



MARITIME SAFETY COMMITTEE
86th session
Agenda item 5

MSC 86/5/2/Corr.1
17 March 2009
ENGLISH ONLY

GOAL-BASED NEW SHIP CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS

Report of the Correspondence Group

At the end of the annex 2 to document MSC 86/5/2, the following text is added:

“2.2 It should be also reminded that Tier I, Goals of GBS, is focusing on “Safety” and “Environmental Friendliness”.

2.3 In this context, IACS considers that to make the self-assessment meaningful there should be trust in the abilities of the organizations to deliver that report. If States recognize organizations to do their work (confirm safety of their ships) surely they should not doubt the abilities of the same organizations to produce a quality self-assessment. Otherwise how can they entrust their ROs with such a life-crucial job as safety.

2009-02-22

SPAIN

I have read the comments from Mr. T. Arima (IACS) in his e-mails of February 13th, and 20th, and wish to clarify some points from the point of view and experience of a member of the Pilot Project Panel as follows:

1 The consideration of a self-assessment by the rule developer as a possible helpful set of auxiliary information for the verification process, was recognized by the Panel in its report of the second phase, document MSC 85/5/1, annex 1, part A, paragraph 3.3 by mentioning it in the documentation package to be submitted as follows:

“3 A comprehensive self-assessment addressing in detail all items listed under information and documentation requirements and evaluation criteria in part B of these Guidelines.”

2 Of course the utility of such information will depend on its quality, and this lies exclusively on the submitter.

3 The capability of the Class Societies to produce a quality self-assessment is not the issue for the verification process. The issue is if a specific submitter produces a comprehensive and spotless document or not. Any professional who has worked for an organization implementing rules or regulations knows by experience that simply the name of the submitter is not by itself a guarantee for a job properly done.

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly asked to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.



4 It was absolutely clear to all the members of the Panel that the objective was to test the GBS Tier III requirements and not the verification of CSR, and that is why the test was used to refine GBS requirements amending them as found necessary.

5 However, the expectations of some Panel members, if not all, were inspired on paragraph 5.31 of document MSC 82/24, which says: "... the project needed to be as credible and as realistic, i.e., as close to the real verification process, as possible ...", and tried to follow it at least for some of the Tier III chapters.

6 Even though the primary objective was the validation of the GBS Tier III requirements the only way to do a meaningful test was trying to apply the requirements to a real situation in order to detect the eventual bugs of the requirements under development.

7 The first complete text for the Information and Documentation Requirements and Evaluation Criteria was produced by the Panel upon culminating the first phase of the pilot project, and it was published in document MSC 83/5/1 dated July 3rd, 2007. No substantial modifications affecting the type or coverage of the information to be submitted were introduced in the final version supplied to IACS on February 29th, 2008.

8 Since the information received from IACS was insufficient to perform a trial as mentioned in item five above (see the attached document* of 5 pages collecting all the information supplied on Fatigue), I decided to compile it myself developing the document attached to my previous message (218 pages).

9 It is clearly obvious that IACS personnel, much more familiarized with CSR, would have done it in a much more efficient way than myself. However since the purpose of the trial was to learn as much as possible from the experiment, my work was provided to IACS representatives for their eventual future use and possible guidance if deemed appropriate.

10 Furthermore Mr. Alex Johnston would probably remember that at the time of the presentation on May 4th and 5th, 2008, a question was placed by one PPP member regarding the computation of tertiary stresses from the 3D FE models used in fatigue analyses, and while the IACS team had not a ready answer, I had no problem to explain to my colleague that such matter was automatically taken care since the instructions for modelling required the use of shell elements.

11 It must also be said that during IACS presentation in March 12th 2007, a number of questions were addressed by Panel members. Some of these questions were answered either completely or partially, and some others remained pending. The final IACS answers were never supplied to the Panel, and instead of that they were included as annex 4 into document MSC 83/INF.5 of IACS submitted to MSC 83. However, the questions mentioned therein were not actually those addressed at the meeting. This point was raised personally to the attention of Mr. Gary Horn during the MSC 83 sessions.

* Submitted to the correspondence group and not attached to this document.

12 At the presentation of the second phase the outstanding questions mentioned above remained without clarification. However, as the Panel had perfectly clear that the objective of the trial test was not to check the CSR, not a single line on this matter was included into its report, document MSC 85/5/1.

Based on the above considerations and referring specifically to item 2.3 of Mr. Arima's last e-mail, it must be said that the ability of any IACS member to produce a top quality self-assessment is absolutely out of question. The issue, indeed, is not whether the States trust or not their recognized organizations, and it must logically be expected that IACS member Societies should not be worried to pass satisfactorily verification by a professional and independent IMO Group of Experts after producing a comprehensive set of the relevant information and justification documentation.

As it has been said already if the self-assessment is comprehensive, well documented and everything clearly justified, the time spent by the Group of Experts in the verification will be minimum. Talking from the experience gained in collecting personally the references for one chapter, I do not believe that such work will be a major task for any well organized Class Society."
