 2.18***

18.102 The Committee considered, in accordance with paragraph 5.12 of the Committees' method of work, whether output 2.18 (Development of guidelines for EPIRB which implement the two-way communication service via the SAR/Galileo Return Link service as a complement to EPIRB performance standards (resolution MSC.471(101))) should be kept in the biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium and the provisional agenda for NCSR 13, noting that no related documents had been received at NCSR 12.

18.103 After consideration, the Committee agreed to retain output 2.18 in the biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium and the provisional agenda for NCSR 13.

### ***Biennial agenda of the NCSR Sub-Committee and workload matters***

18.104 Having noted the consideration by NCSR 12 of matters relating to the workload of the Sub-Committee in response to the instructions by MSC 109; the Committee, in particular:

- .1 approved the draft revised terms of reference of the NCSR Sub-Committee, as set out in annex [...];
- .2 noted the Sub-Committee's biennial status report for the 2024-2025 biennium, as set out in annex [...];

- .3 approved the biennial agenda for the 2026-2027 biennium, as revised; and
- .4 approved the provisional agenda for NCSR 13, as a five-day session.

#### **Biennial agenda of the SDC Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for SDC 12**

18.105 The Committee noted the biennial status report of the Sub-Committee for the 2024-2025 biennium and agreed, in particular, to extend the target completion year of the following outputs:

- .1 "Revision of the Interim explanatory notes for the assessment of passenger ship systems' capabilities after a fire or flooding casualty (MSC.1/Circ.1369) and related circulars" (output 7.42) to 2027;
- .2 "Revision of SOLAS chapters II-1 (part C) and V, and related instruments regarding steering and propulsion requirements, to address both traditional and non-traditional propulsion and steering systems" (output 2.9) to 2028; and
- .3 "Guidelines for use of Fibre-Reinforced Plastics (FRP) within ship structures" (output 2.6) to 2026.

18.106 The Committee approved the biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium, and the provisional agenda for SDC 12, as revised, as set out in annexes [...] and [...], respectively.

18.107 In this regard, the Committee recalled that it had approved the revised terms of reference of the SDC Sub-Committee (paragraph 11.23), as set out in annex [...].

#### **Biennial agenda of the SSE Sub-Committee and provisional agenda for SSE 12**

18.108 The Committee agreed on the continued utilization of the transfer of outputs between the SDC and SSE Sub-Committees to balance their respective workloads, when necessary and, in this context, agreed to include the following items from the post-biennial agenda of the Committee in the provisional agenda for SDC 12:

- .1 "Development of amendments to chapter 6 of the 2009 MODU Code regarding electrical equipment capable of operation after shutdown (output 185)";
- .2 "Development of amendments to chapter 15 of the FSS Code on enclosed spaces containing a nitrogen receiver or a buffer tank of nitrogen generator system (output 186)"; and
- .3 "Revision of the Guidelines for the application of plastic pipes on ships (resolution A.753(18)) (output 192)".

18.109 The Committee noted the biennial status report of the Sub-Committee for the 2024-2025 biennium and agreed, in particular, to extend the target completion year of the following outputs:

- .1 "New requirements for ventilation of survival craft" (output 7.36) to 2027;
- .2 "Development of provisions to consider prohibiting the use of fire-fighting foams containing fluorinated substances, in addition to PFOS, for fire-fighting on board ships" (output 7.41) to 2026, with the understanding that the item would be considered completed if no documents were not received for a second year;
- .3 "Comprehensive review of the requirements for maintenance, thorough examination, operational testing, overhaul and repair of lifeboats and rescue boats, launching appliances and release gear (resolution MSC.402(96)) to address challenges with their implementation" (output 7.29) to 2027;
- .4 "Amendments to the LSA Code for thermal performance of immersion suits" (output 7.19) to 2027;
- .5 "Development of amendments to SOLAS chapter II-2 and the FSS Code concerning detection and control of fires in cargo holds and on the cargo deck of container ships" (output 7.15) to 2028; and



- .6 "Amendments to SOLAS chapter III, and chapter IV of the LSA Code to require the carriage of self-righting or canopied reversible liferafts for new ships" (output 7.30) to 2027.

18.110 The Committee approved the biennial agenda of the Sub-Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium, and the provisional agenda for SSE 12, as revised, as set out in annexes [...] and [...], respectively.

18.111 In this regard, the Committee recalled that it had approved the revised terms of reference of the SSE Sub-Committee (paragraph 14.33), as set out in annex [...].

#### **Biennial agenda of the PPR Sub-Committee**

18.112 The Committee noted that PPR 12 had not requested any action of the Committee.

#### **Biennial status report of the Committee and work programme for the 2026-2027 biennium**

18.113 The Committee invited the Council to note its updated biennial status report for the 2024-2025 biennium, as set out in annex [...].

#### ***Work programme of the Maritime Safety Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium***

18.114 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18/18 (Secretariat), containing the proposed work programme of MSC for the 2026-2027 biennium, and the post-biennial agenda of the Committee.

18.115 After consideration, the Committee:

- .1 approved the work programme of the Committee for the 2026-2027 biennium, including the post-biennial agenda of the Committee, as set out in annexes [...] and [...], respectively; and
- .2 invited the Council to note that the Secretariat would effect any updates and further changes to the work programme emanating from III 11 and CCC 11, which would meet after C 134, to be reported directly to C 135.

***Activities, priorities and plan of meeting weeks of the Committees and their subsidiary bodies for the 2026-2027 biennium***

18.116 The Committee considered document MSC 110/18 (Secretariat) containing the MSC and MEPC Chairs' proposals on activities, priorities and meetings of the two Committees and their subsidiary bodies for the 2026-2027 biennium and, having noted that these had already been approved by MEPC 83:

- .1 noted the information regarding the Committees' and Sub-Committees' planned activities and priorities during the 2026-2027 biennium (MSC 110/18, paragraphs 4 and 5); and
- .2 approved the proposed plan of meeting weeks for MSC and its subsidiary bodies for the 2026-2027 biennium (MSC 110/18, paragraph 6), for inclusion in the Secretary-General's relevant budget proposals, noting the Committee's confirmation of two sessions of five days each for the NCSR Sub-Committee.

***Intersessional meetings***

18.117 The Committee approved, subject to endorsement by the Council, the holding of the following intersessional meetings:

- .1 two intersessional meetings of the E&T Group for the IMSBC Code, one in the spring of 2026 and another one immediately after CCC 12;
- .2 comprehensive review of the 1978 STCW Convention and Code, to take place immediately after HTW 12 (February 2026); and
- .3 intersessional Working Group on MASS, from 29 September to 3 October 2025.

18.118 Having recalled that MSC 107 had approved the holding of annual meetings of the following groups on a continuous basis until decided otherwise (MSC 107/20, paragraph 17.79), the Committee also recalled that (MSC 109/22, paragraph 19.51):

- .1 the twenty-first meeting of the Joint IMO/ITU Experts Group on Maritime Radiocommunication Matters had been planned from 6 to 10 October 2025, at the IMO Headquarters; and
- .2 the thirty-second meeting of the ICAO/IMO Joint Working Group on Harmonization of Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue had been provisionally planned from 3 to 7 November 2025, in Sydney, Australia.

***Substantive items for inclusion in the agendas for MSC 111 and MSC 112***

18.119 Having considered the proposals in document MSC 110/WP.6 and taking into account the decisions made during the session, the Committee agreed to the substantive items to be included in the agendas of its MSC 111 and MSC 112 sessions, as set out in annex [...].

***Establishment of working and drafting groups at MSC 111***

18.120 The Committee agreed that, based on the decisions taken under various agenda items, working and drafting groups on the following subjects might be established at MSC 111:

- .1 Maritime autonomous surface ships (MASS);
- .2 Regulatory framework for safety of alternative fuels and new technologies;
- .3 Long-range identification and tracking of ships; and
- .4 Amendments to mandatory instruments.

**Duration and dates of the next two sessions**

18.121 The Committee noted that MSC 111 and MSC 112 had been tentatively scheduled to take place from 13 to 22 May 2026 and from 30 November to 4 December 2026, respectively.

**19 ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR FOR 2026**

19.1 The Committee unanimously elected Mr. Theofilos Mozas (Greece) as Chair for 2026, and, having noted that the Secretary-General had not received any candidature for the position of Vice-Chair at this session, agreed to postpone to MSC 111 the election for the position of Vice-Chair for 2026.

**Expression of appreciation**

19.2 The Committee expressed sincere thanks and appreciation to Ms. Mayte Medina (United States) for her excellent services to the Committee during the last five years when she served as the Chair of the Committee.

**20 ANY OTHER BUSINESS****Adoption of human-centred design principles**

20.1 The Committee considered document MSC 110/20 (Denmark and United Kingdom), providing information on the significance of human centred design (HCD) in maritime safety and regulatory work, and a draft MSC circular providing HCD principles to ensure a common understanding of the principles and the safe, secure, and environmentally sound operation of ships with the HCD principles.

20.2 Following consideration, acknowledging the importance of HCD principles for the work of the Organization and the need to ensure the appropriate application of these principles to the rule-making process, the Committee agreed that a new output would be required, so that the issue could be considered comprehensively and holistically, including how HCD principles could be applied correctly and effectively.

**Updates on telecommunication submarine cable resilience**

20.3 The Committee considered document MSC 110/20/1 (ITU), providing an update on the ITU initiatives related to telecommunication submarine cable resilience, including the establishment of an International Advisory Body on Submarine Cable Resilience.

20.4 Having noted the information provided as well as the support expressed by some delegations welcoming the ITU's initiatives on this matter, the Committee:

- .1 invited ITU to keep IMO informed of further developments on this matter and in particular, on any issues that may require consideration by IMO; and
- .2 requested the Secretariat to liaise with ITU and continue participating as observer in the International Advisory Body on Submarine Cable Resilience; and to provide any relevant advice for the Organization to assist with the ongoing discussions on submarine cables.

## **Guidelines for the seaworthiness and safety inspection of small fishing vessels**

20.5 The Committee considered documents MSC 110/20/2 and MSC 110/INF.4 (FAO and IMO Secretariats), providing background and justification for the preparation of the FAO/IMO Guidelines for the seaworthiness and safety inspection of small fishing vessels.

20.6 In this connection, the observer from FAO made a statement, underscoring the long-standing cooperation between FAO and IMO on ocean related matters, highlighting that the world fishing fleet consisted of 4.3 million of small fishing vessels of less than 12 meters in 2022 and only 5% of those were covered by marine hull insurance despite most fatalities and accidents happened on small-scale fishing vessels, stressing that the draft guidelines aimed to facilitate the supply of insurance services to small-scale fishers worldwide, particularly in developing countries, and expressing that FAO would be keen to make these guidelines a joint voluntary instrument together with IMO, similarly to other joint instruments developed in the past.

20.7 Following consideration, the Committee:

- .1 noted the continuing collaboration between FAO and IMO on improving safety in the global fishing fleets, in particular the safety of small fishing vessels; and
- .2 instructed III 12, under the existing output OW 8 on "Cooperate with the United Nations on matters of mutual interest, as well as provide relevant input/guidance" in the Committee's Work Programme, to review the draft guidelines for the seaworthiness and safety inspection of small fishing vessels and associated inspection checklist, with two sessions estimated to complete the work.

## **Thematic priorities for the ITCP of the Organization for the 2026-2027 biennium**

20.8 The Committee considered document MSC 110/20/3 (Secretariat), providing an update on the thematic priorities for the Integrated Technical Cooperation Programme (ITCP) of the Organization for the 2026-2027 biennium.

20.9 Having noted the support expressed on the updated thematic priorities for the ITCP, in particular regarding the implementation and enforcement of IMO instruments, the Committee

approved the thematic priorities for the ITCP for the 2026-2027 biennium as set out in paragraphs 3 to 5, and 23 of document MSC 110/20/3.

### **Safety of the nuclear-powered merchant vessels and floating nuclear power plants**

20.10 The Committee considered document MSC 110/20/4 (Russian Federation), providing information on the experience of the Russian Federation in regulating the safety of nuclear-powered merchant vessels (including nuclear icebreakers) and floating nuclear power plants (FNPP), with a proposal to review the previously developed provisions, i.e. 1962 International Convention on Liability of Operators for Nuclear Ships; and Safety Consideration in the Use of Ports and Approaches by Nuclear Merchant Ships No.27, 1968; and to initiate a joint expert-level cooperation between IMO and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

20.11 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views expressed:

- .1 the above-mentioned instruments were under the purview of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and, therefore, the experts of IMO and IAEA should collaborate to identify the needs before any revision work took place;
- .2 the proposed review of the outdated instruments should be undertaken in cooperation with IAEA, potentially under the IMO–IAEA ATLAS (Atomic Technologies License for Application at Sea) initiative; and
- .3 any future work on existing or new instruments would require the active involvement of Member States, in addition to collaboration between the Secretariats of IMO and IAEA.

20.12 In this context, the Committee noted the statement by the delegation of the Russian Federation, the full text of which is set out in annex [...], highlighting:

- .1 the absence of guidance for port Administrations regarding the safe entry, mooring, use of port electric grid, and operation of nuclear ships and floating nuclear power plants (FNPPs);

- .2 the need for a harmonized regime of civil liability for nuclear-powered vessels, consistent with internationally recognized principles of nuclear law; and
- .3 the Russian Federation's national experience with civilian nuclear icebreakers and the world's first operational nuclear floating power plant, offering this as a potential basis for developing international guidance.

20.13 Following consideration, the Committee (see also paragraphs 18.84 to 18.87):

- .1 noted the information provided, and the fact that the above-mentioned instruments fell under the purview of IAEA;
- .2 requested the Secretariat to continue to work with the IAEA Secretariat on issues related to commercial nuclear-powered ships, so that the experts from both organizations could cooperate, with a view to coordinating relevant actions and identifying regulatory needs; and
- .3 requested the Secretariat to provide relevant updates at future sessions of the SDC Sub-Committee and the Committee.

## **Matters related to IQARB and IMO/IACS cooperation**

### ***Development of IQARB***

20.14 The Committee recalled that MSC 109, having noted information on the developments at IQARB's sixth meeting provided in document MSC 109/21/4 (Secretariat), requested the Secretariat to continue keeping it regularly updated on any developments during the trial phase.

20.15 The Committee considered document MSC 110/20/5 (Secretariat), providing updated information on developments regarding the International Quality Assessment Review Body (IQARB) following IQARB's sixth meeting.

20.16 The Committee also noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.11 (Secretariat) regarding the Factual Statements issued to 12 IACS members by IQARB.

20.17 Following consideration, the Committee:

- .1 noted the development of IQARB, in particular the transition of the Quality Assurance and Certification Entity (QACE) and IQARB into a single body – IQARB – as a legal entity (Community Interest Company);
- .2 noted the information on the outcome of the Factual Statements issued to 12 IACS members by IQARB; and
- .3 requested the Secretariat to continue keeping the Committee regularly updated on any developments of IQARB.

***IMO/IACS cooperation on the IACS Quality System Certification Scheme (QSCS)***

20.18 The Committee considered document MSC 110/20/6 (Secretariat), providing information on the possible role change of IMO consultant/observer to IACS QSCS due to the development of IQARB (see paragraphs 20.[...]) and proposing a way forward as set out in paragraph 9 of the document.

20.19 The Committee also noted the report of the IMO consultant/observer concerning the developments of IACS QSCS for the period from February to December 2024, provided in document MSC 110/INF.32 (Secretariat).

20.20 Following consideration, the Committee:

- .1 noted the information provided on the possible role change of the IMO consultant/observer to IACS QSCS due to the development of IQARB and the developments of IACS QSCS from February to December 2024;
- .2 agreed to pause the role of IMO consultant/observer to IACS QSCS until further notice to assess the developments in IQARB; and invited the Secretary-General to develop terms of reference for a future IMO consultant/observer to IQARB, as appropriate, following assessment of the IQARB developments and in consultation with both IACS and IQARB; and



- .3 agreed that any future costs for an IMO consultant/observer to IQARB should be covered by IMO, and invited the Council to approve related budget provisions, if necessary.

**Mater related to the IMO/ILO/UNECE Code of Practice for Packing of Cargo Transport Units (2014 CTU Code)**

20.21 The Committee recalled that MSC 101 had considered the proposal by UNECE to start a revision of the 2014 CTU Code, endorsed the proposed terms of reference and authorized the Secretariat to participate in the work of the IMO/ILO/UNECE Group of Experts for the revision of the CTU Code (MSC 101/24, paragraphs 9.9 and 9.10).

20.22 In this connection, the Committee considered documents MSC 110/20/7 and MSC 110/INF.33 (UNECE), providing an update on the progress and ongoing process of updating and restructuring the 2014 CTU Code, as well as draft terms of reference for the Group of Experts for the finalization of the work on the 2014 CTU Code.

20.23 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted concerns raised regarding the draft terms of reference for the IMO/ILO/UNECE Group of Experts for the revision of the CTU Code. It was highlighted that the industry, which had played a significant role in developing both the original version and revisions of the CTU Code, was not consulted on the draft terms of reference prior to their submission to the Committee. Concerns were also expressed that the draft terms of reference appeared to impose unreasonable limitations on industry participation, including restrictions on speaking rights, submission of documents and expert representation, all of which could impact the inclusiveness and effectiveness of the revision process.

20.24 The Committee also noted the views that, Member States of IMO and the IMO Secretariat during their participation in the work of the Group of Experts would continue to be guided by the long-standing practices and procedures of the Organization and the Committee, including the fact that observers might participate and speak at any topic being considered by any sessions of the Group of Experts and non-governmental international organizations, which have been granted consultative status with IMO, might submit documents to such sessions without first obtaining co-sponsorship from Member States.

20.25 In this context, the Committee noted the comments by the Chair of the Committee with regard to the composition of the Group of Experts and participation of observers, in particular that:

- .1 while IMO would be represented in the Group of Experts by volunteer representatives of its Member States, representatives of other IMO Member States, international organizations and non-governmental organizations may participate in the Group of Experts as observers, without decision-making power;
- .2 the Chairperson, in agreement with the Vice-Chairpersons of the Group of Experts, might permit representatives of international and non-governmental organizations to make or circulate statements for the information of the meeting on matters included in the agenda, and might invite a limited number of technical experts to speak on the topics under consideration; and
- .3 the selection of the participating Member States and the Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson of the governments group was of particular importance, given their role in managing the process and maintaining balance.

20.26 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee agreed that, representatives of relevant international and non-governmental organizations in consultative status with IMO, such as WSC, FIATA, ICHCA and BIC, which participated in the Committee's discussions during this session, were invited to attend the Group as observers, taking into account paragraph 10 of the draft terms of reference, as set out in the annex to document MSC 110/20/7.

20.27 Following discussion, the Committee:

- .1 noted the progress made on the revision of the 2014 CTU Code (MSC 110/20/7, paragraphs 3 to 6);
- .2 approved the proposed draft terms of reference, as set out in the annex to document MSC 110/20/7, and agreed to the establishment of the ILO-IMO-UNECE Group of Experts for Finalization of modifications and restructuring of the CTU Code;
- .3 invited volunteer representatives of the IMO membership to participate, with maritime transport expertise, in the ILO-IMO-UNECE Group of Experts (planned for late 2025 or early 2026 in UN Geneva);

- .4 noted the information on the changes, updates and the reorganization (restructure) of the 2014 CTU Code, which would facilitate the discussions and further revision by the Group of Experts working on the revision of the 2014 CTU Code; and
- .5 requested the Secretariat to continue participating in, and contributing to the work of, the IMO-ILO-UNECE Group of Experts for the revision of the CTU Code.

### **Implementation of the Polar Code**

20.28 The Committee considered document MSC 110/20/8 (FOEI et al.), providing a summary of some issues already raised in previous documents on the challenges experienced in the implementation of the Polar Code, as well as new information presented at important venues, such as the Polar Maritime Seminar.

20.29 In the ensuing discussion, the Committee noted the following views expressed:

- .1 due to the unique nature of the Polar Code, its applicability was defined by geographical area rather than ship type, and a holistic approach to address implementation challenges in polar regions, was needed; and
- .2 recent meetings, including the [2025 Polar Maritime Seminar](#), had continued to identify challenges and lessons learned in implementing the Polar Code. Therefore, a structured review of the Code was supported, noting that nearly nine years had passed since its adoption.

20.30 Following consideration, the Committee:

- .1 noted the information provided, as well as the co-sponsors' commitment to providing further information on the challenges being experienced in the implementation of the Polar Code at future sessions of the Committee; and
- .2 invited interested Member States and international organizations to:
  - .1 continue sharing experiences related to the implementation of the Polar Code; and

- .2 submit a proposal for a new output to revise the Polar Code to a future session of the Committee, as appropriate.

### **Second update on the safety level of bulk carriers**

20.31 The Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.15 (France et al.), updating document MSC 96/INF.6 (France and Germany) and evaluating the safety level of bulk carriers from 1978 to 2024 based on the analysis of accident data.

### **Adriatic regional search and rescue technical agreement**

20.32 The Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.21 (Italy), regarding the Adriatic regional search and rescue technical agreement to enhance cooperation between the national competent authorities in the Adriatic region.

### **Matters related to the best practice industry publications released in 2024/2025**

20.33 The Committee noted the information provided in document MSC 110/INF.34 (ICS), regarding to the recent best practice guidance released in 2024 and 2025 from ICS, including *A Practical Guide to Shipboard Inspections, First Edition; Guide to Helicopter/Ship Operations, Sixth Edition; Maritime Security, Second Edition and Drug Trafficking and Drug Abuse On Board Ship, 2025-2026 Edition*.

### **Statements**

20.34 The delegation of the Cook Islands stated, with regard to document C/134/13/1 (Egypt et al.), and in particular with reference to the proposal to establish a sub-committee on GHG reduction, that it was important to emphasize that any steps to enhance GHG reduction must consider safety aspects, particularly those linked to alternative fuels and technologies, which MSC had already been carrying out substantive work through its working groups and subsidiary bodies. Therefore, should a decision to establish a sub-committee dealing with GHG reduction be taken, it was important that such sub-committee was under the purview of both MEPC and MSC, to allow for an effective coordination between the environmental and resulting safety matters that could originate from the new sub-committee's deliberations; it would also provide the industry with more certainties on future investments and would also be in line with the agreement at MSC 107 of ensuring a closer future coordination with MEPC on alternative fuels related matters.

20.35 The delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran informed the Committee of the terrible tragedy for the maritime community of the Islamic Republic of Iran as a result of the brutal and unlawful military aggression carried out by the Israeli regime that had occasioned the death of Mr. Hamed Saber, who had served in the Seafarers Affairs division of Iran's Ports and Maritime Organization, and his entire family. The horrific attack took place in the dead of night, in a peaceful residential building located in a small northern Iranian town – far from any military or nuclear facility, and the strike hit a private home, targeting innocent civilians as they slept. The Israeli regime had once again demonstrated – just as it had in Gaza – that it adhered to no moral, religious, or humanitarian principles. Its repeated and deliberate targeting of women, children and innocent civilians reflected a deeply rooted pattern of cruelty, one that was tragically enabled and supported by certain States. As requested, the full text of the statement by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran is set out in annex [...].

20.36 The Committee noted statements made by the observers of ICS and ITF, in relation to the unfair treatment of Captain Vitaly Tyutkalo, the master of MV **X-Press Pearl**, a ship that sank off the coast of Sri Lanka in 2021 following a fire on board that arose from a leak from a container stowed on deck. Following the sinking, several crew members including Captain Tyutkalo were arrested by the authorities and placed under a travel ban. Whilst most of the crew had subsequently been released, Captain Tyutkalo remained under a travel ban in Sri Lanka, over four years since the incident. The full text of their statements is set out in annex [...].

20.37 The Committee also noted a statement made by the delegation of Sri Lanka, providing background on the incident of MV **X-Press Pearl** as well as their relevant judicial considerations. The full text of their statement is set out in annex [...].

20.38 The delegation of Iceland, having recalled that fishing was one of the most dangerous occupations in the world, that the fatality rate related to fishing vessels was much higher than for the world merchant fleet, and that there were four key international instruments on safety of fishing: Cape Town Agreement, STCW-F Convention, ILO Work in Fishing Convention (No.188) and FAO Agreement on Port State Measures (PSMA), expressed appreciation to the IMO Secretariat for organizing many global, regional and national events to assist Member States in the implementation and ratification of the Cape Town Agreement, promoting its entry into force; and urged Member States to ratify the Cape Town Agreement as soon as possible.

20.39 Following the statements related to criminalization of seafarers and the Cape Town Agreement mentioned above, the Secretary-General provided the following comments:

- .1 On the 2012 Cape Town Agreement, the Secretary-General recalled that the requirements for its entry into force had been met in relation to the number of States. However, despite all the efforts of the Secretariat, 665 more fishing vessels were required to meet the second criteria, which could only be achieved by additional ratifications. The Secretary-General assured that the Secretariat would continue to provide assistance, including legal assistance to facilitate implementation, including aspects related to the limitations on tonnage applicability of the instrument, in order to address some of the concerns in relation to smaller or domestic fishing vessels. The Secretary-General also mentioned that the Cape Town Agreement set minimum requirements on the safety of fishing vessels, highlighted that some concerns related to the linkage made with illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, and invited the delegations participating in MSC 110 to convey his message to their respective capitals.
- .2 On the criminalization of seafarers, the Secretary-General recalled again his opening remarks at the event held at IMO on 16 June 2025, emphasizing that the views expressed during that event and the experiences shared should not be taken as a criticism to anyone. The intention of that event was to highlight the continued increase of criminalization cases of seafarers in spite of the efforts of IMO and its regulatory work, including the guidelines recently adopted on this matter, and other agencies such as ILO. The Secretary-General expressed the need for action not limited to the expressions of support for seafarers on the Day of the Seafarer. The Secretary-General also expressed that it was not his intention to interfere with the judicial processes of countries. But it was his intention, and the intention of the Organization, that the rights of the seafarers were respected during these processes. IMO would be ready to provide any assistance to Member States to ensure that the IMO guidelines were taken into account in judicial or court processes.
- .3 On the impact of geopolitical situations on seafarers, the Secretary-General recalled that IMO did not address political situations, but he continued to

remain hopeful that these would improve and that shipping and particularly seafarers would not be affected, highlighting that no seafarer should be a casualty of a conflict, particularly when they were serving on board ships, carrying around the world the necessary goods for all. The Secretary-General emphasized that he would keep focus of his interventions and his participations on the negative effects of any geopolitical situations on international shipping and particularly on seafarers.

## **21 CONSIDERATION OF THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON ITS 110TH SESSION**

21.1 The draft report of the session (MSC 110/WP.1/Rev.1) was prepared by the Secretariat for consideration and adoption by the Committee (see footnote on page 1).

22.2 During the meeting held on 27 June 2025, delegations were given an opportunity to provide comments on the draft report and those wishing to provide editorial corrections and improvements, including finalizing individual statements, were given a deadline of 11 July 2025, 23.59 (UTC+1), to do so by correspondence, in accordance with the relevant decisions taken by the Committee at this session.

**PROVISIONAL LIST OF ANNEXES AND CIRCULARS**

ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.572(110) – AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTERS II-2 AND V OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA, 1974
ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.573(110) – AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF SAFETY FOR HIGH-SPEED CRAFT, 1994 (1994 HSC CODE)
ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.574(110) – AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF SAFETY FOR HIGH-SPEED CRAFT, 2000 (2000 HSC CODE)
ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.575(110) – AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL MARITIME SOLID BULK CARGOES (IMSBC) CODE
ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.576(110) – PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR PILOT TRANSFER ARRANGEMENTS
ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.577(110) – AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF SAFETY FOR SPECIAL PURPOSE SHIPS, 2008 (2008 SPS CODE)
ANNEX ...	AMENDMENTS TO THE CODE OF SAFETY FOR FISHERMEN AND FISHING VESSELS, 2005
ANNEX ...	REVISED ROAD MAP FOR DEVELOPING A GOAL-BASED CODE FOR MARITIME AUTONOMOUS SURFACE SHIPS (MASS)
ANNEX...	RESOLUTION MSC.578(110) – ENCOURAGEMENT OF MARITIME INFORMATION SHARING THROUGH THE USE OF NATIONAL AND REGIONAL MARITIME INFORMATION-SHARING CENTRES TO ENHANCE MARITIME SAFETY AND SECURITY
ANNEX ...	DRAFT MSC / FAL CIRCULAR ON GUIDELINES CONCERNING THE RECOVERY OF DECEASED PERSONS AND OF DEATH AFTER RECOVERY
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF SAFETY FOR SHIPS CARRYING INDUSTRIAL PERSONNEL (IP CODE)
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CODE ON THE ENHANCED PROGRAMME OF INSPECTIONS DURING SURVEYS OF BULK CARRIERS AND OIL TANKERS, 2011 (2011 ESP CODE)
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE PROTOCOL OF 1988 RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON LOAD LINES, 1966 (1988 LOAD LINES PROTOCOL)
ANNEX ...	DRAFT ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION ON CODE ON ALERTS AND INDICATORS, 2025



ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.579(110) – ACCESSIBILITY OF INFORMATION ON SEAFARER MEDICAL CERTIFICATES AND MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS RECOGNIZED FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONDUCTING SEAFARER MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL LIFE-SAVING APPLIANCE CODE (LSA CODE)
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE REQUIREMENTS FOR MAINTENANCE, THOROUGH EXAMINATION, OPERATIONAL TESTING, OVERHAUL AND REPAIR OF LIFEBOATS AND RESCUE BOATS, LAUNCHING APPLIANCES AND RELEASE GEAR (RESOLUTION MSC.402(96))
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE REVISED RECOMMENDATION ON TESTING OF LIFE-SAVING APPLIANCES (RESOLUTION MSC.81(70))
ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.580(110) – AMENDMENTS TO THE REVISED RECOMMENDATION ON TESTING OF LIFE-SAVING APPLIANCES (RESOLUTION MSC.81(70))
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO SOLAS REGULATIONS IV/5, V/4 AND V/5
ANNEX ...	DRAFT RESOLUTION MSC.509(105)/REV.2 ON PROVISION OF RADIO SERVICES FOR THE GLOBAL MARITIME DISTRESS AND SAFETY SYSTEM (GMDSS)
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO SOLAS CHAPTER V AND THE APPENDIX
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO 1994 HSC CODE
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO 2000 HSC CODE
ANNEX ...	DRAFT MSC RESOLUTION ON INTRODUCTION OF VHF DATA EXCHANGE SYSTEM (VDES) INTO THE IMO REGULATORY FRAMEWORK
ANNEX ...	DRAFT MSC RESOLUTION ON PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR SHIPBORNE VHF DATA EXCHANGE SYSTEM (VDES)
ANNEX ...	DRAFT MSC CIRCULAR ON GUIDELINES FOR THE OPERATIONAL USE OF SHIPBORNE VHF DATA EXCHANGE SYSTEM (VDES)
ANNEX ...	RESOLUTION MSC.581(110) – REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENTERING ENCLOSED SPACES ABOARD SHIPS
ANNEX ...	DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO THE ORGANIZATION AND METHOD OF WORK OF THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE AND THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COMMITTEE AND THEIR SUBSIDIARY BODIES (MSC-MEPC.1/CIRC.5/REV.7)
ANNEX ...	BIENNIAL STATUS REPORTS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES

ANNEX ...	PROVISIONAL AGENDAS FOR THE FORTHCOMING SESSIONS OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES
ANNEX ...	REVISED TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE SUB-COMMITTEES
ANNEX ...	BIENNIAL STATUS REPORT OF THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE
ANNEX ...	WORK PROGRAMME OF THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE FOR THE 2026-2027 BIENNIUM
ANNEX ...	POST-BIENNIAL AGENDA OF THE MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE
ANNEX ...	SUBSTANTIVE ITEMS FOR INCLUSION IN THE AGENDAS FOR MSC 111 AND MSC 112
ANNEX ...	STATEMENTS BY DELEGATIONS AND OBSERVERS

#### LIST OF CIRCULARS APPROVED BY MSC 110

MSC.1/Circ.1428/Rev.1	Required pilot transfer arrangements for pilots and other personnel
MSC.1/Circ.1690	Voluntary early implementation of the amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 on pilot transfer arrangements
MSC.1/Circ.1266/Rev.1	Carriage of dangerous goods
MSC.1/Circ.1264/Rev.1	Recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships applicable to the fumigation of cargo holds
MSC.1/Circ.1358/Rev.1	Recommendations on the safe use of pesticides in ships
MSC.1/Circ.1395/Rev.7	Lists of solid bulk cargoes for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system may be exempted or for which a fixed gas fire-extinguishing system is ineffective
MSC.1/Circ.1601/Rev.2	Revised industry counter piracy guidance
MSC.1/Circ.1691	Interim guidelines for emergency towing arrangements on ships other than tankers
MSC.1/Circ.1175/Rev.2	Revised guidance on shipboard towing and mooring equipment
MSC.1/Circ.1255/Rev.1	Revised guidelines for owners/operators on preparing emergency towing procedures
MSC.1/Circ.1502/Rev.1	Revised guidance on pressure testing of boundaries of cargo oil tanks under direction of the master

MSC.1/Circ.1331/Rev.1	Revised guidelines for construction, installation, maintenance and inspection of means of embarkation and disembarkation
MSC.1/Circ.1692	Unified interpretation of SOLAS regulation II-1/12.6.2
MSC.1/Circ.1689	Escape arrangements from the lower part of machinery spaces (SOLAS regulations II-2/13.4.1 and 13.4.2)
STCW.7/Circ.[25]	Generic interim guidelines on training for seafarers on ships using alternative fuels and new technologies
MSC.1/Circ.1164/Rev.30	Promulgation of information related to reports of independent evaluation submitted by Parties to the 1978 STCW Convention confirmed by the Maritime Safety Committee to have communicated information which demonstrates that Parties are giving full and complete effect to the relevant provisions of the Convention
MSC.1/Circ.797/Rev.42	List of competent persons maintained by the Secretary-General pursuant to section A-I/7 of the Seafarers' Training, Certification and Watchkeeping (STCW) Code
MSC.1/Circ.1086/Rev.1	Revised Code of practice for atmospheric oil mist detectors
MSC.1/Circ.1693	Unified interpretations of paragraphs 6.1.1.3 and 6.1.2.2 of the LSA Code
MSC.1/Circ.1694	Unified interpretations of SOLAS chapter II-2, and the 1994 and 2000 HSC Codes
MSC.1/Circ.1695	Unified interpretation of the FSS Code
MSC.1/Circ.1696	Unified interpretation of SOLAS regulation II-1/3-13.2.4
MSC.1/Circ.1628/Rev.4	Revised standardized life-saving appliance evaluation and test report forms (personal life-saving appliances)
MSC.8/Circ.[3]	Rules of Procedure of the Maritime Safety Committee
MSC-MEPC.1/Circ.5/Rev.7	Draft amendments to organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies
MSC.1/Circ.1587/Rev.1	Procedural aspects related to the drafting of amendments to safety-related IMO conventions, other than the 1974 SOLAS Convention, and related mandatory instruments