



TM/CONF/C.2/SR.13
9 June 1969
Original: FRENCH

IMCO

FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
TONNAGE MEASUREMENT, 1969

Technical Committee

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE THIRTEENTH MEETING

held at Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1,
on Monday, 9 June 1969, at 9.30. a.m.

Chairman: Mr. F. SPINELLI (Italy)

Secretary: Mr. Y. SASAMURA

A list of participants is given in TM/CONF/INF.1/Rev.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.13

CONTENTS

Page

<u>Agenda item 4</u> - Consideration and preparation of proposed technical regulations on tonnage measurement and tonnage certificates (continued)	3
--	---

AGENDA ITEM 4 - CONSIDERATION AND PREPARATION OF PROPOSED
TECHNICAL REGULATIONS ON TONNAGE MEASUREMENT
AND TONNAGE CERTIFICATES (TM/CONF/6;
TM/CONF/C.2/WP.14; TM/CONF/C.2/WP.18;
TM/CONF/C.2/WP.19) (continued)

The CHAIRMAN suggested adding the words "or movable" after the word "fixed" in the second line of paragraph (2). The additional stipulation would serve to prevent a shipowner from installing doors, thereby reducing the volume of enclosed spaces.

The proposal was approved.

Mr. ter HAAR (Netherlands) thought that Regulation 6 should contain a definition of the upper deck supplementing that of enclosed spaces. In his opinion, to avoid any misunderstanding over enclosed spaces, it would be preferable to delete both the end of the first sentence of paragraph (2), from the words "fixed partitions" onwards, and also the end of the second sentence, from the words "opening or openings" onwards.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) wished to know whether the word "coverings" would apply also to tarpaulins and plastic covers.

Mr. WILSON (UK) was in favour of the suggestions put forward by the Netherlands delegation.

The CHAIRMAN asked the Committee whether it wished to delete the words "on or above the upper deck" in the first line of the paragraph.

Mr. WILSON (UK) pointed out that while paragraph (1) related to the volume of all enclosed spaces, paragraphs (2) and (3) dealt with enclosed spaces on or above the upper deck; he was therefore opposed to the deletion of those words.

As for a definition of the upper deck, it would be of value only if Regulation 6 stipulated that spaces above the upper deck were exempted - which was not the case, since the parameter adopted for the tonnage was the total volume.

Mr. HABACHI (Suez Canal Authority) said that, after examining the proposed amendment to Regulation 6 submitted by the Working Group, he considered that in view of the abolition of the existing system of exemptions for superstructures, the volume of the exempted portions should be added to the gross tonnage of the ship; in other words, a new tonnage certificate would have to be issued to the ship. For a superstructure to qualify for exemption, it would have to conform to the conditions laid down in paragraph (3), which meant that the fore and aft bulkheads of the superstructures would have to be removed so that the superstructure itself became a large open space with a minimum width of opening of not less than 90 per cent of the breadth of the deck.

Under the Suez Canal Rules, the existence of a curtain plate, even one not exceeding in depth the adjoining deck beams, entailed the application of charges to the wide open space.

The recesses mentioned in paragraph (3)(e) should, if situated fore or aft of a deck space or of a superstructure, be included in the chargeable volume, with the definition of enclosed spaces contained in paragraph (2). The measurement of those spaces was identical with that of the wing shelters connecting the three first-tier superstructures on oil tankers.

Paragraph (3)(f) very properly provided that any uncovered and undecked space inboard of the hull was not included in the gross tonnage, but the principle should be applied to any space fulfilling those conditions without thereby benefitting the stern slipways of certain trawlers.

In December 1961, IMCO had put forward five recommendations concerning any new universal system of tonnage measurement. Under the first, the existing exemptions were to be abolished, but the Conference seemed set on replacing them by new exemptions requiring more complicated calculations. The new system was also to be simple, but he feared that the results would scarcely be in keeping with the recommendation. The seaworthiness and efficiency of the ship ought not to be adversely affected but the removal of the fore and aft bulkheads of the superstructures was certainly not likely to facilitate the approval of ships. IMCO had recommended also that the system should not be dependent on certain details of construction; but if the shipyards were to build ships which would benefit from the advantages of the new system, they would have to include big wide open spaces. Finally, the gross tonnage ought to express the total volume of the ship and that objective could not be said to have been achieved.

He ended his statement with the suggestion that the Committee should, in the French text, replace the word "construction" by the word "superstructure" in the fourth and twenty-second lines of page 2 and in the seventh and tenth lines of page 3. In the English text, the term "side-to-side" should be inserted before the word "erection" (or "erections") in lines 6, 27 and 32 of page 2 and in line 14 of page 3.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should delete the last parts of the first and second sentences of paragraph (2), as proposed by the Netherlands delegation.

The proposal was approved.

TM/CONF/C.2/SR.13

Mr. MURPHY (USA) proposed the addition of the words "in the ship's hold" after the words "or openings" in line 7 of paragraph (2).

The proposal was approved.

Mr. GUPTA (India) said that, like the Norwegian representative, he would like further clarification of the meaning of the term "coverings", as the problem was of importance, particularly for navigation in tropical waters.

Mr. WILSON (UK) suggested the addition of the phrase "other than awnings".

Paragraph 3

The CHAIRMAN stated that at page 2, line 4, the words "gross tonnage" should be replaced by the words "total volume".

Sub-paragraph (a)

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) feared that, under the terms of the new regulation, the entire hold might be considered as an open space.

The CHAIRMAN did not share that fear, since any space needed for cargo would automatically be considered as an enclosed space.

Mr. LEIBENFROST (Yugoslavia) suggested introducing into the second sub-paragraph the definition of "breadth of the deck" already used in the International Convention on Load Lines.

The CHAIRMAN agreed that the breadth ought indeed to be defined. As defined in the Load Line Convention, a superstructure was a structure extending from side to side for virtually the entire width of the ship. He wondered whether that definition should be retained or whether it should be replaced by another.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) was of the opinion that the definitions under discussion would be clearer if they were illustrated with diagrams.

Mr. LEIBENFROST (Yugoslavia), quoting from the Convention on Load Lines, recalled that the provisions relating to superstructures spoke of the "side plating not being inboard of the shell plating more than 4 per cent of the breadth"; which was insufficient if 82 per cent were added for the breadth of the superstructures. No one could build such a ship.

The CHAIRMAN said that his understanding of the matter was that the breadth of the superstructures should accordingly be either the total width of the ship, or that width less 8 per cent.

As for the question of illustrating the definitions, if the Committee felt that diagrams would serve a useful purpose, he would ask the Group which had drawn up TM/CONF/C.2/WP.14 to be good enough to prepare some diagrams also.

Mr. BONN (Canada), referring to the beginning of the second sub-paragraph of paragraph 3(a), which he quoted, asked what space would be exempted in that case.

Mr. WILSON (UK) explained that the intention of the ad hoc Working Group had been to bring the provisions into line with the Panama Canal Rules and so to discourage shipowners from building side deck-houses. A diagram would certainly be very useful, and he would be grateful to the French representative, who was near the blackboard, if he would kindly draw one.

Mr. CABARIBERE (France) illustrating his reply with the help of blackboard drawings representing a conventional forecastle and a triangular forecastle, explained exactly how the spaces exempt from measurement would differ, according to whether or not there was a side deckhouse.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the need to define the "out-side plating" in order to prevent shipbuilders from finding loopholes.

Mr. WILSON(UK) said that the term "outside plating" had been used intentionally as being the one which appeared to be the clearest.

Mr. BONN (Canada) asked what would happen in the case of ships whose stem opened up, as in the "roll on-roll off" type of ship.

Mr. WILSON (UK) replied that that type of ship was provided with stem doors, and that, in that case, it would be the breadth of deck which would be considered, the exempted space being limited to half the width of the opening.

Mr. MURPHY (USA) pointed out that sub-paragraph 3(a), line 3 should be amended to read "a curtain plate not exceeding by more than 1 inch the depth of the adjoining deck beams..."

Mr. GUPTA (India) considered that the text should be so worded as to achieve the maximum of simplicity, and an effort should be made to avoid any definition which might influence ships design.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) agreed that defining enclosed and open spaces was of necessity a complex matter, and that the only way to overcome the difficulties was to have recourse to diagrams. Inasmuch as the Convention under discussion would frequently refer to the text of the International Convention on Load Lines, (which allowed a reduction in freeboard for enclosed spaces), he advocated the following principle: whenever a superstructure carried a right to a reduction in freeboard, it would be measured, so as to avoid the potential paradox of a ship having a superstructure which entitled it to a reduction in freeboard, on the one hand, while, on the other, it was not considered as an enclosed space.

Mr. WILSON (UK), in reply to the representative of India, stated that, if cargo was carried in spaces normally exempt from measurement, those spaces ceased to be exempt. There did not appear to be any likelihood, therefore, that the regulations

TM/CONF/C.2/SR.13

would affect ship design. He further drew the attention of the representative of France to the fact that, in accordance with the opinion of freeboard experts, in the International Convention on Load Lines, a space not having a Class 1 opening was not considered as an enclosed space, and that, as a result that type of superstructure would not be taken into account.

Sub-paragraph 3(a) was approved in principle.

Sub-paragraph 3(b)

Mr. LEIBENFROST (Yugoslavia) drew attention to a typing error in line 5 of the English text, where "bulkhead" should read "bulwark".

Sub-paragraph 3(b) was approved in principle.

Sub-paragraph 3(c)

The CHAIRMAN stated that in paragraph 3(c) also, the Drafting Committee would replace the expression "gross tonnage" by the expression "total volume".

Mr. GUPTA (India) wondered whether sub-paragraph (c) applied to the large side openings provided for the purpose of ensuring adequate ventilation in the 'tween-deck spaces on pilgrim ships to which the SIMLA Rules applied, and whether the sponsors of the text had taken that matter into consideration.

Mr. WILSON (UK) was glad to reassure the representative of India on that point. The matter had indeed been taken into consideration. Sub-paragraph 3(c) applied to the side-openings of those ships, to the extent to which the exempted 'tween-deck space was exactly aligned with the opening, thus restricting the exempted space.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) said it would be difficult to determine the exempted spaces if Regulation 6 contained no precise definitions of the meaning of "erection", "super-structure" and consequently of "upper deck".

TM/CONF/C.2/SR.13

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that the Working Group had distinguished between the terms "side-to-side erection", mentioned only in sub-paragraph (c), and "erection" which might also designate a deck-house.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) thought that to introduce special definitions in the new convention would cause difficulties, because the Load Line Convention already included the required definitions. He proposed that a clause should be included in Regulation 6 providing that, (for ships to which the Load Line Convention applied,) the enclosed spaces should include at least (a) the whole volume below the freeboard deck and (b) the whole volume of the superstructures as defined in the Load Line Convention; it would be understood that that was a minimum, and that other spaces might be added to those enclosed spaces. The French delegation intended to submit a proposal on that point.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) approved that proposal in principle, but pointed out that the definitions of the complete deck and of the upper deck proposed by the USSR in connexion with Regulation 2 of Proposal C would be quite appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Working Group should endeavour to draw up a definition of a "side-to-side erection".

Mr. HABACHI (Suez Canal Authority) proposed the adoption of the definition given in the Suez Canal Rules namely, that the side walls should not be more than one English foot from the sides of the ship.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee approve sub-paragraph (c) in principle, subject to a more precise definition of the superstructures.

It was so agreed.

Sub-paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) gave rise to no comments.

Mr. JONES (New Zealand) wondered whether a sub-paragraph should not be added to Regulation 6 (providing for the exemption of various spaces such as the inside of the funnels, the cranes and so on.)

After a short exchange of views in which Mr. ROSELL (Denmark), Mr. WILSON (UK), Mr. GUPTA (India) and the CHAIRMAN participated, the latter expressed the opinion that this was a problem of minor importance because the spaces in question were very limited. He proposed, therefore, that mention of them be omitted.

It was so agreed.

Mr. WILSON (UK) drew the attention of the Committee to the paragraph which his delegation proposed to add to Regulation 6 (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.18), providing for a penalty when the conditions for exemption were not respected. That penalty would be lifted only when the ship received a new certificate on a change of flag or ownership.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) considered that the space thus penalized might be exempted again if the ship underwent large-scale modification affecting that particular space.

Mr. WILSON (UK) accepted that suggestion.

The United Kingdom Proposal (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.18), thus amended, was approved.

PROGRESS REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON GROSS AND NET TONNAGE
(Part I) (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.19)

Mr. ERIKSSON (Sweden), Chairman of the Working Group, said that the Group had not had time to finish its task completely but that the annexes would contain enough data on the results produced by the different formulae to enable the Committee to

TM/CONF/C.2/SR.13

make a choice between them. When that choice had been made, the Group could make definitive calculations on the basis of whatever coefficient the Committee considered most suitable. The Working Party had based its calculations on the standard deviation, in accordance with the statistical theory set out in the study submitted by the United States (TM/CONF/C.2/3). The computer experts and the chairmen of the three task groups were at the disposal of the Committee for any further information which might be required.

Taking the Report paragraph by paragraph, he said in regard to paragraph 5, that the Working Group had estimated that the 600 or so ships covered by the IMCO data and the sample prepared by the United Kingdom were sufficiently representative of world shipping as far as ship size was concerned; the Group had decided to undertake computer studies on series of ships of each size. With regard to paragraph 7(d), he said that if a correction factor for passenger ships was not used, the result would be a tonnage markedly lower than the present tonnage, which would create difficulties with the port authorities. As IMCO had no data on the total volume of passenger spaces, and as the Italian data referred only to 17 ships, the United Kingdom had proposed that additional information be obtained, and the Working Group had put forward a formula based on the number of passengers (sub-paragraph (e)) in which the denominator 10 appeared to be a satisfactory approximation; that formula would be tested on a larger number of ships.

The third task group was carrying out a study of the more complicated formula proposed for the calculation of net tonnage. It had come up against difficulties, because the IMCO data dealing with water ballast deductions on the national certificates did not show the total volume of the different

types of water ballast. However, the task group would try, on the basis of the information available to it on a limited number of Japanese and British ships, to calculate the volume of water ballast for all types of ships, by using the relation between the total volume of ballast and the volume of water ballast. Another solution might be to assign to all ships a certain volume of water ballast, e.g. 10% of the displacement.

With regard to the correction factor for passengers in the same formula, the task group proposed, following a study by Denmark and Italy on a small number of passenger ships, to give to this factor a_2 the value $1 + \frac{D}{10000}$, and France was to make a study on 60 ships of the results thus obtained.

The Working Group had also studied the formula proposed by Denmark for calculating gross tonnage (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.10 and Add.1), but had reached no decision.

Mr. MURPHY (USA) said that in the list of ships shown in Annex I, the number of ore carriers should be 50 and not 15.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.