

ERRATA AND UPDATE SHEET

1. **Issue 8.c Interpretations/Resolutions Proposals** The first proposal was incorrectly labeled as “Proposal 2”. This proposal should be labeled as “Proposal 1”.

2. **Issue 9.a Description** For correctness, the first sentence should read: “. . . on included spaces (both cargo and non-cargo spaces), with associated excluded spaces annotated with an asterisk.” This also helps differentiate this issue from Issue 9.c, which is related.

3. **Issue 13 Round 1 Questionnaire Responses** The summary of Round 1 Questionnaire responses on this issue, specified as “under development” in the Round 2 Questionnaire, has been developed and is provided below. As with the other summaries in this Questionnaire, participants are invited to offer comments on this language using the Round 2 Questionnaire comment block (in this case, on page 120 of the Questionnaire), or may offer such comments during the Round 3 work.

“A majority of respondents disagreed with the proposal. Among those who disagreed, one respondent observed that there was little support in recent work by the Sub-Committee for establishing a third tonnage parameter to address deck cargo (e.g., Option 5 in the annex to SLF 51/6). This participant cited documents from the 1969 Tonnage Conference (e.g., TM/CONF/C.1/SR.15; TM/CONF/C.2/SR.1, 7, 14, 22 and 23), commenting that the design impact of containerized deck cargo under the TM Convention’s measurement approach was taken into consideration at the Conference, and expressing the view that the principles relating to deck cargo treatment are fundamentally unchanged from that time. In neither agreeing nor disagreeing with the proposal, another respondent commented that inclusion of deck cargo in tonnage goes beyond the current concept of enclosed space, and that calculation of volumes could be problematic, noting the limitations of both a “maximum permitted volume” approach (e.g., not addressed by current International standards), and a “real deck cargo volume” approach (e.g., calculation by port authorities on a case-by-case basis as provided for under older British regulations). In support of the proposal, one respondent commented that confusion arising over treatment of new types of ships and different options of carrying cargoes could lead to adoption of parameters other than gross or net tonnage for assessing port and other fees. Another participant highlighted the detrimental effects on the safety of certain aspects of ship designs and the disincentives to improve crew accommodations related to this issue, expressing concern over the future relevance of the TM Convention, and highlighting the consequences for setting limiting criteria in International Conventions and Codes should the TM Convention become irrelevant. This participant commented that the situation will only get worse, and that the correspondence group should make it clear that action by the Maritime Safety Committee is needed to address these concerns.”

4. **Header Information** The headers on pages 120 and 121 of Revision 1 to the Questionnaire should reflect that the pages are part of Revision 1, and not Revision 0. Note that the information on these pages was unaffected by Revision 1.