

**INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF SHIPPING**  
**CREW CHANGE TASK FORCE**  
**TUESDAY 21 APRIL 1200 – 1330**  
**NOTE OF TEAMS MEETING**

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE WITH COMPETITION RULES**

The meeting noted the statement about compliance with completion rules.

**1. OUTCOME OF LAST MEETING**

The Task Force recalled that it was focused on three separate but interconnected issues:

1. Establishing protocols – that could be recommended to governments by IMO, ICAO and WHO – to allow crew changes to resume in a few weeks' time.
2. Exploring possible solutions to the question of providing flights for crew changes, including the identification of major airports via which crew changes could initially take place.
3. Maintaining political pressure on governments to facilitate crew changes, such as the recent ICS/IATA press communication.

**2. A FRAMEWORK OF PROTOCOLS FOR FACILITATING CREW CHANGES**

The meeting noted that the ICS Secretariat was continuing to work on a recommended global 'Framework of Protocols' addressed shipping companies and governments, and the summary extract – attached with the meeting papers – which set out the 'point to point' scope of the document.

The Secretariat was still making some adjustments to the initial complete draft, that would probably extend to about 40 pages, which would be distributed for comment as soon as possible.

It was agreed that key governments, such as Singapore among others, needed to be engaged in the development of the protocols.

It was noted that there was no single solution to the crew change problem, and the protocols were just one part of the overall three-pronged strategy.

It was noted that the Protocols would make general reference to issues such as problems obtaining visas and passport renewals, as well as complex issues such as quarantine and mandatory testing requirements, although these would be referred to

in the context of many national restrictions hopefully being eased in a few weeks' time, and that screening by authorities might be limited to measures such as temperature checks. It was noted that under relevant ILO instruments seafarers should not actually require visas. However, this was a long standing issue of contention with governments.

**There was general support for the 'point to point' approach, although it was recognised that the Task Force would need to see the full draft before being in a position to comment on the detailed requirements that shipping companies might be expected to follow.**

### **3. ADDRESSING POTENTIAL LACK OF FLIGHTS**

#### **3.1 *List of initial major airports***

The meeting noted the initial list of major airports agreed with IATA on which it was thought to be most productive to focus discussion with governments for the purpose of restarting crew changes, and the criteria for determining this list as set out in the meeting papers.

It was agreed that the list should not be widely publicised, it was simply a tool to help prioritise further action, and that it should not preclude continuing efforts to make crew changes possible at other airports.

It was noted that the focus of ICS was no longer on producing a list of 'hub' seaports, in view of concerns raised by some members, as well as port interests.

**It was agreed, using the list, that ICS should now provide advice to national associations, working in conjunction with local seafarer unions and aviation interests in their own countries, on starting a dialogue with the governments, national authorities and airlines concerned.**

#### **3.2 *Assessing demand and marketing for flights***

It was noted that IMEC was expected to finalise its estimates of likely demand for flights with respect to the major labour supply countries, and that IATA had suggested that the best way for airlines to assess demand for specific flights might be for airlines to talk directly to some of the leading specialist crew flight agencies.

It was noted that charter flights seemed to be prohibitively expensive, but the scheduled flights might be available for crew changes, if airlines knew there was sufficient demand and that governments would facilitate the movement of crew.

It was noted that the European Commission had adopted helpful guidelines to EU member states that included sections on crew changes and designated seaports.

**It was agreed that further work was needed on providing demand estimates and identifying global specialist crew travel agents.**

### **3.3 *Issues associated with possible need for ships to divert***

It was noted that ICS was working on an initial draft of clauses for charter parties and bills of lading contracts for discussion with the International Group of P&I Clubs and BIMCO, among others. These clauses would be designed to ensure that ships would have a contractual liberty to sail to/from ports located near the airports on the list agreed with IATA and that the costs of such calls would be shared between all the parties interested in the maritime venture, including the charterers and cargo interests. Discussions had been commenced with the International Group of P&I clubs to ensure that P&I cover would remain for calls to these ports for the purpose of the crew changes.

It was noted that no public statements should be made that implied that shipowners should cover the full cost of any deviation.

**It was agreed a further report should be made at the next meeting.**

## **4. OTHER RELEVANT ISSUES**

### **4.1 *Quarantine/self isolation requirements***

It was noted that it was hoped to refer to these complex issues in a general way in the Protocols.

### **4.2 *Use of cruise ships***

It was noted that CLIA had not yet had a full discussion with its members about the potential for using cruise ships as hotel accommodation or as an alternative means of conducting crew changes but remained open to the possibility.

### **4.3 *Testing***

It was noted that ICS intended to circulate guidance from WHO and the International Maritime Health Association about testing, recognising that advice on this issue was fast moving. Testing was often at the discretion of national authorities and many available tests were not verified as being suitable.

## **5. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

It was noted that the closure of consulates in places like Manila was having an impact on obtaining visas for the Schengen area, and that ECSA was liaising on this issue with the European Commission.

It was **agreed** that further meeting should held on **Tuesday 28 April** at 1200.

## **ATTENDANCE**

### **Representatives of national associations from:**

Australia

Bahamas

Belgium

Cyprus

Denmark

France

Germany

Greece

Japan

Italy

Liberia

Netherlands

Norway

Philippines

Singapore

Spain

Sweden

Switzerland

Turkey

United Kingdom

### **With**

Secretary General

Chairman, Insurance Committee

CLIA

IMEC

WSC