
METHODOLOGY FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF THE STCW CONVENTION AND CODE

Purpose

To provide a methodology for a structured approach for the comprehensive review of the STCW Convention and Code.

Methodology

Using the principles, the list of areas and actions as a basis, identify gaps with a view to developing amendments that address them.

The approach to applying this methodology will be divided into two phases.

Phase 1 – Review/Identification of gaps

Review the Convention and Code (regulation by regulation and section by section, including articles) to identify gaps/provisions that should be addressed based on two criteria:

- .1 Criterion 1: Issues emanating/resulting from external factors including trends and new developments.

For example: use of new technological developments in ships and ship's operations, technological advances in training, requirements from other conventions, etc.; and
- .2 Criterion 2: Issues emanating/resulting from existing provisions based on implementation experiences.

For example: inconsistencies, differing interpretations, challenges with the interpretation, flexibility, etc.

The documents submitted for consideration under this phase 1 must be structured as follows:

- .1 Provision with an identified gap;
- .2 The principle(s) (of those already approved at MSC 107) associated with the proposal;
- .3 Explanation under the applicable criteria (1 and/or 2) above; and
- .4 The area(s) associated with the gap and criterion.

Example 1 of document:

- .1 Gap – section A-I/7 – Communication of information – undertakings under regulation I/10;
 - .2 Principle – XXXX;
-

-
- .3 Criterion 2 – Differing interpretations on whether or not the panel of competent persons must review the submission and issue their determination as to whether or not the Party is giving the Convention full and complete effect; and
 - .4 Area – XXXX.

Example 2 of document:

- .1 Gap – Standards of competence to address cybersecurity awareness;
- .2 Principle – XXXX;
- .3 Criterion 1 – Recent shipping cybersecurity incidents have shown the need for cybersecurity training at all levels. Awareness should be commensurate with their responsibilities. Changes may be needed to include a new competence in tables A-II/1, A-II/2, A-III/1, A-III/2 and A-VI/1; and
- .4 Area – XXXX.

The output from phase 1 is a list of provisions with identified gaps that will be addressed in phase 2.

Phase 2 – Revision*

Develop amendments to address gaps identified under phase 1. This phase may result in consequential amendments to other regulations and sections.

The documents submitted for discussion under this phase 2 must be structured as follows:

- .1 Provisions and gaps identified – from the list generated in phase 1;
- .2 Proposed amendment; and
- .3 Explanation.

* Subject to review upon completion of phase 1.
