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Introduction

1. The Meeting of Experts to Adopt Guidelines on the Training of Ships’ Cooks was held from 23 to 27 September 2013 at the International Labour Office in Geneva, in accordance with a Governing Body decision at its 310th Session (March 2011).

2. At its 316th Session (November 2012), the Governing Body decided that the Meeting would be composed of 18 experts – six experts nominated by the Employers’ group of the Governing Body; six experts nominated by the Workers’ group of the Governing Body; and six experts nominated by the Governments of Brazil, Cyprus, Ghana, Indonesia, Norway and the Philippines. The Meeting was open to all governments as observers, with those that had already ratified the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (MLC, 2006), being particularly encouraged to consider sending observers.

3. The Meeting was attended by six Government experts, five Shipowner experts, and six Seafarer experts accompanied by three advisers. There were 44 observer experts from interested governments, and seven observers from international governmental organizations (IGOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

4. The purpose of the Meeting was to review and adopt Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks (hereinafter, the Guidelines). Pursuant to the resolution concerning the promotion of the MLC, 2006, the Guidelines would serve as a tool to assist ILO Members with implementation of the Convention.

5. The Meeting considered a proposal for Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks. The proposal had been developed and prepared by the Office with the support of expert consultants and an online tripartite expert working group.

6. The Officers of the Meeting were:

   Chairperson: Mr Bro-Matthew Shinguadja (Namibia)

   Vice-Chairpersons: Mr Haakon Storhaug (Norway)
   Mr Brendan Peter Kennedy (Shipowners’ group)
   Mr John Hetmanski (Seafarers’ group)

7. The Secretary-General, Ms Alette van Leur stated that the MLC, 2006, had been ratified by 48 ILO member States and that there remained momentum for further ratifications. Success had been the result of hard work by many people, including some of the participants at the Meeting. The ILO had a long history of developing standards and convening meetings related to most aspects of seafarers’ living and working conditions, and even some pertaining to ships’ cooks.

8. The proposed Guidelines for discussion at the Meeting clearly demonstrated that working as a ships’ cook was a tough duty. The purpose of the Meeting was to transform the Office’s proposed Guidelines into a useful tool for the implementation of the MLC, 2006. All the

---

1 Brazil, Cyprus, Ghana, Indonesia, Norway and the Philippines.
participants of the Meeting were encouraged to engage actively in the discussions and to make suggestions to produce a clear and concise document.

9. There would be three meetings related to the MLC, 2006, convened at the ILO in 2014. They were: a meeting of experts to review guidance on the implementation of the occupational safety and health provisions of the MLC, 2006; a meeting of the Subcommittee on Wages of Seafarers of the Joint Maritime Commission to update the minimum basic wage figure for able seafarers; and the first meeting of the Special Tripartite Committee (STC) for the MLC, 2006.

10. The Chairperson explained that the purpose of the Meeting was to review, improve, and adopt Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks. It was difficult to overestimate the importance of food and nutrition to seafarers. The proposed Guidelines prepared by the Office would serve as the basis for the discussions. The expectation was that the Meeting would adopt guidance that was easy to implement and of a helpful nature to governments, shipowners, and seafarers.

11. The Executive Secretary introduced the Office proposal for Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks. The scope and purpose of the Guidelines focused on the areas that would be supportive for competent authorities and the social partners when implementing the MLC, 2006. The structure for the proposed Guidelines was inspired by the IMO’s International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), 1978, but without the same level of detail. The Guidelines would serve as a tool to help competent authorities fulfil their responsibilities under the MLC, 2006, and ensure that ships’ cooks were trained and qualified for their position on board ship.

12. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson commended the proposed Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks prepared by the Office for discussion at the Meeting. The Shipowners’ group would endeavour to contribute to the further development of the Guidelines.

13. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson explained that the Seafarers’ group had worked hard with the Office to develop the proposed Guidelines. Food was crucial to maintaining the health and morale of crews, and it assured that seafarers could perform their duties effectively on board ship. Ships’ cooks would benefit from the Guidelines, and they would be vital in a new era of professionals in shipping. The Seafarers’ group had been proactive in the promotion of a healthier life on and off ships for crews, which included wellness programmes, conferences and training. The Seafarers’ group looked forward to continuing to work on the Guidelines. They would improve the living and working conditions for seafarers and assist the industry with the implementation of Regulation 3.2 and Standard A3.2 of the MLC, 2006.

14. The Government Vice-Chairperson thanked the Office for the draft text and said his group looked forward to the work of reviewing the proposed Guidelines.

15. The observer expert from the Government of Thailand provided information about the progress of Thailand with regard to the training of ships’ cooks. Since the adoption of the MLC, 2006, Thailand had worked to comply with its standards and was working towards ratification. It was the result of good cooperation between the relevant government authorities, the Thai shipowners’ association and the seafarers’ association. Thailand had completed revision of its Labour Protection Act to reflect the MLC, 2006, including Regulation 3.2 and Standard A3.2. The Marine Department (Ministry of Transportation) and the Department of Skills Development (Ministry of Labour) had designed a training course on food handling for ships’ cooks. The Guidelines adopted by the Meeting would assist Thailand with implementation and compliance with the MLC, 2006. Thailand requested further support from the ILO to help achieve the goals of the MLC, 2006. The Meeting should be careful to consider the issue of mutual recognition of qualifications and training standards for ships’ cooks.
16. A representative of the International Maritime Health Association (IMHA) hailed the development of the proposed Guidelines as an important step in the implementation of the MLC, 2006, and an important tool to ensure the healthy nutrition of all seafarers. The IMHA welcomed all initiatives that could improve the health and well-being of seafarers, and offered to assist in implementation. The training of ships’ cooks was crucial for the provision of healthy nutrition on board ships.

Consideration of proposal for Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks

1. Introduction

1.1. ILO work in the maritime sector

Paragraph 1

17. The Meeting adopted this paragraph as proposed.

Paragraph 2

18. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the number of seafarers had been increased to 1.5 million. After some discussion the Meeting adopted the amendment.

Paragraph 3

19. The Shipowner secretary proposed to add “or instruction” to the title of the guidelines after the word training. Similarly, the Shipowners proposed to replace “catering staff” with “those preparing food”. The Seafarers’ group did not agree to the additions. The Shipowner secretary suggested that their proposal should be left in square brackets as it is important throughout the document.

1.2. Overview of the MLC, 2006

Paragraphs 4 and 5

20. The Meeting adopted both paragraphs as proposed.

Paragraph 6

21. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to add “who have been trained or instructed” to the last line of the paragraph after other seafarers. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 7

22. The Shipowner secretary expressed a concern that the document should reflect the fact that States that had not ratified the MLC, 2006, and are still bound by Conventions No. 68 and No. 69 may also find the Guidelines valuable. She proposed an additional sentence to the end of the paragraph. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.
Paragraph 8

23. The Meeting agreed to delete the paragraph as it was unnecessary.

Paragraphs 9 and 10

24. The Meeting adopted both paragraphs as proposed.

Paragraphs 11 and 12

25. The Meeting decided to delete the paragraphs in light of the relevant provisions of the MLC, 2006, being moved to section 1 from Appendix I.

1.4. Enforcement provisions

Paragraphs 13 and 14

26. The Meeting adopted the paragraphs as proposed.

Paragraph 15

27. The Shipowner secretary explained that two kinds of ships’ cooks could be encountered in the future; those that have substantial experience on board ships, and those that would need a training course. The problem was how to cater for both categories, since it was not fair to suggest that ships’ cooks with extensive professional experience needed to attend training courses and obtain certificates. The aim was to ensure that port State control authorities would not ask for certificates for ships’ cooks and detain ships where the ships’ cooks did not have them.

28. The Seafarer secretary agreed that the existence of two kinds of cooks was an issue. The Meeting should bear that in mind when introducing new requirements and when favouring certification. While it was important to be able to demonstrate that ships’ cooks on board were qualified, there was a need to address those that had the experience so that they did not lose their positions.

29. The observer expert from the Government of Denmark said that if it referred to port State control, then the reference to training and instruction should be retained to cover all situations.

30. The expert from the Government of Norway explained that the Guidelines were not about port State control, given that it was a document to guide the implementation of training of ships’ cooks.

31. The observer expert from the Government of the Marshall Islands concurred with Norway, based on the focus of the Guidelines. Governments were working to ensure that existing cooks with experience could continue to work on board ships, and that those who went to training schools would not be questioned by port State control officers.

32. The Shipowner secretary proposed deleting the end of the paragraph so that it ended after the reference to the issuance of a maritime labour certificate.

33. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.
1.5. **Aim of the Guidelines**

*Paragraph 16*

34. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as proposed.

*Paragraph 17*

35. The Shipowner secretary indicated that paragraphs 16 to 18 should make clear that the Guidelines would apply to all of the relevant Conventions relating to ships’ cooks and not only to the MLC, 2006, for those member States that had not ratified the MLC, 2006. After further discussion, the Meeting agreed that this concern was addressed in the amendment to paragraph 7 and adopted paragraph 17 as originally proposed.

*Paragraph 18*

36. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as proposed.

*Paragraph 19*

37. The Shipowner secretary and the Seafarer secretary each proposed amending the paragraph to include additional language from the Convention. After discussion regarding how much of the Convention should be quoted here, the Meeting decided to delete paragraph 19 and incorporate the language of the Convention into the text under section 1.3.

1.6. **Structure of the Guidelines**

*Paragraph 20*

38. The Meeting reworded the paragraph to reflect the changes to the structure and scope of the Guidelines. The Office was tasked with aligning the language with the rest of the Guidelines and the text of the Convention.

39. The Shipowner secretary proposed a new title for section 2 to be consistent with the changes to the document. The Meeting adopted the change.

2. **Minimum requirements**

*Paragraphs 21, 22 and 23*

40. The Meeting adopted paragraphs 21 and 22, and deleted paragraph 23.

2.1. **Responsibilities of the competent authority**

*Paragraph 24*

41. The Government Vice-Chairperson believed that “must” is not the right word to use in the Guidelines. Generally the Guidelines are a recommendation where the correct word is “should”. However, the Meeting agreed that the Convention language should be used as closely as possible. In this paragraph “must” should be “shall” and “institutions” should be “school”. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.
Paragraph 25

42. The Shipowner secretary pointed out that the text of the Convention included particular manning requirements. Thus, the competent authority should prescribe a minimum period of service at sea. The Meeting agreed and adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 26

43. The Government Vice-Chairperson suggested that the footnote be deleted and asked for clarification where the Convention required documentation. The Shipowner secretary suggested that this issue should be explained by the International Labour Standards Department. The Shipowner secretary and the Seafarer secretary agreed that there needed to be a system to ensure that the ships’ cooks can easily prove that they are trained and qualified. The Chairperson suggested that the Meeting continue reviewing the document, until the representative of the International Labour Standards Department could provide further clarification.

Paragraphs 27 and 28

44. The Meeting agreed to delete these paragraphs as proposed.

45. As part of the discussion regarding the decision to delete the tables from the entire document, the Meeting requested the Office to draft a new paragraph that would capture the language of the portion of the table that explained the methods for demonstrative competence.

Paragraph 26bis – Methods for demonstrating competence

46. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson and the Seafarer secretary agreed with the text proposed by the Office. The Government Vice-Chairperson explained that the emphasis should be on the first sentence regarding the method and that the next two sentences of the paragraph should be deleted to maintain the flexibility found in the Convention. He further suggested that the fourth sentence on the fifth line should read “written or oral and practical components”.

47. The Shipowner secretary preferred to keep the second and third sentences as proposed, given the lack of clarity in the Convention. Additionally, the Shipowners wanted the text to address how existing ships’ cooks with many years of experience could acquire certification. The Seafarer secretary agreed and pointed out that the training course must be approved and that there should be a practical demonstration for existing cooks to show that they have the requisite technical knowledge.

48. The Government Vice-Chairperson indicated that there was nothing onerous about deleting the two sentences. The obligation was already in the Convention.

49. The Seafarer and the Shipowner secretaries agreed that the language should be left in this paragraph even if there was duplication.

50. The Government Vice-Chairperson emphasized the fact that issuance of certification is not an obligation in the Convention. He understood the need to promote certification, but these Guidelines could not require the competent authority to issue certificates. The observer expert from the Government of Canada agreed and also pointed out that the delegation of issuing certificates is also a difficult and resource-intensive task.

51. The Shipowner secretary agreed with the observer expert from the Government of the Marshall Islands that the Guidelines should address the recognition of existing ships’ cooks.
52. The observer experts from the Governments of the Marshall Islands and Portugal emphasized that the document needs to provide the competent authority with flexibility as is in the Convention. The observer expert from the Government of Luxembourg also asked for clarification regarding the recognition of existing ships’ cooks.

53. The expert from the Government of Cyprus provided the example from his country which recognized two years of sea service as a cook within the last five years. An observer expert from the Government of Panama further insisted that the competent authorities were called to ensure both the time of service at sea and to evaluate the competency of skills.

54. An expert from the International Labour Standards Department then offered some additional analysis of the flexibility of the Convention regarding the issue of certification. The Chairperson suggested that the experts consider this advice and return to paragraph 26.

55. The Government Vice-Chairperson agreed to the amended language of paragraph 26 so long as it was clear that the Guidelines merely encourage but do not require certification.

56. The observer expert from the Government of Cameroon supported the language regarding the competent authority approving the training institution. An expert from the Government of Norway preferred the language from the Convention regarding the examination “subject to its control”. The Meeting agreed to adopt paragraph 26 as amended.

New paragraph 26bis

57. Based on the concerns of several Governments to include sufficient flexibility regarding the recognition of the skills and experience of existing ships’ cooks, the Meeting agreed to the language of paragraph 26bis.

New paragraph 26ter

58. An expert from the International Labour Standards Department offered his interpretation that the last sentence regarding existing ships’ cooks undermines the rest of the paragraph discussing methods of examination. He recommended addressing the issue more specifically in a new paragraph. The Office drafted a new paragraph 26ter.

59. The Meeting supported the concept and adopted the new paragraph as proposed by the Office.

New paragraph 26quatro

60. The Seafarer secretary suggested another paragraph that recommended that the competent authority should consider maintaining a list of approved training schools to facilitate the verification process. The Shipowner secretary supported the idea as it would also help the Shipowners to verify that the certificates were valid.

61. The Meeting adopted the new paragraph.

62. The observer expert from the Government of Canada requested the Office to define in an annex more information about exams for each of the sections included in the training requirements for ships’ cooks. The Office explained that this was beyond the scope of the Meeting and it would limit the flexibility that several other Governments were seeking.

Paragraphs 27 and 28 deleted

63. The Seafarer secretary proposed another paragraph about support and resources for the ship’s cook to be inserted before paragraph 29. The proposal reflected the Seafarers’ concern
that all of the demands placed upon the ship’s cook were overburdensome could lead to violations of the Convention’s hours of rest provisions. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson agreed with the language.

64. An expert from the Government of Norway stated that while he understood the Seafarers’ concerns, the language proposed exceeded the scope of the Guidelines. The Convention already included provisions regarding manning. The expert from the Government of Cyprus and the observer experts from the Governments of Denmark, Canada, and the Marshall Islands all agreed with the statement from Norway.

65. The Shipowner secretary agreed with the Seafarers’ proposal. She explained that shipowners have a responsibility regarding the manning scale. The competent authority should also assume their responsibility to ensure that shipowners provide adequate resources to the ships’ cooks so that they may be given adequate hours of rest.

66. Several Government experts argued that this proposal went beyond the scope of the Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks. An expert from the Government of Norway further explained that the Governments take their responsibility to implement the Convention very seriously. The Meeting of Experts to adopt the proposed Guidelines was evidence of the commitment. He said that he had been working on the implementation of the Convention for the last few years. The Seafarers’ proposal for language regarding the ships’ manning should not be part of this document. The Governments were concerned about the issue and have drafted amendments to SOLAS Chapter 5 to strengthen the manning resolution. The Governments were trying to ensure that ships were manned sufficiently and securely.

67. The Seafarer secretary argued that there was a fundamental problem in the implementation of the MLC, 2006, Regulation 2.7, Manning levels. The Seafarers’ concerns needed to be placed in full in the record. The Seafarers’ group withdrew their proposal but wanted their statements recorded in the record. The Shipowner secretary supported the Seafarers’ statements in full.

68. An expert from the Government of Norway expressed his gratitude for the suggestions and proposal, and appreciated the Seafarers’ decision to withdraw the proposal. The Governments’ views must also be reflected in the report.

Paragraphs 29 and 30

69. The Meeting adopted the paragraphs as proposed with the deletion of the footnotes.

2.2. **Suggestions of good practices**

Paragraph 31

70. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson agreed with this paragraph with the added clarification of a reference with respect to ships’ cooks. The Government Vice-Chairperson suggested that the entire list of suggestions be moved to a new location such as section 4. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended and recommended that the Office find a more appropriate location for the section.
2.2.1. Stores of food and drink

Paragraphs (a)–(j)

71. The Shipowner secretary agreed with all of the paragraphs in the list with one change of specificities to requirements in paragraph (b). The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

2.2.2. Organization and equipment

Paragraphs (a)–(h)

72. The Meeting adopted these paragraphs with two minor amendments.

2.2.3. Drinking water

Paragraphs (a)–(c)

73. The Meeting adopted these paragraphs as proposed.

3. Division of responsibilities and obligations

3.1. The shipowner

3.1.1. Food should be provided free of charge for seafarers during their employment

Paragraphs 32, 33 and 34

74. The Meeting adopted paragraphs 32 to 34 as proposed with the minor amendments to maintain consistency throughout the document.

3.1.2. Ships should carry sufficient quantities of good quality food

Paragraph 35

75. The Shipowner secretary suggested an additional reference to take into account providing additional supplies when entering into piracy high-risk areas and a footnote mentioning storage in the citadel or other secure area of the ship. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 36

76. The Government observer from Cameroon pointed out that the paragraph included the word “instructed” that had been removed from other parts of the document. The Meeting agreed with the deletion and the paragraph was adopted.

3.1.3. Ships should provide sufficient good quality drinking water

Paragraph 37

77. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.
Paragraph 38

78. The Shipowner secretary proposed to remove the reference to the European Union and instead refer only to regional regulations. The Seafarer secretary agreed to this proposal as it would also be consistent with social security provisions. The Government Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposal and added that the footnote reference to an EU directive should be deleted. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 39

79. The Shipowner secretary proposed adding language to paragraph 39 to address the problem of contaminated sea water and the spread of diseases from consuming fish sourced from contaminated water, in areas such as Fukushima. An expert from the International Labour Standards Department suggested alternative language.

80. The Seafarer secretary disagreed and preferred the language proposed by the Shipowners and suggested that it be a new paragraph under the heading “Minimizing the effects of contaminated seawater”.

81. The Government Vice-Chairperson agreed that putting the language into a new paragraph was preferable. However, the MARPOL Convention already covered this issue and it may not be relevant here.

82. The observer expert from the Government of Cameroon agreed with the proposed language as it addressed her concerns about seafarers consuming contaminated fish.

83. The Meeting adopted paragraph 39 and the new paragraph regarding contaminated seawater.

84. The Shipowner secretary proposed changing the title of section 3.1.4 to delete the reference to “other catering personnel”. The Meeting agreed to the proposal.

3.1.4. The master and ships’ cooks should be properly skilled for their positions

Paragraph 40

85. The Shipowner secretary proposed to delete the first sentence and then also delete paragraphs 41–43. The Meeting adopted the proposed changes.

86. The Seafarer secretary proposed a new paragraph under a new heading: “Support and resources”. The language would refer to supporting the ship’s cook so that he or she could discharge his or her duties. The Shipowner secretary agreed with the inclusion of the word “consider”. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson agreed to the friendly amendment. The Government observer from the Marshall Islands supported the proposal.

87. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

3.1.5. Catering staff should be trained in food and personal hygiene

Paragraph 44

88. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as proposed.

89. Paragraph 45 was deleted.
3.1.6. The organization and equipment of the galley and storage rooms should be appropriate

*Paragraph 46*

90. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as proposed.

*Paragraph 47*

91. The Shipowner secretary suggested to replace “especially important” from the second to the last line with “essential”. The Meeting adopted the amended paragraph.

*Paragraph 48*

92. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to include “and master” after “shipowner”. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

93. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed a new paragraph regarding provision of protective clothing and equipment. The Shipowner secretary agreed and further added “in line with the MLC, 2006, regulation 4.3”. The Meeting adopted the new paragraph as amended.

94. The Meeting agreed to delete all of section 3.1.7, Dispensation in exceptional circumstances.

3.1.8. National laws and regulations or other measures should be applied

*Paragraph 52*

95. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as proposed.

3.2. **The master**

96. The Government Vice-Chairperson suggested deletion of the entire section 3.2 as being too general. The Shipowner secretary proposed placing the entire section in square brackets and to review it with the Office to see if there is any part that is different from section 3.1 and whether any duplication could be deleted. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson supported the Shipowners’ proposal.

97. The Shipowner secretary suggested renaming the title of 3.2.1 to “Supplies”, and the Meeting agreed.

3.2.1. Supplies

*Paragraphs 57–58*

98. The Meeting adopted these paragraphs as proposed.

3.2.2. Galley equipment and storage facilities should be in good condition

*Paragraph 59*

99. The Meeting adopted this paragraph as proposed.
3.3. **Responsibilities of different categories of catering staff**

100. The Seafarer secretary proposed that the Guidelines only address one category of catering staff, the ship’s cook, because it would simplify the guidance and better reflect the title of the Guidelines.

101. The Shipowner secretary agreed with the proposal.

102. The experts from the Governments of Norway, Philippines and Ghana, and the observer experts from the Governments of Canada, Liberia, Marshall Islands, Portugal, and United Kingdom, agreed with the proposal from the Seafarers’ group.

103. The Meeting decided to only address the training of ships’ cooks in the Guidelines.

4. **Competencies for catering personnel**

4.1. **Overview**

*Paragraph 61*

104. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to align the paragraph with the MLC, 2006, by adding the phrase “which, by virtue of the size of the crew or the trading pattern, may not be required by the competent authority to carry a fully qualified cook”, as found in Standard A3.2, paragraph 5.

105. The Shipowner secretary, supported by the Government Vice-Chairperson, suggested putting the new phrase in square brackets and to postpone its discussion until the Meeting had reached an agreement regarding the categories of ships’ cooks being dealt with in the Guidelines.

106. An expert from the Government of Norway noted that the reference to “ships with fewer than ten crew members” was an inaccurate interpretation of the MLC, 2006, text. It needed to be amended to refer to “ships operating with a prescribed manning of less than ten crew members”. The Meeting should be mindful of any other instances in the Guidelines where there was a reference to this provision of the MLC, 2006.

107. The Seafarer secretary stated that there were other caveats and relevant issues to consider, and therefore the Meeting should revisit such discussions at a later stage.

108. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed to replace the term, “reviews” with the word “addresses”.

109. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

*Paragraph 62*

110. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that the explanatory note on hygiene systems in box 4.1 was not necessary. A ships’ cook could not feasibly carry out a hazard analysis and critical control point (HACCP) system on their own, so it would be preferable for the Guidelines to refer to food safety systems instead.

111. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson remarked that it was important that ships’ cooks were familiar with the principles of hygiene systems.
112. The Government Vice-Chairperson reminded the Meeting that paragraph 62 would be affected by the discussion on the categories of cooks. For consistency, the words, “or instructed”, should be added after the word “trained”.

113. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson requested that the addition of, “or instructed” be put in square brackets.

114. An expert from the Government of Norway noted the clear connection between box 4.1 on hygiene systems and paragraph 97 which referred to food safety self-assessment systems. Once the Meeting had discussed paragraph 97, it could return to reviewing box 4.1.

115. The Seafarer secretary stated that ships’ cooks needed both skills and resources to provide food. A reference to “support” could be inserted into the paragraph.

116. The Shipowner secretary proposed to incorporate the proposal of the Seafarers’ group by adding “support and resources” and removing “be able to”, which was accepted by the Meeting.

117. The Government Vice-Chairperson indicated an issue with the second part of the first sentence and suggested to reword it to “that takes into account the various cultural and religious backgrounds of the seafarers and fulfils hygiene requirements”. He also proposed replacing the term “would” with “may” in box 4.1.

118. The Shipowner secretary proposed to move box 4.1 to section 4.3.8, as that part was about HACCP and CCPs.

119. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended, and box 4.1 was moved to section 4.3.8.

Paragraph 63

120. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

Paragraph 64

121. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

Paragraph 65

122. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson expressed concern that the Guidelines were failing to promote the fact that food should be made from scratch on board ships by including a reference to ready meals or semi-processed products.

123. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson shared the Shipowners’ concern about referring to ready meals and semi-processed products in the Guidelines.

124. The Government Vice-Chairperson indicated that paragraph 65 referred to “four categories” of ships’ cooks which still needed to be discussed by the Meeting.

125. The Executive Secretary explained that, while it was preferable to prepare meals on board ships from fresh ingredients from scratch, there were circumstances where it might be necessary to use ready-meals or semi-processed products. The proposed text allowed for that reality on board ships.

126. The Shipowner secretary suggested that the nutritional quality of the ready meals and semi-processed products should be mentioned if their reference was being retained. It was to avoid the unacceptable situation where ready-made pizzas could be served for a period of six
months without any provision of vegetables. The concept of “nutritionally balanced” should be inserted to qualify the use of ready meals and semi-processed products.

127. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed that the phrase, “for a short period of time”, be added to ensure that ready meals and semi-processed products were only a temporary solution in certain circumstances. This would be in keeping with the spirit of the Guidelines.

128. The Government Vice-Chairperson reiterated that the Meeting needed to address the issue of the “four categories”, and requested that square brackets be inserted.

129. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to insert “and seafarers” after the term “master”.

130. The Government Vice-Chairperson questioned whether it was necessary to include the paragraph in the Guidelines. It could be reworded to focus more on ready-meals and semi-processed products.

131. The Seafarer secretary proposed to end the first sentence after “raw ingredients”, and add “should only” to complete the second sentence.

132. The Shipowner secretary proposed to delete the last two sentences of the paragraph.

133. The Meeting accepted the proposals, and the paragraph was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 66

134. The Shipowners’ Vice-Chairperson proposed to change “mathematical skills” to “calculation skills” for consistency, and it was accepted by the Meeting.

135. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.2. Practical cookery – Basic cooking skills

Table 4.1

136. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that the MLC, 2006, was a triumph for ships’ cooks. Before the MLC, 2006, it had been possible to abuse the system in the industry which had led to some embarrassment for ships’ cooks. The Shipowners’ group felt that there were a lot of problems with able 4.1, in particular, how open it was to misinterpretation by competent authorities. It was preferable to discuss the professional level of cooks entirely before looking at the other levels. The main purpose of the Meeting was that ships had fully qualified cooks on board.

137. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson and Government Vice-Chairperson agreed that there were problems with table 4.1 that needed to be addressed, with the guidance on the level of fully qualified cooks being the priority for the Meeting.

138. The Shipowner secretary informed the Meeting that the Shipowners’ group had provided a draft proposal outlining their suggestions to the secretariat, and suggested that that document be made available to the Meeting for discussion.

139. The Government Vice-Chairperson explained that the Government group had more comments with regard to the structure of the tables contained in the Guidelines than on their content. The Government group had several proposals to improve the format and content of the tables. He expressed regret that there was not better alignment between the tables in section 4 and the commentaries that followed.
140. The Seafarer secretary asked that the Government group’s idea of moving table 3.1 to section 4 be held in abeyance.

141. The Meeting decided that the Government, Shipowners’ and Seafarers’ groups needed to discuss table 4.1 in their groups prior to discussion of it in plenary.

142. When the Meeting returned later to address table 4.1, the Shipowner secretary noted that the Meeting had spent a lot of time reaching consensus and ensuring the quality of the commentaries found in section 4. Given that it would be very difficult to align the commentaries and the tables, the Shipowners’ group proposed that the tables found in section 4 of the Guidelines be deleted. This way there would not be any contradiction or confusion.

143. An expert from the Government of Norway agreed that the tables would take a long time to bring into accordance with the commentaries in the rest of section 4. An explanation of the terminology of knowledge and understanding would remain useful somewhere in the Guidelines.

144. The expert from the Government of the Philippines supported the proposal to delete the tables because the Philippines had its own format for competencies. They would not need the tables to implement the Guidelines.

145. The observer experts from the Governments of the Marshall Islands, Canada, Portugal, and Liberia expressed their support for the proposal to delete the tables in order to avoid confusion.

146. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson agreed with the proposal to remove the tables because of the complexities associated with amending them.

147. The observer expert from the Government of Thailand proposed that the methods for demonstrating competence found in the final columns of the tables be appended to the Guidelines.

148. The Shipowner secretary acknowledged the importance of capturing the methods for demonstrating competence in the Guidelines, and asked the Meeting to consider whether there was any more content in the tables that needed to be retained somehow.

149. The Secretary-General asked whether text on the methods of demonstrating competence would go at the end of each section or if it would be appended to the document.

150. An expert from the Government of Norway reminded the Meeting that the Government had made an earlier suggestion to have a short section on methods of demonstrating competence. It had not been accepted the first time because the Seafarers’ group had wanted to retain that information in the tables.

151. The Secretary-General suggested that the Office could prepare text in line with the suggestion from an expert from the Government of Norway and the observer expert from the Government of Thailand, to be inserted at the experts’ discretion.

152. The Meeting decided to delete all the tables from section 4 of the Guidelines, and to consider adding text on the methods for demonstrating competence in section 2.
Paragraph 67

Chapeau and new bullet point

153. The Government Vice-Chairperson stated that there was a need to be consistent when referring to “cooks”, as seen in paragraph 67. It should either be written as “the fully qualified cook should” or “the cook should”.

154. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson suggested that the chapeau to paragraph 67 read, “the ship’s cook should”, and that this change was adopted in the rest of section 4.2.

155. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed that the chapeau to paragraph 67 state, “the cook should be familiar with”. Furthermore, a new first bullet point should be added to convey that ships’ cooks should be familiar with “various types of menus and their differences”.

156. The Seafarer secretary expressed disagreement with the addition of a reference to familiarity in the chapeau to paragraph 67.

157. The expert from the Government of Cyprus also questioned whether it was advisable to refer to the familiarity of the cook with certain tasks in a section that was supposed to be covering practical matters.

158. The Meeting accepted that the chapeau to paragraph 67 would read, “the ship’s cook should”, and that this would be made universal in the document as appropriate. The new bullet point on various types of menus was also accepted.

New bullet point

159. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson suggested a new bullet point stating that ships’ cooks should “be able to read the company menu book”.

160. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson noted that reading the company menu book was dependant on the company having a menu book. For this reason, it would be useful to add the caveat, “if applicable”.

161. The Government Vice-Chairperson questioned whether the point should refer to the ability of the ship’s cook to read or their familiarity with the company menu book.

162. The expert from the Government of Ghana explained that the need for ships’ cooks to be able to read was already included in the Guidelines in table 4.7, and so there was no problem with referring to them reading in paragraph 67.

163. The Meeting accepted the new bullet point that the ship’s cook should, “be familiar with the company menu book”.

New bullet point

164. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to add a new bullet point to state that a ship’s cook should, “be familiar with the several rules in order to compose a menu”.

165. The Seafarer secretary asked whether the Shipowners’ group could provide an explanation of what was meant by the “several rules” in order to compose a menu.

166. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that, in a normal teaching environment for ships’ cooks, several rules of menu composition would be taught. A professional in nutrition
would know about menu composition, and it was important it was incorporated into the text somehow.

167. The Deputy Secretary-General suggested phrasing the bullet point as, “to be familiar with the rules of menu composition”, which was accepted by the Meeting.

168. The Meeting accepted the new bullet on composing menus, on the condition that the word “several” was deleted.

**New bullet point**

169. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to add a new bullet point that read, “to understand the importance of weekly menus, and to be able to organize and prepare the weekly menus”.

170. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson felt that the Seafarers’ group would need more time to consider the proposal from the Shipowners’ group on weekly menus.

171. The Government Vice-Chairperson thought that the proposed new bullet point was unnecessarily wordy and not well formulated. The content was appropriate, but the formulation could be improved.

172. The Meeting adopted the new bullet point.

**Fourth bullet point**

173. The Shipowner secretary requested to move the bullet point on preparing meals so that the ingredients retained their nutritional content to elsewhere in the Guidelines where it would be more appropriate.

174. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson and the Government Vice-Chairperson preferred that that bullet point was left as it was.

175. The Meeting decided to leave the bullet point in square brackets for discussion at a later stage.

176. The expert from the Government of Tunisia asked if a reference to rations could be incorporated into the part on menus. It could include a table that specified the portions to be included on the menu, such as grams of meat and vegetables in order to avoid health problems.

177. The Meeting did not accept the proposal to define rations.

178. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that the bullet point on preparing a meal so that the ingredients retained their nutritional content concerned preparation and did not belong in the part on menus. It could be either deleted or moved.

179. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson suggested putting the bullet point referring to preparation in square brackets.

180. The Shipowner secretary clarified that the Shipowners’ group did not have an issue with the content of the bullet point on preparation. Their issue was with the placement in the Guidelines.
Fifth bullet point

181. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to move the ninth bullet point to section 4.2.3, which was accepted by the Meeting.

Title of 4.2.1

182. The Government Vice-Chairperson asserted that the Government group accepted all of the paragraph 67 bullet points in principle. However, they suggested that the title of section 4.2.1 was changed to “menu planning” to better reflect its content.

183. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that replacing “menus” with “menu planning”, did not make a difference. If the title was to be changed to “menu planning”, then the bullet point would still be inappropriately placed in the Guidelines because preparing a meal was not the same as planning a meal. “Menus”, as a generic term, was a simpler solution.

184. The Government Vice-Chairperson explained that the reason for suggesting “menu planning” was to align the commentary of paragraph 67 with the text of table 4.1. The issue of deciding which bullet points would remain under the “menu planning” title could be decided later.

185. The Meeting decided to leave the title as “menus” and to square bracket the bullet point on preparing meals so that the ingredients retained their nutritional content.

New bullet point

186. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson suggested a new bullet point that stated that a ship’s cook should “be familiar with the service of portions”.

187. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson had reservations about the addition of that bullet point.

188. The expert from the Government of Norway said that the addition was acceptable.

189. The expert from the Government of Canada asked for clarification about whether the intention of the addition was to emphasize the importance of familiarity with service or familiarity with portions.

190. The Shipowner secretary responded that the reference was to familiarity with portion sizes. To clarify, the Shipowners’ proposal could be amended to, “be familiar with the provision of portions”.

191. The Meeting decided to retain the addition of the bullet point on the service of portions but kept it in square brackets.

New bullet point

192. The Shipowner secretary proposed a final bullet point for paragraph 67 which stated that ships’ cooks should, “be able to adapt menu plans during the voyage in the event of unforeseen changes in circumstances”. There could be times on a voyage when it was not feasible to prepare a particular meal for safety reasons, which the addition would reflect.

193. The expert from the Government of Ghana highlighted that paragraph 79 of the Guidelines already accounted for adapting menus in the event of unforeseen changes in circumstances.
194. The Shipowner secretary explained that it was important to refer to unforeseen circumstances in paragraph 67. If the Meeting felt that there was duplication, paragraph 79 could be revised at a later stage.

195. The expert from the Government of Ghana, with the support of the Seafarer Vice-Chairperson, reiterated that there was no need to refer to unforeseen circumstances in paragraph 67.

196. The Meeting decided not to adopt the addition of a bullet point on adapting menu plans in the event of unforeseen changes in circumstances proposed by the Shipowners’ group.

New bullet point

197. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed that reference be made in the bullet point to the link between portion sizes and a healthy diet.

198. The Seafarer secretary proposed to delete the 11th bullet point because crews often ate from a buffet on board and therefore it was the crew and not the ship’s cook that needed to know about portion sizes. The Meeting decided to revise the 11th bullet point to read, “be familiar with what is a healthy diet”.

199. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 68

200. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

Paragraph 69

201. The Meeting held lengthy discussions on the subject of paragraph 69. The parties wanted to ensure that the list was both consistent and thorough. The Meeting suggested that “must” be replaced with “should” in the first line. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed an additional bullet point to include rice and pasta dishes and to delete the reference to game. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed the deletion of common traditions at the end of the last bullet point.

New bullet point

202. The Meeting adopted a new bullet point which read, “additional meals for persons who may be on board when authorized (excluding passengers)”.

New bullet point

203. The Shipowner secretary proposed to insert a new bullet point which read, “fresh bread and bakery products”, after the bullet point which referred to desserts.

204. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Section 4.2.2

205. The Meeting agreed to delete section 4.2.2 regarding health and nutrition since it was also included in section 4.6. “Nutrition and health”.
Section 4.2.3

206. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to shorten the title of section 4.2.3 to “Fundamentals of cooking”. The Meeting adopted the change to the title.

4.2.3. Fundamentals of cooking

Paragraph 71

207. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as proposed.

Paragraph 72

208. During the discussion of paragraph 69, the expert from the Government of Ghana and the observer expert from the Government of Canada suggested that the additional language regarding dairy products should be included in paragraph 71 or 72, rather than 69.

209. This proposal was also supported by an observer from the Government of Panama.

210. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson agreed that the phrase should be added to the end of paragraph 72.

211. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.2.4. Practical cooking skills

212. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson suggested deleting “for nutritionally balanced menus” in order for the heading to read: “Practical cooking skills”. The Meeting agreed to the heading as amended.

Paragraph 73

First bullet point

213. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to amend the first bullet point with additional language regarding butchery skills. The observer expert from the Government of Canada modified the proposal to exclude the word “properly”. The Meeting adopted the amendment.

Second bullet point

214. The Shipowner secretary suggested that the second bullet point regarding food wastage may be included in another location. The Meeting agreed that this bullet point should be bracketed for later review.

Third bullet point

215. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to add “pastries” after “bakery products”.

216. The expert from the Government of Ghana asked for clarification whether the beginning of the bullet point should be changed to be consistent with the other points.

217. The Meeting adopted the changes to the third bullet point.
Fourth bullet point

218. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson suggested the addition of “and different knife skills” after “kitchen knives” in the fourth bullet point. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson agreed.

219. The observer expert from the Government of Cameroon queried the use of the words “is important” as it did not add meaning to the text.

220. The observer expert from the Government of Canada drew attention to the use of “correct use” as it was open to interpretation.

221. The Shipowner secretary asked the secretariat for additional clarity.

222. The Executive Secretary explained that this point, as drafted, included several phrases which should be simplified, and the retention of the word “correct” emphasized the skill level necessary for using knives and cutting boards.

223. The Office simplified the point. The Meeting agreed to the amended point.

Fifth bullet point

224. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to change or clarify the term “fiddles”.

225. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that “fiddles” was a widely used term in galleys but that “(storm bars)” could be inserted for clarification. The Meeting accepted the proposal.

Additional bullet point

226. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed three additional bullet points. Only one bullet point regarding food preservation was adopted by the Meeting.

227. The Meeting adopted paragraph 73 as amended.

4.2.5. Methods of preparation

Paragraph 74

228. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete the second bullet point on the grounds that it was redundant due to paragraph 73.

229. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 75

New bullet point after first bullet point

230. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed a new bullet point regarding appropriate cooking methods.

231. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson offered a subamendment to address the concerns of the observer expert from the Government of Canada.

232. The Meeting adopted the additional bullet point as amended.
Fourth bullet point

233. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson suggested including the words “and sanitize” before probe thermometers in the fourth bullet point.

234. The Seafarers’ group and the Government group agreed to the change.

235. The Meeting adopted paragraph 75, as amended, in its entirety.

4.2.6. Presentation and serving

Paragraphs 76 to 78

236. The Meeting adopted these three paragraphs as proposed, with the exception of changing the word “customers” to “seafarers” in paragraph 77 to avoid confusion.

4.2.7. Practical cookery under unforeseen circumstances

Paragraphs 79 to 81

237. The Meeting agreed to these paragraphs as proposed.

4.2.8. Purchasing

238. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed merging the content of the part on purchasing to the part on administration, management and supervision. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson suggested retaining the title of the part on administration, management and supervision, but adding “galley” to the beginning. The Meeting adopted a new section containing the paragraphs from the part on purchasing to the part on administration, management and supervision, under the heading 4.3, “Galley administration, management and supervision”.

Paragraph 84

239. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed language to address other authorized persons on board in addition to the crew.

240. The Shipowner secretary thought that “authorized persons” was sufficient and that it was superfluous to include “or other persons expected to be on the ship”. The Seafarers’ group agreed to the subamendment.

241. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 85

242. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete paragraph 85 and offered alternative language in its absence.

243. The Government Vice-Chairperson suggested an alternative amendment that would keep the original paragraph up to the word “supplies”, and then would delete the last phrase.

244. An expert from the Government of Norway explained that the language offered by the Shipowners’ amendment went beyond the intent of this section from the training of skills to the operation of purchasing.
The observer expert from the Government of the Marshall Islands and the Seafarer Vice-Chairperson agreed with Norway.

The Meeting agreed to paragraph 85 as amended by the Government Vice-Chairperson.

The Shipowner secretary requested that the term “vessel” be replaced with “ship” throughout the document. The Seafarers also agreed to this suggestion.

4.2.9. Dietary economics

The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete heading 4.2.9 and paragraph 86 since the concepts were already covered in the second bullet point of paragraph 73.

4.2.10. Administration, management and supervision

Paragraph 87

First bullet point

The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson suggested some language to the end of the first bullet point “related to their department”.

The Shipowner secretary asked for clarification.

The Seafarer secretary suggested that the ships’ cook should only address financial and accounts issues related to the provision of food and not other departments of the ship.

Second and third bullet points

An observer expert from the Government of Panama raised the concern that the language at the end of the third bullet point regarding a ship’s cook providing instruction and training should not be interpreted to replace training and qualifications necessary to prepare food on other ships.

Both the Shipowner Vice-Chairperson and the Seafarer Vice-Chairperson indicated that ships’ cooks typically train the catering staff as a regular part of their daily responsibilities.

An expert from the Government of Norway also agreed that a regular part of supervision of other crew preparing food included instruction and training and that it would not extend to instruction necessary to work on a different ship.

The Meeting adopted the last two bullet points as proposed.

The Shipowner secretary proposed a new bullet point regarding “mise en place”.

The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson rejected this additional bullet point.

The Meeting adopted paragraph 87 in its entirety, as amended.

Table 4.1

The Chairperson then directed the Meeting to return to address table 4.1.

The participants provided guidance to the Office and requested that the Office revise the table for discussion at the following plenary session.
4.3. **Prevention of food-borne disease**

4.3.1. Food-borne disease

*Paragraph 88*

261. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.3.2. Food can cause illness

*Paragraph 89*

262. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.3.3. High-risk foods

*Paragraph 90*

263. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.3.4. Micro-organisms can cause illness;

4.3.5. Bacteria

*Paragraphs 91, 92 and 93*

264. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed that paragraph 91 on micro-organisms was merged with paragraph 92 and paragraph 93 on bacteria, since they dealt with many of the same issues.

265. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson and Seafarer Vice-Chairperson supported the proposal by the Government group, but felt there was a need to address the use of the terms, “bacteria” and “micro-organisms” in the paragraphs and the headings.

266. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson suggested that the term, “micro-organisms” could be left out of the Guidelines.

267. The Seafarer secretary expressed that the retention of “bacteria” in the paragraphs and heading would be limiting and that “micro-organisms” was the larger term.

268. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed combining the heading of sections 4.3.4 and 4.3.5 and leaving the text as it had been proposed in the Guidelines.

269. The Meeting decided to adopt paragraph 91 and paragraph 92 as amended, under a single heading that read, “Bacteria and other micro-organisms that can cause illness”. However the text of the paragraph remained as it was in the proposed Guidelines.

4.3.6. Symptoms of food-borne illness

*Paragraph 94*

270. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.
4.3.7. Food-borne disease prevention

*Paragraph 95*

271. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.3.8. Cross-contamination

*Paragraph 96*

New bullet point

272. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed a new bullet point stating that it was important to have knowledge of “the need to prevent unauthorized personnel from entering the galley”.

273. The Meeting adopted the paragraph, as amended, with the additional bullet point.

4.3.9. Food safety self-assessment system

*Paragraph 97*

274. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson questioned whether there was a need to define or clarify HACCP principles.

275. The Government Vice-Chairperson reminded the Meeting that the HACCP principles were referred to in box 4.1. He proposed to delete the first sentence of the *chapeau*, since it did not add any value to the meaning of the paragraph, and to delete both bullet points. Deleting the bullet points also meant deleting the last sentence of the *chapeau*. He suggested the Meeting replace “all types of vessels” with “ships”.

276. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that ships should take HACCP principles into account. If the principles were not appropriate for the type of ship, then the ship could disregard the principles.

277. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson and the Shipowner Vice-Chairperson expressed a need to retain the bullet points, but accepted the need to delete the reference to “all types of vessels” and the first sentence of the *chapeau*.

278. The Government Vice-Chairperson agreed to retain the bullet points.

279. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.4. Food hygiene

4.4.1. How to break the food-borne disease chain

*Paragraph 98*

280. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.
4.4.2. How to clean and sanitize the galley, mess and stores
and why it is important to do so

Paragraph 99

281. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed replacing derivatives of the term “disinfect” with
derivatives of the term “sanitize” throughout the paragraph. Sanitizing was more widely
understood in the industry.

282. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson and Government Vice-Chairperson accepted the proposal,
and the Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.4.3. How food should be stored and why it is important
to keep good order in stores

Paragraph 100

283. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.4.4. How to handle refrigerated and frozen products

Paragraph 101

284. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.4.5. How to handle food during preparation

Paragraph 102

285. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to add the words, “the ship’s”, prior to “probe
thermometers” in the fifth bullet point.

286. The Meeting accepted the proposal from the Seafarers’ group and the paragraph was adopted
as amended.

4.4.6. How to keep and reheat leftovers and how
to reuse them in other dishes

Paragraph 103

First bullet point

287. The Shipowner secretary proposed to delete the first bullet point because it was covered in
section 4.2.3. The meeting accepted the deletion.

Fourth bullet point

288. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to add the temperature for reheating as, “to
165 degrees Fahrenheit”.

289. The Meeting agreed that the temperature for reheating should be included in degrees
Fahrenheit and degrees Celsius in the Guidelines.

290. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed that the temperature in degrees Celsius be
74 degrees Celsius to simplify reading temperatures for ships’ cooks. The Meeting accepted
the suggestion.
New bullet points

291. The Shipowner secretary proposed two new bullet points. The first new bullet point read, “food should be reheated only once”. If it was possible, a strong word such as “must” would be preferred to the word “should”. The second new bullet point read, “reheated served food should not be reused”. The new bullet points could be placed at the end of the existing bullet points.

292. An expert from the Government of Norway suggested that the first new bullet point was worded as, “under no circumstances should food be reheated more than once”. It was a strong statement that did not use the word “must”.

293. The Deputy Secretary-General proposed that “the fact” was added before “under no circumstances …” in order to gain grammatical agreement with the chapeau.

294. The Meeting accepted the addition of the two new bullet points.

295. The Seafarer secretary further proposed that the term “food” in the new bullet point be replaced by the term “leftovers” for clarification, which was accepted by the Meeting.

296. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.4.7. How to serve food safely

Paragraph 104

Fourth bullet point

297. The Shipowner secretary proposed replacing the word “chill” with “cool down”, and inserting the words “prior to chilling” after “food”, and deleting the rest of the bullet point.

298. The Meeting accepted the proposed addition and proposed deletion.

Sixth bullet point

299. The Shipowner secretary proposed replacing the term “disinfection” with “sanitizing” to remain consistent with earlier amendments to the Guidelines.

300. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.5. Personal hygiene

4.5.1. Personal hygiene

Paragraph 105

301. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.5.2. Skin infections

Paragraph 106

302. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.
4.5.3. Gloves

Paragraph 107

303. The Government Vice-Chairperson asked for clarification about the emphasis on gloves in the Guidelines.

304. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that ships’ cooks had started to use more chainmail gloves when dealing with meat as protection after a few incidents had occurred. Traditionally, the term “gloves” referred to latex gloves as a barrier between the skin and raw foods. In general, gloves were not a substitution for proper hand sanitation.

New bullet point

305. The Shipowner secretary proposed a new bullet point for insertion at the end of the paragraph that read, “sanitizing chainmail gloves after each use”.

306. The Meeting accepted the proposed new bullet point, and the paragraph was adopted as amended.

4.5.4. When to stop working for the sake of the health of others

Paragraph 108

307. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.6. Nutrition and health – Balanced menus

4.6.1. Understanding nutrition

Paragraph 109

Chapeau

308. The Government Vice-Chairperson noted that there was no longer a need to distinguish between types of cooks since the Guidelines dealt with only one category of ships’ cooks. The Meeting decided to remove “with responsibility for the crew’s diet”.

309. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 110

310. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.6.2. Planning – Purchasing and competencies

Paragraph 111

311. The Shipowner secretary proposed adding some flexibility to the emphasis on purchasing in the paragraph by inserting, “where appropriate”, to the beginning of the chapeau. This was important because many companies used central ordering and purchasing.

312. The expert from the Government of Ghana remarked that, given section 4 of the Guidelines concerned competencies for training, the addition of the flexibility proposed by the Shipowners’ group was not necessarily appropriate.
313. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that the reason for adding flexibility was because of a need to acknowledge that the training of ships’ cooks needed to focus on the absolutely necessary competencies given limited training resources.

314. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson suggested inserting the proposed addition, “where appropriate”, to the front of the last bullet point in order to limit the flexibility it afforded.

315. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.6.3. Food allergy and intolerances

Paragraph 112

316. The Shipowner secretary suggested that “food” be added before “intolerance” in the heading of section 4.6.3, and “intolerance” pluralized.

317. The expert from the Government of Ghana, supported by the Seafarer Vice-Chairperson, proposed that “intolerances” be inserted throughout the paragraph following where any derivative of “allergy” was employed.

New bullet point

318. The Seafarer secretary proposed a new bullet point which read, “how to communicate with their crew to be aware of their allergies”.

319. The Government Vice-Chairperson, supported by the expert from the Government of Ghana, reminded the Meeting that the issue of communication was dealt with in section 4.8.4 and that duplication should be avoided.

320. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson stated that it was appropriate to refer to communication in section 4.6.3 and in section 4.8.4 in the Guidelines.

Proposal for a new paragraph with heading

321. The observer expert from the Government of Spain proposed a new paragraph under section 4.6.3. A separate paragraph was needed to address the allergies, illnesses and other health conditions that may arise on board. The Guidelines should also include or refer to diets, such as therapeutic diets, that could help mitigate health situations that may emerge. He proposed that the new heading would read, “special diets to deal with health problems on board”. The text would read, “it is important that the catering personnel have knowledge of the health problems that may come up on board and may require the use of special diets to promote recovery or prevent deterioration. All cooks with responsibility for food preparation should have basic knowledge on the preparation of special diets, such as: soft food diets, for gastric protection, laxative diets, astringent diets, as well as diets to deal with food allergies or intolerance”.

322. The Shipowner secretary explained that a new paragraph on special dietary requirements could lead to guidance on lists of special ingredients to be kept in galleys that might never be used, and had implications for litigation.

323. The Seafarer secretary explained that the proposal on special dietary requirements from the observer expert from the Government of Spain would be putting too much responsibility on the ship’s cook.

324. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson and the Shipowner secretary, while sympathizing with the concerns of the observer expert from the Government of Spain, agreed on a preference for
not including additional text on special diets. They asserted that adding “intolerances” throughout the paragraph had adequately addressed the issue of special dietary requirements.

325. The expert from the Government of Ghana said that the concerns that the observer expert from the Government of Spain had, would already be addressed in the amended text whereby “intolerances” had been inserted throughout.

326. The expert from the Government of Norway understood the proposal from the observer expert from the Government of Spain because it dealt with the problem from a wider perspective. The Meeting needed to differentiate between training requirements for ships’ cooks and particular operational conditions in which the ships’ cooks would be placed. The knowledge that was required of ships’ cooks should be independent of any operational discussions. section 4 of the Guidelines was supposed to be about what ship’s cooks should have knowledge of. Seafarers may fall ill on board and therefore it would be useful to have knowledge of special dietary requirements in order to be able to alleviate some health problems.

327. The Seafarer secretary reaffirmed that the proposed new text put too much responsibility on ships’ cooks. If an illness or health problem arose on board, the seafarer would be diagnosed by a medical professional and that person would be responsible for communicating with the ship’s cook to detail the dietary needs.

328. An observer expert from the Government of Panama agreed with the Seafarers’ group and mentioned that other parts of the Guidelines covered the concerns raised by the observer expert from the Government of Spain.

329. The Meeting did not accept the proposed new paragraph and heading, and the observer expert from the Government of Spain withdrew the proposal.

330. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.6.4. Awareness of the importance of nutrition for combating lifestyle disease

Paragraph 113

331. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete “(including sleep apnoea)” because the word was too difficult to understand.

332. The Meeting accepted the proposed deletion, and the paragraph was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 114

333. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.7. Religious and cultural aspects

Paragraph 115

First bullet point

334. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete the first bullet point because it would put too much of a burden on a ship’s cook.
335. The expert from the Government of Norway explained that the first bullet point only needed to be neutralized rather than removed entirely by deleting the examples about Christmas and Ramadan.

336. The Seafarer secretary, supported by the Shipowner Vice-Chairperson, maintained that retaining any part of the bullet point could lead to a situation where the ship’s cook had to prepare special meals on too many occasions.

337. An expert from the Government of Norway, supported by the expert from the Government of Ghana, reiterated that some mention of requirements of religions and cultural aspects of meals was necessary in the Guidelines because it was about the “knowledge of”. The paragraph aimed to require the knowledge of the religious or cultural aspects and that the burden of the ship’s cook would be dependent upon the situation of the particular ship.

338. The observer expert from the Government of Cameroon stated that religious or cultural aspects were very important for seafarers’ lives and calmness on board ships. A ship’s cook should have good knowledge of those religious and cultural aspects.

339. The Seafarer secretary reminded the Meeting that there were many religious occasions in the world that would need to be catered for if the first bullet point was retained.

340. An expert from the Government of Norway explained that the purpose of retaining part of the first bullet point was to neutralize the guidance and not highlight any particular occasions, and at the same time recognize the importance of knowledge of these religious and cultural aspects.

341. The Meeting decided to keep the first bullet point, but remove the reference to specific examples.

Second and third bullet points

342. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed to retain “religious or cultural dietary requirements”, and delete all other parts in the second bullet point.

343. An expert from the Government of Norway felt that the examples provided in the third bullet point were not necessary and the text could be neutralized by removing the examples.

344. The Shipowner secretary agreed with the expert from the Government of Norway that some of the examples in the third bullet point were over-simplified and could be deleted. However, she proposed retaining language concerning the sourcing of food for cultural reasons, as this was needed, for example, to ensure that halal or kosher meats were procured from the correct sources. The meat, in line with some requirements, needed to be delivered, sealed and cooked in a specific manner.

345. The observer expert from the Marshall Islands proposed to combine the second and third bullet points since they were very closely related. She proposed adding “religious or cultural dietary requirements including requirements concerning purchasing and segregation of different types of food for cultural and religious reasons”.

346. The expert from the Government of Ghana noted that the third bullet point, as written, could be deleted up to the final three sentences, which laid out the necessary elements. He also agreed that reference to the sources of those foods should be retained in the text.

347. An expert from the Government of Norway, as well as the expert from the Government of Ghana, supported the proposal by the observer expert from the Government of the Marshall Islands, but reminded the Meeting that the matter of purchasing was addressed in paragraph
111 of the Guidelines, which introduced the notion of a special competence and being aware of religious issues when purchasing food.

348. The Shipowner secretary agreed with the proposal by the expert from the Government of the Marshall Islands and recommended including, “purchasing, segregation, preparation, and cooking of different types of food”, instead of accepting the proposal from the expert from the Government of Ghana.

349. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.8. **Communication and other basic skills**

4.8.1. Language skills

*Paragraph 116*

350. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed replacing the term “shipowner” with “flag State”.

351. The Government Vice-Chairperson questioned the use of the term, “personnel” since it referred to seafarers, as it was not consistent with the rest of the terminology used in the Guidelines.

352. The expert from the Government of Norway agreed with the proposal of the Seafarers’ group, but further recommended deleting the phrase, “as determined by the shipowner”.

353. The observer expert from the Government of Panama recalled that the MLC, 2006, referenced the working language of the vessel.

354. The expert from the Government of Cyprus supported the proposal by the expert from the Government of Norway because the language on board was not determined by the flag State but by the shipowner. He advised using the phrase, “working language of the ship”.

355. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson addressed the issue of the term “personnel” and proposed replacing it with the term “person with responsibility”. The Shipowners’ group supported following the text of the Convention as it pertained to language.

356. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson agreed to use the “language of the ship” and withdrew the proposal to insert “flag State”.

357. The Shipowner secretary proposed shortening the paragraph to “oral and written information concerning nutrition should be provided to the crew in the language of the ship”.

358. An expert from the Government of Norway, the observer expert from the Government of the Marshall Islands, and the observer expert from the Government of Portugal supported the proposal by the Shipowners’ group.

359. The Meeting adopted this paragraph as amended.

*Paragraph 117*

360. The Shipowner secretary proposed replacing the term “nutrition” in paragraph 117 with the term “catering”, as there were no nutritionists on board ships, only caterers.
361. The Seafarer secretary stated that the issue of language was difficult and suggested the Meeting decide at a later stage whether reference to language skills, mathematics skills and computer skills should be included in the Guidelines.

362. An expert from the Government of Norway could accept the proposal by the Seafarers’ group, but noted that the paragraphs contained some elements pertaining to competencies and training which needed to be included in the Guidelines.

363. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson agreed that the language skills, mathematics skills and computer skills need to be revisited later.

364. The Seafarer secretary proposed the deletion of the first sentence of the paragraph.

365. The Government Vice-Chairperson and the observer expert from the Government of Cameroon agreed with the proposal.

366. The Government Vice-Chairperson requested more clarity as to whether the second sentence should be targeting all seafarers involved in the preparation of food or only ships’ cooks.

367. After discussion from several participants, the Meeting agreed to modify the second sentence to refer to seafarers involved in catering, and to add the word “cooking” before “recipes”.

368. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.8.2. Mathematical skills

Paragraph 118

369. The Shipowner secretary agreed with the language of the paragraph and proposed to add a second bullet point reading “should be able to calculate consumption levels and work within budgets established”.

370. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to change the title of the section to “Calculation skills”. To clarify to whom the paragraph applied, the Vice-Chairperson also proposed changing the language to “the management of the galley should”.

371. The Government Vice-Chairperson preferred the title “Mathematical skills”, as he thought that the paragraph should refer to ships’ cooks and believed that the new proposed bullet point was unnecessary.

372. The observer expert from the Government of Cameroon and the expert from the Government of Cyprus both offered other suggestions to make the paragraph clearer.

373. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.8.3. Computer skills

374. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete the heading and paragraph 119 since it was placing too many responsibilities on the cook and it was rarely feasible to have access to computers. Usually only the officers have regular access to computers.

375. Several government experts and observers argued in favour of keeping the paragraph in some form. Comments were made from the Governments of Norway, Marshall Islands, Canada, Namibia, Cyprus, Thailand and Mexico.
376. After further discussion about the issue of access to computers and information technology versus the need for training on the use of computers, the Meeting agreed to delete the entire section 4.8.3 on computer skills. The Government Vice-Chairperson expressed his disappointment that this section would not be included as the Governments had preferred.

Paragraph 120

Second bullet point

377. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed that the second bullet point be deleted.

378. The Seafarer secretary accepted to delete the bullet point.

379. The Government Vice-Chairperson recalled that the Government group had discussed the paragraph and was not sure about the meaning of some of the vague terminology laid out, such as the “basic principles of communication”.

380. An expert from the Government of Norway and the expert from the Government of Ghana agreed with the Shipowners’ suggestion to delete the second bullet point.

381. The Meeting deleted the second bullet point.

Fourth bullet point

382. The Seafarer secretary proposed replacing the term “when” with the term “on the” in the fourth bullet point.

New bullet point

383. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed including a new bullet point that read “understand various cultural communication behaviours”. The Shipowners’ group was aware that, where there was limited knowledge on board ship of various languages, and, particularly where there were multinational crews, understanding various signals would be helpful.

384. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.9. Workplace safety

385. The observer expert from the Government of Cameroon proposed to change the title of section 4.9 to “workplace safety and health”, since health was covered in that section.

386. The Executive Secretary suggested that section 4.9 could be called “Maritime safety and health”, instead of using the word “workplace”.

387. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson explained that the Office was developing guidance on maritime occupational safety and health and that renaming the heading of section 4.9 in the Guidelines could cause confusion. The Shipowner secretary also preferred to keep the term “workplace” in the heading.

388. The Meeting decided to rename section 4.9 “Workplace safety and health”.

389. An observer expert from the Government of Panama stated that safety and health was clearly covered in the MLC, 2006, and that it was redundant to reiterate aspects of these provisions in the Guidelines. Ships carrying 100 or more persons and ordinarily engaged on international voyages of more than three days’ duration were required to carry a qualified
medical doctor who was responsible for providing medical care, but ships that did not carry a medical doctor were required to have at least one seafarer on board who was competent to provide medical first aid. There was a concern that responsibilities were being duplicated by the Guidelines.

390. An expert from the Government of Norway explained that the Guidelines were helpful because they were complementary to the MLC, 2006, since the provisions on occupational safety and health in the MLC, 2006, were broad. There need not be a concern about a conflict or duplication since the Guidelines concerned the training of ships’ cooks.

Paragraph 121

391. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to add “and crush injuries” to enhance the explanation of the potential hazards of using machines in the galley.

392. The Meeting accepted the addition, and the paragraph was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 122

Fourth bullet point

393. The Seafarers’ Vice-Chairperson proposed to insert the term “safety” to qualify the type of knives, and to delete “and use chainmail gloves”. It was accepted by the Meeting.

Sixth bullet point

394. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to add some general examples of appropriate clothing and personal protective equipment, “such as uniforms, aprons and jackets”. He also added that the example of “(e.g. reefer jackets)” might be helpful. Reefer jackets protected ships’ cooks from freezing temperatures.

395. The observer expert from the Government of Canada asked whether “shoes” could be added to the list being developed. If some parts of the uniform were being included, then it all needed to be included.

396. The observer expert from the Government of Cameroon questioned why gloves were the only item of protective gear that had been singled out elsewhere in the Guidelines and asked for clarification. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson explained that gloves were very important because they were part of hygiene and safety in a galley.

397. The Chairperson suggested that “etc.” be added to the list to demonstrate that it was not exhaustive. The Meeting accepted the addition of the example list “such as aprons, jackets (e.g. reefer jackets), etc.”.

398. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

New bullet point

399. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson, supported by the expert from the Government of Ghana, proposed a new bullet point which read “deal with galley fires”, which was accepted by the Meeting.
4.9.3. Risk assessment

Paragraph 123

400. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed that “of equipment” should be added after “wear and tear”.

401. The paragraph was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 124

402. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

Paragraph 125

403. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

4.9.4. Knowledge of the ISM Code and safety management systems

Paragraph 126

Chapeau

404. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to replace the term, “nutrition”, with the term, “catering” in the chapeau, which was accepted by the Meeting.

First bullet point

405. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed that the bullet point referred to ships’ cooks needing to be “familiar” with the ISM Code, rather than needing to be able to apply it.

406. The Shipowner secretary felt that being able to “apply” the ISM Code was more appropriate because the ship’s cook and the catering personnel were the persons that were being inspected on the ISM Code.

Third bullet point

407. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete the third bullet point because it referred to “all other personnel working in the galley”.

408. The Meeting accepted the deletion, and the paragraph was adopted as amended.

New bullet point

409. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed a new bullet point that read “have awareness of ships’ safety committees”.

410. An expert from the Government of Norway supported the clear reference to ships’ safety committees, but suggested that it would be better to use “have knowledge of”, rather than “have awareness of”. He reminded the Meeting about the problem of referring to too many different types of knowledge that was expected of ships’ cooks. Given that the Guidelines would form the basis of training programmes, they needed to be easy to use for the training schools.
4.9.5. Reporting occupational injuries

Paragraph 127

411. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to replace the term “nutrition” with the term “catering” in the chapeau, which was accepted by the Meeting.

412. The Government Vice-Chairperson questioned the use of the word “know” and suggested that the sentence be reworded.

413. The Shipowner secretary suggested that the paragraph read “ships’ cooks and other personnel with responsibility for catering should know their responsibilities for reporting of occupational injuries and near misses”. The brackets referring to “near misses” needed to be removed to demonstrate that reporting near misses was as important as reporting injuries.

414. The observer expert from the Government of Canada highlighted that to “know” something was not necessarily the same as being “familiar with how to do it”.

415. The Shipowner secretary replied that the reference to “responsibilities” meant that, by definition, they would know how to do the reporting.

416. The Meeting adopted the paragraph, as amended, using the drafting suggestion from the Shipowners’ group.

Paragraph 128

417. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed that “personnel” was replaced with “all other seafarers” for consistency in the Guidelines, which was accepted by the Meeting.

418. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

Paragraph 129

419. An expert from the Government of Norway proposed to delete the reference to the “safety officer”, because the Guidelines were aimed at ships’ cooks and not safety officers.

420. The Executive Secretary explained that the reference to the “safety officer” had been included in the Guidelines because there was a need to demonstrate that the ship’s cook should be supportive of the safety officer’s duties, if there was one, on board the ship. She suggested rewording the paragraph to read: “the ship’s cook should be familiar with post-incident procedures as defined and corrective actions taken to minimize the risk that an injury or exposure could occur in the future”.

421. An expert from the Government of Norway indicated that the phrase “as defined” was unnecessary in the paragraph, but agreed with the insertion of “be familiar with”.

422. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.10. First aid in the galley

Paragraph 130

423. The Seafarer secretary suggested that the reference to “crushing injuries” be changed to “crush injuries” for consistency with the rest of the Guidelines.
424. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson pointed out that the language in the last three lines regarding oil fires was not relevant in this paragraph on first aid. The subject was usually taught in firefighting courses, not first-aid courses for ships’ cooks.

425. The Seafarer secretary preferred the original text as proposed since the basic safety training course was not specific enough for galley fire safety.

426. Several participants then expressed opinions as to whether the STCW basic training course included the relevant firefighting training and whether ships’ cooks were required to attend the basic training course.

427. The representative of the International Maritime Organization confirmed that the basic training course was required for all seafarers and that it included first aid.

428. The Government Vice-Chairperson supported the Shipowners’ suggestion to refer to the relevant section of the STCW. Several Governments confirmed that firefighting was included in the basic course.

429. The Shipowner secretary proposed a new paragraph to follow paragraph 131 referring to firefighting and the STCW basic training course.

430. The Meeting adopted the paragraph, as amended, with the addition of “crush injuries”, and the removal of the reference to addressing oil fires.

Paragraph 131

431. The Meeting adopted this paragraph as amended by the Government Vice-Chairperson.

New paragraph on firefighting in the galley

432. The Shipowner secretary proposed moving the last two sentences of paragraph 130 and adding a reference to the training requirement in MLC, 2006, Regulation 1.3 and the relevant STCW basic training requirements. The Meeting adopted the new paragraph.

4.11. Waste

4.11.1. Wastage, hygiene and safety

433. After a discussion regarding several proposals to clarify the language of paragraph 132, the Government Vice-Chairperson proposed simplifying the language and suggested that if the word “balancing” is deleted from the paragraph it should also be deleted from the title.

434. The Meeting adopted paragraph 132, as simplified.

4.11.2. Waste collection

Paragraph 133

435. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete the phrase “on the bridge” from the last line.

436. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.
Paragraph 134

437. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson proposed to replace “disinfected” with “sanitized” as in the other paragraphs. The paragraph was left open to revisit the issue of the phrase “catering personnel”.

4.11.3. Waste storage

Paragraph 135

438. The Government expert from Cyprus proposed the deletion of the phrase at the end of the paragraph.

439. The Meeting adopted the paragraph as amended.

4.11.4. Waste disposal

Paragraph 136

440. The paragraph was adopted as proposed.

Paragraph 137

441. The Shipowner secretary raised the concern that the language at the beginning of the paragraph should be checked against the language of the MARPOL Convention, or deleted.

442. An expert from the Government of Norway suggested that the ship’s cook does not need to know how to document the waste, but should have an understanding of the need.

443. The Government Vice-Chairperson proposed to delete the paragraph because it did not focus on the training on waste management plans. There was not a need to focus on the operational application in the Guidelines.

444. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson preferred to keep the paragraph and emphasized the importance of training regarding waste disposal and waste record management.

445. The Seafarer secretary explained that training on the recording and documentation required as part of waste disposal management was an important aspect to include for the Seafarers’ group.

446. The Shipowner secretary preferred to delete the reference to gross tonnage in the first sentence to avoid narrowing the scope of the paragraph.

447. The observer expert from the Marshall Islands proposed deleting the first sentence, and adding the phrase “including the recording and documentation requirements” to the end of the paragraph.

448. The Meeting accepted the proposal, and the paragraph was adopted as amended.

Appendix I

449. The Meeting decided to delete Appendix I and include its contents, Regulation 3.2, Standard A3.2 and Guideline B3.2 of the MLC, 2006, in section 1 of the Guidelines.
Appendix II

450. The Meeting decided to delete Appendix II, in light of reservations about the accuracy of the information, and the ILO’s recent development of an MLC, 2006, database. It was preferable to have a single, live repository for MLC, 2006, information from member States.

Adoption of the Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks

451. The Meeting proposed some general and minor editorial changes to the text. Most of the final amendments related to ensuring consistency with the use of terminology throughout the Guidelines and to the simplification of some headings. The Office was further tasked with implementing several universal changes for further consistency.

452. The Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks were adopted as amended.

Closing remarks

453. The Shipowner Vice-Chairperson thanked the Chairperson, the secretariat, the Seafarers’ group and the Government group for their hard work. The Meeting had been mindful of balancing traditional approaches with the need to strive for well-balanced, varied and safely prepared dishes that would cover a variety of personal tastes, and religious and cultural requirements. The Guidelines were an important achievement.

454. The Seafarer Vice-Chairperson thanked the Chairperson, the secretariat, the Shipowners’ group and the Government group for their contribution to completing the Guidelines. The Seafarers’ group looked forward to continuing ratifications of the MLC, 2006, and hoped that seafarers’ welfare and lifestyles would improve as a result of their efforts.

455. The Government Vice-Chairperson thanked the Chairperson, the secretariat and the social partners. The Meeting had developed Guidelines that could be used in member States to improve the training of ships’ cooks.

456. A Seafarer expert from the Philippines explained that the adoption of the Guidelines was the initial accomplishment. The Meeting needed to consider the next step, which should be the development of a model course that could be used for the training of ships’ cooks. The Seafarers’ group would begin designing and preparing a model course.

457. The Shipowner secretary supported the Seafarers’ group’s aspiration for a model course to complement the Guidelines. She suggested that a proposal for a model course on the training of ships’ cooks be outlined by the social partners at the first meeting of the Special Tripartite Committee (STC) of the MLC, 2006.

458. The Secretary-General congratulated the experts for achieving their objective. The Guidelines were a big step forward in developing further guidance on the implementation of the MLC, 2006, and would undoubtedly have an impact on the lives of seafarers. She thanked the participants, the Chairperson, the rest of the secretariat, and everyone that had assisted and played a supporting role at the Meeting.

459. The Chairperson thanked the participants for their work on the Guidelines. Each group had demonstrated exemplary commitment to their roles in the training of ships’ cooks. The Meeting had successfully developed important Guidelines on the training of ships’ cooks.
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