



IMCO

FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
TONNAGE MEASUREMENT, 1969
Technical Committee

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE FIFTEENTH MEETING

held at Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1,
on Tuesday, 10 June 1969, at 9.45 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.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<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/WP.5; TM/CONF/C.2/WP.22) (continued)

First draft of regulations for determining gross and net
tonnages of ships (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.22)

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee, while awaiting the Working Group's report on the formula for calculating net tonnage, taking into account the volume of water ballast, should examine the first draft prepared by the Secretariat on the basis of the Committee's decisions.

He pointed out that the provisions of Regulation 2, paragraph 1, which repeated those of the Convention on Load Lines with the modifications proposed by the United Kingdom, applied only to ships without a load line.

Regulation 1 and Paragraph 1 of Regulation 2 gave rise to no objections.

Regulation 2, paragraph 2

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway), referring to sub-paragraph (a), asked how that definition of moulded depth would be applied to ships whose deck beams were below the deck.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the text be supplemented by an indication that in such cases the depth should be measured to the under side of the deck plating.

Sub-paragraph (a), thus amended, and sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) of paragraph 2, Regulation 2, gave rise to no objections.

Regulation 2, paragraphs 3 and 4

The CHAIRMAN said that paragraph 3, which was taken from the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, defined berthed passengers and paragraph 4 defined unberthed passengers; those two definitions would be necessary if the Working Group adopted a formula which took the number of passengers into account in calculating net tonnage. A problem arose, however, in the case of persons who could be classed neither as crew nor as passengers, such as drivers of lorries carried on ferries.

Mr. SASAMURA (Committee Secretary) pointed out that that question was under study by IMCO's Maritime Safety Committee.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) considered that the best thing would be to refer in paragraph 3 to the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea so that any amendment of the definition contained in that Convention would entail the same amendment in the convention on tonnage measurement.

Mr. RUSSEL (South Africa) raised the question of the families of crew members, who should not be counted as passengers, in his opinion.

Mr. KING (Kuwait) said that the carriage of such family members should be authorised in conformity with the Safety Convention and that they should be considered as part of the crew. The same applied to cattlemen accompanying cargoes of cattle.

Mr. WILSON (UK), supported by Mr. GUPTA (India), recognized that the families of crew members presented a problem but did not think there was any need to mention them in the definition of passengers.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the definition in the Safety Convention should be kept, with a recommendation that any interpretation of that definition given by IMCO should apply automatically to the convention on tonnage measurement.

Mr. LEIBENFROST (Yugoslavia) enquired whether the pilot's cabin was included in the crew space.

Mr. MILEWSKI (Poland) pointed out that if Regulation 2 contained a definition of passenger ships (ships issued with a special certificate and carrying more than 12 passengers), all other ships would automatically be cargo ships, whether or not they carried persons other than the members of the crew.

Mr. HABACHI (Suez Canal Authority) raised the question of spaces used by cadets, technicians and other persons on training ships.

The CHAIRMAN, replying to the Polish representative, observed that if, in the net tonnage formula which took account of the number of passengers, the factor N only appeared when it exceeded 12, that formula would automatically apply to passenger ships only and a definition of the latter therefore became superfluous. It would accordingly be advisable to await the report of the Working Group before taking a decision in the matter.

Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) referring to the question of training ships, said he thought that cadets were generally included in the crew.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK) thought that cadets on training ships would be better classified as special trade passengers, the definition of which could be applied to those ships as well as to SIMLA ships, since the cabins contained more than eight persons and the space per person was far less than on passenger ships. An intermediate category could be included but he thought that would complicate the definition unnecessarily.

The CHAIRMAN agreed, particularly in view of the fact that the formula at present envisaged was very approximate in regard to the number of unberthed passengers.

Mr. GUPTA (India) said that the matter was under consideration in the Committee on the Revision of the Simla Rules, which was to meet shortly. It was that Committee which, in view of the trend towards the improvement of the travel conditions of what used to be known as "deck passengers" (nowadays "unberthed passengers"), had laid down a maximum of 8 persons and it would be preferable to retain that figure in the definition in paragraph (4). Moreover, the ratio $\frac{N}{T}$ which the Working Group proposed for unberthed passengers in the net tonnage formula, was entirely satisfactory.

Mr. LILEWSKI (Poland), referring to training ships, said that in Poland cadets were included in the crew list.

Mr. HABACHI (Suez Canal Authority) considered that the Working Group should nevertheless provide for the case of special ships such as training ships, hospital ships, scientific research ships, etc.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK) drew the Committee's attention to the considerable variations in the volume of space per passenger in different types of ship. If the Working Group adopted the net tonnage formula which took account of the number of passengers, it would be essential to establish a gradation of the volume of space per passenger within the category of unberthed passengers.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee approve paragraphs (3) and (4) of Regulation 2 in principle, on the understanding

that it might be necessary to include a more precise definition of unberthed passengers.

It was so decided.

Regulation 2, paragraph 5

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) pointed out that the text in question had in fact been considered and approved by the Sub-Committee.

Mr. KING (Kuwait) felt that the case of unberthed passengers was covered by the last sentence of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN said that according to the parameter selected - volume of passenger-space or number of berthed and unberthed passengers - the Committee should incorporate in the Convention either paragraphs 3 and 4 or paragraph 5.

Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) said that passenger spaces should be spaces reserved exclusively for passengers and should not be confused with crew spaces.

Mr. GUPTA (India) did not agree with the representative of Kuwait that the last sentence of paragraph 5 covered the case of unberthed passengers. That argument might perhaps have been valid twenty years earlier, when deck passengers only were involved, but since then the carriage of unberthed passengers had been greatly extended and a continually increasing number of passengers were carried steerage. It was not, therefore, possible arbitrarily to exclude all those spaces from the passenger spaces.

Preliminary results of the Working Group's calculations

Mr. ERIKSSON (Sweden) explained that the Working Group had held a brief meeting the previous evening, and had resumed its work that morning. Hence the second part of its report would not be submitted to the Committee till later. He would, however, give a summary of the results reached by the Working Group.

The Group had dealt with water ballast corrections and passenger corrections, and had endeavoured to obtain figures as close as possible to the existing figures. He drew the Committee's attention to the results obtained by the computer study, shown on the blackboard, in the form of the table reproduced below.

In this table the calculations in the first column were based on information from the IMCO fleet and those in the second column on all categories of ship other than passenger ships:

516 ships

NT = 0.297 - 0.21 WB	NT = A (V - WB)
	A.2953
Retained 486	482
Mean deviation 1.651	3.429
SD _o 16.701	18.536
SD _m 16.619	18.216
Fleet percent- 9.882	12.099
age change	

In regard to water ballast, the Working Group had taken information supplied by the delegations of the United Kingdom and Japan as a basis for establishing an average ratio between the deductible volume of water ballast (shown hitherto on international certificates) and the total volume of water ballast for the various categories of ship.

With regard to passengers, the Working Group had concluded that there must be a correction factor for passengers if it was desired to obtain figures not too far removed from the existing figures. The calculations showed that the mean deviation was still 15.73. The Working Group was therefore continuing its studies.

Finally, with regard to the lower limit of net tonnage, computer calculations had shown that 22 ships would have a net tonnage less than 0.23 of the gross tonnage if no such limit were fixed.

He added that at the end of the morning the Working Group would be able to communicate the results of other computer calculations now being carried out.

Mr. KELLY (USA), replying to Mr. GUPTA (India) explained how the Working Group had established its average ratio between the deductible volume of water ballast and the total volume.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee should continue its consideration of the results produced by the Working Group and then vote as to whether the plenary Conference should be asked to extend the Committee's terms of reference, to allow it to seek other formulae based on other parameters.

Mr. VAUGHN (Liberia) said he was in favour of that procedure, with a roll-call vote.

Mr. MURPHY (USA) said he considered, after examining the results obtained, that better ones could be obtained. Both the formulae applied had certain defects and might cause confusion. He supported the proposal made the previous day by the United Kingdom representative that the terms of reference of the Technical Committee should be extended. It would be regrettable, however, if all the work which had been done and which was summarized in document TM/CONF/WP.5, was to be taken up again. It would be better to reconsider only paragraph 1(c) of that document, in which displacement was adopted for calculating net tonnage.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said he had found the results given by the representative of Sweden very interesting. The table appeared to show that the calculations made by the Working Group in an effort to improve the standard deviation were on the right road. It was essential to bring net tonnages as close as possible to the existing values. In his view the application of other parameters would give no better results. Any formula which used the volume of passenger space would give unrepresentative results. Moreover, the use of a formula based on certain volumes of the gross tonnage would produce results differing considerably from the present net tonnages. He invited the Committee to refer to document TM/CONF/C.2/3,

submitted by the United States delegation, and in particular to column B of Appendix III, which showed mean deviations of 17.92 and 15.94 respectively. Better results could also be obtained with the formulae indicated in the table, in which the mean deviations were about 15%, which was not unreasonable. It was therefore unnecessary, in his view, to re-open the debate, especially as the Committee had little time left to complete its work.

Mr. WIE(Norway) said that a study of the Working Group's figures had not changed the opinion he had held on the previous day. He supported the view expressed by the representatives of Liberia and the United States.

Mr. PROSSER (UK) thanked the representative of Sweden for the results he had given to the Committee. On many points he shared the view of the representative of France. The proposed new formula seemed, however, to have certain practical advantages. If certain countries, such as the USSR, the United States, Norway, Japan and Liberia, which had large fleets, could use the formula envisaged hitherto, his delegation would be in favour of adopting the procedure indicated by the representative of France. If however, those countries preferred to calculate net tonnage on the basis of volume, the Conference could meet in plenary session to consider item 1(c) of document TM/CONF/WP.5.

The Committee should hear the views of the delegations of Japan and the USSR.

Mr. SOLDA (Italy) agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. WADA (Japan) considered that the deviations were too large, and he therefore supported the view expressed by the United States delegation.

Mr. PRIVALOV (USSR) said that his delegation was satisfied, to some extent, with the results obtained. It would, however, be a good thing to carry out further calculations before taking a final decision. An attempt should be made to draw up a comparative table for all ships on the basis of displacement and on the basis of volume, in order to find a unanimous solution to the problem.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) shared the opinion of the French representative and feared that nothing would be achieved by following the new method suggested.

Mr. PROHASKA (Denmark) thought that if the Committee asked the Conference to change its terms of reference, the object must not be solely to consider the Norwegian proposal, but also to study the application of a volumetric parameter and to choose coefficients varying in accordance with the size of the ship.

Mr. MURPHY (USA) said that a two-thirds majority was not required for a change in the terms of reference.

The CHAIRMAN confirmed that under Rule 45 of the rules of procedure a simple majority was enough.

The object of the proposal was to ask the Conference to authorize the Committee to study a formula for net tonnage based on the volume of cargo spaces and passenger spaces.

A roll-call vote was taken.

Ghana, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

The result of the vote was as follows:

In favour:

Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Italy,
Japan, Kuwait, Liberia, Mexico, New Zealand, Nigeria,

Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, South Africa, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Argentina, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland.

Against:

Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Belgium, Brazil, France.

The proposal was adopted by 34 votes to 6.

The CHAIRMAN said that the results of the vote would be communicated at once to the Conference, which would decide in plenary session whether or not to change the Committee's terms of reference as requested.

The meeting rose at 12 noon.