

S1913

**International Mobile Satellite Organization**

**ASSEMBLY**

Nineteenth (Extraordinary) Session

5 – 6 March 2007

ASSEMBLY/19/INF/3

Origin: Director

Date: 19 January 2007

**OUTCOME OF IMO MSC 82**

<b>Executive Summary:</b>	this document provides information on the outcome of the eighty second session of the IMO Maritime Safety Committee.
<b>Related documents:</b>	ASSEMBLY/19/7

**1 OUTCOME OF MSC 82**

1.1 The IMO Maritime Safety Committee, at its eighty second session, held in Istanbul, Turkey, from 29 November to 8 December 2006, considered matters of relevance to IMSO and the items under consideration by this Assembly, including:

1. revision of IMO Assembly resolution A.888(21) on *Criteria for the provision of mobile-satellite communication systems in the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS)* and consequential amendments to SOLAS Chapter IV; and
2. Long Range Identification and Tracking of Ships (LRIT).

1.2 Relevant paragraphs from the Report of MSC 82 (MSC 82/24) are attached at Annex.

---

**EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT OF MSC 82 (MSC 82/24):****8 RADIOCOMMUNICATIONS AND SEARCH AND RESCUE****REPORT OF THE TENTH SESSION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE****General**

8.1 The Committee, recalling that MSC 81 had considered urgent matters emanating from the tenth session of the Sub-Committee on radiocommunications and Search and Rescue (COMSAR), approved, in general, the report of that session (documents COMSAR 10/16 and MSC 82/8) and took action on all remaining items as indicated hereunder.

**List of Land Earth Station (LES) Co-ordinators**

8.2 The Committee endorsed the Sub-Committee's action in issuing COMSAR/Circ.38 on List of Land Earth Station (LES) operation co-ordinators in the Inmarsat system, superseding COMSAR/Circ.11 and Corrigenda.

**ITU matters*****IMO liaison statements to the ITU and IALA***

8.3 ...

8.4 ...

**Telemedical assistance services**

8.5 ...

**Ships' compulsory medical supplies**

8.6 ...

**Revision of resolution A.888(21)**

8.7 The Committee recalled that MSC 77 had agreed that an intergovernmental oversight, similar to the oversight presently carried out by IMSO in respect of Inmarsat Ltd., would be needed when other providers of GMDSS satellite services would, in future, be accepted and recognized by the Organization. It had, therefore,

instructed the Secretariat to communicate with IMSO enquiring if that organization could carry out the oversight of future providers of satellite services for the GMDSS.

8.8 Subsequently the IMSO Assembly, at its seventeenth session, agreed by an overwhelming majority that IMSO was willing to carry out the oversight of future providers of mobile-satellite communications systems services for the GMDSS.

8.9 The Committee further recalled that MSC 79 had considered the issue again and confirmed and reiterated its decision that IMSO was the appropriate organization to carry out the required oversight and it had, therefore, instructed the Secretariat to communicate with IMSO formally inviting that organization to carry out such oversight. The Secretary-General of IMO therefore wrote to the Director of IMSO on 31 January 2005 inviting IMSO to carry out that oversight role forthwith.

8.10 The Committee also recalled that MSC 81 had considered the proposed amendments to resolution A.888(21), but was unable to finalize the matter. After extensive discussion, the Committee, recognizing that any revised resolution could not be adopted until the twenty-fifth Assembly, had agreed to reconsider the revision of resolution A.888(21) at MSC 82, on the basis of further comments and proposals from Member States and legal advice.

8.11 IMSO (MSC 82/8/10) advised the Committee on the outcome of the recent IMSO Assembly, held from 25 to 29 September 2006, in relation to aspects covered by the revision of resolution A.888(21). The required amendments to the IMSO Convention to enable oversight of additional satellite providers and LRIT had been adopted. However the IMSO Assembly had yet to make a decision on the provisional implementation of these adopted amendments and an extraordinary session of the IMSO Assembly would be convened in March 2007 to consider the measures required.

8.12 The observer from IMSO, as the Co-ordinator of the COMSAR correspondence group on the revision of resolution A.888(21) briefly introduced the revised resolution (COMSAR 10/16, annex 10). He stated however, that the present draft of the revision was based upon the respective roles of IMO and IMSO, as had been agreed by the majority of delegations at COMSAR 10. However in the light of discussion of the issues at MSC 81 and the further consideration at the current session, this would need further revision, especially in the introductory parts.

#### ***Consequential amendments to SOLAS chapter IV***

8.13 The United States (MSC 82/3/2) proposed the inclusion of the following new

Regulation 4*bis* in SOLAS chapter IV:

“The Organization shall establish performance standards for RMSSPs (Recognized Mobile Satellite Service Providers), and shall establish procedures to provide for the review of the performance of RMSSPs. The Organization may perform such review directly itself, or with the participation of Contracting Governments and/or the participation of other entities it may designate.”

8.14 The delegation of the United States was of the view that such an amendment was necessary in order to allow other satellite providers into the GMDSS in the future. It was also the view of the United States that oversight of such providers by the Organization itself could be permitted by an amendment of SOLAS.

8.15 IMSO (MSC 82/8/10) proposed the following draft in respect of evaluation, recognition and oversight of GMDSS satellite service providers:

“The Maritime Safety Committee shall determine the criteria, procedures and arrangements for evaluating and recognizing satellite services for participation in the GMDSS. Services which have been recognized by the Committee shall be subject to oversight by the International Mobile Satellite Organization.”

8.16 IMSO also advised the Committee of the dangers inherent in having two different oversight schemes, should IMO take on the role of oversight of future satellite providers.

8.17 Spain (MSC 82/3/25), commenting on MSC 82/3/2, highlighted some of the unintended consequences of adopting the United States proposal to the present operation of GMDSS and previous decisions of the Committee.

8.18 The delegation of Spain, supported by several delegations, also queried whether the Organization had the legal basis to conduct the oversight of satellite providers as, in their opinion, the Committee did not have such competence.

8.19 The delegations of the Russian Federation and South Africa also re-iterated their concerns over the functions of evaluation and recognition being undertaken by the same organization.

8.20 The delegation of the United States stressed that if the GMDSS should be opened up to other satellite service providers, the oversight needed to be organized now without delay, to ensure to have a system in place as safe as the present one. According to them, IMSO was not able to provide such an oversight function, as the ratification process of the corresponding amendments to the IMSO Convention was in progress and it would take a considerable time before they would enter into force, allowing IMSO to take on that role.

8.21 A considerable debate ensued, during which the overwhelming majority of delegations, in fact, all delegations who spoke except the delegation of the United States, reiterated the previous decisions of the Committee that IMSO was the appropriate Organization to undertake the oversight of future satellite providers in the GMDSS. Accordingly the Committee invited IMSO to undertake that role forthwith.

8.22 The delegation of the United States reserved its position on the appointment of IMSO to undertake such a role of oversight of future satellite providers.

8.23 Accordingly, the Committee decided in principle as follows:

.1 applications from a new satellite provider by a Member State should be submitted to MSC;

.2 the evaluation of the potential satellite provider should be undertaken by MSC through an appropriate mechanism according to the provisions of resolution A.888(21);

.3 the recognition of the satellite provider to operate in the GMDSS should be undertaken by MSC on the basis of evaluation by an appropriate mechanism; and

.4 the oversight, as decided by MSC 77, in all its context, should be undertaken by IMSO.

8.24 Following the debate the Chairman proposed that:

.1 resolution A.888(21) should be redrafted to reflect the decision on the respective responsibilities of MSC and IMSO. The Committee accordingly,

instructed COMSAR 11 to finalize the resolution and submit to MSC 83 with a view to adoption by 25th Assembly; and

.2 any corresponding amendments to chapter IV should be considered and finalized by COMSAR 11 in February 2007. Accordingly, the Committee authorized the Secretariat to circulate the finalized amendments after COMSAR in accordance with SOLAS article VIII (i) with a view to adoption by MSC 83.

### **Long-Range Identification and Tracking of Ships**

8.25 The Committee recalled that MSC 81 under resolution MSC.202(81) had adopted amendments to SOLAS chapter V in respect of the long-range identification and tracking of ships. The Committee had also adopted resolution MSC.210(81) on Performance standards and functional requirement for the long-range identification and tracking of ships; and resolution MSC.211(81) on Arrangements for the timely establishment of the long-range identification and tracking system.

8.26 The Committee also recalled that the SOLAS amendments are under the tacit amendment process and would enter into force on 1 January 2008, if they are deemed accepted by 1 July 2007 in accordance with the provisions of the resolution.

### ***Aspects of resolution MSC.211(81)***

8.27 The Committee recalled that MSC 81, in adopting resolution MSC.211(81) on Arrangements for the timely establishment of the long-range identification and tracking system, the Committee, *inter alia*, had invited Contracting Governments to the Convention:

.1 to advise the Committee, at its eighty-second session, of their firm intentions in relation to the establishment of National, Regional and Co-operative LRIT Data Centre(s); and

.2 to submit proposals on the issues which need to be addressed in relation to the establishment of the International LRIT Data Centre and of the International LRIT Data Exchange or on any other issues relating to the establishment, operation, performance review and audit of the LRIT system for consideration by the Committee at its eighty-second session.

8.28 The Committee also recalled that MSC 81 had agreed that it would make the necessary decisions at MSC 82, in relation to the assignment of the performance of the functions of the LRIT Co-ordinator.

8.29 The Committee further recalled that the resolution also requested the Secretariat to provide information for consideration by the Committee, at its eighty-second session, on the arrangements for the establishment and maintenance of the LRIT Data Distribution Plan so as to enable Contracting Governments to commence populating the plan with data as from 1 January 2008.

8.30 In response to this, the Secretariat advised the Committee that the LRIT Data Distribution Plan (DPP) would be established and maintained by the Secretariat, possibly as part of the GISIS website. The DPP was a crucial element of the LRIT system. The DDP module of GISIS would provide:

1. A web interface for Contracting Governments to update their data.
2. On-demand automated transfers to the International LRIT Data Exchange and LRIT data centres of the current Data Plan.

It was anticipated that the DDP could be developed using in-house resources. Development and deployment time is estimated to take about 12 man-weeks, including the integration testing phases, based on the final version of the technical requirements documentation. Close co-operation with the LRIT Co-ordinator and the IDC and IDE operators was essential in setting up the DDP. The Secretariat would need to ensure that the GISIS website, hosting DDP is available 99.9% over a year, and 95% over any one day, i.e. maximum ~8 hours downtime per year, and maximum ~1.2 hours downtime over any one day. This requirement could be achieved by procuring two additional servers (main server and a backup server in a cluster) for this purpose, and as part of the project.

#### ***Report of the intersessional working group on engineering aspects of LRIT***

8.31 The Committee recalled that MSC 81 had approved the establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Engineering Aspects of LRIT with the terms of reference, set out in annex 4 to document MSC 81/WP.5/Add.1. MSC 81 had agreed that, if the LRIT system was to become operational by 31 December 2008, the *Ad Hoc* working group needed to complete all its work on time and submit it for consideration by MSC 82 with a view to approval. As a result and bearing in mind the volume of work required, MSC 81 had agreed that the *Ad Hoc* working group would need at least

three meetings and should also endeavour, between meetings, to advance the work by correspondence. Hence and notwithstanding the provisions of the Guidelines on the organization and method of work and as an exceptional case, MSC 81 had agreed to allow the *Ad Hoc* working group to submit its final report to the Secretariat not later than 7 weeks before and Member Governments and international organizations to submit their comments thereon not later than 4 weeks before the opening of MSC 82.

8.32 The Committee considered the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Engineering Aspects of LRIT (MSC 82/8/1) reporting on the outcome of all the intersessional meetings of the Working Group that took place after MSC 81 and presenting an overview of the conclusions and recommendations.

8.33 It was the opinion of the working group that this consolidated document should form the basis of the International LRIT system, and as such the Group recommended that the Committee should forward the document in its entirety to the nominated LRIT Co-ordinator and Members interested in further development of the system.

8.34 The delegation of the Russian Federation supported by several delegations, while appreciating the efforts of the Group to produce such a detailed report in the short time available, nevertheless considered that further technical development was necessary before the technical specifications could be sent to industry for tendering purposes. Canada, as co-ordinator of the Group, also agreed that further consideration by experts was needed.

8.35 Finland (MSC 82/8/11) highlighted the possibility of the establishment of a Regional European LRIT data centre associating IMO Contracting Governments. It also provided comments and a proposal for the development of a set of implementation guidelines in the form of detailed interface specifications to be used by Contracting Governments when implementing National and Regional LRIT Data Centres.

8.36 In considering the report of the *Ad Hoc* Working Group, the Committee recognized there might be additional work for the Group to facilitate early implementation of LRIT, including developing guidance for Contracting Governments planning to associate with an LRIT Data Centre.

8.37 The Committee, after some debate, approved MSC.1/Circ.1219 on Interim LRIT Technical Specifications and other matters, including:

- .1 technical specification for the International LRIT Data Exchange;
- .2 technical specification for the International LRIT Data Centre;
- .3 technical specification for communications within the LRIT System network;
- .4 protocols for the development testing of the LRIT System and for testing the integration into the system of new LRIT data centres; and
- .5 guidance on setting up and maintaining the Data Distribution Plan.

8.38 Recognizing that the technical specifications required further expert development by the group to be established, the Committee agreed to circulate the draft technical specifications on an interim basis, by means of MSC.1/Circ.1219 to the nominated LRIT Co-ordinator and all Member States and instructed the Secretariat accordingly.

#### ***LRIT costing***

8.39 CIRM (MSC 82/8/6) stated that it was CIRM's view that with the system architecture in place the question of how to resolve the issue of communication costs and their billing now needed to be studied in order for LRIT to be implemented. In their view, there was a pressing need to look at the costs involved in employing the various types of data exchange proposed and who pays. The absence of discussion relating to communications billing thus far was of concern to CIRM members working on LRIT. It was for this reason that CIRM proposed that the question of "communications billing" possibly be added to the Terms of Reference for the *ad hoc* engineering group.

8.40 The Committee, noting that, apart from the earlier agreed need for further work on the deliverables approved in paragraph 8.37, there were still some other outstanding issues which could only be progressed intersessionally in order to meet the timely implementation of LRIT, approved the re-establishment of the *Ad Hoc* Engineering Working Group on LRIT with amended terms of reference as given in paragraph 8.61.

***LRIT Co-ordinator***

8.41 The Committee recalled that MSC 78 had instructed the COMSAR Sub-Committee to develop and propose a robust intergovernmental oversight scheme for the approved LRIT Tracking Service(s) and LRIT Data Centre(s) through which their adherence to the conditions imposed on them, at the stage of their approval, could be verified in a transparent manner to the satisfaction of all SOLAS Contracting Governments and had:

.1 agreed that the LRIT Co-ordinator should carry out the oversight of the LRIT Data Centre, the LRIT Tracking Services and relevant elements of the communications systems used and, as appropriate, of the contracts between participants in the system;

.2 agreed that oversight by the LRIT Co-ordinator should include verification that the security requirements established by the Organization for the entire LRIT system are adhered to; and that the LRIT Co-ordinator should report to the Organization on its findings;

.3 requested IMSO to advise the Committee whether IMSO would be willing and able to undertake the oversight of the LRIT system on behalf of the Organization; and

.4 invited IMSO, if it was not already doing so, to contribute to the work of the COMSAR Correspondence Group on LRIT.

8.42 The Committee also recalled that MSC 81, noting that the previously used term "oversight of the LRIT system" had now been replaced by the term "performance review and audit of certain aspects of the LRIT system"; and mindful of the importance of having in place from the outset, the necessary arrangements for the review of the performance and the auditing of the LRIT system, had invited IMSO, as a possible candidate, to advise not later than at MSC 82 whether IMSO would be willing and able, bearing in mind the envisaged entry into force of the SOLAS regulation, to undertake the performance review and audit of certain aspects of the LRIT system on behalf of the Organization.

8.43 The United States (MSC 82/8/5) proposed that, pursuant to SOLAS chapter V/19-1 (resolution MSC.202(81)) and the associated performance standards and functional requirements (resolution MSC.210(81)), the Organization should be prepared to take on the roles and responsibilities of the LRIT Co-ordinator since they

did not believe that IMSO would be in a position to fulfil that role until the respective amendments to the IMSO Convention had entered into force. Additionally, the United States was willing to build and operate an international LRIT data centre and international data exchange until such time as another centre/exchange was available.

8.44 IMSO (MSC 82/8/9) informed the Committee of the decisions of the eighteenth session of the IMSO Assembly in relation to LRIT matters and in particular that IMSO was willing to assume the functions and/or duties of LRIT Co-ordinator at no cost to the Parties and that the IMSO Assembly had adopted an amendment to the IMSO Convention accordingly, subject to the entry into force conditions under Article 18 of the IMSO Convention.

8.45 The delegation of the United States stressed that the technical, organizational and procedural issues related to the LRIT system implementation needed to be resolved and addressed honestly and in earnest. The LRIT clock was ticking towards 31 December 2008 and expeditious action was needed to guarantee timely implementation of the system. The corresponding amendments to the IMSO Convention, adopted last September, needed 59 ratifications for them to enter into force, which would take several years. Further amendments needed to be adopted, in their view, to enable IMSO to fulfil the LRIT Co-ordinator functions. By the planned March 2007 extraordinary session of the IMSO Assembly, an insufficient number of ratifications would be in place. In their view, provisional application of these recent amendments, however, required an unanimous decision. There was, therefore, an unacceptable high risk that IMSO would legally not be able to fulfil the LRIT Co-ordinator function by 1 January 2008. A contingency plan for SOLAS Contracting Governments needed therefore to be in place for them to fulfil that function in case of need. For the same reason the United States had offered, in the absence of other candidates, to provide the AMVER based technology to serve as International Data Centre and International Data Exchange until other options were available.

8.46 A considerable debate ensued, during which the overwhelming majority of delegations unequivocally supported the appointment of IMSO as the LRIT Co-ordinator. A significant minority of delegations, while in the main also supporting IMSO for that role, agreed with the United States that a contingency plan for SOLAS Contracting Governments was needed in case IMSO was unable to fulfil the legal requirements of undertaking LRIT matters in time for the implementation date of the LRIT system.

8.47 IMSO assured the Committee that, with the assistance of the Member States, IMSO would be in a position to provide the role of LRIT Coordinator in the required time frame. As with the amendments adopted in relation to future satellite providers, an extraordinary session of the IMSO Assembly would be convened in March 2007 to consider the measures required to fulfil the LRIT Co-ordinator functions, through provisional application of the above mentioned amendments.

8.48 Many delegations encouraged the Parties to the IMSO Convention to ratify the convention amendments as soon as possible, so that the LRIT system could be implemented in the required timeframe.

8.49 Accordingly, after considerable discussion, the Committee decided to appoint IMSO as the LRIT Co-ordinator and invited IMSO to take whatever action it could in order to ensure the timely implementation of the LRIT system. The Committee also invited IMSO to submit a paper to its next session giving a detailed analysis of how it intended to undertake the role.

8.50 While there was considerable discussion on whether a contingency plan for SOLAS Contracting Governments was needed, the majority of delegations considered that having just appointed IMSO as the LRIT Co-ordinator and with the assurances of the Director of IMSO, they had every confidence that IMSO would be able to fulfil the role of LRIT Co-ordinator and in the appropriate time frame, and that any such contingency plan should be under the purview and be the responsibility of IMSO. The Committee decided accordingly.

8.51 The United States delegation reserved its position on the appointment of IMSO as the LRIT Co-ordinator and without an appropriate contingency plan.

8.52 During the debate on LRIT, the question of funding of the LRIT Co-ordinator was raised by several delegations, given that the system was to be at no cost to the Member States of IMO, the Parties to IMSO or to the ships participating in the system. IMSO re-iterated that the relevant provisions of the functions of the LRIT Co-ordinator in the Performance Standards permitted the LRIT Co-ordinator to recover the costs of its services, and that, in that respect, only the funding of start-up costs would be necessary.

### **International LRIT Exchange and Data Centre**

8.53 In considering the offer by the United States (MSC 82/8/5) to build and operate an international LRIT data centre and international LRIT data exchange until such time as another centre/exchange was available, several delegations were of the view

that such an international exchange and data centre should be neutral and truly international in nature, with a fair and transparent process of establishment and recognition in order to effectively fulfill the required functions.

8.54 The delegation of Cyprus, supported by several delegations was of the view that the reservation entered by the United States on the decision by the Committee to appoint IMSO as LRIT Co-ordinator would have the effect of denying the LRIT Co-ordinator the ability to perform the required performance review and audit of the International LRIT exchange and the International LRIT Data Centre, if such facilities were in the United States and that the United States should consider withdrawing the reservation in this respect. In response to this, the delegation of the United States, while not withdrawing the reservation, assured the Committee that if the offer of the international LRIT exchange and international LRIT data centre was accepted by the Committee, then the United States would meet all obligations aligned to the operations of such facilities, including oversight by IMSO, the LRIT Co-ordinator.

8.55 The Committee noted, with appreciation, the offer by the United States but considered that it was not in a position at this session to decide upon the location of the International LRIT Exchange and the International LRIT Data Centre. The Committee also noted the possibility of the establishment of a European LRIT Data Centre, as advised by several European Member States and the European Commission (MSC 82/8/11). The delegation of Turkey stated that regional centres should be open to the participation of all able and willing countries.

8.56 During the debate and in response to the relevant provisions of resolution MSC 211(81), the delegations of Argentina, Brazil, Chile and China informed the Committee that they were intending to build or had already established a national LRIT data centre to fulfil their obligations. In the case of Brazil, this might subsequently be utilized as a Regional LRIT Data Centre. The delegation of the Russian Federation also advised that their present national LRIT Data Centre may be upgraded to an international centre.

8.57 In view of the time remaining at this session, the Committee agreed to establish an *ad hoc* working group on LRIT at this session with the following terms of reference:

- .1 consider, the terms of reference for further work by the intersessional *Ad Hoc* Working Group on engineering aspects of LRIT;

.2 an interim road map following resolution MSC.211(81) on Arrangements for the timely establishment of the Long-Range Identification and Tracking System in respect of actions required to be completed in the required timeframe; and

.3 provide a progress report to plenary by Thursday, 7 December 2006.

### **Report of the *ad hoc* working group**

8.58 On receipt of the report of the Working Group the Committee took the following action.

8.59 The Committee agreed with the Group's opinion that the arrangements for the timely establishment of the Long-Range Identification and Tracking (LRIT) System envisaged at MSC 81, as set out in operative paragraphs of resolution MSC.211(81) on Arrangements for the timely establishment of the LRIT system were behind schedule due to the lack of proposals on the issues that need to be considered.

8.60 However, the Committee considered that the appointment of an LRIT Co-ordinator should considerably assist in the timely implementation of the LRIT system, bearing in mind that the responsibilities of the LRIT Co-ordinator in the pre-implementation phase, as detailed in resolution 210(81) on Performance standards and functional requirements for the Long-Range Identification and Tracking of Ships (LRIT).

8.61 Subsequent to its decision to re-establish the Group (see paragraph 8.40) the Committee approved the following revised terms of reference for the *Ad hoc* Working Group on the Engineering aspects of LRIT:

The *ad hoc* Working Group on engineering aspects of LRIT should, taking into account the provisions of SOLAS regulation V/19-1, MSC Resolution 211(81) on Arrangements for the timely establishment of the Long-Range Identification and Tracking System, resolution MSC.210(81) the related Performance standards and functional requirements for long-range identification and tracking of ships and the decisions and discussions at MSC 82, specifically the comments on the draft technical specifications given in plenary, complete the following tasks and submit a report to MSC 83 for approval:

.1 Further develop the draft technical specifications, as given in MSC 82/8/1.

- .2 Update the required technical documents taking into account MSC 82/8/11.
- .3 Prepare a technical costing and billing standard within the policy framework as decided by the Committee.
- .4 Address all items within square brackets within the draft technical specifications.
- .5 Consider technical issues and develop technical criteria to be taken into account when establishing the International LRIT Data Centre and the International LRIT Data Exchange.
- .6 Liaise with the IMO Secretariat regarding consistency, security and other aspects of the Data Distribution Plan with the technical specifications.
- .7 Ensure that the testing documents completely address the Performance Standards.

8.62 In view of the very short timeframe before the due date of the implementation of the LRIT system, the Committee instructed COMSAR 11 to consider LRIT issues and extended the deadline for submission of documents on LRIT issues to 22 December 2006 and the deadline for comments to 19 January 2007. Documents submitted to COMSAR 11 on LRIT matters would be considered under item 14 (Strategy for e-navigation). The Committee invited Member States to ensure that appropriate LRIT experts on matters other than the specific engineering aspects were included in their delegations to COMSAR 11.

8.63 The Committee agreed with the Group's opinion and authorized the necessary two to four meetings of the intersessional *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Engineering aspects to finalize the technical specifications in time for the deadline of the submission of the report to MSC 83. The Committee authorized the next meeting of that Group to be held in the week prior to COMSAR 11 (12-16 February 2007) and appreciated the kind offer by CIRM to host the meeting.

8.64 Furthermore, the Committee agreed with the group's view that an additional intersessional MSC Working Group needed to be established for the finalization of legal and financial aspects of costing and billing and for the finalization of draft legal

agreements in preparation for approval by MSC 83. The Committee authorized this group to meet in the May-June 2007 period, just prior to the deadlines for submission of documents to its next session.

8.65 The Committee agreed with the group that there were many issues on LRIT which needed to be finalized, at its next session, in order to ensure the timely implementation of LRIT and consequently decided to establish a Working Group on LRIT during MSC 83.

8.66 The Committee agreed that the assistance of the Legal Division of the Secretariat may be necessary in the development of the appropriate agreements between IMO and various bodies in the LRIT system. The Committee instructed the Secretariat accordingly.

8.67 In regard to the Data Distribution Plan to be established within the Organization, the Committee also agreed with the group's opinion that this should be operational by 1 January 2008 to allow for operational testing before the critical date of 1 July 2008 when, according to the provisions of resolution MSC.211(81), the operational testing of the system was to begin. The Committee instructed the Secretariat accordingly.

8.68 Recalling the provisions of resolution MSC.211(81) on Arrangements for the timely establishment of the LRIT system and recognizing the extensive development, procurement, installation and testing of the LRIT system which still needed to be completed, the Committee approved the updated Road map for the timely implementation of the LRIT system, set out in annex 16.

\* \* \*