

**CORRESPONDENCE GROUP ON GUIDELINES FOR UNIFORM
OPERATING LIMITATIONS OF HIGH-SPEED CRAFT**

ROUND 2 DOCUMENT

Round 1 Document Reference	By	Summary	Coordinator Comment	Group Member View
Entire document	Norway	Support adoption of document without amendment	Nil	
Cover	RINA	Insert list of specific issues to be addressed by DE and other Sub-Committees	It may be preferable to adhere to the specific list in the HSC Code	
All sections	China	Number all paragraphs and correct “operational limitations” to “operating limitations”	Could be done at Round 3	
Section 1	China	Rearrange third para onwards to distinguish between “operating limitations” (for which content of 6.1 & 6.2 of DE 50/18 to be inserted) and “service restrictions”	No need to separate out “service restrictions”. Content from DE 50/18 could, if required, be more appropriately be inserted in section 7.	
Section 1	RINA	Move content of last para and Figures 1 & 2 into section 6 as it primarily relates to significant waveheight.	Useful proposal	
Section 1 & General	Germany	Insert new content stating that sea trials required by Chapter 17 are to demonstrate that all requirements are met in “worst intended conditions”. Provision to be made for extrapolation from trial outcomes in less severe wind and waves.	This proposal is really one to interpret section 17.1 of the Code and so may be outside our terms of reference. This comment should be considered in conjunction with that by RINA regarding section 8.	
Section 2	China	Delete “preferably” from last para.	Supported	

Round 1 Document Reference	By	Summary	Coordinator Comment	Group Member View
Section 2	RINA	Insert reference to definition of “place of refuge” in heading and first sentence.	Supported	
Section 3	Germany	Should assessment of suitable rescue facilities include a trial evacuation at sea similar to aircraft?	The assessment is understood to have been intended to cover only the availability of ship- and shore-based resources along the service route. Evacuation trials at sea have been considered a number of times and found to involve excessive and unnecessary risk to personal safety of participants.	
Section 3	RINA	It would be helpful if guidance was provided on “a high probability” from HSC para 1.4.12.1 referred to in third para.	The Administration needs to be satisfied that the criterion is met.	
Section 3	RINA	Comment - COMSAR input should not be pre-empted.	Supported	
Section 4	RINA	Suggestion for elaboration of most of the parameters	The need for elaboration seems questionable	
Sections 5, 6 & 7	RINA	Suggest combining these sections regarding limiting significant waveheight, with sub-sections to cover individual aspects.	Should be considered provided it does not unduly complicate references.	
Section 5	Germany	Proposal for use of “a map” with given values for the stability calculation to improve uniformity and practicality.	More information required on proposal, preferably proposed text.	
Section 6	RINA	Insert text and figures from section 1	Could be done	
Section 6	RINA	Proposal to insert text	This technology would	

Round 1 Document Reference	By	Summary	Coordinator Comment	Group Member View
		regarding operational determination of limiting sea-state through vertical and lateral accelerometers.	seem an appropriate add-on that the Administration might permit to over-ride any pre-set speed-waveheight parameters	
Section 7	China	Proposed re-wording to complement China's proposals for section 1	Position of Germany is preferred.	
Section 7	Germany	The Correspondence Group should decide whether a uniform formula is to be adopted for the speed-waveheight curve. Such formula could not fit all possible HSC. Admin/class must be able to impose stricter limits.	Supported	
Section 7	RINA	Structural safety should continue to be addressed by class rules. Structural safety in head seas is only one issue to be covered by the guidelines	This position seems to support comment by Germany	
Section 8	RINA	Question reference to "worst operating conditions" as against "critical design conditions".	"Worst operating conditions" represents conditions for a voyage, compared with "critical design conditions" at slow speed in displacement mode to place of refuge.	
Section 8	RINA	Questions on whether a sea evacuation trial should be required on each craft and how outcomes of those trials should be assessed.	Heavy weather trials to be avoided wherever possible and type approvals relied upon when MES is used, the only exception being when "worst operating conditions" exceed conditions for MES	

[illegible]

Round 1 Document Reference	By	Summary	Coordinator Comment	Group Member View