



GÜNLÜ EVRAK

Sayı : 38591462 - 460.02 - 2019 - 6867

06/12/2019

Konu : Arktik Bölgesinde Seyir Yapan Gemilerde Kullanılan ve Taşınan Ağır Yakıtların Oluşturduğu Risklerin Azaltılmasına Yönelik Önlemler Hk

**Sirküler No :844**

SAYIN ÜYEMİZ,

**İlgi** : Uluslararası Deniz Ticaret Odasının (ICS) 02/12/2019 tarihli, MC(19)95 sayılı yazısı.

Uluslararası Deniz Ticaret Odası (ICS) tarafından gönderilen ilgi yazıda, ICS Çevre Alt Komitesi ve Denizcilik Komitesine bildirildiği üzere, ICS Sekreteryasının, IMO Kirlilik Önleme ve Müdahale Alt Komitesi (Pollution Prevention and Response- PPR) ile " Arktik Bölgesinde Seyir Yapan Gemilerde Kullanılan ve Taşınan Ağır Yakıtların Oluşturduğu Risklerin Azaltılmasına Yönelik Önlemlere" ilişkin yönergelerin geliştirilmesi çalışmalarına katıldığı belirtilmektedir.

ICS'in söz konusu çalışmalar kapsamında sunulan teklifi, MARPOL gereklilikleri dışında, bölgede seyir yapacak olan gemilerde bulundurulması gereken yüksek miktardaki kirlilikle mücadele ekipmanlarının, olası bir acil durumda mürettebat tarafından kurulum ve kullanımının pratik anlamda pek mümkün olmadığı gerekçesiyle reddettiği, konu ile ilgili IMO PPR Alt Komitesine bir değerlendirme yazısı yazılmasına karar verildiği bildirilmektedir.

Bu kapsamda ICS, Uluslararası P&I Kulüpleri Birliği (International Group of P&I Associations – IG) ve Uluslararası Tanker Armatörleri Kirlilik Federasyonu (International Tanker Owners Pollution Federation –ITOPF) tarafından hazırlanmış olan arktik bölgesinde seyir yapan gemilerde kullanılan ve taşınan ağır yakıtların oluşturduğu risklerin azaltılmasına yönelik önlemlere ilişkin değerlendirme yazısı Ek'te sunulmakta olup, yazıya ilişkin görüş ve önerilerinizin ICS'e bildirilmek üzere en geç 12 Aralık 2019 tarihi mesai bitimine kadar Odamıza (iletisim@denizticaretodasi.org.tr) iletilmesi hususunda bilgilerinizi ve gereğini arz/rica ederim.

Saygılarımla,

*e-imza*

Cengiz ÖZKAN  
Genel Sekreter V.

**Ek:** İlgi Yazı ve Eki (6 sayfa)

Dağıtım:

Gereği:

- Tüm Üyeler (WEB sayfası ve e-posta ile)

Bilgi:

- Yönetim Kurulu Başkan ve Üyeleri



- Türk Armatörler Birliği
- S.S. Gemi Armatörleri Mot. Taş. Koop.
- Vapur Donatanları ve Acenteleri Derneği
- İMEAK DTO Şubeleri ve Temsilcilikleri
- İMEAK DTO 27,28,35 ve 44 No'lu Meslek Grupları Üyeleri
- Gemi ve Yat İhracatçıları Birliği
- Türk Loydu Uygunluk Değerlendirme Hizmetleri A.Ş.
- Gemi Brokerleri Derneği
- WISTA Türkiye Derneği
- Deniz Emniyet Derneği
- Gemi Sahibi Firmalar

- Piri Reis Üniversitesi
- İMEAK DTO Çevre Komisyonu



Bu belge, 5070 sayılı Elektronik İmza Kanuna göre Güvenli Elektronik İmza ile imzalanmıştır.

Evrakı Doğrulamak İçin : <https://ebys.denizticaretodasi.org.tr/enVision/Dogrula/NNBR39>

Bilgi için: Serkan İNAL Telefon: 02122520130/157 E-Posta: serkan.inal@denizticaretodasi.org.tr

Meclis-i Mebusan Caddesi No: 22 34427 Fındıklı - Beyoğlu - İstanbul Türkiye

Tel : +90 (212) 252 01 30 Faks: +90 (212) 293 79 35

Web: [www.denizticaretodasi.org.tr](http://www.denizticaretodasi.org.tr) E-mail: [iletisim@denizticaretodasi.org.tr](mailto:iletisim@denizticaretodasi.org.tr) Kep: imeakdto@hs01.kep.tr.



Odamızda  
ISO 9001:2015  
Kalite Yönetim  
Sistemi  
uygulanmaktadır.

This Circular and its attachments (if any) are confidential to the intended recipient and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient you should contact ICS and must not make any use of it.

02 December 2019

**MC(19)95**

**To: MARINE COMMITTEE**

**Copy: ENVIRONMENT SUB-COMMITTEE  
ALL FULL AND ASSOCIATE MEMBERS (for information)**

**DRAFT SUBMISSION TO PPR 7 – DEVELOPMENT OF MEASURES TO REDUCE RISKS OF USE AND CARRIAGE OF HEAVY FUEL OIL AS FUEL BY SHIPS IN ARCTIC WATERS**

**Action required: *Members are invited to note the information provided in this circular and review the draft submission attached at Annex and that the Secretariat plan to submit unless Members request otherwise. Members are requested to provide their comments by 13 December 2019.***

As reported to the Environment Sub-Committee and Marine Committee at the last meetings (22 and 23 October respectively) and contained within the draft meeting minutes (ENV (19)09 and MC (19)91) the Secretariat has participated in the PPR Correspondence Group to develop guidelines on measures to reduce risks of the use and carriage of heavy fuel oil as fuel by ships in Arctic waters.

The Secretariat has raised concern regarding the inclusion of the proposed carriage requirements of a significant amount of pollution response equipment. The Secretariat has consistently rejected this proposal throughout the CGH process as it is outside of MARPOL requirements and is impractical for ship's staff to maintain, deploy and use in case of an emergency.

Members were advised and agreed that should the relevant parts of the Guidelines not be deleted or amended as proposed by the Secretariat that a comment paper to PPR would be needed in this regard.

The report of the Correspondence Group has now been published and the relevant parts have been retained, therefore as agreed by the Environmental Sub-Committee and the Marine Committee a comment paper has been developed by ICS, working with the IG and ITOPF.

The ICS Secretariat recommends co-sponsorship of the draft submission. The draft submission is attached at **Annex**.

**Members are requested to review the draft submission and advice their support (or otherwise) along with providing any other comments to the undersigned ([chris.oliver@ics-shipping.org](mailto:chris.oliver@ics-shipping.org)) by Friday 13 December 2019.**

Chris Oliver  
Nautical Director

Enclosures:

**Annex – DRAFT SUBMISSION TO PPR 7 – HFO IN THE ARCTIC – ANNEX A**

SUB-COMMITTEE ON POLLUTION  
PREVENTION AND RESPONSE  
7th session  
Agenda item 14

PPR 7/14/XX  
xx December 2019  
Language: Original: ENGLISH  
Pre-session public release:

**DEVELOPMENT OF MEASURES TO REDUCE RISKS OF USE AND CARRIAGE OF  
HEAVY FUEL OIL AS FUEL BY SHIPS IN ARCTIC WATERS**

**Comments on the Report of the Correspondence Group**

**Submitted by ICS, International Group of P&I Associations and ITOPF**

**SUMMARY**

*Executive summary:* This document provides comments on document PPR 7/14/XX - Report of the Correspondence Group on the development of Guidelines on Measures to Reduce Risks of Use and Carriage of Heavy Fuel Oil as Fuel by Ships in Arctic Waters

*Strategic direction, if applicable:* 6

*Output:* 6.11

*Action to be taken:* Paragraph 22

*Related documents:* PPR 7/14/XX (this will be the submission of the Report by the Russian Federation)

1 This document comments on document PPR 7/14 – Report of the Correspondence Group and the draft Guidelines on mitigation measures to reduce risks of use and carriage for use of HFO as fuel by ships in Arctic waters.

2 ICS, the International Group of P&I Associations and ITOPF participated in the Correspondence Group on the development of Guidelines on Measures to Reduce Risks of Use and Carriage of Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO) as Fuel by Ships in Arctic Waters. The co-sponsors wish to thank the Russian Federation for coordinating the Correspondence Group and submitting the report.

3 However, the co-sponsors feel the compelling need to provide comments on the Report of the Correspondence Group as well as the text of the draft Guidelines set out in the annex to the report.

## **Discussion**

4 The co-sponsors raise concern with regard to the content of paragraph 16 of the Report of the Correspondence Group and how that is being interpreted with respect to the carriage of OSR equipment on board vessels trading in Arctic waters.

5 The co-sponsors also note that some of the allocations of recommendations to ship operators, marked as "OP" rather than Maritime Administrations, marked as "MA" respectively in the draft Guidelines, present issues of concern.

6 Specifically, concern exists related to the recommendations allocated to the ship operator in paragraphs 4.5, 4.6, 6.5, 6.12, 6.14, 6.19, 6.20, 6.21, 6.22, 6.23, 6.26, 6.28 and 7.8.

7 The co-sponsors maintain that all the recommendations listed above should be allocated to Maritime Administrations and not to the Ship Operator.

8 Additionally, the co-sponsors have concern regarding the practicality and effectiveness of emergency response equipment being placed on board a vessel and specifically with respect to oil booms, floating beacons, skimmers and elastic floating tanks.

9 The co-sponsors consider that recommending the ship operator carry response equipment is unlikely to achieve a better response to potential risks associated with the use of carriage of HFO as fuel by ships in Arctic waters.

10 The co-sponsors would highlight a study undertaken by ITOPF in 1998 regarding the question as to whether oil tankers should carry oil spill response equipment on board. The study was undertaken as a result of the US Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (OPA'90), which comments that after much debate, the resultant US requirement stipulated the carriage of limited equipment for small on-deck spills only and not equipment to respond to a spill of oil into the sea.

11 It is understood that there may be a perception that the carriage of spill response equipment on vessels in Arctic waters might promote a quicker and easier clean up of any spilled HFO. However, there are many reasons why the carriage of booms, skimmers and other on water spill response equipment is neither practical nor likely to achieve a better response.

12 Not least of these reasons is storage, maintenance and deployment. It is always considered preferable for responders to bring their own equipment on which they have been trained. They are able to select this equipment for optimal efficiency given the environmental factors and the type of oil spilled. This equipment will be probably more reliable given the unknown level of maintenance of that on board a vessel. Indeed, the harsher conditions to which the deck of a ship is exposed will accelerate deterioration of equipment stored there in comparison to that stored on land.

13 In practical terms, ship's deck fittings, such as pipework and other structures do not make the deck of a ship the ideal place to store and launch equipment. Cranes, intended for cargo, stores or handling of hoses in the calm conditions of a port cannot be used efficiently and safely in a heavy swell or strong winds. A ship can have a high freeboard and any equipment could be easily damaged or cause further damage to the ship if deployment were not performed carefully.

14 The numbers of crew on board most vessels make the deployment of oil spill response equipment impractical given the other responsibilities and tasks that need to be undertaken in any emergency situation.

15 The use of workboats to hold a boom in place as would be needed would require further equipment, storage, maintenance and their operation is labour intensive and time consuming. Lifeboats should specifically not be used for this or any other purpose for which they were not designed.

16 The conclusion from the study was that to manage an entire response safely and effectively there must be sufficient trained response personnel on scene, numbers of whom will not be available from the crew in the event of an incident. Vessels simply cannot carry on board sufficient resources to fulfil the requirements of a satisfactory response. The preparation of suitable vessel contingency plans is a much more practicable alternative to achieving a successful response to a spill of oil.

17 This has been recognised internationally by the International Maritime Organisation and reflected in the Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL), which requires ships to carry a shipboard oil pollution emergency plan (SOPEP). This plan must include emergency activation procedures for the notification of the relevant authorities, the coordination of shipboard action with national and local authorities and the reduction or control of the discharge of oil following the incident. It has been acknowledged that these actions rather than the carriage of equipment onboard will do significantly more to mitigate the effects of any oil spill.

18 It is therefore questionable to link the requirements of the OPRC-90 as stated in paragraph 16 to the increased carriage recommendation proposed in the draft Guidelines.

19 The co-sponsors would also comment that these carriage recommendations are outside of the MARPOL requirements and therefore not in-line with the statement made in the Preamble of the draft Guidelines that states “The Guidelines are in alignment with the requirements of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea of 1974 (SOLAS), the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships of 1973, as modified by the Protocol of 1978 and as amended by the 1997 Protocol (MARPOL), the International Code for Ships Operating in Polar Waters (Polar Code) and other relevant IMO mandatory instruments.”

20 Reference can also be made to MSC/Circ.1056 paragraph 16.2.1, which states – “All ships should have the capability to contain and clean up minor deck and over side spills.”

21 The co-sponsors advise that the concerns contained within this document were previously raised during the work of the Correspondence Group.

## **Proposal**

22 The co-sponsors recommend that the Sub-Committee in continuing its work on development of measures to reduce risks of use and carriage of HFO as fuel by ships in Arctic waters, including the development of the draft guidelines, take into account:

- .1 that the recommendations with respect to oil spill response equipment allocated to the ship operator in the draft guidelines are amended as currently they are not practicable or efficient in achieving a successful response to potential HFO spills; and

- .2 the need to ensure that all new recommendations and/or requirements placed on the ship operator should be based on thorough consideration and assessment.
- .3 amendments are made to paragraphs 4.5, 4.6, 6.5, 6.12, 6.14, 6.19, 6.20, 6.21, 6.22, 6.23, 6.26, 6.28 and 7.8 of the draft Guidelines to allocate responsibility to the Maritime Administration.

**Action requested of the Sub-Committee**

23 The Sub-Committee is invited to note the discussion in paragraphs 4-21, consider the proposal in paragraph 22, and take action as appropriate.