



IMO

E

SUB-COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF
TRAINING AND WATCHKEEPING
37th session
Agenda item 17

STW 37/17/4
18 November 2005
Original: ENGLISH

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Review of STCW Code chapter VI on demonstration of competence

Submitted by the United States

SUMMARY

Executive summary: MSC 80 instructed the STW Sub-Committee to consider the need for review of the STCW Code chapter VI requirements and advise MSC 81, as appropriate. The United States believes that there is no need to review the STCW Code chapter VI requirements; however, the United States is proposing amendments to table B-I/11 of the STCW Code eliminating the conflicting information related to chapter VI from Table B-I/11.

Action to be taken: Paragraph 10

Related documents: MSC 80/21/3, MSC 80/24 and STW 36/17

Background

1 The Maritime Safety Committee (MSC), at its seventy-eighth session, instructed STW 36 to consider the need for review of the STCW Code chapter VI requirements and advise MSC 80 as appropriate. STW 36 considered the matter and agreed that this was a complex issue requiring further discussions and advised the Committee that more time was needed to provide appropriate advice (STW 36/17, paragraph 16.14). MSC 80 considered a proposal by Norway (MSC 80/21/3) to conduct a systematic review of all requirements regarding demonstration of competence in chapter VI of the STCW Code and, after a lengthy discussion, instructed STW 37 to consider the need for review of the STCW Code chapter VI requirements and advise MSC 81, as appropriate.

Discussion

2 The United States believes that there is no need to conduct a systematic review of the chapter VI requirements regarding demonstration of competence. Some of the methods for demonstrating competence, as well as the criteria for evaluating competence, may not lend themselves to safely be performed on board a ship; however, training approval is within the purview of each Party. In consideration that the existing requirements are clear and concise and provide the necessary flexibility for Administrations to determine the means through which the seafarer provides evidence of having achieved the required standard of competence, there is no need to amend the existing text in chapter VI of the STCW Code. Furthermore, in view of the

discussions at STW 36 regarding the requirement for refresher training, the United States notes that the sections in chapter VI of the STCW Code, related to basic training (section A-VI/1), proficiency in survival craft and rescue boats other than fast rescue boats (section A-VI/2), and advanced fire fighting (section A-VI/3), require the seafarer to provide evidence that the standard of competence was achieved in the previous five years.

3 The United States believes that conflicting information in the Code, specifically between chapter VI and table B-I/11, may have caused some confusion as it relates to applying the requirements for continued professional competence for basic safety training and proficiency in survival craft and rescue boats. The following paragraphs explain this conflict.

4 Regulation I/11, paragraph 1 clearly states that the regulation is not to be applied to chapter VI, and understandably so, since chapter VI has continued professional competency requirements embedded within the mandatory provisions in Part A of the Code. Specifically, section A-VI/1, paragraph 2.2 requires seafarers to provide evidence of having achieved the required standard of competence for basic safety training “within the previous five years”. Section A-VI/2, paragraph 8 likewise requires candidates for certification in proficiency in survival craft and rescue boats to provide evidence of having achieved the required standard of competence “within the previous five years”.

5 Table B-I/11 (differences between STCW 78 certification requirements and STCW 95 certification requirements) provides information on basic safety training and survival craft and rescue boats which conflicts with section A-VI/1 and A-VI/2 of the Code. The first row of table B-I/11 under “Basic safety training or instruction” describes the STCW 78 requirements. The second row describes the 1995 amendments requirements in excess of the STCW 78 requirements. The first row of table B-I/11 under “Basic safety training or instruction” in the last two columns for both rows, “Revalidation of training required” and “Revalidation of certification required”, state “No”. Therefore, as per the footnotes 1 and 2 there is no need for “undergoing such specific training or service to continue to qualify for seagoing service” and “there is no need to establish continued professional competence” for basic safety training under the 1995 amendments.

6 The first row of table B-I/11 under “Survival craft and rescue boats” describes the STCW 78 requirements. The second row describes the 1995 amendments requirements in excess of the STCW 78 requirements. The last two columns of both rows, “Revalidation of training required” and “Revalidation of certification required”, state “No”. Therefore, as per the footnotes 1 and 2 there is no need for “undergoing such specific training or service to continue to qualify for seagoing service” and “there is no need to establish continued professional competence” for survival craft and rescue boats under the 1995 amendments.

7 This information in Table B-I/11 contradicts the provisions in chapter VI of Part A of the Code, which contains requirements for continued professional competence within the previous five years. Therefore, the United States is proposing amending the information for “Basic safety training or instruction” and “Survival craft and rescue boats” as outlined in the annex to this document.

8 Furthermore, the United States also recommends amending the second footnote of table B-I/11. This is necessary because certification is not always applicable, as is the case for Basic Safety Training or instruction per section A-VI/1.

Recommendation

9 The United States supports Norway's views that refresher training may be necessary for some of the elements contained under chapter VI, however, we believe that the existing text in the Convention provides the flexibility for Administrations to require this training, if desired, provided that we eliminate the conflicting information related to chapter VI from table B-I/11.

Action requested of the Sub-Committee

10 The Sub-Committee is invited to consider the proposed amendment to table B-I/11 and take action as appropriate.

ANNEX
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TABLE B-I/11

**Table of differences between STCW 78 certification requirements
and STCW 95 certification requirements**

Certificate or training	STCW 78 certificate requirements	STCW 95 certificate					
		Requirements	Amendments apply to	Implementation dates	Certificate required	Revalidation of training required ¹	Revalidation of certification required ²
Basic safety training or instruction	Included under chapters II, III and IV		Masters, officers and watchkeeping ratings	In force now (until 1 February 2002)	No	No Yes	No <u>Not applicable</u>
		Reg. VI/1, section A-VI/1, paragraph 2	All other seafarers with designated safety and pollution-prevention duties	1 February 1997	No	No Yes	No <u>Not applicable</u>
Survival craft and rescue boats	Reg. VI/1		Every seafarer required to be certificated	In force now	Yes	No	No
		Reg. VI/2, paragraph 1	Every candidate for certification under reg. VI/2, paragraph 1 or under 1978 regulations of chapters II and III	1 August 1998 for those who commenced approved training after that date Until 1 February 2002	1 Appropriate certificate under chapters II and III or chapter VII, or 2 Certificate under reg. VI/1 of the 1978 Convention, or 3 Certificate under reg. VI/2	No Yes	No Yes

¹ *Revalidation of training required* means either updating existing STCW 78 certificates to 1995 standards or undergoing such specific training or service to continue to qualify for seagoing service.

² When a "Certificate" is required, *Revalidation of certification required* means establishing continued professional competence.