

CMI Report

Professor Edgar Gold AM QC
Marine Shipping Law Unit
The University of Queensland
Brisbane

**THE IMO/ILO GUIDELINES ON FAIR TREATMENT OF SEAFARERS IN
THE EVENT OF A MARITIME ACCIDENT:
A CMI Update**

**Prof. Edgar Gold, AM, CM, QC, PhD, FNI
Marine & Shipping Law Unit, University of Queensland**

Introduction

In recent years all sectors of the maritime industry and many governments have become concerned about the criminal action taken against seafarers in the aftermath of maritime accidents, especially those that involve marine pollution. Examples such as those involving the masters of vessels such as *Nissos Amorgas*, *Erika*, *Tasman Spirit*, *Virgo*, and *Prestige* immediately come to mind. However, there are many other cases, both reported and unreported, that illustrate this increasing trend where seafarers appear to have become the 'scapegoats' for maritime accidents, regardless of whether they are directly or indirectly involved or responsible.

In some cases masters and chief-engineers of vessels, and other sea-going personnel, have been arrested, imprisoned or otherwise detained, under a variety of 'criminal law' and other proceedings for extensive periods. Often the most basic rights of such persons are not observed and access to legal advice is frequently neither provided nor even permitted. Furthermore, such persons are often neither charged nor provided with information why they are being held. In many instances, such seafarers appear to be held as 'material witnesses' or for other 'administrative and technical' reasons. In other instances seafarers may be 'charged' with causing the relevant marine accident and/or with marine pollution. This occurs despite the fact that there is rarely any directly attributable responsibility for such accidents that may result from circumstances quite beyond the operational responsibility or competence of those so charged. It should be noted that these cases often occur in states that otherwise have an excellent reputation in terms of their criminal justice system and observance of the rights of individuals.

Legal and Practical Issues

The difficulties faced by seafarers that may lead to unfair treatment subsequent to a maritime accident can be confined to three general areas:

- Criminal action is today frequently taken against seafarers involved in maritime accidents that have been beyond their control;
- In many states regardless of whether seafarers, who have been involved in a maritime accident, are at fault or not, they are treated as criminals;
- Even in cases where the relevant seafarers have not been found at fault, they are, nevertheless, held under criminal law provisions as 'material witnesses'.

Some difficulties in the initial IMO/ILO deliberations in this area relate to defining the meaning of 'maritime accident'. Some interests had argued that the expression should instead be 'maritime incident'. This is the type of discussion that might make

lawyers happy but does not provide a solution to the practical issues that need to be resolved. Although a number of good arguments can be made that 'maritime incident' might cover almost all areas where seafarers might be disadvantaged, it is suggested that if widely implemented fair treatment guidelines were to be achieved, it would only occur if the somewhat narrower 'maritime accident' expression were utilized. Fortunately this was also accepted in subsequent IMO/ILO discussions.¹

As a result, the work that is presently taking place at a number of levels by the various interests involved has been confined to 'maritime accidents'. Although much international discussion has concentrated on maritime accidents involving serious oil pollution, there are many other maritime accidents that could lead to criminal action and commensurate disadvantage to seafarers. Maritime accidents include:

- Collision between two or more vessels
- Collision between a vessel and fixed objects, such as an offshore structure, navigational mark, or port installation
- Grounding or stranding of a vessel
- Fire or explosion on board due to various causes
- Machinery breakdown on board due to various causes
- Accidental overboard discharge of pollutants due to various causes, i.e. collision, grounding, fire, explosion, hull or machinery metal fatigue; machinery breakdown; negligence; misinformation or error
- Industrial accidents on board leading to personal injury and/or death of crew members, stevedores or other visitors. These include access problems involving pilot ladders; hold access ladders; tank entry; gangways; equipment failure involving cargo loading equipment; containers; pumping systems etc.; safety and health problems
- Accidents on board passenger vessels leading to personal injury and/or death of passengers from various causes
- Accidents arising from pilotage, towage or salvage operations
- Accidents arising from extreme weather conditions at sea, including foundering
- Accidents due to improper loading and/or stowage of cargo, including overloading
- Accidents occurring during cargo operations from various causes
- Accidents occurring during cargo transshipment or lightering operations

This list is not exhaustive and simply illustrates the wide variety of 'maritime accidents' that may occur. In most cases direct or indirect damage will result. This will give rise to damage claims by those who have been affected. In other words, the word 'accident' always implies an unforeseen, fortuitous, or unexpected event. Administrative or criminal action for damage resulting from a maritime accident against those considered to have been at fault or otherwise negligent is resorted to more frequently today. This is also the area where most difficulties for seafarers that may lead to unfair treatment may occur. This is due to the fact that in many maritime accident cases some type of direct or indirect human error or omission is likely to be present. This error or omission may not necessarily involve only those operating the vessel. In some cases a vessel may have been improperly constructed, repaired or even loaded without the direct involvement of those in charge of the vessel. In other cases, weather conditions, totally beyond the control of the seafarers involved, may have resulted in a major grounding with commensurate damage from pollutants. In other cases, cargo operations undertaken by stevedores, again generally beyond the control of the seafarers involved, may result in personal injury and death. Yet in such cases administrative and criminal action is often taken against the seafarers on the subject vessel.

Flag states have specific jurisdiction to take administrative and/or criminal action against seafarers operating vessels under their flag who have been proven to be reckless or incompetent or who have been under the influence of alcohol or narcotics

¹ See IMO Doc. LEG 90/15, paras. 379-383

when an accident has occurred.² Coastal and port states also have certain, strictly limited, rights to take action especially if damage has occurred.³ It has long been accepted under established international human rights provisions that anyone accused of a crime should always be treated fairly and be provided with all available legal rights. This is also spelt out specifically under the UNCLOS regime.⁴

Given this very brief initial assessment of state responses, the question arises of why the fair treatment has arisen in the first place? Some of this difficulty appears to have arisen from the concern about the 'criminalisation of maritime accidents.' This may well be the wrong starting point. Most states utilize their criminal law system when maritime accidents and commensurate damage, injury and death occur. That is also confirmed in the responses to the questionnaires. Furthermore, there is no question that sovereign states have every right to criminally prosecute individuals and other entities for maritime accidents, occurring in their jurisdiction, that are in breach of national law. The problem is not the use of criminal law but its *administration* that has appeared to lead to unfair treatment of seafarers, especially in cases where there is evidence that such seafarers had no direct responsibility for the accident. For example, if a vessel laden with a pollutant cargo experiences an engine breakdown and subsequently grounds and causes serious pollution, although the master has done everything possible to prevent the grounding, he can hardly be held criminally responsible for the damage that occurs?

Although the coastal state is likely to have national law provisions that make pollution a criminal offence it can only be applied if there was clear evidence that the accident that caused the pollution was due to a deliberate or negligent act. Frequent cases involving oily water separators that have been poorly maintained or otherwise tampered with are good examples. However, if the negligent act could be attributed to the shipowner, cargo owner, or other entity, but not to those in charge of the ship, criminal sanctions against the seafarers involved will be limited. At best the coastal state could ensure that those in charge of the vessel would supply whatever material evidence might be required to impose criminal or civil law sanctions on those entities that were considered to have ultimate responsibility for the accident and the damage.

However it is at this stage that the 'unfair treatment' problem often arises. There may be several causes for this. Firstly, the damaged state may be frustrated in receiving insufficient cooperation from the relevant shipowner or other entity. In some cases, the shipowner may be difficult to locate, especially in cases of single-ship companies. As a result, this may result in the relevant seafarers being held longer than necessary—almost as an inducement for those responsible to come forward. Secondly, there may be differences of opinion between the damaged state and those in charge of the vessel on technical matters that led to the accident. The master and chief-engineer may have a certain loyalty to the shipowner in order to protect the owner's interests, which may be interpreted as a lack of cooperation with the damaged state. In other cases, a master, who may have experienced the trauma of losing his ship, perhaps involving loss of life and pollution damage may be reluctant or even be physically unable to cooperate as fully as may be expected by the coastal state. In other cases, the coastal state may itself be partially to blame for what eventually occurred and is then anxious to ensure that those in charge of the vessel become the principal 'scapegoats'. There are numerous other permutations that may all lead to the misadministration of otherwise acceptable criminal law provisions and the commensurate lengthy detention and unfair treatment of

² UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1982, (UNCLOS) Arts. 94, 97 & 217

³ UNCLOS, Arts. 21, 25, 27, 218, 220, 225, 226, 228, 231 & 232

⁴ UNCLOS, Art. 230

seafarers. In other words, the principal problem in this area is administrative rather than legal.

IMO/ILO Responses and Action

As a result of these problems, a number of states, international organisations and professional groups have expressed their concern about this growing phenomenon to the IMO, as well as the ILO. In response a 'Joint IMO/ILO *Ad Hoc* Expert Working Group on the Fair Treatment of Seafarers in the Event of a Maritime Accident' was formed in September 2004 and finalized later that year.⁵ This Working Group, drawn from China, Egypt, Greece, Nigeria, Panama, Philippines, Turkey and the USA, as well as four shipowner and four seafarer members, was requested to provide recommendations to the IMO Legal Committee and the ILO Governing Body, including draft guidelines on the fair treatment of seafarers in the event of a maritime accident. The Working Group's Terms of Reference required that account should be taken of the relevant international instruments. The Joint Working Group, chaired by Ambassador Liliana Fernandez of Panama, held its initial meeting at the IMO in London in January 2005. The terms of reference of the group were also finalized at that stage.⁶ In addition, it was decided that a 'correspondence group' composed of other maritime interests, including interested states, would be formed. This group was requested to assist the Joint Working Group in its deliberations through specific, expert input. In particular, the correspondence group would include a number of non-governmental organizations such as:

- Comité Maritime International (CMI)
- International Shipping Federation (ISF)
- International Chamber of Shipping (ICS)
- International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICTFTU)
- International Association of Classification Societies (IACS)
- Baltic and International Maritime Council (BIMCO)
- International Federation of Shipmasters' Associations (IFSMA)
- International Group of P&I Associations
- International Association of Independent Tanker Owners (INTERTANKO)
- International Christian Maritime Association (ICMA)

During 2005 the IMO/ILO Correspondence Group received input and submissions from a number of these interests. At the 24th Assembly of the IMO a 'Resolution on Guidelines on Fair Treatment of Seafarers in the Event of a Maritime Accident' was adopted.⁷ This Resolution was also adopted by the ILO Governing Body at its 292nd Session in March 2005. At the same time the IMO/ILO *Ad Hoc* Expert Working Group also decided that its second session would be held in London 13-17 March 2006 and issued an invitation to IMO member states, UN and other specialized agencies, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations to attend.⁸

At this stage a number of specific responses to the 'Guidelines' were submitted to the IMO/ILO Working Group by interested members of the 'Correspondence Group'. This included a submission from the ISF, ICS and ICFTU,⁹ as well as working documents from the CMI and IFSMA, which were appended in a 'Progress Report from the Correspondence Group' tabled in January 2006.¹⁰ This resulted in a progress report on the IMO/ILO working group first and second sessions being submitted to the 91st session of the IMO Legal Committee in April 2006. During this session the IMO Secretariat introduced a set of agreed guidelines. This was then extensively discussed

⁵ See: ILO Doc. GB.291/STM/4 of November 2004 and IMO Doc. IMO/ILO/WGFTS1/WP.6 of 19 January 2005

⁶ IMO Doc: IMO/ILO IWGFTS 1/111 of 3 February 2005

⁷ IMO Resolution A.987(24). See IMO Doc: A 24/5(b)/1)

⁸ IMO Doc: A1/A/4.ILO. Circular Letter No. 2679 of 19 November 2005

⁹ IMO Doc: IMO/ILO/WGFTS 3 of 3 January 2006

¹⁰ IMO Doc: IMO/ILO/WGFTS 2 of January 2006

by the Legal Committee and resulted in a number of changes and a Resolution that contained a final set of approved guidelines.¹¹ This was submitted to the ILO Governing Body and approved in mid-June 2006. As a result, the 'Guidelines on Fair Treatment of Seafarers in the Event of a Maritime Accident' entered into force on 1 July 2006, but are, of course, subject to voluntary acceptance by states.

CMI Responses and Action

As already indicated above, the CMI was also specifically requested to assist in this work. In response, the 'CMI International Working Group on the Fair Treatment of Seafarers' (CMI-IWG) was formed in October 2004 to provide an initial response to this request.¹² The CMI International Working Group commenced its work as soon as it had been formed and decided that it should concentrate its efforts in three areas:

- A CMI Questionnaire on the subject matter to be sent out to CMI member states;
- Developing close contacts and communications with other members of the IMO/ILO Correspondence Group; and,
- Participation in a Panel Discussion on the 'Fair Treatment' subject at the CMI Colloquium in Cape Town, South Africa, in February 2006.

The CMI International Working Group's Questionnaire on Fair Treatment of Seafarers was sent to 52 member states in December 2004 by the CMI Head Office. The questionnaire covered administrative and criminal action that may be taken by states in the aftermath of maritime accidents. Responses were received from 27 states representing a variety of legal and maritime administrative systems.¹³ Although a response rate to a CMI questionnaire of 50 per cent is apparently considered satisfactory, it is disappointing that no responses were received from a number of states that have had specific difficulties in the area under discussion.¹⁴

These responses have been expertly summarized by David Hebden of the CMI Working Group.¹⁵ The common theme in the responses is that although most states have the right to exercise investigative, administrative powers when a maritime accident occurs, such powers are always designed to protect the rights of the individuals who are involved. Furthermore, the responses also indicate that criminal action is only applicable in cases where there has been a clear breach of national law by the individual who is being charged. In other words, according to the responses, seafarers subject to criminal action must be presented with clear evidence of a breach of criminal law that led to the accident. From the responses it appears that if no such evidence is present, the coastal,

¹¹ Report of the Legal Committee on the Work of its 91st Session, Annex 2, IMO Doc. LEG 91/12 of 9 May 2006

¹² The Working Group consists of: Prof. Edgar Gold, CM, AM, QC, of the Marine and Shipping Law Unit, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia, Chairman; Michael Chalos, of Fowler, Rodriguez & Chalos New York; David Hebden, Marine Consultant, formerly of Thomas Cooper & Stibbard, London, who succeeded Prof. Gold as Chairman of the Working Group in February 2006; Linda Howlett, General Manager-Legal, International Chamber of Shipping (ICS), London; Kim Jefferies, Senior Claims Executive and Legal Adviser, Gard P&I Club, Arendal, Norway; and, Prof. P.K. Mukherjee, ITF Professor of Maritime Safety, World Maritime University Malmö, Sweden. Natalie Wiseman, the Secretary of the International Shipping Federation, London, and Colin de la Rue, of Ince & Co. London, are corresponding members. The CMI President, Me Jean-Serge Rohart, and Immediate Past President, Patrick Griggs are ex-officio Members. Three members of the Working Group, including the present and former chair, are also master mariners with extensive sea-going service.

¹³ Argentina; Australia; Bulgaria; Belgium; Brazil; Canada; Chile; China; Croatia; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Finland; France; Germany; Hong Kong; Italy; Japan; Korea (Republic of); Nigeria; Norway; Slovenia; South Africa; United Kingdom; Uruguay; USA. In addition, an incomplete response was received from Indonesia.

¹⁴ Spain and Russia

¹⁵ Available from the CMI web site (www.comitemaritime.org)

port or flag state can only mount an administrative enquiry that may result in monetary penalties for the individuals involved or the ship that was the source of the accidental damage.

The CMI Questionnaire responses also indicate that a majority of states have the legislative powers to detain seafarers who have been involved in maritime accidents so that administrative and criminal investigations can proceed. However, such states also indicate that such detention would always be for a reasonable period. The responses indicate that seafarers held as 'material witnesses' must be treated properly and that no discrimination between nationals and foreigners is permitted. Although there are some administrative differences between states that apply 'common law' principles and those subject to civil law, in general, the responses indicate that the rights of individuals are paramount in cases where the criminal law is applicable.

During the year the CMI Working Group also made contact and worked closely with a number of other members of the IMO/ILO Correspondence Group. This was made easier as the ICS and ISF were actually represented on the Working Group. In addition, the chairman also held meetings and corresponded with IFSMA, which had significant involvement in the subject from the beginning, as well as the ICTFU (ITF). Documentation was exchanged whenever available. The CMI Working Group also drafted several working documents, including a paper that was presented at the 'International Conference on Security of Ships, Ports and Coasts 2005'.¹⁶

The CMI Working Group also developed a panel presentation on the subject for the CMI Colloquium in Cape Town in February 2006. The panellists included several members of the CMI Working Group, as well as Dr. Rosalie Balkin, Head of the IMO Legal Division, and Alfred Popp, Q.C., the former chairman of the IMO Legal Committee.¹⁷ The panel presentations led to extensive discussions by participants to the Colloquium and a decision by the CMI to continue to assist the IMO/ILO Working Group in its future work. As a result, several members of the CMI Working Group participated actively in the subsequent IMO meetings, already described above.

The New Guidelines

The Guidelines recognize seafarers as a special category of worker. Given the global nature of the shipping industry and the many different jurisdictions with which they may be in contact, seafarers need special protection, especially in relation with public authorities. As a result, the principal objective of the Guidelines is to ensure that seafarers are treated fairly following a maritime accident and during any subsequent investigation and detention by public authorities and that detention is for no longer than necessary.

The Guidelines provide advice on the necessary steps to be taken by the various interests that may be involved following a maritime accident: the port or coastal state, the flag state, the seafarers' state, the shipowner, and the seafarers themselves. The overall emphasis is on cooperation and communication between the various parties involved and to ensure that no discriminatory or retaliatory measures are taken against seafarers because of their involvement or participation in investigations. For example, the Guidelines set out some 22 steps that port and coastal states are required to consider, in order to ensure that investigations are conducted with speed, civility and full regard to seafarers' legal and human rights and their special position in the jurisdiction in which they find themselves. In this connection references are made to the rights of

¹⁶ Edgar Gold, "Initiatives on Fair Treatment of Seafarers by the Comité Maritime International". Halifax, NS, Canada, September 2005

¹⁷ Details are available on the CMI web site (www.comitemaritime.org)

individuals and duties of governments under the *Vienna Convention on Consular Relations*, MARPOL 73/78, and the 'IMO Code for the Investigations of Marine Casualties and Incidents'.

The Guidelines also enumerate 12 considerations to be taken into account by flag states in relation to the fair treatment of seafarers. The main requirement for flag states, when not conducting their own investigations, is to assist other investigating states and to facilitate the fair treatment of seafarers serving on flag state vessels. Similarly, the Guidelines also provide the seafarer's state with 8 aspects to consider when investigations involving their citizens take place. Although such a state may not have a specific legal obligation to assist, the Guidelines suggest that there is a moral obligation. In many cases, where seafarers are employed under other flags, the seafarer's state has frequently not bothered to become involved. The Guidelines attempt to rectify this problem.

The negotiations that produced the new Guidelines had particular difficulties in framing provisions that would be applicable to shipowners and the seafarers themselves. Shipowners were concerned about protecting their legal position as owners of property, obligations under carriage and insurance contracts, as well as exposure to costs of maintenance and welfare for seafarers detained in foreign ports. The Guidelines attempt to address these concerns in seven specific provisions for shipowners. On the other hand, those representing the interests of seafarers during the discussions were principally concerned that seafarers be protected from exposing themselves to criminal justice processes by making statements without legal advice and their lack of familiarity with the rights to silence and self-incrimination. This was addressed in four specific provisions for Seafarers in the Guidelines.

Conclusion

The conclusion of the Guidelines represents a positive step forward in this complex area. The responses to the CMI questionnaire revealed that although states have effective legislation that is designed to protect the legal rights of seafarers, such laws are frequently and regularly disregarded. That raises the question on whether states that disregard their own laws will implement guidelines that are voluntary.

A number of states expressed concerns about the effectiveness of the new Guidelines at the IMO Legal Committee meeting April 2006. International organizations representing seafarers, such as IFSMA and the ICFTU felt that voluntary guidelines still provided insufficient protection for seafarers. It was argued very forcefully that such protection could only occur if the guidelines became mandatory. This may indeed be true! As a result, the IMO Legal Committee decided that an *ad hoc* Working Group should be convened at its October 2006 meeting and recommend any changes to the new Guidelines that may be necessary. A number of states¹⁸ have already expressed the wish to review the Guidelines later this year.¹⁹ The concerns expressed included:

- Lack of clarity that the Guidelines were not intended to apply to incidents committed with criminal intent
- The definition of 'maritime accident' lacked reference to actual or potential damage or injury
- The Guidelines should be interpreted and applied in conformity with domestic law
- The right to avoid self-incrimination needs to be more clearly addressed
- The ultimate obligation to pay wages rests upon the shipowner and not on states

¹⁸ Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Netherlands, Norway, Singapore, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States

¹⁹ IMO Doc. LEG 92/6/X of 11 August 2006

- Although reference is made to have warships excluded no reference is made to state vessels operated for non-commercial purposes

It is hoped that most of these concerns can be addressed with only minor adjustments to the Guidelines. The CMI Working Group continues to be actively involved and has, in fact, created a small sub-committee to work directly with the US government on the US concerns.²⁰

One of the principal reasons why there was such excellent cooperation between the various sectors of the maritime industry in reaching these Guidelines was the awareness of the fact that this problem has a direct and very negative effect on attracting new personnel into the seagoing industry. This is exacerbated by the additional consideration that at present there is already a shortage of skilled senior engineer and navigating officers and looming shortage in other areas in the near future. At this stage, it is too early to assess how effective of this new initiative will be. Yet it is clearly in the interest of all sectors of the shipping industry, as well as coastal states, to ensure that every effort is made to implement these measures. 'Scapegoating' seafarers is of no advantage to anyone!

²⁰ Two CMI Working Group members, Kim Jefferies of Gard P&I and Michael Chalos of New York are working directly with the USCG on this matter through Elizabeth Burrell of New York, the President of the USMLA

The IMO/ILO Guidelines on Fair Treatment of Seafarers
in the Event of a Maritime Accident:
A CMI Update

Prof. Edgar Gold, AM, QC
Marine & Shipping Law Unit, University of Queensland

MLAANZ 33rd Annual Conference
Sydney, 27-29 September 2006

IMO/ILO Guidelines
DEFINITIONS

“Maritime Accident” means any unforeseen occurrence or physical event connected to the navigation, operations, manoeuvring or handling of ships, or the machinery, equipment, material, or cargo on board such ships which may result in the detention of seafarers

IMO/ILO Guidelines

DEFINITIONS

“Detention” means any restriction on the movement of seafarers by public authorities, imposed as a result of a maritime accident, including preventing them leaving the territory of a State other than the seafarer’s country of nationality or residence.

IMO/ILO Guidelines

APPLICABILITY

- Port or Coastal State
(22 Provisions)
- Flag State
(12 Provisions)
- Seafarer State
(8 Provisions)
- Shipowners
(7 Provisions)
- Seafarer
(4 Provisions)

IMO/ILO Guidelines

MAIN PROVISIONS

Port or Coastal States

- Fair and expeditious investigation
- Cooperation and communication with all interested parties
- Preservation of Seafarers' human and economic rights
- Ensure/verify that adequate subsistence for detained seafarers is provided
- Non-discriminatory due process of law provision
- Ensure the provision of adequate legal and interpretation services for detained seafarers

IMO/ILO Guidelines

MAIN PROVISIONS

Port or Coastal States contd.

- Detained seafarers to receive full information on the basis of any investigation
- Detained seafarers to be provided with the means to communicate privately with family members as well as all parties that may provide assistance
- Minimization of the need for the continuing physical presence of seafarers
- Conduct interviews promptly but taking into account the seafarers' physical and mental state in the aftermath of a maritime accident

IMO/ILO Guidelines

MAIN PROVISIONS

Port or Coastal States contd.

- Non-custodial alternatives to be considered
- Compensation for unreasonable or unjustified detention
- Decisions to be consistent with UNCLOS and MARPOL
- No discriminatory or retaliatory measures to be taken against seafarers because of their participation during investigations

IMO/ILO Guidelines

MAIN PROVISIONS

Flag States

- Fair and expeditious investigations
- Cooperation and Communication with all interested parties
- Utilization the 'IMO Code for the Investigation of Maritime Casualties and Incidents' when appropriate
- Fund the repatriation of detained seafarers when shipowners fail in this obligation
- Ensure that flag state consular officials are given access to the detained seafarers

IMO/ILO Guidelines MAIN PROVISIONS

Seafarer State

- Cooperation and communication with all interested parties
- Monitor the physical and mental well-being and treatment of seafarers
- Fund the repatriation of seafarers where shipowners and flag states have failed to do so
- Ensure adequate access to consular officials for detained seafarers
- Ensure that all funds remitted for the support of detained seafarers' families are properly distributed

IMO/ILO Guidelines MAIN PROVISIONS

Shipowners

- Ensure that no discriminatory or retaliatory measures are taken against seafarers because of their participation in any investigation
- Cooperate and communicate as required with all interested parties in order to expedite investigations
- Encourage seafarers in their employ to cooperate with authorities in any investigations
- Use all reasonable means to preserve evidence so as to minimize the physical presence of seafarers in the investigating jurisdiction

IMO/ILO Guidelines

MAIN PROVISIONS

Shipowners contd.

- Fulfil obligations for the repatriation or re-embarkation of detained seafarers
- Ensure and verify that detained seafarers are provided with adequate subsistence, including wages, suitable accommodation, food and medical care
- Protect the legal rights of seafarers in their employ, including the right to avoid self-incrimination

IMO/ILO Guidelines

MAIN PROVISIONS

Seafarers

- Ensure that they fully understand their right not to self-incriminate when making statements to investigators, as these may be used in future criminal action
- Ensure, where necessary, that they have access to legal advice prior to giving statements to investigators
- Participate and cooperate in any investigation and provide truthful information