



TM/CONF/C.2/SR.11  
6 June 1969

Original: ENGLISH

IMCO

FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON  
TONNAGE MEASUREMENT, 1969

Technical Committee

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE ELEVENTH MEETING

held at Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1,  
on Friday, 6 June 1969, at 9.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. F. SPINELLI (Italy)

Secretary: Mr. Y. SASAKURA

A list of participants is given in TM/CONF/INF.1

---

N.B. Corrections to be incorporated in the final summary record of the meeting should be submitted in writing (two copies in French or English), preferably on the provisional summary record, to the Documents Officer, Committee Room 2 and after the Conference to the IMCO Secretariat, 22 Berners Street, London, W.1, not later than 8 July 1969.

TM/CONF/C.2/SR.11

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Agenda item 3</u> - Consideration of matters as instructed by the Conference (TM/CONF/WP.3; TM/CONF/6, Corr. 1 and Add.1; TM/CONF/9/Add.1; TM/CONF/C.2/WP.12 and WP.13) (continued)	3

AGENDA ITEM 3 - CONSIDERATION OF MATTERS AS INSTRUCTED BY THE  
CONFERENCE (TM/CONF/WP.3; TM/CONF/6, Corr.1  
and Add.1; TM/CONF/9/Add.1; TM/CONF/C.2/WP.12  
and WP.13 (continued)

The CHAIRMAN invited attention to Progress Report No. 4 (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.12), containing a summary of the results of the previous day's discussions, and to the Japanese delegation's proposal on the draught for calculating displacement in respect of ships to which the 1966 Load Line Convention did not apply (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.13). He suggested that the Committee should consider document TM/CONF/C.2/WP.12. Its decision on the minimum length and the definition of such length were set out in subparagraphs 2(i) and 2(ii) respectively. In accordance with paragraph 3, the Committee had left open the question whether, for the purpose of defining length, it should adopt the definition of moulded depth in the International Convention on Load Lines, replacing the word "freeboard" by "uppermost", so that the moulded depth would be defined as the vertical distance measured from the top of the keel to the top of the uppermost complete deck at side.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that in that case, the uppermost complete deck would have to be defined. He invited attention to his delegation's suggestion in document TM/CONF/9/Add.1.

The CHAIRMAN questioned whether it would be proper to depart from the provisions of the Load Line Convention. The Committee's decision to adopt 24 metres as the minimum length meant that for the time being it was discussing depth for the determination of minimum length. Since the decision had been made for the purpose of conformity with the Load Line Convention and to avoid two definitions, if the Committee now considered only

ships with a load line, the definition should be identical with the one in the Load Line Convention which could be referred to, without the need to repeat it. The Committee would then need only to consider the minimum length for fishing vessels and yachts to which the Load Line Convention did not apply. The question was linked with the problem of displacement which had been left open as far as fishing boats were concerned.

Mr. GRUNER (Finland) said that if the length of 24 metres was to be used solely for the purpose of identifying ships, the total length could be used and all definitions could be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN said that the length should be the same as the length in the Load Line Convention: in other words, the load line definition of depth and freeboard deck should be retained, without being repeated.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that in using the moulded depth it would be necessary to specify the meaning, and to which deck the moulded depth would be measured. He suggested that the first part of the definition of freeboard deck in the Load Line Convention would be sufficient if "freeboard deck" were replaced by "upper deck" and the word "normally" deleted.

The CHAIRMAN asked if the Committee would agree that for ships with load lines, moulded depth and freeboard should be defined as in the 1966 Load Line Convention, and that for ships not subject to that Convention the United Kingdom suggestion should be followed, namely, the definition of freeboard deck as in the 1966 Load Line Convention should be used, replacing "freeboard" by "upper" and deleting "normally".

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said that a Convention should be self-contained; too many references to provisions in other Conventions might cause legal difficulties. The Committee and the General Committee might do well to consider the legal aspects. Where such references were essential, they should be as brief as possible, and texts from other Conventions should not be reproduced;

with identical provisions in two different Conventions, there was the risk that one of them might subsequently be changed and that difficulties of interpretation might ensue.

Moulded depth needed defining only for ships without freeboard: several of the suggestions in document TM/CONF/C.2/WP.13 were relevant. Minimum length should be the same as in the 1966 Load Line Convention, and it should be so stated.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that his point on the need merely for a reference to the Load Line Convention had been supported by the French representative. The definition of freeboard deck also, however, referred to the owner's option to choose a second deck as freeboard deck. Had the Committee agreed that the owner would have such an option? Was the Chairman's suggestion that an owner wanting such option could have reduced draught, i.e., moulded depth measured to an assumed deck instead of to the actual upper or freeboard deck, in line with what had been previously agreed?

The CHAIRMAN explained that the present problem was merely to establish the minimum length at which the new Convention would apply. For consistency, the depth should be the same as in the Load Line Convention. The problem is not related to tonnage measurement, but only to the establishment of the minimum length at which the new Convention would apply.

Mr. LIEBENFROST (Yugoslavia) said that the definition of depth did not indicate the point at which the ship's length should be measured. He suggested using the definition in paragraph (2) on page 86 of TM/CONF/6, which provided that the moulded depth should be the vertical distance measured from the inner side of the keel plate to the underside of the deck at side: that was preferable to the definition in the Load Line Convention.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to decide whether, for ships which had to comply with the Load Line Convention, the minimum for the new Convention should be the length provided in the Load Line Convention.

There were 34 votes in favour and none against.

The CHAIRMAN asked if there was any support for the idea that the same result could be obtained by using a different definition from that in the Load Line Convention.

In the absence of support for the idea, he asked if the Committee agreed, for ships which had to comply with the 1966 Load Line Convention, to wording on the following lines:

"The minimum length at which the Convention would apply should be the same as the minimum length at which the 1966 Load Line Convention applied".

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the question of ships which did not have to comply with the Load Line Convention should be left until the question of displacement, which was closely connected, had been discussed.

He invited attention to paragraph (4) - total volume of enclosed spaces. The total volume was in two parts: the displacement volume, below the waterline; and everything

above the waterline. The problem was whether or not to include in displacement the appendages such as bossings and rudders, but exclude bilge keels, wells and recesses in open connexion with the sea (page 82 of TM/CONF/6) or include in the under-deck volume the volumes of bulges in the ship's side, such as a bulbous bow and propeller bossings (page 88 of TM/CONF/6).

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said that since the displacement calculation was based on the volume calculation, it would be going a little far to say that the ship's volume was in two parts - the displacement volume and the volume of spaces above the waterline: the two concepts were different. If the total volume was the sum of a series of internal ship's volumes, in certain cases the deck volume would not be taken into account. Perhaps the aim was to exclude the volume of deck plating from the total volume; but displacement took into account all the structural elements up to the line from which displacement was calculated.

His delegation regarded the displacement volume as the volume of water displaced by the ship. Hence all the hull appendages would be taken into account, as in the Danish amendment.

Mr. WILSON (UK) agreed with the French representative that displacement and total volume were rather different concepts. In the case of extreme displacement, shell plating, rudder, bossings and similar items would have to be taken into account, but that was not necessary for moulded displacement.

It had already been decided that for gross tonnage, the total volume should be measured to moulded lines: thus the thickness of the upper deck plating would not be measured; the measurement would be to the inside of the boundary plating and the top of the deck to the underside of the deck ceiling. No one would

want to include normal bossings or rudders, for example, in total volume. The only bossings to include would be those with a volume; solid castings should not be included in moulded volume.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that unnecessary complications were being introduced for little gain.

Mr. STEWART (USA) said that his own authorities were working for results as close as possible to existing tonnage measurement. He supported the United Kingdom representative's view that measurement should be to the moulded line. In all shipbuilding, moulded displacement should be ascertained first. Tonnages could be determined more rapidly if the moulded volume concept were retained.

Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) agreed with the United Kingdom representative's comments on displacement and volume. He supported the deletion of "rudders" on page 82 of TM/CONF/6.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that for the time being the Committee should consider only volume and what it should contain, leaving displacement until later. The majority appeared to support the view that moulded volume should not include deck thicknesses. But would the stern frame casting be included or excluded?

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said that the choice was between logic and tradition. He would favour the logical solution of moulded volume. The logical solution of moulded volume was equivalent to saying that one should only pay for the inside of an orange because one did not eat the skin.

Mr. BECKWITH (Liberia) supported the use of moulded volume. Whereas under-deck volume could be obtained from displacement curves, moulded volume must be measured physically.



With regard to the inclusion of, for example propeller bossings, the USSR amendment on page 87 of TM/CONF/6 could be used as a basis.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation had never doubted that the total volume was measured to the moulded line. The Committee was discussing details which should be cleared up in a small working group.

Mr. SOIDA (Italy) said that the simplest solution was the moulded volume as in other conventions. In a moulded plan, the bossings would automatically be included.

Mr. GUPTA (India) agreed fully with the French stand. Displacement must necessarily correspond to the total weight of the ship in water; he would accordingly propose that, in paragraph 5(1) the word "moulded" be deleted.

Secondly, some provision should be included to cover the case of the convertible passenger/cargo ship, operating with different load lines according to the traffic of the moment.

Mr. FILIPPOVICH (USSR) said his delegation would support the Argentine view on grounds of simplicity. It should be possible to make all calculations at the design stage and accordingly calculation of displacement should be done on moulded lines.

Mr. STEWART (USA) endorsed the Soviet stand. Secondly, unlike France, he believed that moulded displacement was critical for the determining of stability.

Mr. VAN DER TOORN (Netherlands) said that he, too, was in favour of the simplest possible system. The weight of the shell plating on a ship was a completely unknown factor and it would be pointless for the intended purpose to place an arbitrary percentage value on it, however low.

It was decided, by 31 votes to 3, that the displacement should be moulded displacement.

The CHAIRMAN invited comments on sub-paragraphs (i), (ii) and (iii) of paragraph 5(1).

Mr. WILSON (UK) suggested a minor drafting change in sub-paragraphs (i) and (iii): the words "as defined by" to be replaced by the words "in accordance with". In sub-paragraph (ii), he would prefer the wording: "... to the assigned subdivision load line in accordance with ...", as possibly permitting account to be taken of fresh water or tropical allowances.

Secondly, a provision should be included to cover the case of the passenger ship that had also an assigned cargo load line giving a much deeper draught than the passenger subdivision load line. For the purpose of displacement, the higher of the two marks should be used.

Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) suggested that sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii) should be combined and in that way the last United Kingdom point would be covered. His delegation considered that sub-paragraph (iii) should be deleted, as inappropriate to an international convention. Countries could not be bound by such an instrument to apply certain national regulations.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) endorsed the last point made, the more so as national regulations on load line varied widely.

Mr. BECKWITH (Liberia) endorsed the amendment proposed by Denmark, with the addition at the end of the combined text of the words: "whichever is applicable". The change would also cover India's point.

Mr. GUPTA (India) saw no need for taking the deeper of the two draughts, as suggested by the United Kingdom; provision should be made for differentiation in line with actual conversion.

The CHAIRMAN observed that that point could be taken up later in considering the question of restriction on conversion.

In answer to a point raised by Mr. NOZIGLIA (Argentina), the SECRETARY explained that the usual practice concerning related international conventions was to refer simply to the convention in force, without specifying any particular year; that matter would be taken care of at the drafting stage.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) asked whether the SOLAS Convention contained a definition of the deepest subdivision load line. In any event, the higher mark should be used in the case of convertible ships, for there could conceivably be cases where that mark corresponded to the cargo load line.

In sub-paragraph (iii), the better wording would be: "for ships to which a load line had been assigned under national regulations ..."; in the case of dual load lines, the deepest should apply.

The CHAIRMAN stated that the definition in question was to be found in Article 2 of the SOLAS Convention.

Mr. GUPTA (India) said that in his country there was no question of a fixed period for application of one or other of the dual load lines. Conversion was possible from voyage to voyage.

Mr. FILIPPOVICH (USSR) considered that sub-paragraph (iii) should be maintained, but in amended form for clarification purposes on the following lines: "for ships to which the International Load Line Convention does not apply but to which a load line has been assigned under national regulations ...".

In considering the question of ships with dual load lines, the case of the timber-carrying ship (deck cargo) should not be overlooked.

Mr. MUENCH (Israel) thought that the question of ships having dual load lines should be discussed also at General Committee level; the Technical Committee was not in a position to take a final decision in the matter.

Secondly, he too considered that the maintenance of sub-paragraph (iii) was essential and he endorsed the text as amended by France and the USSR.

As to sub-paragraph (iv), some countries, although not assigning a load line, set a maximum draught for certain vessels through loading regulations related to maintenance of stability. Where such statutory regulations existed, certified displacement under the Convention should be calculated according to the fixed draught limitation.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to take up the various issues that had been raised, one by one. He invited comments first on the marginal case of the timber-carrying vessel mentioned by the USSR.

Mr. FILIPPOVICH (USSR) said his delegation considered that in the case of such ships the regular load line should apply rather than the higher timber mark, since normally the ship would be carrying water ballast when loaded with timber. A contrary decision would therefore penalize the ship.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) pointed out that water ballast had no relevance to the question.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) supported the Soviet proposal; under the International Tonnage Mark scheme the timber mark had thus far been ignored and there was no reason for any change in that situation.

The USSR proposal was accepted by 32 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN asked whether the Committee wished in principle to retain sub-paragraph (iii).

There were 31 votes in favour of retention and 3 against.

The CHAIRMAN invited comments on the Japanese proposal (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.13), which was relevant to sub-paragraph (iii).

Mr. MUENCH (Israel) considered that the Japanese proposal was opposed in spirit to the concept of displacement. There was no need to resort to an imaginary load line; where a draught limitation existed under statutory rules, national or international, it should be used for calculation of displacement.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said he had been thinking along the same lines.

The Israeli proposal was approved in principle by 31 votes to none.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to sub-paragraph (iii) of TM/CONF/C.2/WP.13 and to the suggestion made by the United Kingdom delegation to use the definition of moulded depth given in Regulation 3, paragraph 5(a) of the 1966 Load Line Convention, replacing the words "freeboard deck" by "uppermost deck". The latter would then take the definition assigned to the freeboard deck in paragraph (9) of that Regulation, with deletion of the word "normally", i.e. the uppermost deck would be the uppermost complete deck exposed to weather and sea which had permanent means of watertight closure.

He went on to note that such a definition would, unfortunately, encourage shipowners not to close the higher deck and suggested that it might be better not to make any stipulations about the uppermost deck.

Mr. ROSELL (Denmark), Mr. ENDO (Japan) and Mr. SOLDA (Italy) all agreed that it was not feasible to qualify the term "uppermost deck" in any way.

The CHAIRMAN concluded that in the case of a ship having no loading mark of any kind on its side, displacement would be taken as eighty-five percent of the moulded depth to the uppermost deck, the latter remaining undefined for the time being.

Change of net tonnage (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.12, paragraph 7)

The CHAIRMAN invited delegations' comments on the proposed time limit within which no change of tonnage certificate would be permitted, i.e. five years, one year or six months.

Mr. GUPTA (India) referred back to his country's problems of the "pilgrim ships" operating under the Simla Rules and carrying cargo or passengers at different times of the year, and maintained that in such cases any time limitations imposed would be completely artificial and unnecessary.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France), Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) and Mr. PRIVALON (USSR) held that the matter raised by the delegation of India represented a specific problem quite distinct from the question of the time limit to be imposed. Both the 1966 Load Line Convention and the 1960 Safety Convention recognized that a ship could bear loading marks for cargo and for passengers at the same time and there should, of course, be no time limitation for such ships.

Mr. VAN DER TOORN (Netherlands), supported by Mr. HUNNICH (Federal Republic of Germany), pointed out that the imposition of a five-year period within which a ship's certificate could not be changed would cause many difficulties to shipowners in the matter of buying and selling of ships and would depress considerably second-hand prices; the time limit should thus be no more than six months.

Mr. GUPTA (India) agreed that there was no question of altering a single value for the displacement in the case of a so-called "pilgrim ship" since it was assigned two displacements; one in accordance with the Load Line regulations and the other in relation to its function as a passenger ship. The ship was then authorized to use the deeper draught only when it was carrying less than twelve passengers.

He nevertheless still maintained that in the case of other ships there was no virtue in imposing a long period of time within which the displacement could not be changed.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) held that there was no valid reason for putting any time limitation on the changing of net tonnage or displacement since it would only restrict owners in the normal operation of their ships.

Drawing attention to paragraph 7(3) of TM/CONF/C.2/WP.12, where it was envisaged that the time limitation would be waived if the flag of the ship were changed or if it underwent large-scale modification, he asked whether that should not be extended to cover the case of change of owner, as well.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that in TM/CONF/WP.5, paragraph 1(g) the Conference had decided that the change from closed to open shelter conditions should not be allowed at frequent intervals; the Committee had only to decide how to interpret the concept of infrequent change.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it was in favour of imposing a time interval of one year or less, or in favour of a period of more than one year, for changes in the tonnage certificate of a ship.

There were 27 votes in favour of a time interval of one year or less and six in favour of a time interval of more than one year.

It was decided to impose a time interval of one year or less.



The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it was in favour of a time interval of one year or of six months.

There were 20 votes in favour of a time interval of one year and 12 in favour of a time interval of six months.

It was decided to impose a time interval of one year within which the tonnage certificate of a ship could not be changed.

Mr. HERD (Australia), referring to the question of the "pilgrim ships" mentioned by the delegation of India, pointed out that Australian ships which carried either passengers or cargo had only one tonnage certificate. Since tonnage was to be made dependent on displacement, such ships would be given two certificates, one for their permitted displacement with cargo and one for passenger trade. His delegation was opposed to the idea of dual tonnages for purely cargo-carrying ships.

Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) pointed out that such ships would have the same tonnage certificate all the time; it was only the draught which altered in accordance with the defined conditions of sailing. He considered that the Committee should decide whether the tonnage should be altered at all under the two or three sets of conditions; in his view the only solution was to issue a tonnage certificate in accordance with the largest draught, i.e. the draught calculated in accordance with the 1966 Load Line Convention.

The CHAIRMAN concluded that the tonnage assigned should not correspond to the largest draught but to the largest tonnage. Ships having two tonnage load lines, one for cargo and one for passengers, would then have only one certificate, listing a figure which could be changed every year, but which for the duration of that year would be the highest value calculated for the tonnage on either draught, or from the displacement plus the volume of passenger ships, whichever the Working Group might decide.



Mr. GUPTA (India) maintained that "pilgrim ships" do not have two load lines but rather one load line and one subdivision mark.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the subdivision mark was recognized as a load line under the 1966 Load Line Convention.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.