



**REVIEW OF MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM (MSP) REFLAGGINGS**

Procedure Number: E2-25

Revision Date: October 28, 2024

J. D. Baldassini, CDR, Chief, Engineering Division

**Purpose**

This Plan Review Guideline (PRG) describes MSC's process for implementing the requirements of U.S. Code 53102(e) in accordance with Commandant policy.

**Contact Information**

If you have any questions or comments concerning this document, please contact the Marine Safety Center (MSC) by e-mail or phone. Please refer to Procedure Number E2-25.

E-mail: [msc@uscg.mil](mailto:msc@uscg.mil)

Phone: 202-795-6729

Website: [www.dco.uscg.mil/msc](http://www.dco.uscg.mil/msc)

## Table of Contents

1. Applicability .....	3
2. Background.....	3
3. References.....	3
4. Definitions.....	3
5. Plan Approval .....	4
5. Machinery Space Attendance Equivalencies .....	4
7. Disclaimer.....	5

## **1. Applicability**

This Plan Review Guideline (PRG) is applicable to all vessels reflagged under the Maritime Security Program (MSP). The submitter is responsible for providing all relevant information for review to determine compliance with USCG regulations and policy.

## **2. Background**

The law implementing the MSP, 46 U.S. Code 53102, required the establishment of the Maritime Security Fleet. The Coast Guard released a Navigation and Vessel Inspection Circular (NVIC) to provide uniform process guidance to assist vessel owners and operators, authorized classification societies, and Coast Guard personnel regarding the MSP. Like all NVICs, this document is clearly stated to be only guidance and not a rule; however, as it was subject to public review and comment, and there is underlying authority in the U.S. Code, it has been strictly implemented by MSC.

Foreign-built vessels are eligible for COIs under this program if they are designed and classed to accepted Classification Society rules, and if they were determined to be in compliance with international standards by the previous flag state. A list of approved classification societies can be found [here](#).

During the public comment period for reference (b), the Coast Guard received several comments related to periodically unattended machinery space (PUMS) operation, minimum safe manning levels, and their relationship to an approved Periodic Safety Test Procedure (PSTP). As vessel manning is, and always has been, determined directly by the flag Administration, the Coast Guard determined that minimally attended machinery space (MAMS) or PUMS operation and manning would only be authorized if the vessel had an approved PSTP. In addition, the Coast Guard created a “general equivalency” to streamline automation requirements for vessels that had previously operated with unattended machinery spaces or reduced manning while under foreign flag. Reference (a) amended the original NVIC to incorporate these changes. While automation was not retained by MSC in the NVIC, equivalencies were retained, so these “general equivalency” PSTPs are submitted to MSC.

## **3. References**

- a. 46 Subchapter F
- b. NVIC 01-13, “Inspection and Certification of Vessels under the Maritime Security Program (MSP),” COMDTPUB P16700.4, dated May 26, 2015
- c. MSC Work Instruction E2-19, Periodic Safety Test Procedures

## **4. Definitions**

Please note that NVIC 01-13 used the term “automation” to refer specifically to the parts of 46 CFR 62 that are relevant to manning, namely 62.50-20 and -30. Confusion on this point has caused ambiguity in the past, as there are vital system automation requirements in 46 CFR Subchapter F outside of those two subparts.

## **5. Plan Approval**

Plans for systems being modified or added, plans requested by the OCMI due to specific questions or concerns, plans applicable to an equivalency determination, and the VSP must all be submitted to MSC. These are reviewed as they would be for any other vessel; Plan Review Guides for other review types can be found [here](#). Note that anything specifically requested for review by the OCMI will be reviewed as the OCMI directs, based on their concerns. Anything being added or modified should conform to the U.S. Coast Guard's interpretations of international regulations at the time of the modification insofar as is reasonable and practical.

## **6. Machinery Space Attendance Equivalencies**

The majority of what is submitted to MSC is PSTPs using the "general alternative" equivalency provision. If the intent is for the ACS to approve the PSTP, and MSC is only engaged to review the equivalency (the most common situation), MSC reviews the PSTP for the following items:

- a. Documentation that a U.S. recognized classification society authorized MAMS/PUMS for classification purposes, indicated by the following class-specific notations on the classification certificate, e.g., ACC/ACCU (ABS), ECO/E0 (DNV), UMS (LR), M0 (ClassNK);
- b. Documentation that the previous flag administration authorized MAMS/PUMS, best verified using the Minimum Safe Manning Document;
- c. Compliance with 46 CFR 62.50-20(h) and/or 62.50-30(j), as appropriate (affirmation in the submission email is sufficient, as verification will be performed by the OCMI); and
- d. The requirements of section 3.2.1.1.C.i through x in enclosure (2) of the NVIC, as follows:
  - 1) Meets the failsafe requirements of SOLAS. (SOLAS Chapter II-1/ Reg. 31.2.7; and Reg. 49.5 – PUMS). See Section 1.1.3.6 of Enclosure (2) of the NVIC.
  - 2) Propulsion safety trip control systems must not operate as a result of failure of the normal electric power source unless it is determined to be the failsafe state.
  - 3) Sensors for the primary speed, pitch or direction of rotation control in closed loop propulsion control systems must be independent and physically separate from required safety, alarm or instrumentation sensors.
  - 4) An alarm to indicate starting capability of less than 50% of the requirement total starting capacity must be provided. (SOLAS Chapter II-1, Reg. 31.2.9; and Reg. 49.7 – PUMS).

- 5) Propulsion control from the Navigating Bridge is to be provided. (SOLAS Chapter II-1, Reg. 31.2 – MAMS; and Reg. 49.1 – PUMS).
- 6) A personnel alarm must be provided and must annunciate on the Navigating Bridge if not routinely acknowledged at the centralized control station or in the machinery space.
- 7) All required alarms must annunciate throughout the Centralized Control Station and the machinery space. (SOLAS Chapter II-1, Reg. 51 – PUMS).
- 8) Continuity of electrical power. (SOLAS Chapter II-1, Reg. 53.2 – PUMS).
- 9) The fire detection and alarm system must activate all alarms at the Centralized Control Station, the Navigating Bridge, and throughout the machinery spaces and engineer’s accommodations.
- 10) The Centralized Control Station must include control of the main machinery space fire pumps. Where one or more fire pumps is required to be independent of the main machinery space, at least one of such pumps must be controlled from the Navigating Bridge. (See SOLAS II-2/10.2.2.3.1.2). All required fire pump control locations must include the controls necessary to charge the fire main and have a fire main pressure indicator or a fire main low pressure alarm.

## **6. Disclaimer**

This guidance is not a substitute for applicable legal requirements, nor is it itself a rule. It is not intended to nor does it impose legally-binding requirements on any party. It represents the Coast Guard’s current thinking on this topic and may assist industry, mariners, the general public, and the Coast Guard, as well as other federal and state regulators, in applying statutory and regulatory requirements. You can use an alternative approach for complying with these requirements if the approach satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations. If you want to discuss an alternative, you may contact MSC, the unit responsible for implementing this guidance.