INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME
CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION

IMCO

TM/CONF/C.2/SR.16
10 June 1969
Original: ENGLISH

FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
TONNAGE MEASUREMENT, 1969

Technical Committee

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTEENTH MEETING

held at Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1,
on Tuesday, 10 June 1969, at 2.35 p.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

AGENDA ITEM 4 - CONSIDERATION AND PREPARATION OF PROPOSED TECHNICAL REGULATIONS ON TONNAGE MEASUREMENT AND TONNAGE CERTIFICATES (TM/CONF/6; TM/CONF/C.2/2; TM/CONF/C.2/WP.19 - WP.25) (continued)

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) submitted for the Committee's consideration the following volumetric formula to be used for the calculation of net tonnage:

$$NT = A(C + H)\frac{D}{D_{LL}} + B \times P$$

where:

A = coefficient

C = the moulded volume in cubic metres of the ship's cargo spaces

H = the moulded volume in cubic metres of hatchways and hatchway trunks leading directly to the cargo spaces

D = ship's displacement, draught or freeboard

D_{LL} = displacement, draught or freeboard corresponding to the maximum summer load line under the International Load Line Convention in force

P = passenger spaces

B = coefficient.

The Committee might consider it simpler to include the factor "H" in the factor "C", and he would have no objection to that course.

The following limit should be considered:

$$NT \geq 0.30\ GT$$

The CHAIRMAN invited comments on the new formula which, if accepted by the Committee as a possible alternative, would be passed on immediately to the Working Group for further investigation, with a view to determining the coefficients "A" and "B" to the minimum standard variation about the mean.

It should be noted that, if draught or freeboard was substituted for displacement, "D_{LL}" would represent the minimum freeboard or the maximum draught assigned under the International Load Line Convention and "D", the actual draught or freeboard. Secondly, consideration would eventually have to be given to the choice of an alternative value, in the case of passenger ships, for B x P. The following formula should then be considered:

$$\left(1 + \frac{D}{10000}\right)\left(N_b + \frac{N_u}{10}\right)$$

where N_b = Number of berthed passengers and

N_u = Number of unberthed passengers.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) asked whether the factor "C" would comprise all spaces used for the carriage of cargo, including those used only occasionally for that purpose; he had in mind, in particular, tanks that might be used either for the carriage of liquid cargo or for water ballast.

Secondly, the factor "D_{LL}" would, he thought require authorities to determine scantling freeboard in order to comply with Regulation 1 of the Load Line Convention, in which case difficulties of interpretation might arise.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) confirmed that the factor "C" was intended to cover all cargo spaces, including tanks for the carriage of liquid cargo; obviously, tanks for water ballast were outside that category.

The ship with the scantling freeboard also had an assigned minimum freeboard so that the formula would still be valid where the owner wanted to obtain a reduced freeboard.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the concept of displacement as used under the new formula was the same as that applied in Proposal C, so that the question of scantling freeboard need not be a matter of special concern.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK) said he was somewhat confused as a result of the explanations given. According to the Chairman's interpretation, the factor "D_{LL}" could be a completely fictitious value inasmuch as it could be based on sheer geometry without regard to hull strength. It would be unwise, he would have thought, to use as one part of the ratio a displacement that would never be obtainable by the ship. His understanding was that the ratio was intended to take into account the shelter-deck concept by relating two extremes of practical displacement; in other words, "D_{LL}" would represent the deepest draught permitted under the Load Line Convention having regard to geometric form and scantlings, whereas "D" would represent the displacement selected by the owner as the draught advantageous to him to be applicable for a specified period of time.

The CHAIRMAN said that the point he had had in mind related to the retention of the shelter-deck concept. It was general practice for a ship to be built for operation in a particular trade throughout its whole lifetime and the trade concerned would determine the scantling strength needed. The prospective Convention should not require a ship to have greater scantling than that needed for the minimum draught.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK) suggested that, for the kind of ship the Chairman had in mind, "D" would be equal to "D_{LL}" and the factor would be unity.

Mr. OVERGAAUW (Netherlands) said that his delegation had no objection to the new formula, which represented a step in the right direction. He would merely ask, in view of the introduction of the coefficient "A", whether the spaces represented by "C" and "H" would be measured to moulded lines, even in the case of insulated spaces.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said he was under the impression that there was no agreement between the Chairman and the United Kingdom concerning the term to be used as denominator, and the matter should be cleared up for the benefit of the Working Group. If, as the United Kingdom suggested, actual displacement was to be selected, authorities would be bound, in order to comply with Regulation 1 of the Load Line Convention, to determine scantling freeboard, a calculation that would require application of the rules of the classific tion societies. That would raise a problem, irrespective of whether or not reference could be made in the Convention to those rules.

Secondly, both the interpretations given would require authorities to determine geometric freeboard and he was doubtful whether they would dispose of agents trained for that purpose.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) thought the matter was in fact quite simple; the classification societies could be asked to determine the load line mark the ship would be assigned in the absence of such scantlings.

The point raised by the Netherlands was one that was open to discussion.

Professor PROHASKA (Denmark) suggested that France's point would be met by using the coefficient definition proposed by his delegation in connexion with gross tonnage measurement (see TM/CONF/C.2/WP.10, p.2), suitably amended.

The CHAIRMAN thought it a pity that the factor "D_{LL}" should be made to depend on scantling strength, for that would mean that scantling freeboard would also have to be determined, a matter of some difficulty having regard to the differences in the rules of the classification societies. Secondly, it would force the owner of a ship being built to operate throughout its lifetime at a light draught to add heavier scantling simply to obtain a reduced tonnage.

Professor PROHASKA (Denmark) failed to see wherein the problem lay. The classification society would determine the minimum freeboard under the Load Line Convention at the stage of ship design; the question of scantlings would arise only in the event of an owner wanting at a later stage to obtain a reduced freeboard.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK) agreed that the interpretation given by the Chairman and Denmark would simplify matters; on the other hand it would mean that one factor in the ratio would be completely unreal and he was doubtful of the need for maintaining such a factor simply to cover the case cited.

Mr. SOLDA (Italy) and Mr MILCH (Israel) affirmed the need for retaining the factor in question. Mr Milch added that, in any case, there was no problem for the Working Group, since it was only displacement for open or closed shelter-deck ships that was in question; "D" represented the minimum displacement in the open condition and "D_{LL}" the maximum displacement in the closed condition. Those definitions were amply clear.

Mr. VLASIC (Yugoslavia) said that, in the light of the Chairman's explanations, he would propose adding to the definition of "D_{LL}" the words "irrespective of the ship's scantlings".

The CHAIRMAN thought the point might be met by adopting either the Yugoslav or the Danish Proposal.

It would seem that all necessary points had been cleared up for the guidance of the Working Group. The Working Group would have at its disposal the data submitted in a number of working papers covering, inter alia, results relative to "P" in terms of volume and in terms of passenger number.

Professor PROHASKA (Denmark) pointed out that the data available in terms of volume was based on a limited number of passenger ships only.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK) said that his delegation had prepared data using for the ratio draught and freeboard in addition to displacement. It had found that the biggest differential resulted in comparison of freeboards. The Working Group might decide that a relationship between freeboard in open condition and freeboard in closed condition would be preferable to a relationship between either of the other two parameters for the purpose of obtaining the closest approximation to existing net tonnage figures. The data, in the form of a table, was at the Committee's disposal.

The CHAIRMAN thought the Working Group should be asked carefully to check results in respect to passenger ships, especially large-sized ones, for if freeboard instead of displacement or draught was used, the ratio might have to be reduced to get approximate figures for that class of ship.

In answer to a point raised by Professor Prohaska (Denmark) he said that the Italian delegation had available certain data on passenger ship freeboard which would be at the disposal of the Working Group.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) agreed with the Danish rperesentative that it would be difficult to evaluate the corrective coefficient on the basis of passenger ships because of the lack of date on geometric freeboard for that class. In France, the practice in the case of such vessels was to take account only of sub-division freeboard.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that for passenger ships the factor "P" would be predominant, i.e. the cargo space would be small in relation to the total passenger space. The Working Group should endeavour to obtain as much data as possible to serve as a basis for final conclusions.

He proposed that the Working Group should be asked to proceed immediately with the work of investigating the new formula proposed by Norway on the lines suggested in the discussion and on the understanding that an additional sub-group might be set up if deemed necessary.

It was so agreed

First Draft of Regulations for Determining Gross and Net Tonnages of Ships (TM/CONF/C.2/WP.22) (Continued)

The CHAIRMAN re-opened the discussion on "Passenger Space" (Regulation 2, paragraph 5).

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) drew attention to the list of "spaces used or intended to be used as public spaces for passengers" and asked whether it was to be assumed that passenger kitchens, galleys, pantries and service rooms were to be included.

Secondly, citing the stipulation that "promenade decks on and above the upper deck and other similar spaces not served by the ship's interior heating and ventilation systems" were not to be included in passenger spaces, he asked whether, in view of Regulation 3 on gross tonnage, there was any need to define such "weather decks". He pointed out that if such spaces were to be enclosed and became liable for inclusion in the gross tonnage formula they would not then be considered passenger spaces, whereas if they were enclosed and as such became passenger spaces, they would then be exempt from gross tonnage, if the appropriate formula were to be adopted.

As regards the "ships interior heating and ventilating systems" themselves, he asked whether, if those were not to be considered passenger spaces, they would be included in the gross tonnage. In short, a reappraisal of Regulation 3 and Definition 5 was called for.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) observed that the tonnage concept had always been that a space could not be included for calculation in the net tonnage unless it was also included in the gross tonnage. The same therefore applied to passenger spaces, whether open or closed.

Mr. GUPTA (India) stated that the present practice was to consider promenade and weather decks as necessary spaces for the exercise of onboard passengers berthed in the lower or upper tween decks. In fair seasons, passengers might also travel on weather decks providing that sufficient space still remained for the original purpose of those decks. In the special trade ships, therefore, such spaces were truly passenger spaces and, being two-dimensional, had never been involved in the measurement of tonnage, either gross or net.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that his delegation believed that such rooms as passenger galleys, pantries, etc. should be exempted only if used exclusively for the passengers; it had taken the clause "passenger dining rooms, and other similar spaces associated therewith" to signify such galleys, kitchens and pantries.

It further considered that such spaces as passageways used for both crew and passengers, for instance, those leading to sleeping accommodation and mess rooms, should not be considered as passenger space.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) observed that since the galleys, kitchens, etc. in general occupied more space than the others specified in the text, they should be included at the top of the list of exempted spaces.

The CHAIRMAN proposed, in response to the first point raised by the delegation of France, that passenger galleys, pantries, kitchens, etc. should be included specifically in the list of exempted spaces, when the text of Definition (5) was redrafted.

It was so agreed.

Mr. WILSON (UK), returning to the second point originally raised by the delegation of France, agreed that certain glassed-in passenger spaces without heating or ventilation which had traditionally always been exempt from measurement would, under draft Regulation 3, become included in the gross tonnage. He suggested that Regulation 4 could rectify the situation with a stipulation that any space to be included in the net tonnage should first be included in the gross.

Mr. BONN (Canada) asked whether, for instance, a steward's room located within the passenger accommodation would render all the adjoining passageways non-eligible for exemption.

Mr. NOZIGLIA (Argentina) noted that since the passenger term in the net tonnage was positive it should be made as small as possible, which could be done by stipulating that such spaces were to be for the exclusive use of passengers, with the interspersion of spaces for stewards, etc; the latter would, however, lead to artificial distributions of cabins in order to render passageways exempt.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) pointed out that it was unavoidable that certain crew lockers containing stores were located in passageways within the passenger accommodation but that since such stores would be for the service of the passengers there was no question of those passageways ceasing to be classified as passenger space.

Mr. WILSON (UK) explained that his delegation wished the clause qualifying the term "promenade deck" to be removed so that the last sentence would read: "Service and crew areas shall not be included in passenger spaces".

Mr. KING (Kuwait) suggested that the word "exclusively" be included after "used" in the first line of the paragraph.

Mr. NOZIGLIA (Argentina) proposed that instead the word "primarily" or ordinarily" be added, to cover the case where small spaces for crew use were interspersed throughout the passenger accommodation.

Mr. VLASIC (Yugoslavia) asked whether in that case a galley used primarily for passengers but also for crew would be included or excluded in the definition.

Mr. BORG (Sweden) said that his delegation preferred the word "exclusively".

Mr. CABARIBERE (France), supported by Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK), believed that the whole definition should be redrafted so as to take specific account of spaces used exclusively for passengers, such as certain passageways and services, and ones used primarily for passengers or jointly for passengers and crew.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that a small drafting group, consisting of a maximum of four members and including a representative each for France, United Kingdom and USSR, be set up to deal with the matter of passenger spaces for exclusive and joint use. The matter of passenger galleys etc, and the United Kingdom proposal for deletion in the last sentence.

It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN recommended that, in view of the difficulties arising, if the Working Group were to find that a formula including passenger number only were reasonably adequate, the Committee should immediately drop all discussion of definition of passenger space.

He then opened the discussion on Water ballast spaces (Regulation 2, paragraph 6 - TM/CONF/C.2/WP.22).

Mr. GUPTA (India) observed that the term "water ballast spaces" had been variously interpreted in the past; he strongly hoped that in the final drafting of that definition the Committee would take care to ensure that there was no longer any room for manipulation.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) suggested that a clause be added to provide that in a case where water ballast spaces were used to carry cargo, they would be excluded permanently from exemption.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that that case was covered by the word "exclusively" in the first line.

The CHAIRMAN said that the wording referred to by the representative of France, which had been included on the proposal of the UK delegation, appeared in item (4) on page 8 of document TM/CONF/C.2/WP.22.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that the point made by the representatives of France and India was covered by the text as it stood; the opening line referred to space used "exclusively" for carrying water ballast; and the first line of sub-paragraph (ii) specified that the space should be "solely" adapted for water ballast.

The Indian representative's difficulty had perhaps arisen from the tendency in recent times to depart from the classic concept of exclusiveness of water ballast spaces, and to take into account other uses, such as fresh water. The problem would not arise, however, unless water ballast was incorporated in a formula. In that event the principle of exclusive use would have to be applied because double-bottomed tanks frequently had a dual use.

In connexion with sub-paragraph (ii) he suggested that the words "motor" in the fourth line should be replaced by the word "engine".

Mr. GUPTA (India) thanked the United Kingdom representative for his explanation. The tonnage regulations of most countries had always included provisions similar to those set out on pages 6 and 7, but that had not prevented serious manipulations. It was essential to guard against such practices in the future. He suggested that if the water ballast concept were included in the new formula, a limit should be set to the total reduction allowed for water ballast.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) instanced the case of a ship carrying cattle or sheep, where all the tanks had to be filled with fresh water. Would such tanks have to be treated as cargo spaces thereafter?

Mr. GRUNER (Finland) said that the question of fresh water did not arise, since water ballast taken from a river would be fresh.

Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) supported the Indian representative's suggestion. It was easy for engineers to alter pipe lines to enable spaces to be used for other than the certified purpose. He also suggested that provision should be made for fixed ballast, which was carried on many passenger and cargo ships.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that fixed ballast was not relevant to the present discussion. The Committee was trying to prepare a definition of water ballast in case it was included in the formula produced by the Working Group.

Mr. NOZIGLIA (Argentina) said that in Argentine ships, a considerable number of which carried cattle and sheep cargoes, double-bottomed tanks were used for both water ballast and drinking water.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) asked whether, in a ship having topside and other tanks as water spaces, removal of water ballast and pumping equipment, to provide more cargo space, would constitute a change in the ship's character and thus alter the tonnage.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that he did not see the relevance of the Norwegian representative's point concerning water ballast on ships with cattle cargoes. The Committee was trying to define water ballast space for tonnage purposes and was not concerned with water ballast requirements for particular circumstances. The point was that water ballast spaces should be used exclusively for that purpose. If they were used for anything else the tonnage would have to be raised accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN said that the penalty stipulated in item (4) on page 8 would apply only if cargo were carried in a space certified as water ballast space, He asked if the Committee agreed to the addition at the end of item (6) - water ballast spaces - of wording to the effect that if water ballast space were found to be used for cargo, it should be included in the net tonnage until the ship had transferred to another flag or there had been a real change in ownership.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France), while agreeing to such an addition, suggested that the Committee should agree on the principle only at the present stage, since the wording would depend on whether the formula ultimately adopted included cargo volume or water ballast volume.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the addition would be needed only for a formula which included water ballast volume.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said that if the formula on the blackboard were adopted, it would be necessary to define C (cargo spaces) and perhaps also water ballast space used both for water ballast and for cargo.

The CHAIRMAN drew attention to the definition of cargo spaces in paragraph (2) of document TM/CONF/C.2/WP.25, submitted by Norway, which he suggested might be discussed at a later stage. For the present purpose the Committee should be very specific, since it was preparing a definition for use in a formula with water ballast deduction. He suggested that the Drafting Committee should be requested to prepare an addition to item 6 on the following lines: "If a ship is discovered with any space officially certified as water ballast space filled with cargo, that space shall no longer appear on the tonnage certificate as a deduction from net tonnage."

It was so agreed.

Mr. GUPTA (India) said that, to avoid future difficulties, water ballast spaces should be very clearly specified on the tonnage certificate.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Committee, jointly with the General Committee, should set up a small working group on the tonnage certificate to prepare a number of possible alternatives.

It was so agreed.

Mr. UGLAND (Norway), referring to the Danish representative's comments on other types of ballast, suggested that the heading of item (6) should be amended to "Ballast Spaces", and that the necessary consequential changes should be made in the text.

The CHAIRMAN said that such an amendment was inappropriate at the present stage, as a definition of water ballast spaces was required in connexion with the formula. The question of solid ballast should not be discussed until it was certain that it would be required.

He invited attention to sub-paragraph (iii) (2), item (1) having already been considered.

Mr. BECKWITH (Liberia) proposed that the words "separated off" at the end of the second line should be replaced by the word "contained".

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the matter should be referred to the drafting committee.

It was so agreed.

Following a question by Mr. ROSELL (Denmark) as to the meaning of "awnings", Mr. KING (Kuwait) suggested that the words "either fixed or portable" should be inserted after the word "awnings" at the end of the third line.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that he would have no objection to the insertion of the words "fixed or portable" before the word "awnings", although they were superfluous.

Mr. VUURSTEEN (Netherlands) did not understand the relevance of the words "or fixed or portable partitions" which followed.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the word "by" should be inserted before the words "or fixed or portable partitions".

It was so agreed.

The Committee approved the amendment of Kuwait: the insertion of the words "fixed or movable" after the word "awnings" in the third line.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that a question had been raised concerning the words "stores" in the fourth line of item (3). He suggested that the drafting group should be requested to revise the wording so as to avoid any reference to the part of the deck between the poop and the bridge, since this area would be considered as a closed space if a propeller was installed there.

It was so agreed.

Mr. VUURSTEEN (Netherlands), illustrating his point by a diagram, proposed that the words "side to side" should be inserted before the word "erections" in the first line of sub-paragraph (3) (a)(iii). Otherwise, there might not be an empty space between the two erections and the volume of the entire erections would have to be included in the total volume of enclosed spaces.

Mr. WILSON (UK) supported the proposal.

Mr. CABARIBERE (France) said that it might be necessary to specify a minimum distance between the erection and the forecastle or an entirely different side to side erection, such as bridge or poop. Otherwise the intervening space might be closed.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that for existing ships, under the Panama Canal rules, anything other than a hatch would invalidate the exemption.

Mr. HAMLIN (Observer, Panama Canal Company), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, said that there would be no problem with a hatch, which, under the Panama Canal regulations, was not regarded as an erection.

Mr. HABACHI (Observer, Suez Canal Authority), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, supported the amendment. He also drew attention to the comments on document TM/CONF/C.2/WP.14 recorded in document TM/CONF/C.2/SR.13.

It was agreed to insert the words "side to side" before the word "erections" in the first line of sub-paragraph (3)(a)(iii).

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.