



IMCO

FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
TONNAGE MEASUREMENT, 1969

Technical Committee

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE TWENTIETH MEETING

held at Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1,
on Thursday, 12 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

	<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/C.2/2; TM/CONF/WP.19-35)
(continued)

Mr. PROHASKA (Denmark) noted that so far the Working Group had been studying the question of the depth of a vessel in relation to one of the two existing Load Line Conventions (1930 and 1966); he proposed that a simpler solution would be to define the load line as eighty-five per cent of the ship depth to uppermost deck and to construct the formula $(H/0.85 D_u)^n \leq 1$, where $n = 2$ or 3 , to take account of the smaller ships. Another possibility was to drop the 0.85 term and make allowance for it instead in the coefficient A in the formula $NT = A(VC) + f(P_N \text{ or } P_V)$. He suggested that the Technical Committee should instruct the Working Group to consider that possibility.

The CHAIRMAN commented that even with that solution, the matter of defining the uppermost deck together with the problems noted by the French delegation at the previous meeting of the Committee still remained.

Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK) supported the idea expressed by Mr. PROHASKA (Denmark) but suggested that instead of $0.85 D_u$, the term D_u alone be used; there was then no need for an inequality formula since H/D_u was bound to be less than unity.

Mr. PROHASKA (Denmark) replied that in that case the coefficient A would still have to be adjusted and the uppermost deck still defined.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee should give a broad mandate to the Working Group to investigate all approaches to the problem of ship's depth and to bear in mind the need to avoid anomalies in the future design of uppermost decks.

It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN re-introduced discussion on the position of the line to be drawn for the passenger term in the net tonnage formula (TM/CONF/WP.30).

Mr. PROHASKA (Denmark), supported by Mr. MURRAY SMITH (UK), observed that since the passenger correction term had in any case to be recalculated, the Committee should decide only on the principle for fixing the position of the line and leave the matter of actual figures to the Working Group.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Working Group should immediately re-open its investigation of the passenger correction term and the definition of ship's depth.

It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN recapitulated that the Committee had yet to decide how to define cargo spaces and how to measure them.

Mr. SOLDA (Italy) pointed out that since the cargo space parameter was to be measured by coefficients, the method of linear measurement itself was not of great importance. He therefore considered that the Committee should maintain the principle of measuring all spaces as far as possible to the moulded lines.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (USA) said that initially his delegation had used the concept of grain cubic capacity in determining cargo space. After further consideration of TM/CONF/9, however, it had concluded that it was preferable to measure volume to

the moulded lines of the vessel, or to the steel plating of the boundary bulkhead in all cases, thereby avoiding any possible reductions for insulation, for lightweight inner bulkheads, for deep tanks in LNG carriers or for pressure vessels in LPG carriers.

Mr. WILSON (UK), supported by Mr. SIMPSON (Liberia), agreed with the United States delegation but specified that to eliminate any confusion the bulkhead should be measured to the inner structural boundary of the vessel.

Mr. GUPTA (India) asked whether it was proposed to measure all types of cargo spaces, (dry and liquid) in all types of carrier, in the same way.

The CHAIRMAN observed that the agreement was to measure cargo spaces in all cases to their moulded boundaries.

He proposed that the Committee should also agree on the inclusion of a clause in the regulations to the effect that if any vessel were found to be carrying cargo in spaces not designated as cargo spaces, extra tonnage would be added to the tonnage certificate of the ship until such time as it changed hands.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) said he understood that double bottoms would not be included in cargo spaces and asked whether bilges would be included or not.

Mr. WILSON (UK) suggested that the definition adopted by the United Kingdom might be useful, viz: "Cargo spaces are all spaces below the uppermost deck fitted or adapted for the carriage of goods, liquids or gas in bulk which are not ship's stores, bunkers or ballast."

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said that special consideration was needed in the case of refrigeration ships with their special insulation, and methane tankers, which used their cargo as fuel. He believed that although cargo should be determined according to its nature, its position within the vessel was also relevant.

The CHAIRMAN said that the solution might be to stipulate a higher tonnage for ships which were granted the privilege of using their own cargo for fuel. Otherwise the regulation would have to take into consideration all the different possibilities.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) said that the easiest method would be to take cargo spaces to moulded lines, including fuel tanks but excluding pump rooms and refrigerator spaces.

Mr. UGLAND (Norway) said that if cargo were defined as all goods carried on the ship and discharged from it - which would exclude such items as stores - cargo spaces could be defined as the spaces used for cargo.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that that definition would not cover water ballast.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said that, for the purposes of the Working Group, the Committee would have to decide whether or not to include fuel bunkers in the general volume of cargo spaces. Two delegations had proposed including fuel oil tanks which, being large, would affect the formula to be prepared.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Working Group had been using volume without fuel in the coefficient.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (USA) said that the main difficulty with fuel was the outboard wing tanks aft and forward of the engine room, which might be defined as spaces in

the vicinity of cargo spaces. The IMCO data on volumes to be added for tankers referred to volumes in the tanker cargo space area, namely, the block of tonnage forward of the engine room bulkhead. It could be indicated that bunkers outside the engine room would be included in the tonnage.

Mr. WILSON (UK) said that it would be illogical to include oil fuel or any other bunkers in the ship's cargo space. The Committee was discussing the cargo, which was the ship's payload, put on board because the owner expected profit from delivering it to its destination. If there were any fear that bunkers might be used for cargo it could be stated that oil fuel bunkers on vessels such as tankers should not be connected in any way with the ship's cargo lines.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) observed that pipe connections were easy to install and easy to remove. Bunkers were normally of small capacity: the point was to prevent excessive bunker space being taken into account.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that cargo and cargo space were real, not theoretical. Inclusion of bunkers or fuel tanks would only give rise to further questions and make matters more complicated.

Mr. FILIPPOVICH (USSR) said that fuel bunkers required for a ship should not be considered as cargo space and should not be included in the net tonnage.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) said that the real problem was for the measurer. It was known that oil carriers used water ballast spaces for oil, but who was to know whether store rooms, fuel bunkers or water ballast spaces were being used for cargo?

The CHAIRMAN said that he had had that point in mind in suggesting a penalty clause. He invited the Committee to vote on the concept that fuel should not be included in cargo.

There were 30 votes in favour and 2 against.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote on the inclusion of a sentence to the effect that if an owner were discovered to be using the fuel tank for cargo, the net tonnage would be increased by the volume of the fuel tank so used, until the ship transferred to another flag. The wording would be left to the Drafting Group.

Mr. WILSON (UK) proposed that the penalty should apply in the case of all spaces not intended for cargo, and not be limited to fuel tanks.

It was decided by 32 votes to 2 to instruct the Drafting Group to prepare a text on the lines indicated by the Chairman, as amended by the UK representative.

The CHAIRMAN, in reply to a question by Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands), said that the problem of checking the spaces should be left to the proposed working group on the tonnage certificate.

The CHAIRMAN, in the absence of volunteers, suggested that the question of cargo spaces should be referred to the drafting group, composed of representatives of France, UK, USA and USSR, which should be instructed to prepare:

- (1) a definition of cargo space as the space to the moulded line of the structural boundaries of cargo spaces;
- (2) a draft of the penalty for abuse of cargo space;
- (3) a text for the exclusion of fuel from cargo.

s It was so agreed.

The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider its instructions at the proposed working group on the tonnage certificate. The problem of the draught remained to be settled. Whatever coefficients were used, the tonnage would be related to the ship's actual draught since only by checking the tonnage certificate could it be ascertained whether the ship was sailing at its correct or at a higher draught. Hence the draught should correspond to displacement at the denominator in the tonnage certificate.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands), suggested that it would be sufficient to record the number of the national load line certificate on the tonnage certificate.

Mr. GUPTA (India), referring to the problem of water ballast space, pointed out that in a ship with a large number of wing tanks, all of which were certified as water ballast spaces, the measuring authority would measure only the spaces specified by the owner as cargo spaces.

The CHAIRMAN said that the penalty clause agreed upon would cover that situation, since water ballast space used for cargo would have to appear on the tonnage certificate.

Mr. GUPTA (India) said that he was still not satisfied that the problems such as the carriage of fresh water for cattle and the use of oil for a variety of purposes had been satisfactorily resolved.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France), referring to the Netherlands representative's comment, said that it would not be sufficient to indicate merely the number of the freeboard certificate on the tonnage certificate. The gross tonnage, net tonnage and all other figures relevant to the formula should also appear on the tonnage certificate.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that for passenger ships there should also be a reference to the SOLAS certificate.

Mr. OVERGAAUW (Netherlands) said that since the second formula had been chosen, it would be necessary to specify on the tonnage certificate all the spaces capable of containing liquid or dry cargo; otherwise there would be ample opportunity for manipulation.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Working Group could include that point in the penalty clause.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) stressed the need for simplicity.

Mr. WILSON (UK) drew attention to a four-page model tonnage certificate which his delegation had prepared in the light of comments made during the discussions. The first page contained the gross or net tonnage and space for information such as passenger numbers and draught if necessary. The second and third pages had been left blank for the insertion of a sketch of the ship, so that the ship could be measured to ascertain if the outline had been altered. The fourth page listed the main spaces in the gross tonnage, with description, length and tonnage. A column could be added to that page showing the spaces included in the net tonnage with reference to numbers reflected in the sketch. A tonnage certificate on those lines would make it very easy to check in cases where misuse of cargo space was suspected.

Mr. KING (Kuwait) agreed that the spaces not included in the cargo space should be listed on the tonnage certificate.

The carriage of fresh water, referred to by the Indian representative, was essential when a ship carried cattle, but the spaces so used would otherwise become ballast spaces. He wondered what such spaces should be called.

Mr. GUPTA (India) said that in general he agreed with the Netherlands on the need to list all potential cargo spaces on the tonnage certificate. Since, however, manipulation was widespread even where such spaces were listed, he urged that special mention should be made of water spaces.

Mr. HABACHI (Observer, Suez Canal Authority), speaking at the invitation of the Chairman, stressed the need for as much detail as possible on the tonnage certificate.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) enquired what would be the position of new ships, whose certificate would show both the old and the new tonnage during the transition period.

The SECRETARY replied that, in accordance with Article 3, as agreed by the General Committee (page 3 of TM/CONF/C.1/WP.11) the regulations in Annex I would apply to new ships. Hence new ships would be measured in accordance with the new Convention as soon as it came into force.

The CHAIRMAN invited volunteers for membership of the Working Group on the tonnage certificate.

The representatives of France, the Netherlands, Norway, UK, USA and USSR having volunteered, he suggested that the Working Group should be established with that membership.

It was so agreed.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.