

MARINE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COMMITTEE (MEPC 72) REPORT

Monday, 9 April to Friday, 13 April 2018

Chaired by Mr. H. Saito (Japan). The Vice-Chair of the Committee, Mr. H. Conway (Liberia)

MEPC was opened with the Secretary General's Address and the highlights of interest are:

- I will start with the status of implementation of the Ballast Water Management Convention. With 36 contracting parties to date and with the only outstanding entry into force condition of 35% of the world's merchant tonnage now being close to fulfilment, a little under 6% is all that is still required. We ought to be optimistic that the Convention will enter into force soon. However, the industry continues to have major concerns over the cost of compliance.
- I would strongly suggest that now is the time to move towards implementation. The problem associated with ballast water is inherently connected to the expansion of world trade and, therefore, an issue from which the shipping industry cannot escape. It is recognized that there is a substantive cost required for installing and operating a ballast water management system – some 1-2 million US dollars per ship, depending on size and type, plus operational costs. However, the estimated costs for society to deal with problems caused by alien aquatic species are comparatively very high, in fact astronomical. Just, for example, in the United States, the invasive Zebra Mussel has infested over 40% of inland waterways, and management and control costs for facilities such as power plants are calculated in billions of dollars. In the Caspian Sea, the costs related to one single alien species – the American comb jelly – are estimated to be 500 million dollars annually due to the drastic decline in fisheries, and the costs for alien aquatic species in Europe have been estimated to be some 2.9 billion dollars per year.
- Shipowners concerns should not stop us from activating the implementation of the Convention and I would strongly encourage IMO Member Governments, and the major flag States in particular, to co operate and establish meaningful measures which would ease the burden for the shipping industry of introducing the necessary ballast water management technologies, within the framework of the Ballast Water Management Convention. We must move to entry into force and implementation of the BWM Convention.
- Another IMO Convention on my radar of concern with respect to the need for speedy ratification and implementation is the Hong Kong International Convention for the Safe and Environmentally Sound Recycling of Ships. Having been adopted almost four years ago, on 15 May 2009, the Convention has yet to attract even its first accession or ratification. This is despite the fact that the whole package is complete, including all six guidelines identified by the Hong Kong Conference and required under the Convention.
- I particularly request ship recycling countries, including Bangladesh, China, India, Pakistan and Turkey, to accelerate the process of ratification. At the same time, I would like to encourage all other Member Governments to pay respect to the provisions of the Convention by supporting it through early ratification as well and by making every possible effort towards its implementation through the IMO process. A slow pace of ratification and a prolonged state of non-fulfilment of the entry into force conditions only risk creating a situation that may compel some authorities to take action to try to enforce measures that would go beyond IMO regulations or impose additional requirements, even before such IMO regulations enter into force. This is against the spirit of co-operation at IMO and damages the credibility of the Organization. Therefore, anything related to the implementation of the Hong Kong Convention should be discussed here at IMO and not elsewhere.
- The Committee's work on matters related to air pollution under the revised MARPOL Annex VI (agenda item 4) will, once again, continue on various fronts and include consideration of the recommendations of the review of technological developments to implement the Tier III NOx emission standard; and the need for further measures to address Volatile Organic Compounds.
- You will also be invited to consider sulphur emissions averaging as an equivalent approach to comply with the sulphur limits under the Annex. I trust that you will carefully weigh the benefits of such an approach,

and be always mindful of the need to ensure both a robust and workable approach to the full and effective implementation of the sulphur reduction requirements.

- The entry into force, on 1 January of this year, of mandatory technical and operational measures for ships' energy efficiency signalled a new era for international shipping.
- Several proposals have been submitted for consideration at this session, all of which confirm that enhancing the energy efficiency of ships remains paramount. As you may recall, energy efficiency is one of the pillars I believe should underpin Sustainable Development Goals for shipping and the maritime industries. Specifically, at this session you will be asked to consider requirements for collecting and verifying data on ship emissions to encourage further energy efficient improvements.
- I welcome the proposal by IACS to collate and provide to the Committee information pursuant to the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Design Index. Here again, in short, IMO will have a good story to tell the outside world that IMO is making progress in the field of energy efficiency.
- As regards the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from international shipping (agenda item 5), I am encouraged by the outcome of the Expert Workshop that was endorsed by the Committee at MEPC 64. Held at IMO Headquarters earlier this year, this workshop identified draft Terms of Reference for an update of the estimate of greenhouse gas emissions from international shipping, which you will be invited to consider. An updated emissions estimate would provide a robust baseline to assess the impact of the technical and operational energy efficiency measures for international shipping that entered into force on 1 January.

Following the Opening Address, a number of Nations made statements on the need to combat Climate Change and support the Paris Agreement and to make the necessary changes to achieve Global Sustainable Shipping and the necessary reduction in Greenhouse Gasses. These can be found in the Report of the Committee.

1. **Agenda Item 1 - Adoption of the agenda**

- a. The following Groups are expected to be formed:
 - i. Working Group 1 on Reduction of GHG emissions from ships; **Agenda Item 7**
 - ii. Working Group 2 on Air pollution and energy efficiency; **WG2 will be set up to look at this Agenda Item 5 – See Paper 5/4, 5/5 and Inf.12 – Representation for IFSMA would be useful**
 - iii. Drafting Group on Amendments to mandatory instruments; **Agenda Item 3**
 - iv. Ballast Water Review Group; **Agenda Item 4**

2. **Agenda Item 2 - Decisions of other bodies**

- a. MEPC 72/2, 2/1, 2/2, 2/3, 2/4, 2/5 – Outcomes of MSC 98, TC67, C118, C/ES.29, LC39/LP12, A30 – **Nothing significant to report for IFSMA**

3. **Agenda Item 3 - Consideration and adoption of amendments to mandatory instruments**

- a. MEPC 72/3, 7/3/1 and 7/3/2 – Sec - Proposed amendments to regulations A-1, B3, D-3, E1 and E5 of the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments, 2004 – **The Chair decided that a DG would be required, to consider the and prepare the final text of the amendments and that only major issues should be discussed by Plenary. In addition, the DG should consider the Paper 72/4/5 Draft Unified Interpretation by IACS.**
- b. MEPC 72/3/9 and Corr.1 - Bahamas, Jamaica, Liberia, Netherlands and IACS – D3 above
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA – to be sent to the DG for inclusion.**
- c. MEPC 72/3/3 – Sec – Adoption of the Code for approval of ballast water management systems (BWMS Code) - entry into force on 13 Oct 2019 agreed.

- d. MEPC 7/3/8 – France – as above -
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA – sent to the DG for inclusion.**
 - e. MEPC 72/3/4 – Sec – Draft amendments to MARPOL Annex VI
 - f. MEPC 72/3/7 – CESA and IACS – Proposed amends to above
 - g. MEPC 72/5/10 – Rep of Korea – Proposal for issuing of an MEPC circular on voluntary early implementation of the amendment to required EEDI for ro-ro cargo and ro-ro passenger ships
 - i. **Nothing Significant to report for IFSMA in these 2 Papers. Chair summed up majority spoke in favour of 72/3/4 amended by IACS Paper and these should be referred to the Drafting Group taking into account Paper 72/5/10 (RofK) and add a para to encourage early implementation.**
 - h. MEPC 72/3/5 – Sec – Draft amendments to the IBC Code
 - i. MEPC 72/3/6 – Sec - Draft amendments to the BCH Code
 - i. **Nothing Significant to report for IFSMA - these 2 Papers were forwarded to the DG**
4. **Agenda Item 4** - Harmful aquatic organisms in ballast water
- a. MEPC 72/4 – Norway - Application for Final Approval of the Envirocleanse inTank™ BWTS (Bulk Chemical Variation)
 - b. **Nothing Significant to report for IFSMA**
 - c. MEPC 72/4/3 and Corr.1 – Sec – Report of the thirty-fifth meeting of the GESAMP-Ballast Water Working Group
 - i. **Nothing Significant to report for IFSMA – report approved in general.**
 - d. MEPC 72/Inf.2 – Singapore – Information on the type approval of the Semb-Eco LUV 250, Semb-Eco LUV 500, Semb-Eco LUV 750, Semb-Eco LUV 1000 and Semb-Eco LUV 1500 ballast water management systems
 - e. MEPC 72/4/Inf.19 – Norway – Information on the type approval of the Alfa Laval PureBallast 3.2 ballast water management system
 - f.
 - g. MEPC 72/4/1 – Sec – Draft amendments to BWM.2/Circ.33 and BWM.2/Circ.43 and
 - h. MEPC 72/4/6 – Denmark – Draft amendments to BWM.2/Circ.33
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**
 - i. MEPC 72/4/2 - Sec – Expected budgetary implications of the data gathering and analysis plan for the experience-building phase associated with the BWM Convention
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**
 - j. MEPC 72/4/4 – IACS – Contingency plan in the ballast water management plan
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**
 - k. MEPC 72/4/5 – Sec – Draft unified interpretation of Appendix I (Form of the International Ballast Water Management Certificate) of the BWM Convention
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**
 - l. MEPC 72/4/7 – Rep of Iran – Recording working time of ballast water operational pump and connecting it to the GPS system
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**
 - m. MEPC 72/4/8 – Turkey – Discussion of ballast water management systems for rescue tug boats in terms of implementation
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**

- n. MEPC 72/4/9 – Denmark and Singapore – Technical and operational challenges faced by unmanned non-self-propelled (UNSP) barges fitted with ballast water tanks in complying with the Ballast Water Management Convention
 - o. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**
 - p. MEPC 72/4/10 – China – Proposal for the development of a model course under the Ballast Water Management Convention
 - i. **Nothing Significant for IFSMA**
 - q. MEC 72/Inf.7 – FOEI - An assessment of ballast water treatment to protect Arctic waters
 - i. **Nothing for IFSMA – Above 3 Papers for info only**
5. **Agenda Item 5 - Air pollution and energy efficiency** Working Group 2 will be set up to look at this Agenda Item – SEE Paper 72/5, 5/6, Inf.13, 72/9 1 and 72/9/1 IFSMA represented on this WG by David Appleton.

Following MEPC 71, ICELAND deposited its instrument of accession to MARPOL Annex VI, bringing the total number of Contracting States to the Annex to 89, constituting 96.18% of world tonnage.

Of greatest importance was the decision by the Committee to prohibit not just the use, but also the carriage of bunkers above 0.50% sulphur. Thus the way is now clear for formal adoption of this amendment to MARPOL Annex VI Regulation 14 at MEPC 73 in October this year, meaning that a carriage ban can take effect as early as 1 March 2020, enabling a more effective enforcement of the 2020 sulphur limit. A number of other matters debated by the dedicated WG were subjects within their report which was approved by the Committee in general, and in particular, also:

1. Approved a draft MEPC circular on Guidance of best practice for fuel oil purchasers/users for assuring the quality of fuel oil used on board ships;
2. Concurred with the WG's view that the draft best practice Guidance for fuel oil suppliers in document MEPC 72 (INF.13(IBIA)) should form the basis for developing IMO guidance at MEPC 73;
3. Issued instructions to the Correspondence Group on EEDI review beyond phase 2 regarding definition and exclusion of ice-strengthened ships higher than IA Super from the EEDI regulations;
4. Noted the Group's agreement to incorporate the issue of early submission of the SEEMP part II and its timely verification in the draft MEPC circular on the Sample format for the Confirmation of compliance pursuant to regulation 5.4.5 of MARPOL Annex VI; and

5. Approved the draft MEPC circular referred to in 4 above, for early submission of the SEEMP part II on the ship fuel consumption data collection plan.

- a. MEPC 72/5 – ICS, INTERTANKO, Ibia – Proposed amendments to the draft Guidance on best practice for fuel oil purchasers/users for assuring the quality of fuel oil used onboard ships
 - i. Not supported by USA but was by Finland and INTERTANKO and the chair referred to Paper to the Working group for discussion and finalise the Draft.
- b. MEPC 72/5/6 – Ibia – Best practice for fuel oil providers for assuring the quality of fuel oil used on board ships
- c. MEPC 72/Inf.13 – Ibia - Best practice for suppliers for assuring the quality of bunkers supplied to ships
 - i. USA again was not supportive but most other delegations support of the Best Practice Paper at Inf.13 and that it was a good starter but needs refinement. WG should consider this and provide advice to the Committee on the way forward for both of the 2 Papers above.
 - ii. Nothing significant for IFSMA in either Paper. Papers 72/9 and 72/9/1 were not introduced but raised for discussion only at plenary as they had already been forwarded to WG 2 for consideration. There was much discussion on this topic with a number trying to push for a deferral of the implementation of the 2020 timeframe for fuel oil sulphur content of 0.5%. The Chair summed up that the majority want to introduce the carriage ban and many supported comments made by IMarEST to clarify the points. The WG should finalise the draft amendments to MARPOL Annex VI based on the above documents.
- d. MEPC 72/5/1 – Sec - Ozone-depleting substances
 - i. Nothing significant to report for IFSMA
- e. MEPC 72/5/2 – Sec – Consistent implementation of regulation 14.1.3 of MARPOL Annex VI – Consideration of the framework of ISO 8217
 - i. Nothing significant to report for IFSMA
- f. MEPC 72/5/7 - China – Proposal to unify the test methods of Sulphur content of fuel oil
 - i. Nothing significant to report for IFSMA – this Paper would be forwarded to the Intersessional PPR WG meeting.
- g. MEPC 72/5/3 – Sec – Sulphur monitoring programme for 2017
 - i. Nothing significant to report for IFSMA but the Chair advised the Committee to note the content of the report.
- h. MEPC 72/5/4 – Japan – Progress report of the Correspondence Group on EEDI review beyond phase 2
- i. MEPC 72/5/5 – Japan – Coordinator's summary of the Correspondence Group on EEDI review beyond phase 2.

- i. Interim report with recommendations should be submitted to 73 on Phase 3 and 74 Phase 4, but when is MEPC going to take the decision on Phases 3 and 4.
- ii. IFSMA had intended to intervene on this Paper with "IFSMA would like to thank the Chair of the Correspondence Group for his Summary Paper, 72/5/5. The Correspondence Group have clearly put in an enormous amount of work and I was therefore disappointed to see that this Summary Paper does not sufficiently reflect the significant issue of Mariner Safety, Weather Conditions and Sea States raised on a number of occasions in the Main Report by ICS, Denmark and others. This omission is of serious concern for shipmasters who understand better than any that having sufficient power to manoeuvre in the weather conditions and Sea States they experience on a daily basis around the world is of fundamental importance to Mariner Safety and Safe Navigation and must be properly reflected, considered, and acknowledged accordingly in our discussions and reports."

However, following discussion with ICS there was concern that the Chair of the CG could be undermined by this and result in him stepping down or being changed to someone more hard-lined and less sympathetic to this issue than the current Chair. It was therefore decided not to pursue this at Plenary. Although ICS did make the point on Minimum Power in their own intervention which was welcomed by IFSMA.

Chair summed that the WG should consider Para 10 of the Correspondence Group and provide a Final Draft for the proposed amendments.

- j. MEPC 72/Inf.12 – Japan - Participants' comments provided in the Correspondence Group on EEDI review beyond phase 2
 - i. This is an issue that IFSMA has intervened on a number of times at MSC and MEPC 71. At a recent meeting with ICS on the issue it was pleasing that both are in agreement over these proposed Power reductions and this is backed up by the ICS comments within the Correspondence Group. ICS Comments in Annex 1 Page 11 and 12 are particularly important "When considering EEDI reductions, it is essential that ships still retain sufficient power to maneuver safely in sea conditions which they can expect to encounter in service. This is expanded upon in our response to question 1-3 but in short, we believe that outstanding concerns over minimum power must be resolved before agreeing any further EEDI reductions or early implementation of EEDI phase 3. This necessitates agreement on the degree of ship control/maneuverability which a ship is to be able to maintain in adverse weather and the sea state which should be taken to represent these adverse weather conditions. If this is not done, then ICS considers the risks of ships and lives being lost at sea and of major pollution incidents as a direct consequence of ships lacking sufficient power to manoeuvre safely and maintain control in adverse weather will be completely unacceptable. ICS would remind the group that the Maritime Safety Committee (MSC) is the IMO body responsible for decision making on matters of safety therefore there will need to be coordination between the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) and MSC, this is not simply an environment/MARPOL matter to be decided by MEPC. The EEDI database in itself is not sufficient to undertake the required analysis for the EEDI review since it gives no indication on whether the ships concerned are able to maneuver and maintain appropriate levels of ship control in a range of weather conditions and sea

states.

- ii. And ICS on page 37 " Two questions are central to any consideration of minimum power and maintaining maneuverability in adverse weather conditions:

1. What sea state should be adopted in order to quantify the adverse weather conditions to be used when establishing minimum power requirements?
2. What level of manoeuvrability/ship control should a ship be able to maintain in this sea state?

Unless answers to the above two questions can be agreed then we will not be able to establish minimum power guidelines for ships. The adverse weather conditions used by the proposed draft guidelines (MEPC.71/INF.28) are considered to be too conservative by ICS and not representative of conditions which ships face in normal service. Additionally, the degree of manoeuvrability proposed in these draft guidelines is considered by ICS to be unacceptably low, based on an advance speed of 2 knots and considering manoeuvring in coastal waters. ICS is aware that the 2-knot advance speed may be increased to a 4-knot advance speed but would still consider this to be inadequate under the weather conditions defined in the draft guidelines at this time. ICS also considers that deep ocean conditions should be considered since a loss of power and the resultant risk to crews and risk of collision is as unacceptable in deep ocean waters as in restricted to coastal waters.

- k. See also comments on page 21,22,43 and 44 of Annex 2
- l. The Correspondence Group will make their recommendations to the next Committee on introduction of EEDI Phase 3.
- m. MEPC 72/5/8 – China – Proposal for amendments to regulation 21 of MARPOL Annex VI with regard to EEDI reference line parameters for large tonnage bulk carrier and tanker ship types
- n. INTERTANKO and ICS made comment on their concerns on Minimum Power which supports IFSMA view and concerns. The Paper should be referred to the correspondence Group in their deliberations on phase 3 and 4, but should not refer to Phase 2 which has been already agreed. IFSMA will discuss this with ICS.
- o. MEPC 72/5/9 – China – Proposed amendments to the 2013 Interim Guidelines for determining minimum propulsion power to maintain the manoeuvrability of ships in adverse conditions
- p. MEPC 72/Inf.16 – China – An alternative numerical method for calculating quadratic transfer function of the added resistance in regular waves applied in the 2013 Interim guidelines for determining minimum propulsion power to maintain the manoeuvrability of ships in adverse conditions
- i. General feeling was that more information would be needed to take this forward. Chinese proposal would not be taken forward but invited them to provide more and better information.
- q. MEPC 72/5/10 – Rep of Korea – Proposal for issuing of an MEPC circular on voluntary early implementation of the amendment to required EEDI for ro-ro cargo and ro-ro passenger ships
- r. Nothing significant for IFSMA but would be referred to the DG for consideration.
- s. MEPC 72/Inf.6 – ITTC - Updated ITTC Recommended Procedures and Guidelines concerning the determination and verification of EEDI
- i. MEPC 72/Inf.8 – Sec - EEDI database – Review of status of technological development (Regulation 21.6 of MARPOL Annex VI)

- t. MEPC 72/Inf.15 – China – Study on application of ISO 15016:2015 during implementation of amendments to the 2014 Guidelines on survey and certification of the Energy Efficiency Design Index (EEDI)
 - u. Nothing significant for IFSMA in the above Inf Papers other than Inf.12
 - v. The Working Group was established based on the ToR outlined in WP.2 but regrettably there was nothing of interest for IFSMA in these items.
6. **Agenda Item 6** - Further technical and operational measures for enhancing the energy efficiency of international shipping
- a. MEPC 72/6 - Sec – Status report of the development of the IMO Ship Fuel Oil Consumption Database
 - b. MEPC 72/6/2 – IACS – Sample form of the confirmation of compliance pursuant to regulation 5.4.5 of MARPOL Annex VI – **Provided to the WG for finalisation.**
 - c. MEPC 72/6/3 – Rep of Korea – Consideration of early submission of SEEMP Part II for assessment – **Prepare an MEPC Circular notify Early Implementation of 1 Sep 18. Send to the WG for preparation and recommendation to the Committee.**
 - d. MEPC 72/6/1 – IOGP and IMCA – Information on the difficulty of defining relevant, appropriate, and meaningful proxies for "transport work" for dynamically positioned (DP) ships used in offshore energy industry
 - e. MEPC 72/6/4 – Russia – Comments on document MEPC 72/6/1
 - i. **The Chair invited Delegates/Organisations to provide concrete proposals on this issue to IOGP, IMCA and Russia to propose a more detailed paper for the next session of the Committee.**
 - f. MEPC 72/Inf.10 – Sec - Uncertainty analysis of methods used to measure ship fuel oil consumption – Information Paper only.
7. **Agenda Item 7** - Reduction of GHG emissions from ships - Working Group 1.
- a. MEPC 72/7 – Sec – Report of the second meeting of the Intersessional Working Group on Reduction of GHG emissions from ships (ISWG-GHG 2)
 - i. **Nothing significant for IFSMA although it is useful to see Page 17 34.6 "speed reduction has safety implications and when considering both speed reduction and speed optimization for inclusion in the initial Strategy, the work of MEPC on the revision of the 2013 Interim guidelines for determining minimum propulsion power to maintain the manoeuvrability of ships in adverse conditions should be taken into account;" In view of Paper WP.5 below, this Paper was not introduced or put forward for discussion.**
 - b. MEPC 72/WP.5 – Sec – Report of the Third meeting of the Intersessional Working Group on Reduction of GHG emissions from ships (ISWG-GHG 2)
 - i. **Annex 1 is worth reading to understand the Draft way ahead for the IMO Strategy and it highlights the need to take EEDI into account. It will therefore be important to argue that EEDI properly reflects the minimum propulsion power to maintain the manoeuvrability of ships in adverse conditions. ICS will raise this point in the Working Group.**
 - c. MEPC 72/7/1 – INTERTANKO – Understanding CO2 emissions and challenges in assessing the operational efficiency for ships
 - d. MEPC 72/7/2 – Norway – Action plan for implementing the IMO GHG Strategy

- e. MEPC 72/7/3 – Japan – Analysis of GHG emissions reduction targets for international shipping
 - f. MEPC 72/7/4 – CESA – Towards zero CO₂ emissions through innovative technology
 - g. MEPC 72/7/5 – Russia – The changing dynamics of harmful emissions into the atmosphere from seagoing ships operating in the Kola Bay area
 - h. MEPC 72/7/6 – Canada – Proposed list of priority measures to reduce GHG emissions from shipping
 - i. MEPC 72/7/7 – France and Marshall Isles – The "Tony de Brum" Declaration on reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from ships
 - j. MEPC 72/7/8 – WWF and CSC – IMO engagement in Talanoa Dialogue under Paris Agreement
 - k. MEPC 72/7/9 – CSC – The need for an evidence-based level of ambition and immediate action on the EEDI
 - l. MEPC 72/7/10 – WWF, Pacific Environment and CSC – How speed reduction can ease international shipping's path to zero GHG emissions
 - m. MEPC 72/Inf.17 – Russia – The changing dynamics of harmful emissions into the atmosphere from seagoing ships operating in the Kola Bay area
 - n. MEPC 72/Inf.5 – INTERTANKO – Understanding CO₂ emissions and challenges in assessing the operational efficiency for ships
 - o. Despite there being a long debate on all of these Papers there was nothing significant to report and only newly submitted Papers WP.5 was forwarded for the finalisation of the Draft Strategy by the WG.**
8. **Agenda Item 8** - Identification and protection of Special Areas, ECAs and PSSAs
- a. **No Papers submitted**
9. **Agenda Item 9** - Pollution prevention and response (Urgent matters emanating from the fifth session of the Sub-Committee)
- a. MEPC 72/9 – Sec - Pollution Prevention and Response
Urgent matters emanating from the fifth session of the Sub-Committee
- b. MEPC 72/9/1 – CSC and IPIECA – Urgent matters emanating from the fifth session of the Sub-Committee Prohibition to carry non-compliant fuel under regulation 14.1 of MARPOL Annex VI
- i. **Nothing significant for IFSMA – these Papers were forward to WG2 for consideration**

The achievement by Member States in agreeing to adopt an IMO Strategy of GHG emissions from ships, should not be under-estimated. It took two weeks of tough negotiations during which a great many countries set out incompatible, even opposing, positions making the chances of signing up to a compromise text slimmer by the minute. However, during Plenary discussion of the proposed Strategy, over 70 Member States supported the draft text and of those, only 2 Member States opposed. Although consistent with the Paris Agreement temperature goals, the initially agreed 'level of ambition' to reduce the sector's total GHG emissions to at least 50% by 2050 (compared to 2008 levels) was the most hotly contested point. It was viewed as far too weak by many, whilst others objected to defining a reduction figure at such a premature stage, particularly as it is not based on

evidence. Meanwhile, IMO agreed to present a revised GHG Strategy in 2023, when it will have received and analysed data from its mandatory fuel consumption data collection and a new IMO GHG Study to better define shipping's actual contribution to global GHG emissions.

10. **Agenda Item 10** - Reports of other sub-committees
11. **Agenda Item 11** - Development of measures to reduce risks of use and carriage of heavy fuel oil as fuel by ships in Arctic waters
 - a. MEPC 72/11- Russia – Proposal for possible measures to reduce risks of use and carriage of HFO as fuel by ships in Arctic waters
 - b. MEPC 72/11/1 – Finland, Germany, Iceland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden and the United States - Proposal to ban heavy fuel oil use and carriage as fuel by ships in Arctic waters
 - c. MEPC 72/11/2 – CSC, FOEI, Greenpeace, Pacific Environment, and WWF - Use and carriage of heavy fuel oil in the Arctic by ship type
 - d. MEPC 72/11/3 – Russia – Comments on the document with the proposal to ban heavy fuel oil use and carriage as fuel by ships in Arctic waters (MEPC 72/11/1)
 - e. MEPC 72/11/4 – Canada and Marshall Isles - Comments on document MEPC 72/11/1 on measures to reduce risks of use and carriage of heavy fuel oil as fuel by ships in Arctic waters
 - f. MEPC 72/11/5 – CSC, FOEI, Greenpeace, Pacific Environment, and WWF - Proposal to ban heavy fuel oil use and carriage as fuel by ships in Arctic waters
 - g. MEPC 72/11/6 - CLIA – Comments on a proposal to ban heavy fuel oil use and carriage as fuel by ships in Arctic waters
 - h. MEPC 72/Inf.14 – Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden and the United States – Summary of the work undertaken by the Arctic Council's Protection of the Marine Environment Working Group on Heavy Fuel Oil
 - i. MEPC 72/Inf.18 – Russia – Example of navigational measures to reduce risks associated with use and carriage of HFO as fuel by ships in Arctic waters
 - j. MEPC 72/Inf.20 – CSC, FOEI, Greenpeace, Pacific Environment, and WWF - Heavy Fuel Oil Use in the IMO Polar Code Arctic: Summarized by Ship Type
 - i. **Nothing significant in any of the above Papers for IFSMA**
12. **Agenda Item 12**- Technical cooperation activities for the protection of the marine environment
 - a. MEPC 72/12/1- Sec – Update on major projects (1 April to 31 December 2017)
 - b. MEPC 72/12/2 – Sec – Update on activities related to the implementation of the Protocol concerning Cooperation in Preventing Pollution from Ships and, in Cases of Emergency, Combating Pollution of the Mediterranean Sea (2002 Prevention and Emergency Protocol) to the Barcelona Convention, 1 April to 31 December 2017
 - c. MEPC 72/12/3 – Sec – Update on the work of the Global Industry Alliance to Support Low Carbon Shipping
 - i. **Nothing significant in any of the above Papers for IFSMA**

13. Agenda Item 13 - Capacity building for the implementation of new measures

- a. MEPC 72/13 – Vice Chair - Assessment of capacity-building implications of the amendments to mandatory instruments and new outputs approved at MEPC 71
 - i. **Nothing significant to report for IFSMA.**

14. Agenda Item 14 - Application of the Committees' method of work

- a. MEPC 72/14 and Rev.1 – Sec - Outcome of A 30
 - i. **Nothing significant in any of the above Papers for IFSMA**

15. Agenda Item 15 - Work programme of the Committee and subsidiary bodies

- a. MEPC 72/15 and Corrn.1 – Sec – Sustainable Development Goal 14 and marine plastic litter
- b. MEPC 72/15/1 – Aus, Netherlands and New Zealand – Review of the 2011 Guidelines for the control and management of ships' biofouling to minimize the transfer of invasive aquatic species (resolution MEPC.207(62))
- c. MEPC 72/15/2 – FAO - Comments on document MEPC 72/15
- d. MEPC 72/Inf.11 – New Zealand – Implementation of the Craft Risk Management Standard in New Zealand

The IMO Marine Environment Protection Committee held its 72nd Session (MEPC 72) from Monday 9 through Friday 13 April 2018 under the Chairmanship of Mr Hideako Saito (JAPAN) and his Vice-Chair, Mr H Conway (LIBERIA).

Two Working Groups (WG), one Drafting Group (DG), and one Review Group (RG) were formed and chaired as follows:

WG1 Air pollution and energy efficiency, Mr K Yoshida (JAPAN)

WG2 Reduction of GHG emissions from ships, Mr S Oftedal (NORWAY)

DG1 Amendments to mandatory instruments, Mr H Steinbock (GERMANY)

RG1 Ballast water management, Mr C Wiley (CANADA)

The meeting was attended by representatives from 105 Member States, plus 3 Associates, 3 UN and Special Agencies, 9 Inter-Governmental and 51 Non-Governmental organisations. The InterManager Accredited Representative was assisted by some of our Associate Members, Seagull UK and Videotel, also SGS, three in number who helped us to cover proceedings in both Plenary and the Ballast Water Review Group.

Matters of most interest to InterManager members are as follows:

IMO SECRETARY GENERAL'S ADDRESS. The Secretary-General, Mr Ki Tack Lim, welcomed delegates by first reminding all that the theme for this year's World Maritime Day, which is to be held at IMO on 27 September, is "IMO 70: our heritage – better shipping for a better future". He next spoke of the visit by HM Queen Elizabeth II to IMO Headquarters on 6 March to celebrate the 70 years' anniversary since the Convention establishing IMO was adopted, unveiling a commemorative plaque to mark the occasion.

Mr Lim said that he was in no doubt that one of the items dominating discussions this week would be the prevention of atmospheric pollution from ships including the reduction of GHG emissions, pursuant on the 0.50% limit for the sulphur content of ships' fuel oil which comes into effect from 1 January 2020. He reminded delegates that regulation 22A of MARPOL Annex VI entered into force on 1 March introducing provisions for a mandatory data collection system for fuel consumption of ships. The report from ships to their flag Administration will be forwarded to IMO via the Ship Fuel Oil Consumption Database which has now been launched as a new module within the GISIS platform. Welcoming the good progress made in the week preceding MEPC 72 by the intersessional working group on reduction of GHG emissions from ships (ISWG-GHG3), he stressed the need for the Strategic direction adopted at this meeting to be seen by the outside world as matching the new Strategic Plan adopted by Assembly last year (Strategic Direction 3, 'Respond to Climate Change').

Mr Lim next reminded delegates that this is the first session since the entry into force of the BWM Convention, and that the focus must now shift to effective implementation, guided by the experience-building phase, which was approved at MEPC 71. This will undoubtedly be a learning period for both shipowners and Administrations in which the specific arrangements formulated this week will be critical in allowing the phase to commence in order to start generating the information and insight crucial to success.

As a specialised agency of the United Nations, IMO has an important role to play in helping to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goal 14, thus at this session, the Committee will be considering the issue of marine plastic litter from shipping, as directed by the 30th session of the IMO Assembly.

An important IMO Convention of concern is that of the Hong Kong Convention for the Safe and Environmentally Sound Recycling of Ships of which to date, only 6 States have ratified or acceded to it, constituting 21.12% of the world's shipping fleet, of 107,478 gross tons, insufficient for the Convention to enter into force. Whilst finding it encouraging that leading international associations of shipowners have agreed to support voluntary adherence to the requirements of the Convention prior to its entry

into force, he implored recycling and flag States to make every effort to bring the Convention into force as soon as possible.

Acknowledging that there are a great many significant items on the MEPC's extensive agenda, Mr Lim went on to single out the importance of amendments to MARPOL Annex VI concerning ECAs and the required EEDI for ro-ro passenger ships, also, information on technical cooperation activities relating to the protection of the marine environment.

The Secretary General concluded his welcoming address by wishing the Committee good luck and every success in their deliberations.

AMENDMENTS TO MANDATORY INSTRUMENTS. Following preliminary discussions in Plenary, a drafting group (DG) was established to finalise the text of draft amendments for adoption at this session. In its report, the DG invited the Committee to consider and adopt proposed amendments to the BWM Convention concerning the implementation schedule of ballast water management (BWM) for ships, the Code for the approval of BWM systems and endorsement of additional surveys on the International BWM Certificate; amendments to MARPOL Annex VI concerning ECAs and the required EEDI for ro-ro cargo and ro-ro passenger ships; also, amendments to the IBC and BCH Codes concerning the Model form of the Certificate of Fitness for the Carriage of Dangerous Chemicals in Bulk. These recommendations were duly endorsed by the Committee.

HARMFUL AQUATIC ORGANISMS IN BALLAST WATER. The BWM Convention entered into force on 8 September 2017 and the number of Contracting Governments is now 69, representing 75.11% of the world's merchant fleet tonnage. It will be recalled that MEPC 71 was momentous in achieving significant outcomes including, *inter alia*, the approval of amendments to the Convention and of the Code for 'approval of ballast water management systems' (BWMS Code) (both of which have now been adopted by MEPC 72 under the preceding agenda item); the establishment of an experience-building phase (EBP) and the approval of numerous new or revised guidelines and guidance documents addressing various topics related to the implementation and enforcement of the Convention. In addition, III 4 finalised the inclusion of Survey Guidelines under the BWM Convention in the HSSC, subsequently adopted at Assembly 30. Fifteen documents were submitted on this item, as well as those emanating from III 4 and following discussion in Plenary, terms of reference were formulated for a Ballast Water Review Group. The Group convened for several days and submitted a report which the Committee approved in general, and in particular:

1. Agreed that Procedure G9 should be revised as a consequence of the revision of Guidelines G8, and that Procedure G9 need not be made into a code under the Convention;
2. Approved a draft BWM.2 circular on the data gathering and analysis plan for the experience-building phase;
3. Concurred that further consideration of document PPR 5/5/2 at PPR 6 is necessary, with a view to adding to the data gathering and analysis plan for the experience-building phase of an Annex on analytical procedures for sampling and analysis;
4. Approved BWM.2/Circ.33/Rev.1 on revised 'Guidance on scaling of BWM systems';
5. Approved BWM.2/Circ.43/Rev.1 on revised 'Guidance for Administrations on the type approval process for BWM systems';
6. Invited proposals for developing guidance on validating compliance of individual BWMS with regulation D-2 of the BWM Convention in conjunction with their commissioning;
7. Invited proposals to clarify when elements introduced by the Guidance on contingency measures under the BWM Convention should be included into BWM plans; and
8. Re-established the review group for MEPC 73, in accordance with the provisions of regulation D-5 of the BWM Convention, subject to approval by the Council.

-

AIR POLLUTION AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY. Following MEPC 71, ICELAND deposited its instrument of accession to MARPOL Annex VI, bringing the total number of Contracting States to the Annex to 89, constituting 96.18% of world tonnage. Eleven documents were submitted together with six information papers plus urgent matters emanating from PPR 5. The main issues considered under this item were draft amendments to MARPOL Annex VI for a prohibition of carriage of non-compliant fuel oil (consistent implementation of 0.50% sulphur fuel oil) and drafting guidance on best practice for fuel oil purchasers/users and for fuel oil providers. Additionally, in considering energy efficiency of ships, draft amendments to MARPOL Annex VI for the EEDI requirements of ice class ships and the EEDI reference line parameters for bulk carriers and tankers were also subjects for deliberation. Of greatest importance was the decision by the Committee to prohibit not just the use, but also the carriage of bunkers above 0.50% sulphur. Thus the way is now clear for formal adoption of this amendment to MARPOL Annex VI Regulation 14 at MEPC 73 in October this year, meaning that a carriage ban can take effect as early as 1 March 2020, enabling a more effective enforcement of the 2020 sulphur limit. A number of other matters debated

by the dedicated WG were subjects within their report which was approved by the Committee in general, and in particular, also:

1. Approved a draft MEPC circular on Guidance of best practice for fuel oil purchasers/users for assuring the quality of fuel oil used on board ships;
2. Concurred with the WG's view that the draft best practice Guidance for fuel oil suppliers in document MEPC 72 (INF.13(1BIA)) should form the basis for developing IMO guidance at MEPC 73;
3. Issued instructions to the Correspondence Group on EEDI review beyond phase 2 regarding definition and exclusion of ice-strengthened ships higher than IA Super from the EEDI regulations;
4. Noted the Group's agreement to incorporate the issue of early submission of the SEEMP part II and its timely verification in the draft MEPC circular on the Sample format for the Confirmation of compliance pursuant to regulation 5.4.5 of MARPOL Annex VI; and
5. Approved the draft MEPC circular referred to in 4 above, for early submission of the SEEMP part II on the ship fuel consumption data collection plan.

REDUCTION OF GHG EMISSIONS FROM SHIPS. MEPC 70 approved the Roadmap for developing a comprehensive IMO Strategy on reduction of GHG emissions from ships which predicated the adoption of an initial Strategy at MEPC 72 and adoption of a revised Strategy in Spring 2023. In the interim, ISWG-GHG 3 held its third intersessional meeting during the week preceding MEPC 72 where it set out to finalise the draft IMO GHG Strategy. This included the definition of a vision expressing IMO's commitment to further reduce or limit GHG emissions from ships; identification of levels of ambition for this initial Strategy; agreement of guiding principles, including the question of differentiation; and, agreement on timelines, especially on the issue of early action.

Eleven documents and two information documents were submitted to MEPC 72 in addition to several recommended by ISWG-GHG3, all of which were introduced for discussion prior to establishing the Working Group. In considering the WG's subsequent report, the Committee approved it in general, and in particular:

1. Adopted the IMO Strategy on GHG emissions from ships, together with an associated MEPC resolution;
2. Noted that, due to time constraints, consideration of a number of documents would have to be referred to GHG 4;

3. Agreed to hold a fourth meeting of ISWG-GHG4; subject to Council endorsement;
4. Considered the Group's discussion on the timing of GHG 4; and
5. Approved draft terms of reference for GHG 4.

The achievement by Member States in agreeing to adopt an IMO Strategy of GHG emissions from ships, should not be under-estimated. It took two weeks of tough negotiations during which a great many countries set out incompatible, even opposing, positions making the chances of signing up to a compromise text slimmer by the minute. However, during Plenary discussion of the proposed Strategy, over 70 Member States supported the draft text and of those, only 2 Member States opposed. Although consistent with the Paris Agreement temperature goals, the initially agreed 'level of ambition' to reduce the sector's total GHG emissions to at least 50% by 2050 (compared to 2008 levels) was the most hotly contested point. It was viewed as far too weak by many, whilst others objected to defining a reduction figure at such a premature stage, particularly as it is not based on evidence. Meanwhile, IMO agreed to present a revised GHG Strategy in 2023, when it will have received and analysed data from its mandatory fuel consumption data collection and a new IMO GHG Study to better define shipping's actual contribution to global GHG emissions.

MEASURES TO REDUCE RISKS OF USE AND CARRIAGE OF HEAVY FUEL OIL AS FUEL BY SHIPS IN ARCTIC WATERS. Heavy fuel oil (HFO) is toxic and extremely viscous, breaking down more slowly in the marine environment than other fuels, particularly in colder regions like the Arctic. The anticipated increase in Arctic ship traffic due to reduced sea ice will increase the risk of incidents associated with use and carriage of HFO as fuel by these ships. FINLAND, supported by a number of other Arctic Council Member States, therefore proposed a mandatory HFO ban for such ships. However, the RUSSIAN FEDERATION suggested a number of risk reduction factors rather than an outright ban including navigational and operational measures, also emergency preparedness, believing that these should be explored before any mandatory ban is established. Given the range of divergent views on this proposal by FINLAND et al in the Plenary discussion that followed, the Committee decided to delegate resolution of the problem to the PPR Sub-Committee and issued a scope of work as follows:

1. Develop a definition of HFO taking into account regulation 43 of MARPOL, Annex I;

MARINE PLASTIC LITTER. Marine litter presents a huge problem in our oceans, with some scientists warning that, by 2050, the quantity of plastics in the oceans will outweigh those of fish. Plastics break down extremely slowly in the marine environment, taking in excess of 400 years to do so. It has been estimated that around 80% of marine litter is from land-based sources and 20% from sea based sources, such as ships, offshore platforms and fishing vessels.

The Chairman recalled that Assembly 30 recognised the ongoing problem of marine plastic pollution, as addressed in MARPOL Annex V, which requires further consideration as part of a global solution within the framework of ocean governance, in pursuance of SDG 14's target to prevent and significantly reduce marine pollution of all kinds by 2025. Following extensive discussion, the Committee expressed overwhelming support for the IMO to enhance its work in addressing maritime plastic litter. This includes strengthening the implementation and enforcement of existing mandatory requirements, in particular, the relevant regulations in MARPOL Annex V. In addition, further improvements to interagency cooperation, collection and assessment of relevant data and, promoting best practice, should also be pursued. The Committee then agreed to:

1. Include a new output 'Development of an action plan to address marine plastic from ships' in the 2018-2019 biennial agenda of the MPEC, assigning the PPR Sub-committee as the associated organ, with a target completion year of 2020;
2. Include the new output on the agenda of MEPC 73;
3. Invite proposals to MEPC 73 on the development of an action plan;
4. Request the Secretariat to submit a summary of the Organisation's work on addressing marine plastic litter, including an update on the status of interagency cooperation, to MEPC 73;
5. Invite the governing bodies of the London Convention/Protocol to submit their input on the proposed action plan to future sessions of the Committee; and
6. Invite the FAO and other international organisations to keep the Committee updated on its work related to addressing marine plastic litter.

- i. Nothing significant in any of the above Papers for IFSMA

16. Agenda Item 16 - Any other business

- a. MEPC 72/16 – Sec – Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden and the United States - Regional Reception Facilities Plan (RRFP) – Outline and Planning Guide for the Arctic

- b. MEPC 72/16/1 – Sec - Update on recent interagency cooperation activities on issues relating to the protection of the marine environment
- c. MEPC 72/16/2 – Japan - Necessary efforts towards the early entry into force of the Hong Kong Convention
- d. MEPC 72/16/3 – Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals - Outcomes of the 12th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species
- e. MEPC 72/16/4 – Netherlands - The Ocean Cleanup's deployment in the North Pacific
- f. MEPC 72/16/5 – Canada - Reducing underwater noise utilizing ship design and operational measures
- g. MEPC 72/16/6 – FOEI, Greenpeace, WWF, CSC and Pacific Environment - Vessel grey water concerns
- h. MEPC 72/Inf.3 – Sec – Global Integrated Shipping Information System (GISIS)
- i. MEPC 72/Inf.4 – ITTC – ITTC Recommended Guideline on Model Scale Cavitation Noise Measurement
- j. MEPC 72/Inf.9 – International Whaling Commission – Further information related to impacts of underwater noise on marine life
- k. MEPC 72/Inf.21 - FOEI, Greenpeace, WWF, CSC and Pacific Environment - Vessel grey water concerns

17. Agenda Item 17 - Consideration of the report of the Committee