INTER-GOVERNMENTAL MARITIME CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION

TM/CONF/C.2/SR.6
4 June 1969
Original: FRENCH

IMCO

FOR PARTICIPANTS ONLY

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
TONNAGE MEASUREMENT, 1969

Technical Committee

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SIXTH MEETING

held at Church House, Westminster, London, S.W.1,
on Tuesday, 3 June 1969, at 4.50 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. F. SPINELLI (Italy)

Secretary: Mr. Y. SASAMURA

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.

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 4 - CONSIDERATION AND PREPARATION OF PROPOSED TECHNICAL REGULATIONS ON TONNAGE MEASUREMENT AND TONNAGE CERTIFICATES

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the Committee proceed to draw up definitions to serve as a basis for the deliberations of the working group which was to be set up on the calculation of conversion factors. As far as gross tonnage was concerned, it was evident from earlier discussions that the main paramater should be a volumetric one. Proposal C, which suggested that gross tonnage should be calculated from the ship's total volume, called for a definition of open and closed spaces. The Norwegian Proposal (TM/CONF/9/Add.1) required a definition of passenger spaces situated above deck and of under-deck cargo spaces which might also be included in the gross tonnage if the proposal were modified.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) observed that his delegation intended to submit a compromise proposal the following day which would include, in the calculation of gross tonnage, the under-deck volume supplemented by cargo spaces and passenger spaces situated above deck and, if necessary, the hatchway tonnage. Although no other spaces (crew, safety equipment, chart room, etc.) would be included in the gross tonnage, they would be taken into account by applying to the ship's total volume a coefficient which would enable designers to extend those spaces in the interests of crew welfare and safety without increasing the tonnage.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) said that the decision taken at the plenary meeting to base the calculation of gross tonnage on the ship's volume, doing away with the shelter-deck concept and the dual value for gross tonnage, simplified the problem and made

the definition of a deck unnecessary. The advantages which the Norwegian Proposal would offer in excluding from the gross tonnage the service spaces in the superstructures were doubtful and Proposal C had the advantage of being simpler - since it did not call for a definition of the various spaces - and of offering, for the calculation of gross tonnage, a parameter (total volume) which was at once intangible and representative of the ship; that seemed to meet the wishes expressed during the general debate and it was useful for statistical purposes and for certain operations such as towage.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) stressed that the spaces under discussion would not be excluded from the ship's gross tonnage as account would be taken of them in a conversion factor applied to the volume of the spaces directly measured which would in effect be the equivalent of the new tonnage unit in Proposal C designed to give results very similar to existing tonnage values.

Mr. ROCQUEMONT (France) considered that under the Norwegian Proposal gross tonnage would not be related to the ship's actual volume and might thus differ for two ships having the same volume but different space distribution; that was contrary to rational tonnage measurement. Proposal C, on the other hand, made provision for the new tonnage unit to be applied to all parts of the ship without distinction.

Mr. PROHASKA (Denmark), pointing out that the Technical Committee would have to choose between Proposal C and the Norwegian Proposal, listed some of the advantages and disadvantages of those proposals. Proposal C had the drawback that all crew spaces were included in the calculations and some shipowners might tend to cut down on such spaces; in that sense the Norwegian Proposal seemed preferable. In regard to the definition of gross tonnage, however, he explained to the Committee, illustrating his ideas on the blackboard, that in so far as possible it should not be influenced by the design of the ship; a very slight design modification might produce a substantially lower gross tonnage but might make the ship less seaworthy.

Mr. OVERGAAUW (Netherlands) agreed with the French representative that if the Norwegian Proposal were adopted a definition of the decks would be necessary so as to prevent such practices as the incorporation in the design of a stringer designated as a deck.

He was not in favour of adopting a new unit and would prefer the use of a conversion factor. His delegation intended to submit a proposal with regard to the use of a conversion factor at the next day's meeting.

The CHAIRMAN said there were two alternatives: to exclude certain spaces in calculating a ship's tonnage - more precisely, to provide an overall volume for crew spaces, which would then be the only spaces requiring measurement - or to measure everything in order to avoid difficulties. The Committee should begin by taking a decision on that point.

Mr. WILSON (UK) pointed out that the Norwegian Proposal would demand a precise definition of certain spaces, and in particular a definition of the "upper deck", as certain spaces above that deck were included in the tonnage calculation. There would also have to be a precise definition of cargo spaces which, in the view of his delegation were not defined clearly enough in document TM/CONF/9/Add.1. In the case of refrigerated ships, for instance, it would be necessary to decide whether the refrigeration equipment spaces should be treated as cargo spaces; he himself considered that they should. Cargo spaces would have to be measured up to the boundary bulkheads, and if necessary a conversion factor would have to be applied to them.

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Norway) said that his delegation did not wish to submit an entirely new proposal but merely to put forward a suggestion concerning the calculation of gross tonnage. It was indeed necessary to define what was meant by the "upper deck", bearing in mind the definitions in the International Convention on Load Lines.

He thought it would be fairly easy to find a single conversion factor to cover frames, floors and crew spaces, as had been suggested by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Mr. DE JONG (Netherlands) also considered that if the Norwegian Proposal were adopted a precise definition of decks would have to be provided. However, any proposal which required a definition of decks appeared undesirable to him. Such proposals might affect ship construction, as had been shown at the blackboard by the representative of Denmark.

He agreed with the representative of the United Kingdom that it was difficult to define cargo spaces and crew spaces.

As the representative of France had rightly pointed out, the shelter-deck concept had not been retained by the Committee. For calculating net tonnage, therefore, the total volume of the ship would be used, with or without a conversation factor. The Committee would have to decide whether it was desirable to apply a conversion factor and, if so, what its value should be.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM (USA) drew the Committee's attention to document TM/CONF/C.2/3, which his delegation had submitted for information, and in which a comparison had been made by a computer study between Proposal C and the Norwegian Proposal, ignoring cargo spaces above deck, which appeared to exist on few vessels. That document might be useful to give an idea of the standard deviation which would result from the adoption of the Norwegian Proposal or of Proposal C.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.