IMPLEMENTATION OF IMO CONVENTIONS IN PAKISTAN

AUTHOR
Advocate Sher Afzal Khan Babar

National Institute of Maritime Affairs
www.nimapak.org /nimaisb dnima@bahria.edu.pk nima_pakistan /nimaisb

CHAPTER 1

STUDY PARAMETERS

1.1 Introduction

In today's interconnected world, nations are linked through international conventions, charters, protocols, and treaties. These instruments enable collective action on global challenges, foster mutual growth, and promote peaceful coexistence. Concept of a "global village" emphasizes the need for cooperation among nations.

Pakistan's role is crucial as a significant player in regional and global affairs. With a growing population nearly exceeding 240 million (World Bank, 2022) and a strategic location, Pakistan's active participation in international conventions and agreements is essential for advancing its national interests and contributing to global governance.

International conventions, charters, protocols, and treaties provide a normative framework for addressing pressing issues, including human rights, environmental protection, trade, and maritime law. These instruments facilitate cooperation, establish legal frameworks, and promote peace and stability.

For Pakistan, accession to international instruments is crucial for enhancing its global standing, ensuring economic development, and addressing transnational challenges. By acceding to these agreements, Pakistan can demonstrate its commitment to upholding international norms and standards, thereby bolstering its reputation as a responsible member of the international community.

This research report examines the significance of IMO conventions for Pakistan, analyzing existing conventions, identifying ratified agreements, and elucidating the importance of unratified conventions. By exploring Pakistan's participation in IMO conventions, this research aims to provide a nuanced understanding of the country's role in global maritime governance.

This research report serves as a foundational framework for evaluating Pakistan's involvement in international conventions, highlighting the importance of global cooperation in addressing shared challenges and opportunities. By examining the intersections between Pakistan's national interests and its engagement with IMO conventions, this study seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of the country's position within the global maritime landscape.

1.2 Primary Questions

The study answers the following key questions:

a. How many IMO conventions and protocols have so far been adopted and enforced?

b. How have those conventions been grouped?

c. Which of those conventions has Pakistan ratified?

d. To which national legislation, have the ratified IMO conventions been transposed directly or impliedly?

e. Which conventions has Pakistan not ratified?

1.3 Secondary Questions

Besides primary questions, the study has also answers the following secondary questions:

a. Which are the conventions Pakistan may ratify?

b. Which are the conventions Pakistan may not ratify?

c. How does Pakistan's ratification ratio compare to that of nonratification?

d. How does Pakistan's ratification ratio compare to that of regional countries?

1.4 Objectives

The following objectives of the research study have been achieved:

a. To provide a contextual overview of the IMO conventions relevant to Pakistan's maritime interests.

b. To analyze the grounds for ratifying more IMO conventions that Pakistan has not yet ratified.

c. To analyze the ratification status of regional countries.

d. To assess the grounds for the IMO conventions Pakistan may never ratify.

e. To assess the extent to which Pakistan has successfully transposed ratified conventions into national legislation.

f. To synthesize stakeholder insights into practical recommendations for policymakers.

g. To provide final conclusions with actionable recommendations for Pakistan's engagement with international legal frameworks, including proposed corrections to national laws.

1.5 Scope

This comprehensive study has deliberately focused on the pivotal areas of international law and International Maritime Organization (IMO) conventions, as these are paramount to Maritime Affairs. The majority of conventions adopted under the auspices of IMO or for which the Organization is otherwise responsible, fall into three main categories. The first group is concerned with maritime safety; the second with the prevention of marine pollution; and the third with liability and compensation, especially in relation to damage caused by pollution. Outside these major groupings are a number of other conventions dealing with facilitation, tonnage measurement, unlawful acts against shipping and salvage, etc. Apart from IMO conventions ILO convention on Marine Labour Convention 2006 being relevant to maritime affairs has also been studied.

In addition to achieving the predefined objectives of this study, Chapter 2 undertakes a critical examination of the process of implementing international law, providing a nuanced understanding of the complexities involved. Chapters 3 to 6 discuss the total IMO conventions, Chapter 7 examines ratified and non-ratified conventions, and the final chapter presents conclusions and recommendations. Details of the chapters are submitted hereunder:

a. Chapter – 1 Study Parameters (this chapter)

b. Chapter – 2 Mechanism for Implementation of International Law and Conventions

c. Chapter – 3 IMO Conventions Related to Maritime Safety

d. Chapter – 4 IMO Conventions Related to Maritime Pollution

e. Chapter – 5 IMO Conventions Related to Liability and Compensation for Damages

f. Chapter – 6 Conventions Related to Seafarers / Fishers

g. Chapter – 7 IMO Conventions Ratified and Not Ratified by Pakistan

h. Chapter – 8 Conclusions & Recommendations

1.6 Methodology

The following methodology was adopted:

a. Literature Review: Examine existing literature on implementation of conventions and international law. Examine contents of IMO conventions and Pakistan's participation.

b. Data Collection: Compile a comprehensive list of IMO conventions and identify Pakistan's ratification status.

c. Case Studies: Analyze all the conventions not ratified by Pakistan.

d. Gap Analysis: Identify conventions Pakistan has ratified but not transposed to national legislation. Scan relevant legislation for any error.

e. Personal Engagement: Engage with policymakers, legal experts, and international organizations to gather insights.

CHAPTER 2

IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW: TREATIES, CONVENTIONS, PROTOCOLS, CHARTERS, ETC.

2.1 International Law and Key Terms

The proliferation of treaties, conventions, protocols, and charters has catalyzed the widespread adoption of the term "international law," which denotes a complex framework of legal norms and principles that regulate inter-state relations (Shaw, 2017). Since its inception, the discipline of international law has contended with an enduring challenge: how to ensure compliance among sovereign states in the absence of a centralized enforcement mechanism, akin to a global "police force", or a consolidated judicial system equipped to adjudicate disputes uniformly across diverse legal jurisdictions (Krasner, 1983). This inquiry raises essential questions regarding state sovereignty, the effectiveness of multilateral institutions, and the role of customary international law in promoting adherence to international obligations.

In contrast to municipal law, which is enforced by governmental authorities through coercive measures such as arrest and punishment (Austin, 1832), international law fundamentally relies on the voluntary cooperation and consent of states. The absence of a centralized authority capable of governing all countries has historically presented a significant impediment to the effective enforcement of international law (Bull, 1977). As articulated by Brownlie (2006), "*the decentralized nature of international law, coupled with the absence of a universal legislature, has necessitated a reliance on consent-based enforcement mechanisms that hinge on the goodwill of states*." This intricate landscape underscores the importance of diplomatic engagement, negotiation, and the cultivation of a normative culture conducive to compliance, as states navigate the complexities of their international commitments.

2.2 Defining Key International Legal Instruments

A salient inquiry within the domain of international law revolves around the nuanced distinctions between treaties, conventions, protocols, and charters. Although these terms are frequently utilized interchangeably in everyday discourse, a meticulous examination reveals subtle differentiations that critically influence their formulation, enforcement, and precedence within the *international* legal architecture. To elucidate the intricacies inherent in these legal instruments, it is imperative to delineate each term and explore the existence of a hierarchical structure, determining whether one category of instrument possesses greater legal authority than another (Shaw, 2017).

The definitions of international instruments can be precisely articulated as follows:

a. **Treaty:** A formal, legally binding agreement between sovereign nations encompassing a broad spectrum of subjects, from

trade and commerce to human rights (Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 1969). For instance, The Indus Waters Treaty 1960 between India and Pakistan.

b. **Convention:** A specific category of treaties, typically negotiated under the auspices of an international organization (such as the International Maritime Organization or the United Nations). Conventions often delineate detailed regulations on specialized matters, exemplified by the SOLAS Convention (1974) concerning ship safety.

c. **Protocol:** An ancillary agreement that modifies or enlarges the scope of an existing treaty. An illustrative example is the STCW Manila Amendments, 2010, which updated the original STCW Convention by introducing new training regulations.

d. **Charter:** A foundational treaty establishing an international organization or articulating broad principles. While legally binding, the term often embodies significant symbolic implications, representing collective state commitments. For instance, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) or the UN Charter 1945, which is the constitution of United Nations.

Through these distinctions, it becomes evident that an intricate interplay exists among various international legal instruments, each contributing uniquely to the entity of international relations and law.

2.3 Precedence of International Instruments

From a strict legal perspective, a hierarchical structure among international instruments is essentially nonexistent; each treaty, convention, or protocol, once duly ratified, holds equal legal binding force. Nonetheless, practical distinctions arise, shaped by the distinctive characteristics and operative functions of each instrument. For instance, foundational documents like the United Nations Charter may exert a heightened diplomatic influence due to their pivotal role in establishing the overarching frameworks of global governance (United Nations, 1945).

Generally, treaties and charters encompass broader thematic scopes, tackling comprehensive global issues, while conventions and protocols often delineate more specialized domains of inquiry, centering on specific regulatory concerns. Protocols serve as adaptable mechanisms, providing a flexible approach that allows for timely modifications in response to emerging international challenges. This adaptability is particularly illustrated by the environmental protocols enacted under the auspices of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC, 1992), which exemplify the dynamic nature of contemporary international law.

Ultimately, the terminological distinction between instruments, be it treaty, convention, protocol, or charter, is of secondary significance; the crux lies in the legal commitments undertaken by states to adhere to the stipulations enshrined

within these frameworks (Krasner, 1983). A comprehensive compliance audit mechanism, bolstered by the ratification of treaties, remains the most effective means of ensuring adherence to international obligations in practice.

2.4 Working for International Law without Strict Enforcement

The implementation of international instruments commences with the formal deposit of the instrument of ratification, approval, acceptance, or accession with the appropriate secretariat of the relevant international organization such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the World Health Organization (WHO), or the World Trade Organization (WTO) which sponsors the instrument in question. Upon the fulfillment of the requisite threshold of ratifications, as specified by the international organization at the time of adoption, the instrument gains enforceability.

The terminology “ratification,” “approval,” “acceptance,” and “accession” encompasses distinct modalities through which a state manifests its consent to be legally bound by a treaty or international instrument. While these terms are often employed interchangeably in colloquial discourse, they possess specific procedural connotations within the framework of international law. The following definitions delineate these concepts:

a. **Ratification:** This represents a formal act through which a state confirms its commitment to adhere to a treaty that it has previously signed. Ratification typically entails an extensive domestic process, requiring validation by pertinent authorities or legislative bodies. Normally it is done after enforcement of the convention.

b. **Approval:** Equivalent to ratification, approval signifies a formal expression of a state's consent to be bound by a treaty. The nuances distinguishing approval from ratification may differ contingent upon the state’s internal legal processes or the particulars of the treaty.

c. **Acceptance:** Acceptance constitutes another mechanism through which a state conveys its consent to be bound by a treaty. Mirroring ratification and approval, acceptance involves a formal act signifying the state's intent to comply with the treaty's stipulations.

d. **Accession:** Accession refers to the process by which a state that has not signed a treaty, possibly due to its absence during negotiations or its non-existence at the time of signing, formally agrees to adhere to its provisions. Accession essentially embodies a “joining” process, wherein a state, previously uninvolved in the treaty’s formation, opts to become a party to it.

The pressing inquiry arises how these instruments can be effectively enforced in the absence of a comprehensive international policing mechanism? This poses a significant challenge; however, an exploration of the multifaceted

difficulties inherent in the implementation of treaties, conventions, protocols, and charters can elucidate the matter:

a. **Power Imbalances:** Dominant states frequently operate with impunity, circumventing obligations without facing tangible repercussions, while smaller nations bear disproportionate pressure to comply.

b. **Lack of Effective Sanctions:** Diverging from domestic legal frameworks, contravening international commitments seldom incurs serious penalties, undermining the deterrent effect of compliance.

c. **Cumbersome Legal Reform:** The process of amending global regulations requires consensus among states, rendering timely adaptations an arduous task.

In light of these challenges, several potential mechanisms for the implementation of international law are:

a. **Voluntary Compliance:** A substantial number of countries adhere to international norms as a matter of self-interest. For instance, regulations governing maritime safety, such as the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), are consistently observed since nations seek to avert maritime disasters within their jurisdictions (IMO, 2020).

b. **Peer Pressure and Reputation:** States are acutely aware of their international standing. Noncompliance with treaties can lead to diminished trust and reduced trade opportunities (Chayes & Chayes, 1995).

c. **Economic Incentives:** Regulatory frameworks such as the Container Safety Convention (CSC) are effective because adherence is vital for businesses seeking to engage in international trade. No nation desires the blockade of its goods at foreign ports (Smith, 2015). Incentives like carbon credits extension of support from donor agencies at time make states adhere to an international instrument.

d. **International Organizations:** Role of International Court of Justice (ICJ) and International Tribunal for Law of the Sea (ITLOS) is restricted to dispute resolution that too if the states involved accept jurisdiction of ICJ or ITLOS. However, IMO through member states audit system, the THETIS system, an electronic platform developed by the Paris Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Port State Control and the Tokyo Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Port State Control (PSC) are the arrangements to enhance maritime safety, security, and environmental protection by inspecting vessels.

2.5 IMO Member State Audit Scheme (IMSAS)

International Maritime Organization is the United Nations specialized agency with responsibility for the safety and security of shipping and the prevention of marine and atmospheric pollution by ships. IMO's work supports the UN sustainable development goals. IMO has six main bodies concerned with the adoption or implementation of conventions. The Assembly and Council are the main organs, and the committees involved are the Maritime Safety Committee, Marine Environment Protection Committee, Legal Committee and the Facilitation Committee. Developments in shipping and other related industries are discussed by Member States in these bodies, and the need for a new convention or amendments to existing conventions can be raised in any of them. IMO itself is governed by IMO convention 1948.

Among the most efficacious tools for ensuring adherence to international conventions is IMO's Member State Audit Scheme (IMSAS). It serves to assess whether member countries are effectively implementing the treaties they have ratified.

The IMO Member State Audit Scheme creates a basis to assess the extent to which a Member State complies with its obligations set out in the various IMO instruments to which it is a Party. In addition, the IMO Instruments Implementation (III) Code (resolution A. 1070(28)) stipulates a number of principles a Member State should adhere to in order for its maritime administration to deliver on its obligations and responsibilities, with respect to maritime safety and protection of the marine environment, and to be capable of improving its performance in the discharge of its duties (IMO audit Pakistan Interim report 2022).

2.6 Objectives and Purpose

The core objectives and purposes of the IMO audit are delineated as follows:

a. **Universal Compliance Verification:** IMSAS endeavors to ensure uniform global adherence to IMO conventions, including SOLAS, MARPOL, STCW, and MLC. It systematically assesses whether member states have transposed these treaties into their national legal frameworks and whether they are effectively operationalizing them.

b. **Performance Benchmarking:** The scheme provides an objective, empirical assessment of a nation's maritime administration, pinpointing areas of regulatory strength and identifying deficiencies in enforcement practices.

c. **Capacity Building:** The audit findings facilitate the IMO in customizing technical assistance programs for developing nations, thereby reinforcing their capabilities to meet established international standards.

d. **Transparency and Accountability:** By institutionalizing mandatory audits, the IMO enhances transparency within maritime governance, mitigating substandard shipping practices and fostering a culture of accountability.

2.7 Legal Basis and Scope

The legal underpinnings for the IMO audit encompass the following:

a. **Mandated Framework:** Codified through IMO Resolution A.1067 (28) in 2013, the audit process is rendered compulsory for all member states, reinforcing the obligation to adhere to international norms.

b. **Non-Punitive Approach:** IMSAS adopts a cooperative framework rather than a punitive methodology, promoting a continuous improvement regime among member states.

2.8 Challenges and Criticisms

While the IMO audits undeniably enhance compliance, several challenges persist:

a. **Resource Constraints:** Several states face fiscal limitations impeding their capacity to implement necessary corrective actions arising from audit recommendations.

b. **Non-Binding Nature:** Although audits are obligatory, the enforcement of recommendations hinges on voluntary compliance, raising concerns about the efficacy of the system.

c. **Frequency:** Auditing can occur on a seven-year cycle, which may result in vulnerability to emerging maritime issues that necessitate timely intervention.

2.9 Paris MoU's THETIS System

The other important system of shipping governance at the global level is the Paris MoU's THETIS System. It has a Centralized Database to store inspection records, deficiencies, detentions, and ship risk profiles. This data is linked with EQUASIS (global ship safety database) for broader transparency. Based on this data Ship Risk Profile (SRP) is calculated and automatically categorizes vessels as High-Risk (HRS), Standard-Risk (SRS), or Low-Risk (LRS). Factors include flag performance, age, inspection history, and company performance. Through the system, Real-Time Alerts & Targeting are done. High-risk ships are called for priority inspections, and Tracks are banned for repeatedly non-compliant vessels. It ensures consistent PSC inspections across 27 member states (all European). Annual performance statistics are issued to flag states, classification societies, and ship owners. This system reduces manual

paperwork and inspection delays. For Transparency, publicly accessible detention lists, and ship performance data are displayed.

The THETIS system is a cornerstone of the Paris MoU's success, ensuring smarter, data-driven port state control. Its real-time risk assessment and transparency set a benchmark for other PSC regimes.

2.10 Tokyo Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Port State Control

Before the Tokyo MoU, port state control was fragmented, with varying inspection standards across Asia-Pacific nations. Following the success of the Paris MoU (1982) in Europe, the Asia-Pacific region established its own PSC regime. It was officially signed in Tokyo, Japan, on December 1, 1993, and entered into force on April 1, 1994. However, Paris MoU has the highest detention rate (8-10%), whereas Tokyo MoU has the largest coverage area (Asia-Pacific dominance).

Established in 1993 and enforced from 1994, the Tokyo MoU aims to eliminate substandard shipping and information sharing through coordinated port state inspections, ensuring compliance with IMO conventions. IMO's Port State Control Procedures [Resolution A.1155(32) 2021] provides the legal basis for this MoU. However, it faces the following challenges in enforcement consistency:

a. Inconsistent enforcement among member states.

b. Lack of resources in some countries (e.g., Pacific Island nations).

c. Rising ship traffic leading to inspection backlogs.

d. Detention disproportionately affects smaller flag states.

e. Slow digitalization compared to Paris MoU's THETIS system.

2.11 Conclusion

The most effective is IMO audit because Pakistan has been subjected to it. Details of last audit will reveal that it has matured enough to be considered by member states. Last IMO audit of Pakistan was undertaken from 5 to 20 September 2022, by three auditors drawn from Sri Lanka, Jordan and the IMO Secretariat. The scope of the audit included the flag, coastal and port State obligations of Pakistan in relation to the applicable IMO instruments to which it was a Party. The audit team was appointed by IMO on 23 January 2020 and amended on 10 August 2022.

The pre-audit questionnaire (PAQ) and additional pre-audit information was provided by Pakistan to the audit team on 16 August 2022. The PAQ and the additional pre-audit information were major documents for the preparatory work of the audit team prior to the audit. The Memorandum of Cooperation (MoC) between Pakistan and IMO, concerning participation in the IMO Member State

Audit Scheme, was signed on 21 November 2019. The detailed audit timetable and programme regarding the audit of Pakistan was confirmed on 26 August 2022. The opening meeting was held remotely on 5 September 2022. The closing meeting was held remotely on 20 September 2022. The report provided a detailed account of the findings and the evidence on which the findings were based (IMO audit Pakistan Interim report 2022). All departments of maritime administration represented at the audit meeting.

The above information shows that among the three audit/data-based systems discussed above, IMSAS stands out as the most effective. It has reached a mature stage of implementation, with established procedures including advance notification of audit teams, pre-audit communication of member names, and predetermined audit locations prior to commencement. This structured approach ensures transparency and preparedness for all parties involved.

This concludes discussion on implementation of international law in general and implementation of IMO conventions in particular. In the next chapter, the IMO conventions grouped under maritime safety shall be briefly described.

CHAPTER 3

IMO CONVENTIONS ON MARITIME SAFETY

As discussed in chapter 2 that IMO has Maritime Safety Committee hence there are 25 IMO conventions / protocols related to Maritime Safety, each of those is briefly described in the ensuing paragraphs.

3.1 The International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), 1974

The convention was formally adopted on 1 November 1974, at the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, convened at the International Maritime Organization (IMO) headquarters in London (International Maritime Organization, 1974). Before adoption of SOLAS, maritime safety regulations were characterized by fragmentation and inadequacy, resulting in devastating losses of life and property (Baxter, 2012). The catastrophic sinking of the RMS Titanic in 1912 served as an emotional catalyst, exposing glaring deficiencies in safety standards and prompting the convening of the first SOLAS Convention in 1914 (International Maritime Organization, n.d.). This convention has following additional protocols:

a. **SOLAS Protocol 1978:** It was introduced to address safety concerns specifically related to oil tankers, following major tanker accidents in the 1970s. The protocol strengthened design, operational, and safety requirements for vessels.

b. **SOLAS Protocol 1988:** It was adopted to implement the Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS), revolutionizing maritime communication and emergency response.

c. **SOLAS Agreement 1996:** It is a regional implementation framework under the SOLAS convention. It focuses on special safety requirements for roll-on/roll-off (Ro-Ro) vessels operating in specific regions. This agreement was prompted by disasters like the Estonia sinking (1994) and introduced stricter stability standards. It is not a global protocol, but a regional legal instrument adopted by states to address localized safety challenges.

3.2 The International Convention on Load Lines (LL), 1966

The convention was formally adopted on 5 April 1966 at the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO, later International Maritime Organization (IMO)) headquarters in London, England (International Maritime Organization, 1966). This diplomatic conference culminated nearly a decade of technical preparation by IMCO's Sub-Committee on Stability and Load Lines. It establishes minimum safety standards for the freeboard (the distance from the waterline to the deck) of ships. Its primary purpose is to ensure that vessels have sufficient reserve buoyancy and stability to withstand harsh sea conditions, thereby reducing the risk of sinking or capsizing. The convention has following additional protocol:

a. **The Load Lines Protocol of 1988:** It harmonized the survey and certification requirements of the Load Lines Convention with those of other major IMO conventions, such as SOLAS and MARPOL.

3.3 The International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships, 1969

The convention was adopted on 23 June 1969 during an international conference convened by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) in London, United Kingdom. The convention established the inaugural internationally recognized uniform system for quantifying the tonnage of vessels, superseding a disparate array of national systems that previously engendered inconsistencies and disputes regarding port dues, safety regulations, and manning requirements. The convention introduced two principal tonnage measurements: gross tonnage (GT) and net tonnage (NT), both derived from the vessel's overall volume rather than weight.

3.4 The International Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea (COLREG), 1972

It was adopted on 20 October 1972 at the International Conference on Revision of the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, held in London under the auspices of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) (International Maritime Organization, 1972). It is a cornerstone of maritime safety, ensuring uniformity in navigation rules to prevent collisions between vessels (International Maritime Organization, 1972). Its importance cannot be overstated, as it provides a standardized framework for mariners worldwide, fostering predictability and safety in increasingly congested waterways.

3.5 International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue (SAR), 1979

The International Convention on Maritime Search and Rescue (SAR) was adopted on 27 April 1979 during a conference convened by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) in Hamburg, Germany. The convention delineates standardized protocols and assigns explicit responsibilities to maritime search and rescue entities, mandating that contracting governments implement arrangements to assist individuals in distress at sea, irrespective of their nationality or status, and without regard to the circumstances that led to their peril.

3.6 Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, SUA Convention 1988

The convention was formally adopted in Rome, Italy, on 10 March 1988 under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). It is designed to combat terrorism, piracy, and other unlawful acts targeting ships and maritime navigation. It criminalizes acts such as seizing ships, violence against persons on board, and destroying maritime navigational facilities. The convention has following additional protocols:

a. **SUA Protocol 1988:** It extends the provisions of the SUA Convention to cover unlawful acts against fixed platforms (e.g., oil rigs, offshore installations) located on the continental shelf. It ensures that crimes committed on such platforms are subject to similar legal consequences as those on ships.

b. **SUA Convention 2005 (a):** It modernizes and expands the original treaty to address emerging maritime security threats, including criminalizing the transport of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) by sea, the use of ships for terrorist financing or supporting terrorist acts and strengthens mechanisms for boarding, inspection, and detention of suspect ships.

c. **SUA Protocol 2005 (b):** It applies the updated provisions of the SUA Convention 2005 to fixed platforms, ensuring consistency in addressing threats against offshore installations.

3.7 International Convention on Salvage (SALVAGE), 1989

The SALVAGE Convention was formally adopted on 28 April 1989 at the International Conference on Salvage in London, hosted by the IMO. Major maritime nations, including the United Kingdom, France, and the United States, were among the early adopters, ensuring its widespread application in global shipping. The convention is a pivotal maritime treaty that modernized the legal framework governing salvage operations at sea. The Lloyd's Open Form (LOF) 1980, a widely used salvage contract, introduced a "safety net" clause to address this gap, laying the groundwork for the 1989 Convention.

3.8 Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks (WRC), 2007

The Nairobi International Convention on the Removal of Wrecks (WRC), adopted in 2007 under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), constitutes a significant legal instrument designed to facilitate the prompt and effective removal of shipwrecks that may pose threats to navigation or the marine environment. The convention by establishing a uniform legal framework that delineates the responsibilities of shipowners for locating, marking, and removing wrecks that constitute a hazard, particularly within the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of states. Furthermore, it introduces compulsory insurance mandates, obligating registered shipowners to secure insurance or other financial mechanisms to cover the costs of wreck removal.

3.9 The International Convention for Safe Containers (CSC), 1972

The convention is a important international treaty designed to ensure the structural integrity and safe handling of cargo containers during transportation by sea, land, and air (International Maritime Organization, 1972). It was established under the auspices of the IMO and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE). The CSC sets uniform safety standards for

container design, construction, testing, inspection, and approval. The convention has following additional protocol on its amendments:

a. **Amendments to the International Convention for Safe Containers (CSC), 1993:** It refers to updates made to the convention. These amendments were adopted to enhance safety standards for container design, testing, inspection, and maintenance, ensuring containers withstand the rigors of international transport without posing risks to lives, equipment, or the environment.

3.10 Special Trade Passenger Ships Agreement, 1971

The agreement is an International Maritime Organization (IMO) treaty that sets special safety standards for passenger ships engaged in "special trades," such as pilgrim transport, seasonal migrations, or other high-capacity passenger operations where unique conditions (e.g., overcrowding, long voyages) necessitate enhanced safety measures. It complements the SOLAS Convention by addressing risks specific to these operations. The convention has following additional protocol:

3.11 Protocol on Space Requirements for Special Trade Passenger Ships, 1973

It is an extension of the agreement. It specifically addresses minimum space requirements for passengers on ships engaged in "special trades" (e.g., pilgrim transport, seasonal migrations) to ensure health, safety, and comfort during high-capacity voyages. It complemented the STP Agreement by adding detailed provisions for living space, sanitation, and ventilation.

3.12 Convention on the International Maritime Satellite Organization (IMSO), 1976

The Convention established the International Maritime Satellite Organization (IMSO), now known as the International Mobile Satellite Organization (IMSO). Its primary purpose was to oversee the provision of global maritime satellite communications for safety, distress, and operational efficiency at sea. IMSO initially managed the INMARSAT system, ensuring reliable satellite services for ships worldwide. The convention has following additional protocols on its amendments:

a. **IMSO Amendments 2006:** These amendments modernized the IMSO Convention to reflect **technological advancements** and the expansion of satellite services beyond maritime to include aeronautical and land mobile communications.

b. **IMSO Amendments 2008:** These amendments further updated to align IMSO's functions with evolving satellite technology and global communication needs. It encouraged cooperation with new satellite providers and addressed emerging challenges like data security and modernized service standards.

c.

3.13 Operating Agreement, on the International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT), 1976

The agreement was the foundational legal and financial framework that accompanied the IMSO Convention 1976. It established the International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT) as an intergovernmental organization to provide satellite communications for the maritime industry. The OA detailed the operational, financial, and technical principles for INMARSAT's satellite services, focusing on global maritime safety, distress communications, and commercial operations.

3.14 SFV Protocol 93

This protocol refers to Torremolinos International Convention for the Safety of Fishing Vessels, 1977, as modified by this protocol. Although it has also been superseded by Cape Town Agreement of 2012, but it is mentioned on the list of IMO conventions, so it is imperative to discuss it briefly. It provides minimum safety standards for the construction and equipment of fishing vessels. Its goal is to protect the lives of fishers who work in one of the world's most dangerous professions. The 1993 Protocol was created to update and make the original 1977 Torremolinos Convention more acceptable and easier for countries to ratify. While the 1993 Protocol itself did not enter into force globally, it laid the groundwork for the current standard. The protocol sets out detailed requirements for Stability and Seaworthiness, Construction and Watertight Integrity, Machinery and Electrical Installations, Fire Protection, Life-Saving Appliances, Radio Communications, Navigational Safety etc.

3.15 The Cape Town Agreement of 2012

This agreement is the modern successor to the Torremolinos Convention and its 1993 Protocol. It aims to finally bring a mandatory global safety regime for fishing vessels into force. It incorporates the technical provisions of the 1993 Protocol but with updated measures and a clearer implementation framework.

This concludes discussion on the IMO's conventions related to Maritime Safety, demonstrating that all critical areas have been comprehensively addressed. In the next chapter, the conventions concerning environmental protection and pollution control shall be briefly described.

CHAPTER 4

IMO CONVENTIONS ON MARITIME ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND POLLUTION CONTROL

As discussed in chapter 2 that IMO has Marine Environment Protection Committee hence there are 14 IMO conventions / protocols related to Maritime Pollution, each of those is briefly described in the ensuing paragraphs.

4.1 International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL)

The convention is a critical treaty governing marine pollution prevention. Its comprehensive framework addresses pollution from oil, chemicals, harmful substances, sewage, garbage, and air emissions, making it a cornerstone of international maritime environmental law. The convention is composed of the following separate conventions:

a. **MARPOL 73/78 (Annex I/II):** Annex I regulates Prevention of Pollution by Oil and Annex II regulates Control of Pollution by Noxious Liquid Substances in Bulk.

b. **MARPOL 73/78 (Annex III):** Regulates Prevention of Pollution by Harmful Substances Carried by Sea in Packaged Form.

c. **MARPOL 73/78 (Annex IV):** Regulates Prevention of Pollution by Sewage from Ships.

d. **MARPOL 73/78 (Annex V):** Regulates Prevention of Pollution by Garbage from Ships.

e. **MARPOL Protocol 97 (Annex VI):** Regulates Prevention of Air Pollution from Ships (e.g., sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides).

4.2 Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matter, 1972 (London Convention 72)

The convention is one of the first global treaties to protect the marine environment from human activities. It specifically regulates the deliberate disposal (dumping) of waste and other matter into the ocean from vessels, aircraft, and platforms. The convention has Annex I (Blacklist) that prohibits dumping of highly hazardous materials (e.g., mercury, cadmium, persistent plastics, radioactive waste, and biological/chemical weapons). It has Annex II (Grey List) that allows dumping of less harmful substances only with special permits (e.g., arsenic, lead, pesticides). It also has Annex III that sets general technical factors for permit issuance, including waste characteristics, dump-site conditions, and potential marine impacts. The convention has undermentioned single additional protocol:

a. **London Convention Protocol 1996:** The convention has largely been superseded by this protocol with more stringent regulations. The protocol adopts a "reverse list" approach, prohibiting all dumping except for a limited list of less harmful materials.

4.3 International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-Fouling Systems on Ships (AFS), 2001

The AFS Convention was adopted on 5 October 2001, and opened for signature (International Maritime Organization, 2001). The convention aims to prohibit the use of harmful anti-fouling paints on ships to protect marine ecosystems and human health. Prior to the Convention, anti-fouling paints containing tributyltin (TBT) were widely used, causing severe ecological damage (International Maritime Organization, n.d.). Scientific studies revealed TBT's harmful effects, including hormone disruption and bioaccumulation, prompting calls for regulatory action. The convention establishes a global ban on organotin compounds and sets regulations for alternative anti-fouling technologies. Organotin refers to a class of tin-based organic compounds used primarily in maritime industries as biocides in antifouling paints for ship hulls (Antizar-Ladislao, B.:2008). Their use needed to be heavily restricted globally due to severe environmental toxicity.

4.4 International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments (BWM), 2004

The BWM Convention was adopted on 13 February 2004 and was opened for signature (International Maritime Organization, 2004). The convention required ratification by at least 30 states representing 35% of the world's merchant shipping tonnage to enter into force. Prior to the BWM Convention, the issue of invasive species transported through ballast water had been recognized as a growing environmental crisis (International Maritime Organization, n.d.). Several high-profile cases demonstrated the severity of the problem, prompting the IMO to develop a mandatory international convention.

4.5 Hong Kong International Convention for the Safe and Environmentally Sound Recycling of Ships, 2009

The convention was adopted on 15 May 2009 and opened for signature (International Maritime Organization, 2009). The convention required ratification by major ship recycling countries or at least 15 states representing 40% of the world merchants' shipping by gross tonnage to enter into force. The convention has entered into force from 26 June 2025, as the ratification criteria have been met after it was ratified by Bangladesh and Pakistan (International Maritime Organization, n.d.). This comprehensive treaty establishes legally binding standards for preparation for safe and environmentally sound recycling.

4.6 International Convention on Oil Pollution Preparedness, Response and Co-operation (OPRC Convention), 1990

The OPRC Convention was adopted at an international conference in London convened by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) on 30 November 1990. Before the adoption of the OPRC Convention, the international response to oil spills was largely reactive and ad-hoc. Key issues included lack of Preparedness as many nations, particularly developing countries, lacked national contingency plans, adequate equipment, and trained personnel to respond to oil spills. There were no standardized international procedures for requesting, providing, or receiving assistance during a pollution emergency. The absence of pre-established frameworks often led to delays in response, allowing spills to spread and causing greater environmental and economic damage. Uncertainty over who would bear the costs of assistance and potential liability issues often hindered the rapid deployment of international help. Major oil spills like the Exxon Valdez (1989) starkly highlighted these deficiencies and acted as a catalyst for the international community to develop a more robust and cooperative system, leading directly to the OPRC Convention. The convention has undermentioned single protocol:

a. **OPRC/HNS protocol 2000:** The protocol extends the principles of the OPRC Convention 1990 (which deals with oil pollution) to include pollution incidents by Hazardous and Noxious Substances (HNS). Its goal is to establish a framework for international co-operation and preparedness for responding to HNS spills, which pose different and often more severe risks than oil spills.

4.7 International Convention relating to Intervention on the High Seas in Cases of Oil Pollution Casualties, 1969

Intervention convention empowers coastal states to take necessary measures on the high seas to prevent, mitigate, or eliminate grave and imminent dangers to their coastline or related interests from oil pollution casualties (e.g., ship accidents, spills). It was adopted in response to the 1967 S S Torrey Canyon oil spill disaster, where traditional laws limited states' rights to act beyond territorial waters. Through this convention coastal states may take action on the high seas if an oil spill threatens their shores. It requires that measures must be proportionate to the threat and not exceed what is necessary. It binds the states to consult with affected parties (e.g., flag state, shipowner) before acting, unless extreme urgency requires immediate action. The convention has undermentioned single additional protocol:

a. **INTERVENTION Protocol 1973:** It extends the provisions of the 1969 Convention to cover pollution casualties involving hazardous substances other than oil (e.g., chemicals, radioactive materials). It ensures coastal states have the same rights to intervene in cases involving non-oil substances that pose severe threats.

This concludes discussion on the IMO's conventions related to Maritime Environmental Protection and Pollution Control, demonstrating that all critical areas

have been comprehensively addressed. In the next chapter, conventions concerning Liabilities and Compensation shall be briefly described.

CHAPTER 5

IMO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING MARITIME LIABILITIES AND COMPENSATION

As discussed in chapter 2 that IMO has Legal Committee hence there are 16 IMO conventions / protocols concerning Liabilities and Compensation, each of those is briefly described in the ensuing paragraphs.

5.1 Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage (CLC), 1969

The CLC was adopted on 28 November 1969 and opened for signature (International Maritime Organization, 1969). Prior to the CLC, the legal landscape for oil pollution damage compensation was fragmented and inadequate (International Maritime Organization, n.d.). The S S Torrey Canyon disaster of 1967 exposed the glaring deficiencies in existing legal frameworks, prompting the International Maritime Organization to develop a specialized liability regime (M. G. Faure: 2007). The convention establishes the principle of strict liability for shipowners in cases of oil pollution damage. This landmark convention represents the international community's collective response to the growing threat of marine oil pollution. The convention has following additional protocols:

a. **CLC Protocol 1976:** It was adopted to update the original convention. Its primary purpose was to address practical and financial challenges in the original convention, particularly by replacing the gold-based monetary unit (Poincaré franc) with the Special Drawing Right (SDR) as the currency for liability limits. This change ensured that compensation amounts remained stable and internationally consistent amidst fluctuating gold prices.

b. **CLC Protocol 1992:** It comprehensively revised the CLC regime to increase liability limits for shipowners and expanded the scope of compensation for oil pollution damage. It was designed to ensure adequate compensation for victims while streamlining claims procedures. This protocol effectively replaced the original CLC 1969 and its 1976 protocol for ratifying states.

5.2 International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage, 2001

The convention was adopted in 2001 and entered into force internationally on 21 November 2008. It is a key instrument under the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The convention establishes a regime for compensation for damages caused by spills of bunker oil (the fuel used to power a ship's engine) from ships. The registered shipowner is held strictly liable for any pollution damage caused by their ship's bunker oil. This means the claimant (e.g., a coastal state, a fisherman) does not need to prove the shipowner was at fault. It requires compulsory insurance for ships over 1,000 gross tonnages to cover their liability under the convention. Claimants can sue the insurer directly for

compensation, which ensures that funds are available even if the shipowner is bankrupt.

5.3 Convention relating to Civil Liability in the Field of Maritime Carriage of Nuclear Material, 1971

The convention was adopted on 17 December 1971 and entered into force on 15 July 1975. It is a key instrument that bridges international nuclear law and maritime law. Its primary purpose is to clarify and channel liability in the very specific case of a nuclear incident during maritime carriage. It ensures that only one liable party exists, preventing complex and overlapping legal claims. The convention states that if a nuclear incident involves nuclear material being carried by sea, the liability lies exclusively with the operator of the nuclear installation (e.g., the power plant, reprocessing facility) that the material originated from or was destined for. The convention absolves the shipowner, charterer, manager, operator, and salvor of the carrying ship from all liability for any nuclear damage arising from such an incident.

5.4 Protocol to the International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage, 1976

The 1971 Fund (as amended by the 1976 Protocol) is now obsolete. The purpose of the 1976 Protocol was to amend the original 1971 Fund Convention to change the unit of accounts used for calculating compensation limits from the Gold Franc to the Special Drawing Right (SDR). This was a practical, administrative change to modernize the fund's financial mechanism and make it more stable. The original International Oil Pollution Compensation (IOPC) Fund was created by the 1971 Fund Convention to provide supplementary compensation to victims of oil pollution when damages exceeded the shipowner's liability limit under the CLC Convention 1969. The convention has following additional protocols:

a. **Fund Protocols 1992:** In 1992, new protocols were adopted that significantly overhauled the system. These Protocols increased compensation limits substantially.

b. **Fund Protocol 2003:** It was adopted on 16 May 2003 and entered into force on 3 March 2005. The protocol added an extra layer to the existing framework. Under first tier, the shipowner is liable up to a limit based on the ship's tonnage. Second tier provides additional compensation when damages exceed the shipowner's limit, up to a maximum of 203 million SDR (approx. $275 million USD). Under third tier if damages exceed the maximum compensation available from the 1992 Fund, the Supplementary Fund provides a further top-up.

5.5 International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea (HNS), 1996

The HNS Convention was adopted on 3 May 1996, at a diplomatic conference in London convened by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). It creates a comprehensive legal framework for compensating victims of maritime incidents involving hazardous and noxious substances (HNS). Unlike oil spills covered under the CLC and FUND conventions, the HNS Convention addresses a broader range of dangerous goods, including chemicals, liquefied gases, and other toxic materials. The convention establishes a two-tier compensation system: the first tier holds shipowners strictly liable, while the second tier provides additional compensation through an international fund financed by HNS cargo receivers. This system ensures adequate compensation for pollution damage, fire, explosions, and health risks caused by HNS incidents, filling a critical gap in maritime liability regimes (International Maritime Organization [IMO], 1996). The convention has undermentioned protocol:

a. **HNS Protocol 2010:** Protocol of 2010 to the International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea, 1996 is the key to making the original HNS Convention 1996 workable and bringing it into force. Its primary purpose was to amend the flawed 1996 HNS Convention to resolve practical and legal difficulties that had prevented it from entering into force for over a decade. It aimed to make the convention more acceptable to potential member states and the relevant industries.

5.6 Athens Convention relating to the Carriage of Passengers and their Luggage by Sea (PAL), 1974

The PAL Convention was adopted on 13 December 1974 during an international conference in Athens, Greece, convened by the IMO. The diplomatic conference brought together maritime nations to finalize the text after several years of preparatory work by the IMO Legal Committee (IMO, 1974). It is a fundamental international maritime treaty that establishes a liability regime for damage suffered by passengers during international sea travel. The convention provides a standardized legal framework governing carrier liability for death, personal injury, and loss or damage to luggage occurring during maritime transport (International Maritime Organization [IMO], 1974). The convention introduced strict liability principles for shipping incidents while allowing carriers to limit their financial exposure, thereby balancing passenger protection with industry sustainability. Its importance lies in creating uniform rules for international passenger carriage, replacing the previous patchwork of national laws that often led to inconsistent compensation outcomes (Griggs, Williams & Farr, 2005). The convention has following additional protocols:

a. **PAL Protocol 76:** The sole purpose of the 1976 Protocol was to change the unit of account used for calculating the limits of liability for

the death of, injury to, or loss of a passenger, or for the loss of or damage to their luggage. It changed the unit from the Poincaré franc (a gold-based currency unit) to the Special Drawing Right (SDR) used by the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

b. **PAL Protocol 90:** The primary purpose of the 1990 Protocol was to significantly increase the limits of liability for the death of, injury to, or loss of a passenger, or for the loss of or damage to their luggage. The increases were substantial, approximately 4 to 5 times higher than the limits set by the 1976 Protocol.

c. **PAL Protocol 02:** The protocol completely modernized the international regime for liability and compensation for passenger claims. Its main goals were to increase compensation limits for death, injury, and loss. It introduced a two-tier strict liability system to make it easier for passengers to recover damages. It introduced compulsory insurance for shipowners to ensure adequate and prompt compensation for passengers involved in maritime incidents.

5.7 London Convention on the Limitation of Liability for Maritime Claims, 1976

It is a crucial international maritime treaty that fundamentally shapes how shipowners and salvors can limit their financial liability after a maritime incident. It is an international convention adopted under the auspices of the International Maritime Organization (IMO). Its primary purpose is to establish a uniform global system that allows shipowners and salvors to limit their liability for certain types of maritime claims to a predictable maximum amount. This promotes investment in the shipping industry by providing legal certainty and helps ensure that claimants can receive compensation up to a known limit. It replaced older limitation regimes (like the 1957 Convention) which were seen as having limits that were too low and outdated. It significantly raised the limits of liability compared to previous conventions. It established a much higher bar for claimants to prove that a shipowner should be denied the right to limit their liability. It provided a wide range of maritime claims, provided they occur "on any distinct occasion" (a single incident). It provided a wide range of maritime claims that are excluded from limitations. It provided how the limits are calculated based on the ship's tonnage, using a two-tier system for property and personal claims. The 1976 Convention originally set the limits in Special Drawing Rights (SDRs), an IMF currency basket, to avoid fluctuation issues with national currencies. The convention has undermentioned single protocol:

a. **LLMC Protocol 1996:** The limits were significantly increased by the 1996 Protocol, which is now the widely accepted standard. When people refer to the "LLMC Convention," they often mean the 1976 Convention as amended by the 1996 Protocol.

This concludes discussion on the IMO’s conventions concerning Liabilities and Compensation, demonstrating that all critical areas have been comprehensively

addressed. In the next chapter, conventions concerning Seafarers and Fishers shall be briefly described.

CHAPTER 6

IMO CONVENTIONS CONCERNING SEAFARERS / FISHERS

As discussed in chapter 2 that IMO has Facilitation Committee hence there are 3 IMO conventions concerning Seafarers / Fishers. There is also a convention of International Labour Organization (ILO) namely Marine Labour Convention MLC. 2006. Each of IMO conventions and MLC 2006 are briefly described in the ensuing paragraphs.

6.1 The International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW), 1978

The STCW Convention was formally adopted on 7 July 1978 during a diplomatic conference at IMO headquarters in London (International Maritime Organization, 1978). This historic gathering united maritime administrations, labor organizations, and industry representatives in recognizing that human competency constituted the common denominator across all maritime safety systems. The convention entered into force on 28 April 1984, nearly six years after adoption, when Greece's ratification satisfied both the minimum country count and critical tonnage threshold (International Maritime Organization, 1984). This transformative moment compelled member states to overhaul their maritime education systems and establish rigorous certification processes aligned with the convention's standards.

6.2 The International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping for Fishing Vessel Personnel. (STCW-F) 1995.

The STCW-F convention was adopted by the International Maritime Organization at an International conference in London, United Kingdom, on 7 May 1995, and thereafter opened for signature at IMO Headquarters from 1 January 1996 until 30 September 1996, following that period it has remained open for accession by any state wishing to become party to the convention. The convention established the uniform international standards of training, certification, and watchkeeping specifically tailored for crews of seagoing fishing vessels of 24 meters in length and above.

6.3 Convention on Facilitation of International Maritime Traffic, 1965 (FAL Convention)

It was adopted on April 9, 1965, and entered into force on March 5, 1967. It is one of the core international maritime conventions administered by the International Maritime Organization (IMO). The primary goal of the FAL Convention is to simplify and reduce formalities, documentation requirements, and procedures associated with the arrival, stay, and departure of ships engaged in international voyages. It aims to achieve maximum freedom for shipping from unnecessary formalities and delays. It recognizes that excessive and varying bureaucratic red tape in ports around the world is a significant impediment to maritime trade and efficiency. It aims to achieve Economic Efficiency by reducing port delays and Maritime Security by standardizing pre-arrival information that allows authorities to perform risk assessments and

target inspections more effectively, enhancing security. Nevertheless, recognizing the Seafarer Welfare the convention addresses the importance of facilitating shore leave to them.

6.4 ILO Convention, Maritime Labour Convention 2006 (MLC)

The Maritime Labour Convention (MLC), 2006 was officially adopted on 23 February 2006 during the 94th International Labour Conference (Maritime Session) convened by the International Labour Organization (ILO) in Geneva. The convention emerged from extensive negotiations among governments, shipowners, and seafarers' organizations, embodying a robust tripartite consensus. Its adoption represents a significant milestone in maritime labour law, as it consolidates existing instruments into a cohesive, contemporary, and enforceable framework.

The convention represents a comprehensive international treaty that delineates minimum working and living standards for seafarers globally. Commonly referred to as the "Seafarers' Bill of Rights," the MLC amalgamates and modernizes over 65 prior ILO instruments about maritime labor. It establishes a uniform and enforceable framework designed to address critical issues such as fair remuneration, work hours, rest periods, accommodation, health protection, medical care, welfare provisions, and commercial activities, irrespective of flag state. This treaty mandates that flag states, port states, and shipowners uphold compliance through mechanisms of certification, inspections, and grievance redressal. As a "fourth pillar" of the international regulatory framework for quality shipping, alongside SOLAS, MARPOL, and STCW, the MLC plays an essential role in promoting equitable working conditions at sea, thereby contributing to the maintenance of safe, secure, and efficient maritime operations on a global scale.

This concludes discussion on the conventions concerning Seafarers and Fishers, demonstrating that all critical areas have been comprehensively addressed. In the next chapter, ratification and nonratification of international conventions by Pakistan shall be discussed.

CHAPTER 7

RATIFICATION AND NONRATIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS BY PAKISTAN

Before discussing ratification and nonratification of international conventions by Pakistan, it would be appropriate to have a glance on the ratification and non-ratification status of IMO conventions by the regional countries i.e. India, Iran and Bangladesh. This data will help to draw certain conclusion and make suitable recommendation while discussing the same with regards to Pakistan. Table below shows the ratification status of 4 regional countries:

Table 1: Ratified Conventions by Regional Countries

S No	Name of Convention	Iran	India	Bangladesh	Pakistan
1	IMO Convention 48	yes	yes	yes	yes
2	SOLAS Convention 74	yes	yes	yes	yes
3	SOLAS Protocol 78	yes	yes	No	yes
4	SOLAS Protocol 88	yes	yes	yes	yes
5	SOLAS Agreement 96	No	No	No	No
6	LOAD LINES Convention 66	yes	yes	yes	yes
7	LOAD LINES Protocol 88	yes	yes	yes	yes
8	TONNAGE Convention 69	yes	yes	yes	yes
9	COLREG Convention 72	yes	yes	yes	yes
10	CSC Convention 72	yes	yes	No	yes
11	CSC amendments 93	No	No	No	No
12	SFV Protocol 93	No	No	No	No
13	Cape Town Agreement 2012	No	No	No	No
14	STCW Convention 78	yes	yes	yes	yes
15	STCW-F Convention 95	No	No	No	No
16	SAR Convention 79	yes	yes	yes	yes
17	STP Agreement 71	No	yes	yes	No
18	Space STP Protocol 73	No	yes	yes	No
19	IMSO Convention 76	yes	yes	yes	yes
20	INMARSAT OA 76	yes	yes	yes	yes
21	IMSO amendments 2006	No	No	No	No
22	IMSO amendments 2008	No	No	No	No
23	FACILITATION Convention 65	yes	yes	yes	No
24	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex I/II)	yes	yes	yes	yes
25	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex III)	yes	yes	yes	yes
26	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex IV)	yes	yes	yes	yes
27	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex V)	yes	yes	yes	yes

S No	Name of Convention	Iran	India	Bangladesh	Pakistan
28	MARPOL Protocol 97 (Annex VI)	yes	yes	yes	No
29	London Convention 72	yes	No	No	yes
30	London Convention Protocol 96	yes	No	No	No
31	INTERVENTION Convention 69	yes	yes	yes	yes
32	INTERVENTION Protocol 73	yes	No	No	yes
33	CLC Convention 69	No	Denounced	No	No
34	CLC Protocol 76	No	yes	No	No
35	CLC Protocol 92	yes	yes	No	yes
36	FUND Protocol 76	No	yes	No	No
37	FUND Protocol 92	yes	yes	No	No
38	FUND Protocol 2003	No	No	No	No
39	NUCLEAR Convention 71	No	No	No	No
40	PAL Convention 74	No	No	No	No
41	PAL Protocol 76	No	No	No	No
42	PAL Protocol 90	No	No	No	No
43	PAL Protocol 02	No	No	No	No
44	LLMC Convention 76	yes	yes	No	No
45	LLMC Protocol 96	No	yes	No	No
46	SUA Convention 88	yes	yes	yes	yes
47	SUA Protocol 88	yes	yes	yes	yes
48	SUA Convention 2005	No	No	No	No
49	SUA Protocol 2005	No	No	No	No
50	SALVAGE Convention 89	yes	yes	No	No
51	OPRC Convention 90	yes	yes	yes	yes
52	HNS Convention 96	No	No	No	No
53	HNS PROT 2010	No	No	No	No
54	OPRC/HNS 2000	yes	No	No	No
55	BUNKERS CONVENTION 01	yes	No	No	No
56	ANTI FOULING 2001	yes	yes	yes	No
57	BALLASTWATER 2004	yes	No	yes	No
58	NAIROBI WRC 2007	yes	yes	No	yes
59	HONG KONG CONVENTION	No	yes	yes	yes
Total Ratifications		**35**	**35**	**26**	**26**

As discussed in chapter 2, ratification of international conventions improves standing of a state in the global community. It was further discussed that ratification means transposition of international conventions in national legislation. In this chapter, this aspect will be discussed in detail.

Pakistan has formally committed to 26 of the 59 listed IMO conventions. This foundational commitment is further bolstered by the ratification of the pivotal Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (MLC), a cornerstone instrument of the International Labour Organization that safeguards the rights and welfare of seafarers.

The most prominent laws are Merchant Shipping Ordinance 2001 (MSO 2001) and Maritime Security Agency Act 1994 (MSA 1994). For gap analysis of any single convention with the corresponding legislation, a separate study is required because it is believed the once amendments are affected to an international convention those are not promptly transposed in the domestic legislation. Convention wise gap analysis is beyond the scope of this study. However, a meticulous mapping exercise, cross-referencing each of these ratified conventions against Pakistan's existing national legislation shall be undertaken. This process is essential to visualize the direct or implied incorporation of these international obligations into Pakistan's domestic legal fabric. The table appended below enables to assess whether a ratified convention has been fully transposed or impliedly transposed into domestic legislation:

Table 2: Ratified Conventions by Pakistan and Corresponding National Laws

S No.	Convention	Laws of Pakistan	Remarks
1	IMO Convention 48	-	Not transposed but Audit of Maritime Administration by IMO proves implied implementation
2	SOLAS Convention 74	MSO 2001	Statute is devoid of RO code and qualifications of ship casualty investigators, SOLAS Agreement 96 has not been ratified
3	SOLAS Protocol 78		
4	SOLAS Protocol 88		
5	LOAD LINES Convention 66	MSO 2001	Ratification criteria met
6	LOAD LINES Protocol 88		
7	TONNAGE Convention 69	MSO 2001	Ratification criteria met
8	COLREG Convention 72	MSO 2001	Ratification criteria met
9	SAR Convention 79	MSA 1994	Certain area of Arabian Sea has been allocated by IMO to PMSA for SAR responsibilities.

S No.	Convention	Laws of Pakistan	Remarks
10	SUA Convention, 88	Pakistan Maritime Zones Act 2023 & MSA 1994 and	The statute mandates PMSA to protect national vessels against criminal threats within the maritime Zones of Pakistan only. Punishments are defined in the other statute.
11	SUA Protocol, 88		
12	NAIROBI WRC 2007	MSO 2001	Ratification criteria met
13	CSC Convention 72	Not transposed	Containers are not manufactured in Pakistan. Therefore, its implementation may not be required at this moment but in future if industrial development initiates manufacturing then legislation may be required
14	IMSO Convention 76	MSO 2001	Chapter 22 is on radio installation and radio equipment but does not talk of International Mobile Satellite Organization (IMSO)and International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT). Moreover, IMSO Amendments, 2006 and IMSO Amendments, 2008, have not been ratified therefore extensive amendments in MSO 2001 are required
15	INMARSAT OA 76		
16	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex I/II)	MSO 2001	Ratification criteria are met, but MARPOL Protocol 97 (Annex VI) needs ratification and incorporation after ratification.
17	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex III)		
18	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex IV)		
19	MARPOL 73/78 (Annex V)		
20	London Convention 72	MSO 2001	London Protocol 1996 has not been ratified, and MSO 2001 will

S No.	Convention	Laws of Pakistan	Remarks
			need to be updated after ratification.
21	HKC 2009	Not transposed	Draft legislation in process at Balochistan Government
22	OPRC Convention 90	MSA 1994	Regular Barracuda exercises of the Pakistan Maritime Security Agency are conducted involving practical scenarios simulating a mock oil spill in both coastal and open sea environments. Search and rescue operations are also a significant component of the exercise. However, OPRC-HNS Protocol, 2000, has not been ratified
23	INTERVENTION Convention 69	MSA 1994	Under section 10 (2) (l) of the Act PMSA may intervene at high seas on direction of Federal Government
24	INTERVENTION Protocol 73		
25	STCW Convention 78	Part IV Chapter 6, MSO 2001	Ratification criteria met, However, STCW-F Convention, 1995, has not been ratified therefore amendments related to it may require incorporation after ratification of STCW-F
26	CLC Protocol 92	Part XIII chapter 41 of MSO 2001	Only latest protocol is ratified the basic conventions i.e. CLC Convention, 1969 has been denounced by 80 states including India.
27	MLC, 2006	MSO 2001	Ratification criteria met, incorporation of recent amendments is in process

Apart from the above, under section 609 of MSO 2001 Federal Government is empowered to make rules for implementing the provisions of the Maritime International Conventions ratified by Pakistan provided those are not inconsistent to the general

provision of the ordinance. Therefore, making rules to give effect to the ratified convention does not require cabinet and parliamentary approvals.

Following an in-depth analysis of ratified conventions, the study now proceeds to examine the conventions that have not been ratified. As of 13 August 2025, Pakistan has not ratified 33 out of 59 IMO conventions, which adversely affects its global standing. This section assesses the possible reasons for non-ratification and presents corresponding conclusions. The table appended below illustrates these details:

Table 3: Not Ratified Conventions by Pakistan and Corresponding Remarks

S No.	Convention	Remarks
1	SOLAS Agreement, 96	Pakistan has ratified SOLAS Convention 74, SOLAS Protocol 78, and SOLAS Protocol 88 hence there appears no reasons for not ratifying this agreement.
2	SUA Convention, 05	Pakistan has ratified SUA Convention 88 and SUA Protocol 88 therefore there appears no reason for not ratifying these conventions that extend the application to installations, rigs etc.
3	SUA Protocol, 05	
4	CSC Amendments, 93	Pakistan has ratified CSC Convention 72 therefore there appears no reasons for not ratifying these amendments.
5	STCW-F Convention, 95	Part IX of MSO 2001 addresses the specific regulations for fishing vessels and Fishing Vessels Inspection Rules, 2020 have also been promulgated. Therefore, there appears no reason for not ratifying this convention
6	IMSO Amendments, 06	Pakistan has ratified IMSO Convention 76 therefore there appears no reasons for not ratifying these amendments. However, MSO 2001 will require extensive amendments
7	IMSO Amendments, 08	
8	FACILITATION Convention, 1965	Ratification of this convention would reduce time spent in ports by ships, which is very important aspect of efficiency in economy so there is strong need to ratify this convention. All other regional states have ratified this convention.

S No.	Convention	Remarks
9	MARPOL Protocol 97 (Annex VI)	Pakistan has ratified Annex I to Annex V of MARPOL convention so there is a strong need to ratify this convention also. Moreover, all regional states have ratified this convention therefore its ratification would align Pakistan with regional states.
10	London Protocol, 96	Pakistan has ratified London Convention 72 therefore there appears no reasons for not ratifying this protocol. Moreover, all regional states have ratified this Convention therefore its ratification would align Pakistan with the regional states.
11	OPRC-HNS Protocol, 2000	Pakistan has ratified OPROC Convention 90, which applies to oil Pollution therefore there appears no reasons for not ratifying this protocol, which applies to pollution by hazardous and noxious substances.
12	CLC Convention, 69	CLC Protocol 92 has replaced earlier convention and protocol with higher rates of compensation that Pakistan has ratified. CLC Convention 69 has been denounced by 80 states including India because of lower compensation rates. Hence ratification of these conventions does not merit consideration.
13	CLC Protocol, 76	
14	FUND Protocol, 76	Ratifying FUND conventions requires Pakistan to contribute to the fund, which Pakistan cannot afford due to poor economy therefore not ratifying these conventions is logical.
15	FUND Protocol, 92	
16	FUND Protocol, 03	
17	BUNKERS Convention, 01	All the conventions that attach responsibility of polluting sea from oil spills from liquid cargoes Pakistan has ratified. This convention does the same for oil spills from bunker tanks so its ratification should not be withheld.
18	PAL Convention, 74	Pakistan does not operate and is not likely to operate passenger ship therefore not ratifying these conventions is logical. Moreover, these conventions have not been ratified by any of the regional states.
19	PAL Protocol, 76	
20	PAL Protocol, 90	

S No.	Convention	Remarks
21	PAL Protocol, 02	
22	LLMC Convention, 76	Pakistan has ratified latest protocol, i.e. CLC Protocol 92 without ratifying basic convention and an earlier protocol, which means Pakistan has intentions to claim civil liabilities against a sustained damage. These conventions provide limits of claims therefore these should be ratified.
23	LLMC Protocol, 96	
24	SALVAGE Convention, 89	Part XII of MSO 2001 covers legal aspects of dealing with wrecked ships and salvage operations, hence there appears no reasons for not ratifying this convention
25	HNS Convention, 96	Pakistan has ratified almost all conventions on marine pollution related to oil including OPROC Convention 90 but has not ratified conventions on pollution by hazardous and noxious substance. Considering this type of pollution equally important, ratifying these conventions is imperative
26	HNS Protocol, 10	
27	Anti-Fouling Convention, 01	These conventions are meant to maintain chemistry of the local sea waters therefore by ratifying those will ensure vital area protection. Moreover, Anti-Fouling Convention, 2001 has been ratified by two regional states and Ballast Water Convention, 04 has been ratified by all other regional states therefore its ratification would align Pakistan with regional states.
28	Ballast Water Convention, 04	
29	SFV Protocol, 93	If Pakistan ratifies STWC-F 1995 then ratifying these conventions may not be required. Moreover, none of the regional states have ratified these conventions.
30	Cape Town Agreement, 12	
31	STP Agreement, 71	Chapter 20 of MSO 2001 addresses issues related to Special Trade Passenger ships, i.e. Pilgrim Ships. Since the issue is already covered in the national legislation, there appears no reason for not ratifying this convention. Moreover, 2 of the regional states have ratified these conventions.
32	Space STP Protocol, 1973	
33	NUCLEAR Convention, 71	The convention attaches responsibility of spread of radio activity to the operator and not to the master or owner of the nuclear ship and MSO 2001 vide chapter 34

S No.	Convention	Remarks
		addresses issues related to Nuclear Ships. Since the issue is already covered in the national legislation therefore there appears no reason for not ratifying this convention.

This concludes discussion on the conventions ratified and not ratified by Pakistan demonstrating that all critical areas have been comprehensively addressed. In the next chapter, conclusions and recommendations derived from the above analysis shall be summed up.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Conclusions

The previous chapter depicts that Pakistan has ratified 26 IMO conventions but has not ratified 33 of them. This means the country has formally adopted only 44% of these key international agreements. The high proportion of non-ratified conventions i.e. 56% points to a considerable shortfall in Pakistan's current international maritime commitments. On the other hand, India and Iran have ratified 35 IMO conventions but has not ratified 23 of them besides this India has denouncing one convention i.e. CLC Convention 69. This means India has formally adopted 59% of these key international agreements. The lower proportion of non-ratified conventions i.e. 41% points to a considerable surge in India's current international maritime commitments. The other regional country i.e. Bangladesh has also ratified 26 IMO conventions but has not ratified 33 of them. This means that in the international maritime commitments Pakistan and Bangladesh stand together. Hence to improve international standing Pakistan needs to ratify more conventions.

In the context of Pakistan further analysis reveals two significant impediments to robust compliance. First, there is a pattern of inconsistent ratification, whereby core conventions have been adopted but their crucial amending protocols, which address modern challenges and close legal loopholes have not. Second, even where ratification has occurred, the domestic transposition of these international obligations into enforceable national law and practice remains partial and lacks the thoroughness required for full effectiveness. Yet there is also a case where amendment protocol has been ratified but the original convention and an earlier protocol has not been ratified.

Notably, there are cases where Pakistan's national legislation already incorporates principles or regulations that align with unratified conventions. This creates a paradoxical situation where domestic law may partially satisfy international standards, yet the country remains without the formal obligations and benefits of ratification.

Section 354 of MSO 2001 empowers Federal Government to authorize any recognized organization to perform all or any of the functions related to safety certificates, but provisions of the Ordinance do not reflect the mandatory requirements of the Code for Recognized Organizations (RO Code). The ROs should meet the standards set by IMO in the said code. Incorporation of RO Code in MSO 2001 is mandatory.

The Merchant Shipping Ordinance 2001 prescribes the offences, penal provisions, and legal procedure, including a provision to impose penalties through regulations. However, as the entities responsible for enforcing relevant provisions are not authorized to impose administrative fines and penalties directly, any decision to impose penalties had to follow the process in place through the courts of law.

Section 471 of MSO 2001 empowers federal government to appoint any person to inquire into shipping casualty, but no provision speaks of required training, knowledge and experience of the person to be appointed. The impartiality and objectivity of investigators could not be safeguarded if any person irrespective of any predefined qualification is appointed.

In section 1 and 2 of MSO 2001 repealed statute “Territorial Waters and Maritime Zones Act, 1976” is referred whereas new statute Pakistan Maritime Zones Act 2023 should be referred.

8.2 Recommendations

It is recommended that Pakistan may ratify following 20 conventions for the reasons stated hereunder, which will improve it ratification ratio from 44% to nearly 90%:

a. Since SOLAS Convention 74, SOLAS Protocol 78 and SOLAS Protocol 88 have been ratified therefore SOLAS Agreement 96 amending previous conventions and protocols may be ratified.

b. Since CSC Convention 72 has been ratified therefore CSC Amendments, 1993 amending original convention may be ratified.

c. Part IX of MSO 2001 under heading, Fishing & Sailing Vessels, addresses the specific regulations for fishing vessels and Fishing Vessels Inspection Rules, 2020 have been promulgated. Therefore, convention STCW-F 95 may also be ratified.

d. Since IMSO Convention 76 has been ratified, IMSO Amendments, 2006 and IMSO Amendments, 2008 may also be ratified. After ratification updating MSO 2001 will also be important.

e. Since MARPOL Conventions Annex I to V have been ratified, therefore MARPOL Protocol 97 (Annex VI) may be ratified. It is important because all regional states have ratified this convention.

f. Since London Convention 72 has been ratified therefore London Protocol, 1996 amending original convention may also be ratified.

g. Since OPRC Convention 90 has been ratified, OPRC-HNS Protocol, 2000 which makes the convention applicable to pollution from hazardous and noxious substances may also be ratified.

h. Pakistan has ratified latest protocol, i.e. CLC Protocol 92, which means Pakistan has intentions to claim civil liabilities against a sustained damage. LLMC Convention, 76 and LLMC Protocol, 96 provide limits of claims therefore these may be ratified.

j. Ratification of FACILITATION Convention, 1965 would reduce time spent in ports by ships, which is very important aspect of efficiency in economy therefore this convention may be ratified.

k. Since Pakistan has ratified all conventions that attach responsibility of polluting sea from oil spills from liquid cargoes therefore BUNKERS Convention, 2001, which attaches same responsibility to oil spills from bunker may also be ratified.

l. Since Pakistan has ratified SUA Convention, 1988, SUA Protocol, 1988, therefore the newer conventions i.e. SUA Convention, 2005 and SUA Protocol, 2005, may also be ratified.

m. Since Part XII of MSO 2001 covers legal aspects of dealing with wrecked ships and salvage operations, therefore SALVAGE Convention, 1989 may be ratified.

n. ANTI-FOULING Convention, 2001, and BALLASTWATER Convention, 2004 are meant to maintain chemistry and biodiversity of the local sea waters therefore these conventions may be ratified.

p. Since Chapter 20 of MSO 2001 addresses issues related to Special Trade Passenger ships, i.e. Pilgrim Ships therefore STP Agreement, 1971 and Space STP Protocol, 1973 may be ratified.

q. Since MSO 2001 vide chapter 34 addresses issues related to Nuclear Ships therefore Nuclear Convention, 1971 that attaches responsibility of spread of radio activity to the operator and not to the master may be ratified.

It is recommended that Pakistan may not ratify following 11 conventions for the reasons stated hereunder:

a. Pakistan does not operate and is not likely to operate passenger ship therefore it may not ratify PAL Convention, 1974, PAL Protocol, 1976, PAL Protocol, 1990 and PAL Protocol, 2002.

b. Ratifying FUND conventions requires Pakistan to contribute to the fund, which Pakistan cannot afford due to poor economy therefore it may not ratify FUND Protocol, 1976, FUND Protocol, 1992 and FUND Protocol, 2003.

c. If Pakistan ratifies STWC-F 1995 as recommended above, then it may not ratify SFV Protocol, 1993 and Cape Town Agreement, 2012 because STCW-F 95 addresses all certifications requirements of fishers. Apart from this, no regional state has ratified these conventions.

d. Since CLC Convention, 69 has been denounced by 80 states including India therefore Pakistan may not ratify this and CLC Protocol, 76.

Based on other conclusions following general recommendations are made:

a. Section 609 of MSO 2001 Federal Government is empowered to make rules for implementing the provisions of the Maritime International Conventions ratified by Pakistan provided those are not inconsistent to the general provision of the ordinance. Therefore, making rules to give effect to the ratified convention does not require cabinet and parliamentary approvals. Therefore, legislation in progress to cover HKC and latest amendment to MLC may be expedited to justify the ratification of these important conventions.

b. Based on the case law Aziz Khan vs The Director General Ports and Shipping (1991 CLC 362A), an international convention cannot be enforced as municipal law unless it is formally enacted by the legislature. While the government is morally bound by conventions it has ratified, domestic law prevails in case of conflict. Therefore, mere reference to a convention in existing law is insufficient; new ratifications recommended in this report require dedicated legislation to be implemented or extensive amendments to the existing legislation.

c. RO Code may be incorporated in MSO 2001

d. To ensure impartiality qualifications of persons to be appointed for preliminary investigation into shipping casualties may be prescribed in MSO 2001.

e. To avoid court proceedings, the entities responsible for enforcing laws may be authorized to directly impose administrative fines and penalties.

f. Section 1 and 2 of MSO 2001 may be amended to replace “Territorial Waters and Maritime Zones Act, 1976” with “Pakistan Maritime Zones Act 2023”.

This concludes conclusions and recommendations. In the next part references are listed. It may be pertinent to add that data of IMO conventions is available on IMO website with all the details of their ratification or otherwise by all the member and nonmember states. The same has been used to develop this report. Details of each convention are also available on the IMO website the same has been used to briefly describe the conventions in chapters 3 to 6. Some other references listed in last part are relevant to chapter 2 whereas chapter 1 describes the study parameters. Chapter 7 & 8 are purely based on research work by the author.

REFERENCES

IMO Conventions:

1. IMO Convention 48
2. SOLAS Convention 74
3. SOLAS Protocol 78
4. SOLAS Protocol 88
5. SOLAS Agreement 96
6. LOAD LINES Convention 66
7. LOAD LINES Protocol 88
8. TONNAGE Convention 69
9. COLREG Convention 72
10. CSC Convention 72
11. CSC amendments 93
12. SFV Protocol 93
13. Cape Town Agreement 2012
14. STCW Convention 78
15. STCW-F Convention 95
16. SAR Convention 79
17. STP Agreement 71
18. Space STP Protocol 73
19. IMSO Convention 76
20. IMSO amendments 2006
21. IMSO amendments 2008
22. INMARSAT OA 76
23. FACILITATION Convention 65
24. MARPOL 73/78 (Annex I/II)
25. MARPOL 73/78 (Annex III)
26. MARPOL 73/78 (Annex IV)
27. MARPOL 73/78 (Annex V)
28. MARPOL Protocol 97 (Annex VI)
29. London Convention 72
30. London Convention Protocol 96
31. INTERVENTION Convention 69
32. INTERVENTION Protocol 73
33. CLC Convention 69
34. CLC Protocol 76
35. CLC Protocol 92
36. FUND Protocol 76
37. FUND Protocol 92
38. FUND Protocol 2003
39. NUCLEAR Convention 71
40. PAL Convention 74

41. PAL Protocol 76
42. PAL Protocol 90
43. PAL Protocol 02
44. LLMC Convention 76
45. LLMC Protocol 96
46. SUA Convention 88
47. SUA Protocol 88
48. SUA Convention 2005
49. SUA Protocol 2005
50. SALVAGE Convention 89
51. OPRC Convention 90
52. HNS Convention 96
53. HNS PROT 2010
54. OPRC/HNS 2000
55. BUNKERS CONVENTION 01
56. ANTI FOULING 2001
57. BALLASTWATER 2004
58. NAIROBI WRC 2007
59. HONG KONG CONVENTION

ILO Convention

MLC 2006

Laws of Pakistan

Merchant Shipping Ordinance 2001
Fishing Vessels Inspection Rules, 2020

Others

1. World Bank Report, 2022

2. Shaw, M. N. (2017) International Law Cambridge University Press

3. Krasner, S. D. (Ed.) (1983) International Regimes Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press

4. Austin, John. (1832) The Province of Jurisprudence Determined. London: John Murray

5. Bull, H. (1977). The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics. New York: Columbia University Press.

6. Brownlie, Siobhan. (2006) “Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory.” Across Languages and Cultures, vol. 7, no. 2, 2006, pp. 145-170

7. UN Charter 1945

8. UNFCCC, 1992, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

9. IMO's Member State Audit Scheme (IMSAS)

10. IMO Instruments Implementation (III) Code {resolution A. 1070(28) 2013}

11. IMO's Port State Control Procedures [Resolution A.1155(32) 2021]

12. IMO Audit Pakistan Interim report 2022

13. Paris MoU's THETIS System 1982

14. Tokyo Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Port State Control 1994

15. M. G. Faure (2007) International Liability as an Instrument to Prevent and Compensate for Climate Change, published in the South African Law Journal (Volume 43A).