



International Oil Pollution  
Compensation Funds

|                                      |                |   |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|---|
| <b>Agenda Item 9</b>                 | IOPC/MAR21/9/1 |   |
| <b>Date</b>                          | 21 April 2021  |   |
| <b>Original</b>                      | English        |   |
| <b>1992 Fund Assembly</b>            | 92AES24        | ● |
| <b>1992 Fund Executive Committee</b> | 92EC75         | ● |
| <b>Supplementary Fund Assembly</b>   | SAES8          | ● |

## RECORD OF DECISIONS OF THE MARCH 2021 SESSIONS OF THE IOPC FUNDS' GOVERNING BODIES

### FEEDBACK FROM DELEGATIONS

#### Note by the Secretariat

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Summary:</b>            | <p>The consolidated draft Record of Decisions contained in document IOPC/MAR21/9/WP.2 was published on Wednesday, 7 April 2021, upon which a seven working day correspondence period opened for delegations to provide comments on that document. The correspondence period closed at 5.00 pm (BST, London time), Thursday, 15 April 2021.</p> <p>During this correspondence period, comments were submitted by Australia and Singapore, which are reflected in the Annex.</p> |
| <b>Action to be taken:</b> | <p><u>1992 Fund Assembly, 1992 Fund Executive Committee and Supplementary Fund Assembly</u></p> <p>Information to be noted.</p>  |

#### 1 Introduction

- 1.1 At their March 2021 virtual meeting, the governing bodies decided that, upon conclusion of the virtual meeting on 31 March 2021, the sessions should remain open for an additional seven working day period from the publication of the consolidated draft Record of Decisions for delegations to comment on that document by correspondence (document IOPC/MAR21/9/WP.2).
- 1.2 The consolidated draft Record of Decisions was published on Wednesday, 7 April 2021, and the correspondence period closed at 5.00 pm (BST, London time), Thursday, 15 April 2021.
- 1.3 The governing bodies also endorsed the proposal that the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairs, would publish a document containing comments received during the correspondence period, with an accompanying explanation on how they have been addressed for the final Record of Decisions.
- 1.4 During the correspondence period, comments were submitted by Australia and Singapore, which are reflected in the Annex.

**2 Director's considerations**

- 2.1 The Director has consulted with the Chairs of the 1992 Fund Assembly and the Supplementary Fund Assembly, who have agreed to accept the comments made by the delegations of Australia and Singapore.
- 2.2 Taking into account the proposed amendments to the draft Record of Decisions, the final Record of Decisions will be issued in due course as IOPC/MAR21/9/2.

**3 Action to be taken**

1992 Fund Assembly, 1992 Fund Executive Committee, Supplementary Fund Assembly

The 1992 Fund Assembly, 1992 Fund Executive Committee and Supplementary Fund Assembly are invited to take note of the information.

\* \* \*

## ANNEX

### FEEDBACK FROM DELEGATIONS ON IOPC/MAR21/9/WP.2

#### 1 Comments on 7.2 Information Services

##### *Amendments proposed by Australia*

- 1.1 Australia proposed the following amendments to paragraph 7.2.11 to accurately reflect its intervention made during the virtual meeting:

One delegation thanked the Secretariat for the work undertaken to adapt the induction course and the short course ~~in order to deliver them remotely to offer alternate delivery models~~. That delegation noted that the ~~remote virtual~~ delivery of ~~these courses~~ the Short Course would be carried out on a trial basis and expressed hope that such virtual training opportunities would continue to be offered after the restrictions on travel as a result of the global pandemic were eased. That delegation highlighted the particular value of ~~such~~ alternate delivery models, including remote activities offerings for the Induction Course, for those Member States that were least able to travel to London and commented on the usefulness of both the physical and virtual training services offered by the Secretariat.

#### 2 Comments on 7.3 Appointment of the Director – Procedures

##### *Amendment proposed by Australia*

- 2.1 Australia proposed the following amendment to paragraph 7.3.26:

One delegation suggested a further option, namely a hybrid of the three voting systems (in-person, online and by post) to accommodate the preferences of all States. Another delegation highlighted that with any hybrid option it would be important to ~~ensure~~ safeguard ballot secrecy while ensuring that each State could only vote once. That delegation also enquired as to how the presentations by candidates could be accommodated if postal votes were made before the meeting week, as it noted that to be a key part of the election process.

##### *Amendment proposed by Singapore*

- 2.2 Singapore proposed the following amendment to paragraph 7.3.32:

~~The delegation of Singapore~~ One delegation noted that many delegations had expressed their support for options (a) and (c) and the use of online voting. That delegation stated that it remained highly uncomfortable with the use of online voting for the purposes of the appointment of the Director. In its view, options (c) and (d) could both be successfully used and it strongly believed that there was sufficient time to organise an in-person vote, even if the meeting was held remotely. That delegation also stated that delaying a decision on this matter until a session in July 2021 should not be for the purpose of following the decisions of IMO since the IOPC Funds was a separate organisation. It did, however, agree that lessons could be learned given that the two organisations were located in the same building.