INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION

E

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SHIP SYSTEMS AND EQUIPMENT
9th session
Agenda item 19

SSE 9/19/8
23 December 2022
Original: ENGLISH
Pre-session public release: ☒

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Need to clarify the terms "make" and "type" within resolution MSC.402(96)

Submitted by CESA

SUMMARY

Executive summary:	This document reiterates concerns regarding non-uniform interpretations of the terms "make" and "type". CESA emphasizes the significance of competent personnel, which is trained and certified for identifiable LSA products and performs individual services using type specific tools and maintenance manuals. Uncertainties of the mandatory requirements should be rectified by use of clear terminology within a revised resolution MSC.402(96).
Strategic direction, if applicable:	2
Output:	Not applicable
Action to be taken:	Paragraph 22
Related documents:	MSC 102/22/6; MSC 103/20/15, MSC 103/20/17; MSC 104/17/6; MSC 105/19/1; SSE 8/15/5, SSE 8/15/14; MSC 106/18/5, MSC 106/19; SSE 9/19/1; MSC.402(96) and ISO 23678-1:2022

Background

1 At MSC 102, ISO has notified the Committee of the publication of the ISO/PAS 23678 (series) "Service personnel for the maintenance, thorough examination, operational testing, overhaul and repair of lifeboats (including free-fall lifeboats) and rescue boats (including fast rescue boats), launching appliances and release gear", providing guidance on the training and certification of life-saving appliances (LSA) service personnel.

2 The adequacy of the ISO/PAS approach to facilitate the implementation of resolution MSC.402(96), which recently materialized in a slightly modified ISO Standard 23678-1:2022, has been discussed and commented controversially since then. MSC 106 did not reach a consensus whether ISO 23678 should be referenced in resolution MSC.402(96) as a footnote or whether the resolution itself should be amended.

NEW TECHNOLOGIES FOR GREENER SHIPPING

3 In order to facilitate an in-depth discussion at SSE 9, CESA submitted an updated assessment of resolution MSC.402(96) vis-à-vis relevant concepts and modifications of ISO 23678, reconfirming the concerns of LSA manufacturers.

Discussion of resolution MSC.402(96)

4 Shipbuilders and equipment manufacturers would like to emphasize the significance of regular inspection and maintenance, thorough examination, operational testing, overhaul and repair of LSA by qualified and certified personnel in order to maintain the highest safety standards for passengers and crew members. CESA has scrutinized the issue in detail, in consultation with members and would like to bring the following observations and conclusions to the attention of the Sub-Committee.

5 The safety intention of resolution MSC.402(96) is clear and has not been disputed yet. Although the resolution does not contain explicit definitions of "make" and "type", the meaning of these terms appear to be self-explanatory if considered in the context of the general objectives and individual safety requirements. The resolution establishes standards for type approved LSA equipment and requires maintenance, examination, testing, overhaul and repair to be performed by adequately trained personnel according to maintenance manuals developed by the manufacturer. Manuals and associated technical documentation are, for good reasons, type specific and cannot be substituted by generic information for broad categories of LSA equipment that might have common characteristics, which are nevertheless difficult to establish and to maintain permanently.

6 The interpretation and implementation of the term "type" is not homogenous. Despite the clear intention, certificates of authorization of service providers are not uniform and differ significantly among Member States. While most Administrations issue certificates incorporating detailed annexes comprising manufacturer/make, type/model, equipment category and sometimes even sub-categories, some flags just display generic equipment categories without disclosing the makes and types; the company service providers are required to provide ISO accreditation or documentation regarding service engineer qualifications.

7 *Guidelines for evaluation and replacement of lifeboat release and retrieval systems* (MSC.1/Circ.1392) define the term "type" for lifeboat release and retrieval system. It should be noted that for lifeboat release and retrieval system, the definition of type is rather detailed and related to the term "identical", making it unlikely that types can successfully be consolidated into generic categories, even for the purpose of authorizing service providers or certifying the competency and training service personnel.

Discussion of ISO 23678:2022

8 Even after the Publicly Available Specification (ISO/PAS) has been converted into the ISO 23678-1:2020, this standard is based on a generic approach to categorize LSA. The definition of the term "type" in the Standard is incompatible with the intention of resolution MSC.402(96):

> **"3.1.21 Type**
> category of equipment (3.1.6) having common characteristics, including lifeboats (including free-fall lifeboats) and rescue boats (including fast rescue boats), launching appliances and release gear"

9 The intention of this definition to group individual models of original equipment manufacturers (OEM) into generic categories (including sub-categories displayed, but not defined in Table B.1) constitutes an obvious deviation from the make and type specific

approach of resolution MSC.402(96). The motivation of the authors to depart from the IMO approach is clearly described in the introduction to ISO 23678-1:2020 stating:

> "This document has been developed by identifying common design features in relation to survival craft, davits, winches and release gear makes and types for which service is provided. This has been achieved by professional discussions with disciplined experts to obtain the appropriate information to develop a training programme that is fit for purpose. (…)"

10 Against this background, it is astonishing that the ISO model certificate for Level 2 assessment provided as "Figure D.3 – Example 3 (see annex D (informative) of ISO 23678-1:2020) displays "make and type" specific competencies making, inter alia, use of the terms "model" and "series" that have been newly introduced into the ISO Standard when converting the ISO/PAS.

11 Although the ISO's intention to standardize training modules according to generic LSA categories is well understood, CESA doubts that the complex relation between specific makes and types, and generic training requirements can be adequately assessed and regulated without continuous involvement of the OEM.

12 Such close involvement of OEM is not envisaged in ISO 23678-1:2020. Instead, it is stipulated that the authorized service providers should perform a stand-alone "standardization" into generic LSA categories and the ISO subcategories without verification and authorization by the OEM:

> "**4.6.1 General**
> (…) It is the responsibility of the authorized service providers training establishment to carry out a technical evaluation regarding the makes, types, models and series of equipment to be included within the level 2 assessment and level 2 re-assessment process. The purpose of the technical evaluation is to establish which specific makes, models and series of equipment can be categorized into a type listed within Table B.1."

Summary

13 Due to the incompatibility of terminology, it remains unclear whether the personal competencies of service technicians certified in accordance with ISO lives up to the IMO approach, which is based on the unique identification of individual products.

14 In order to achieve and maintain consistency between individual products and standardized training modules, several conditions would need to be fulfilled:

.1 availability of detailed information on functionalities, materials, dimensions and other specifics required for the definition of suitable training modules;

.2 robust verification and documentation of appropriate cross-referencing of system peculiarities with standardized ISO training modules by IMO; and

.3 regular review and update of both product information and training requirements in order to integrate novel systems entering the LSA market and to ensure that the ISO categorization remains compatible with the state of the art.

15 In summary, CESA is of the view that:

.1 resolution MSC.402(96) and ISO 23678-1:2022 are currently incompatible due to differences in intention, approach and definition;

.2 standards should only be utilized to complement IMO instruments when carefully reviewed by the Organization, but should never prevail over safety regulations by changing definitions or modifying intentions;

.3 LSA safety could, in future, benefit from technical standardization of equipment designs, but standardization of education and training programmes should not overtake and hurry ahead of the standardization of products;

.4 continuous compatibility between individual products and standardized training provisions requires a detailed cross-referencing of the functionalities of equipment with the technical content of training modules; and

.5 competence and responsibility to distinguish types with significant differences in design, functionalities, etc. rests with the OEM and should not be transferred to service providers.

Proposals and way forward

16 Based on the above considerations, CESA offers the following proposals to amend and improve resolution MSC.402(96) (<u>additional wording is underlined</u>):

"2.2 For the purpose of these Requirements:

(…)

<u>.8 "Make" means the name of the original equipment manufacturer as referred to on the approval certificate and ID plate, as appropriate;</u>

<u>.9 "Type" means the [specific][unique] brand name of the equipment model or series of the original equipment manufacturer provided in conjunction with the make in order to clearly identify and distinguish individual [type approved] equipment [to be maintained, examined, tested, overhauled and repaired in accordance with the Requirements]."</u>

17 In order to improve the transparency of the scope of the certification of service providers defined in paragraph 7.1, paragraphs 7.2 and 7.4 should be clarified, as follows:

"7.2 The Administration shall ensure that <u>make and type specific</u> information regarding authorized service providers is made available.

(…)

7.4 Issuance and maintenance of authorization document:

.1 upon successful initial audit of a service provider, an authorization document shall be issued by the Administration defining the scope of services provided (e.g. makes and types of equipment). The expiry date shall be clearly written on the document;

.1*bis* the document issued shall contain a list of specific LSA equipment defining the scope of expertise of the service provider, providing for each entry the name of the manufacturer (make) as well as the name of model or series (type) to be serviced. It is not sufficient to refer to generic categories of LSA equipment, such as lifeboats, rescue boats etc., or to generic elements of the system, such as different propulsion systems, davits, winches or release gear."

18 The scope of the certification of personnel provided in paragraph 8.1 could also be clarified with analogous wording:

"8.1 Personnel for the work specified in paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 shall be certified by the manufacturer or authorized service provider for each make and type of the equipment to be worked on in accordance with the provisions in this section. In order to clarify the scope for which the personnel have been educated and trained, the certificate issued shall contain a list of specific LSA equipment, providing for each entry the name of the manufacturer (make), as well as the name of model or series (type) to be serviced. It is not sufficient to refer to generic groups of LSA equipment, such as lifeboats, rescue boats etc., or to generic elements of the system, such as different propulsion systems, davits, winches or release gear."

19 This clarification could be complemented by a model certificate annexed to resolution MSC.402(96). Such guidance could significantly improve clarity of the scope of authorization and the transparency of the process. In order to uniformly implement the meaning of the term "type" the model certificate should contain a structured three-column table. In order to illustrate this approach, the table presented below contains typical entries of specific models/series that have to be distinguished (kindly provided by Fr. Fassmer GmbH & Co KG):

Make (manufacturer)	**Description** (of LSA category)	**Type** (name of the model or series)
Launching appliances (incl. davits, ramps)		
FASSMER	Hydraulic davit	FHD
FASSMER	Hinged davit	FHDY
FASSMER	Freefall davit	FFH
FASSMER	Freefall ramp	FLR
FASSMER	(Multi) pivot davit	FPD, FFD D, FMPD
FASSMER	Outrigger davit	FOD, FOD LBC, FOD SAR, FOD-R, FOD-TC
FASSMER	Rescue boat davit	FOSV
FASSMER	Rescue boat crane	FSAH, FSAR
FASSMER	Rescue boat liferaft crane	FSARR
Release gear		
FASSMER	Freefall lifeboat release mechanism	FFRU
FASSMER	Offload rescue boat hook	FOH
FASSMER	Onload release gear	Duplex xxE, Duplex xxE2, Duplex xxxE2
Lifeboats (incl. freefall lifeboats, tenders)		
FASSMER	Davit launched totally enclosed lifeboat	GMR, TGMR, CLR-C, CLR-T, CL-C, CL-T, CLX
FASSMER	Freefall lifeboat	CFL, CFL-C, CFL-T, GAR, GAR-T
FASSMER	Partially enclosed lifeboat (incl. multi-purpose)	CL-P, SEL, SEL-T, SEL-R, PLL, PLT-EVO, SEL-RT

Make (manufacturer)	**Description** (of LSA category)	**Type** (name of the model or series)
Rescue boats (incl. fast rescue boats)		
FASSMER	Rescue boat	RIR
FASSMER	Rigid rescue boat	RR, RR-M, RR ID
FASSMER	Fast rigid rescue boat	FRR, FRIR

20 It should be noted that the LSA subcategories listed in the middle column comprise equipment differing significantly and, therefore, requires specific services and training. Among series with similar designation listed in the right-hand column (e.g. CFL) also specific versions with ship type related design characteristics must be distinguished (e.g. 'T' for tanker or 'C' for cargo ships). In addition, also models of different size might require differentiation due to technical peculiarities although named with identical letters.

21 Company specific naming conventions necessitate a process in which the manufacturer takes responsibility to distinguish LSA models requiring specific consideration in the authorization process based on in-depth knowledge of their designs. In order to facilitate clarity and consistency in the classification and naming of LSA products, a database of existing make and types should be developed and maintained as an additional GISIS module. The combination of a model table with make and entries extracted from the database would ensure uniformity of the authorization documents and facilitate homogeneous auditing.

Action requested of the Sub-Committee

22 The Sub-Committee is invited to consider the assessment summarized in paragraph 15, as well as the proposals provided in paragraphs 16 to 21, and take action, as appropriate.