



BALLAST WATER MANAGEMENT

Inside this edition.....

<i>Ballast water: dates for installation of treatment systems</i>	2
<i>Sulphur limits in ECA's</i>	3
<i>Review of the IBC code</i>	4
<i>MEPC.2/Circ.20</i>	4
<i>Carriage of Used Cooking Oil</i>	5
<i>Fuel Quality Issues</i>	5
<i>Operational Energy Efficiency Measures</i>	6
<i>EU: Regulation on Monitoring, Reporting and Verification of Emissions</i>	6
<i>8th Edition of the CDI SIR</i>	7
<i>Inspection Costs</i>	7
<i>CDI Best Practice Recommendations on the Use of Nitrogen</i>	8
<i>Concurrent CDI and SIRE Inspections</i>	8
<i>2015 IPTA/Navigate conference</i>	8

The prospect of entry into force of the ballast water convention continues to creep ever closer. The convention will enter into force 12 months after it has been formally ratified by 30 IMO member states representing 35% of world tonnage. The required number of states was reached some time ago but the reluctance of many of the larger Flag states to ratify has meant that the magic number of 35% of world tonnage has so far eluded those who are eager to see this legislation become effective. Announcements of their accession by Japan and Turkey during the 67th session of the Marine Environment Protection Committee, however, have brought the percentage up to 32.5%. If France and Argentina ratify in the near future, as they announced their intention of doing during the last session of the IMO Council, that will bring the total to more than 34%, thus tantalisingly close.

Review of G8 Guidelines for Approval of Treatment Systems

One of the reasons that so many states have been reluctant to ratify the convention is the general lack of confidence in the system of approving ballast water treatment systems. The industry has repeatedly proposed that the G8 Guidelines on the method of approval should be revised, but the MEPC has until now continually resisted. At MEPC 67, however, following yet another joint submission from a wide range of industry representatives (including IPTA), agreement was finally reached for a review of the guidelines to be embarked upon as soon as possible. A correspondence group has been instructed to address the various issues identified in the industry paper, which include testing using fresh, brackish and marine waters, considering the effect of temperature in cold and tropical waters and ensuring that testing methods realistically represent the flow rates the system is approved for.

Until such time as the review of the guidelines is complete, approvals will continue to be carried out according to the current system. An important element of the industry submission was that those who have installed (or will install in the near future) systems approved in accordance with the

current guidance should not be penalized. This principle was finally agreed, although many of the member states were of the opinion that a time limit should be placed upon this concession. The resolution that was subsequently developed in relation to the G8 review simply states that “...shipowners that have installed type-approved ballast water management systems prior to the application of the revised Guidelines (G8), should

not be penalized”, with no mention of any time limit, but we are not convinced that we have heard the end of this issue, particularly given that Canada and New Zealand, as Chair of the Ballast Water Review Group and coordinator of the Correspondence Group respectively, have both continually refused to acknowledge the concerns expressed by Industry and resisted any meaningful compromise on guidelines for Port State Control.

Resolution 1088: Effective Dates for the Installation of Ballast Water Treatment Systems

It will be recalled that in an attempt to encourage ratifications the 28th IMO Assembly agreed to a Resolution that encourages Member States to consider all vessels constructed before the date of entry into force as “existing vessels” and allow them some leeway in the fitting of treatment systems. The relevant application dates are summarized below.

Ballast Capacity (M ³)	Date of Construction	Entry into Force of the Convention		
		2015	2016	2017 and beyond
<1,500 or >5,000	<2009		1 st renewal survey after anniversary date of delivery	1 st renewal survey after EIF
1,500-5,000	<2009	1 st Renewal Survey after EIF		
<5000	2009 - EIF	1st renewal survey after EIF		
	EIF onwards	At delivery		
≥5,000 m	2009-2011		1 st renewal survey after anniversary date of delivery	1 st renewal survey after EIF
	2012 - EIF	1 st renewal survey after IF		
	EIF onwards	At delivery from yard		

Effective Dates in the United States

Vessel	Ballast Capacity (M ³)	Compliance Date
Constructed on or after 1 December	All	Delivery
Constructed before 1 December 2013	< 1,500	First scheduled drydocking after 1 Jan 2016
	1,500 – 5,000	First scheduled drydocking after 1 Jan 2014
	> 5,000	First scheduled drydocking after 1 Jan 2016

The resolution agreed by the IMO Member States is non-mandatory, and the United States has made it clear that it will be sticking to its own schedule of effective dates as set out in the Coast Guard’s Final Rule published in 2012. The aim is that ultimately all treatments systems will have to be approved by the Coast Guard, but our understanding is that owing to delays in the type approval process the Coast Guard are currently accepting systems approved by the IMO.

1 January 2015:

Entry into Force of 0.10% Sulphur Limit in ECA's

With roughly two months to go before the sulphur limit in the European and North American ECA's is reduced to 0.1% owners and operators should have already made their provisions for compliance. The question that has been posed repeatedly over recent years is "will there be enough fuel to go round?" The answer still seems to be "We don't know".

A number of oil majors, including Exxon-Mobil, Neste, and CEPESA, have recently announced that they are producing ultra low sulphur fuel oils that will be in compliance with the MARPOL Annex VI regulations. It seems that they will not be compatible with each other, however, and specific cylinder oils will be required to counteract viscosity problems so both supply and storage are likely to prove problematic. Taking this into account, and given the fact that scrubbers are not considered to be viable for many vessels, it is expected that the majority of operators will be depending primarily on distillates to achieve compliance.

Enforcement

In the meantime a group of companies is less concerned about availability of compliant fuel than whether their competitors will be able to get away with flouting the regulations. The so-called Trident Alliance is worried that some companies might weigh the high cost of compliant fuel against the chances of being detected in violation and decide to take a chance, thus allowing them to operate more cheaply than their law-abiding competitors. Whether or not there are any grounds for such fears, these companies definitely see this as a commercial threat and have been pushing the authorities, primarily in Europe, to ensure strict enforcement of the regulations, including the use of drones with emission sensors.

Concerns have already been expressed by pilots about the possible use of drones in UK airspace and it seems unlikely that their use will become widespread in the short term, but the Trident Alliance's campaign has certainly ensured that the authorities will be expecting and looking for ships trying to flout the rules. We cannot help but feel that this crusade can ultimately do the industry as a whole no favours. While in our experience the majority of operators simply want to comply with the regulations and be left alone to go about their business, a campaign such as this can only reinforce the notion already sadly prevalent in many circles that the shipping industry has no regard for the environment and spends its time looking for ways of getting round the rules designed to protect it.

Low Flash Fuels

The US and Canada are certainly assuming that distillates will play a major part in achieving compliance in the 200 mile zone around their coasts from 1 January 2015 but have realised rather belatedly that they could face supply problems. In order to increase availability to ships they are proposing that the flashpoint limit for bunker fuels be reduced from the current and long standing SOLAS requirement of 60°C to 52°C to bring it in line with the limit for automotive fuels in the US. This proposal will be considered by the IMO's Maritime Safety Committee when it meets in November, but even if the basic premise is accepted it would be some time before any change could come into effect and it would thus make no change to availability for the foreseeable future.

The issue is also not as clear-cut as the US/Canada proposal suggests. Firstly, while this measure would probably succeed in making more fuel available locally in certain ports, it would make no difference to global availability since the quantity of the basic product would remain the same and ships would be competing with road and rail transport - and indeed domestic heating - for the same fuel. In addition there are some fundamental issues that would have to be addressed before the proposal could be accepted. While the submission claims that there would be no safety implications from reducing the limit, it seems inconceivable that this could simply be accepted at face value without some further investigation. In addition, 60°C is the cut-off point for low flash products throughout SOLAS and other IMO instruments including the IBC Code. It would surely make no sense for one limit to be applied to bunker fuels and another to cargo, so such a change could have a knock-on effect on a myriad of other regulations.

Paris MOU Guidance on Enforcement

The Paris MOU has issued guidance on enforcement of the new limits as from 1 January. The initial inspection will concentrate on evidence of compliance in the form of the Bunker Delivery Note and representative sample, but Port State Control Officers are also instructed to check for evidence of a written changeover procedure and records demonstrating that fuel switching has taken place prior to entering the ECA, such that 0.1% fuel is being used upon entrance to the ECA. The records must also show that compliant fuel continues to be burnt until after the vessel has exited the area. Officers are further reminded that in colder conditions they must check that the fuel pipelines are fitted with adequate heating facilities.

In the event that it has not been possible to source compliant fuel, the owner/Master must present a record of the actions taken to source the fuel. The authority in question is obliged to take all evidence in to consideration but it is up their discretion whether or not to issue any penalty.

Review of the IBC Code

The IMO's ESPH Group is continuing its review of proposed changes to the criteria for assigning carriage requirements to products in chapters 17 and 18 of the IBC Code and examining the effect these changes might have on individual products.

Many of the potential impacts that had been considered more problematic have been ironed out, particularly since the provision of additional data on some products by CEFIC. There are still likely to be some significant changes, however (see box) and IPTA has made it clear that industry must have some time to evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes. This point has been accepted and the intention is to give further consideration to the amendments at PPR 2 in January next year and then issue a circular outlining the proposed new carriage requirements and asking for comments.

All members should have received a copy of the proposed revised chapters 17 and 18 and we would ask that any concerns be notified to the secretariat as soon as possible in order that we can raise them at PPR2.

MEPC.2/Circ. 20

The next edition of the MEPC.2/Circ. will be issued, as usual, on or soon after 17 December. As well as the usual crop of new products submitted for the assignment of carriage requirements, the ESPH Group, when it met in September, considered new data that had been provided in respect of 2 products that already appear in the IBC code, namely tert-Dodecanethiol and Fluorosilicic acid solution. In

A number of products that have appeared as tripartite agreements for the last three years will not appear in MEPC.2/Circ.21 because the data needed to formally evaluate them has not been received within the timeframe allowed.

Products deleted from List 1

Bis(2-propylheptyl)phthalate
Disulfide oil
Lauric acid methyl ester/myristic acid methyl ester mixture
2-Methyl-1,5-pentadiamine
Phosphorus containing polyamine acid
Salt of polyaminocarboxylate solution

Products deleted from List 3

Antifreeze preparation
EC1575A
EC9360A
EC9378AEC9398A
EC9660A
Gypton SA3070
Heavy aromatics HVA 9W
Heavy aromatics HVA 9Y
Lubrizol 70179
Lubrizol FM2600TL
Petroscreen SC16D

Since **Heavy aromatics HVA 9B, 9C, 9E, 9K, 9V and 9Z** are products from a single chemical family and very similar in formulation they have been grouped together in List 1 under the single entry Alkybenzenes mixtures (containing naphthalene).

Changes to Ship Typing?

Type 2 or 3 → Type 1

Acetone cyanohydrin (Tank Type 1G)
Crotonaldehyde, (Tank Type 1G)
Ethylene chlorohydrin
Glutaraldehyde solutions
Lactonitrile solution
Nitrating acid (Tank Type 1G0)
Beta propiolactone,
Propionitrile
Trixylyl phosphate

Type 1 → Type 2

Alkylaryl phosphate mixtures
1,5,9 Cyclododecatriene
2,6 di-tert-butylphenol
N-N-Dimethyldodecylamine
Diphenylamine reaction product with 2,2,4-
Trimethylpentene
Tert-dodecanethiol
Methylcyclopentadienylmanganese tricarbonyl
1,2,3 Trichlorobenzene (molten)
Tricresyl phosphate

Chapter 18 → Chapter 17

Diethylene glycol
Ethylene carbonate
Glycerine
Hexamethylenetetramine solutions
Hexylene glycol
N-Methylglucamine solution
Methyl propyl ketone
Polyaluminium chloride solution
Polyglycerin sodium salt solution
Potassium formate solutions
Propylene carbonate
Propylene glycol
Triethylene glycol

both cases the information provided led to a relaxing of the carriage requirements, Tert-dodecanethiol from Ship Type 1 to Ship Type 3, and Fluorosilicic acid solution from Tank Type 1g to 2g. This, of course, means that until the next formal revision of chapter 17 of the IBC code these two products will appear in the IBC Code and the MEPC.2/Circ. with different carriage requirements.

The IBC Code makes it quite clear that future amendments shown in the circular serve as "prior notice of the carriage conditions that will only apply when the next set of amendments enter into force." Some Administrations, however, are prepared to allow amendments that relax the carriage requirements to apply immediately. Since this is something of a grey area, we would suggest that members check with all parties involved (Flag state, shipping state and receiving state) before agreeing to carry either of these cargoes under the carriage requirements that will appear in MEPC.2/Circ. 20.

Carriage of Used Cooking Oil

The ESPH Group finally took a proactive stance with regard to the carriage of this product during its meeting in September this year. As members are aware, this cargo is being offered for carriage in increasing quantities despite the fact that it has never been evaluated in order for carriage requirements to be assigned. On a number of occasions member states have expressed concern that they have found evidence of it being carried under a variety of different names, and we understand that one vessel was prosecuted in Europe for carrying UCO as Yellow Grease.

Despite repeated calls (not least from IPTA in a variety of forums) for the industry to provide the required data to IMO in order for carriage requirements to be assigned, the required information has not been forthcoming, possibly due to the fact that it is traded as an amalgamation of different edible oils rather than as a single product. Since it seems unlikely that data will be submitted in the near future, the ESPH Group concluded that the

only route left was to assign carriage requirements on the basis of other vegetable oils in the IBC Code, but adopting a precautionary approach with regard to assigning the pollution category.

A group of member states duly drafted a paper for submission to PPR2 and asked IPTA to co-sponsor. The AGM, when consulted on this, agreed to co-sponsorship on the basis that the certainty this will provide will be preferable to the current uncertainty. Some doubt has been expressed about whether it is really necessary to assign pollution category X, but in the absence of data it would simply not be possible to do otherwise. There is also the hope that this might finally galvanise the industry into action and get some data provided that would allow the pollution category to be relaxed.

The entry for Fuelstreamers will not appear in List 4 of MEPC.2/Circ.20 and the intention is that following PPR2 a corrigendum will be issued showing Used cooking oil as a generic entry in List 1.

Fuel Quality Issues

The reaction from IMO member states to the joint industry submission to MEPC 67 on fuel quality was disappointing, to say the least. The paper, submitted by a wide coalition of industry organisations, together with Liberia and Marshall Islands, proposed a strengthening of the oversight capacity by Member States on bunker suppliers in their ports, through amendments to regulation 18 of MARPOL Annex VI. In an almost unique display of cross-industry solidarity the paper was supported by both the International Association of Ports and Harbours (IAPH) and the International Bunker Industry Association (IBIA), which had significantly changed its stance and submitted a paper elaborating on the shipping industry's proposals.

Despite the fact that the industry paper merely highlighted the responsibilities that member states already have under regulation 18 of MARPOL Annex VI and looked for ways of ensuring better enforcement of these provisions, the US submitted a paper in response claiming that to accept the industry proposals would mean a fundamental change to the relationship between ship and bunker supplier *"from a market/contract based relationship to one that is regulated by the country where the supplier resides"*. In introducing the issue they stressed that the quality of fuel procured by a ship is a commercial contract issue and it is the ship owner's responsibility to ensure that the fuel they purchase is compliant. In this they were strongly supported by the UK and a number of other European states who evidently do not want to take on any responsibility for policing bunker supplies in

their ports. After a long and depressing list of further states had queued up to agree with the US (with one or two honourable exceptions such as Norway and Panama) it was finally agreed that non-mandatory guidelines should be developed *"to assist countries to ensure that local suppliers provide compliant fuel"*.

IPTA pointed out that the industry cannot take much comfort from the promise of yet more *"guidance"*. Guidelines already exist in respect of bunker supplies that do not achieve what they set out to do. A case in point is the Guidelines on Bunker Sampling, where the fundamental requirement that samples should be taken from the ship's manifold is routinely ignored. A number of the other industry NGO's and a handful of Member states supported our comments and a few of the member states who had supported the US position had the good grace to look extremely embarrassed. Most interestingly, however, the Secretary General, in his closing address, stated that in his view this is an extremely important issue and he favours mandatory measures to control bunker suppliers.

Since MEPC the Chief Executive of IBIA has issued a statement asserting that the risk to vessels using fuel 'not fit for purpose' is unacceptable and while any improvements that can be made to the fuel supply chain are welcomed, the authorities must impose sanctions on continuously underperforming suppliers. *"Without this, the current disquiet in the industry will continue."*

Reduction of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Shipping

Are mandatory operational energy efficiency measures the way to go?

The Marine Environment Protection Committee spent nearly a day at its latest session discussing the proposed mandatory measures for the monitoring, reporting and verification of fuel consumption by ships and whether this should lead directly to the imposition of operational energy efficiency measures. There is a hard core of member states (notably the EU states, the US and Japan) who feel that it should, strongly supported by a number of environmental groups, such as the Clean Shipping Coalition, for whom it seems that no measure enacted against the shipping industry will ever be enough.

The shipping industry in general does not argue against the collecting of data on fuel consumption, but there is great concern about the potential imposition of operational energy efficiency measures and in particular about the fact that there are those who seem to be trying to push measures through without any discussion of the basic principle and whether it would even make sense to have such measures. A joint industry paper (with IPTA as a co-sponsor) had been submitted to the latest session of MEPC in an attempt to generate some

discussion on the fundamental issue of operational energy efficiency measures (as opposed to design measures) and why they should be considered necessary for maritime transport when no other form of transport is subject to them.

While there were attempts by a number of member states to brush such concerns aside and proceed directly to a discussion of the proposed “metrics” for the measuring of efficiency, it was finally agreed that a correspondence group should go ahead with developing a mandatory provision for the monitoring and reporting of data on fuel consumption, but that for the present no further data (such as miles travelled, hours of operation, cargo etc.) should be included. A series of questions posed in the industry paper, such as whether such standards would be likely achieve greater gains in fuel efficiency than the economic incentives presented by fuel price increases, and what would happen to vessels that fail to comply with any future reduction targets, will be discussed at future sessions prior to any policy decision being made on the introduction of operational measures.

Operational Efficiency and the Chemical Tanker Sector

We have thus far refrained from any comment on the individual metrics currently on the table, since this might have been construed as agreement with the basic principle, but we remain concerned that if such measures were to be introduced the chemical tanker sector is the one that would be likely to suffer most. The proponents of mandatory measures blithely claim that it would be possible to develop a simple method of measuring efficiency that would not increase the administrative burden for either ships' crews or Administrations. We would question whether this is the case for any sector, but it certainly would not be possible for the chemical tanker industry. Firstly, there is the issue of fuel used for purposes such as cargo heating, tank cleaning, operating nitrogen generators, etc. None of the metrics proposed take this into account, and it would certainly make reporting and verification considerably more complex and burdensome if it were to be included, but without including such details it would not be possible to get an accurate picture of the efficiency of a chemical tanker. Then there is the fact that it is not possible to define a “typical” chemical tanker voyage in terms of fuel consumption; it is likely that sister ships would have widely differing consumption over a given period according to what trades they are engaged in and even an individual ship could not be expected to have the same level of consumption over consecutive voyages, particularly if trading in the

spot market. This makes comparisons and the setting of targets practically impossible.

The fact remains, however, that there is an enormous appetite among many of the IMO member states for being seen to “do something”, and having invested so much into this issue so far they will extremely reluctant to abandon their plans. We will continue to monitor developments and decide whether and at which point it becomes necessary to detail our concerns to the IMO.

EU Regulation on Monitoring Reporting and Verification

In the meantime the Council of the European Union have decided to move ahead with developing their EU Regulation for Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) of CO2 emissions. The EU has always stated its preference for global, rather than purely European, measures, but Italy, currently in the presidency of the European Council, has made the decision to push ahead with the European measure on the assumption that it could be adapted at a later date to whatever is eventually agreed at the international level. The proposed EU regulation envisages monitoring and reporting of fuel consumption beginning in 2018.

CDI – 8th Edition of the Ship Inspection Report

The CDI Technical Committee has completed its consideration of the revisions of the Ship Inspection Report and it is anticipated that the 8th edition will be launched at the end of this year or the beginning of 2015. Many of the anomalies that had been highlighted in previous editions have been ironed out, and there are some significant changes in the new edition.

Crew Knowledge and Proficiency Testing

This scheme has been controversial from the outset, with owners complaining that it creates additional stress for ships' officers at a time when they are already under pressure and that the questions posed do not accurately reflect the candidate's practical knowledge. Increasing numbers of operators have been instructing their crews not to take the test and the owners' representatives on the CDI Technical Committee have twice recommended that the scheme be scrapped.

The ship owners' concerns have now finally been acknowledged and the new edition of the SIR will not include provisions for the computer testing of officers during inspections. References within the SIR to operators' own onboard training programs will be strengthened, however, and inspectors will be required to check that the operator's training program is documented and available on board. Operators will further be expected to be able to demonstrate that the training program has been audited both internally and externally (e.g. in conjunction with the ISM audit).

Self-Inspection

From the launch of the new SIR all ships will be eligible for self-inspection of certain aspects of the SIR. The intention is to develop a protected Excel Template containing the relevant questions that can be completed by the operator and emailed to the inspector prior to the inspection. Random "sampling" of the SI questions will be carried out by the inspector to check the accuracy of the answers. If it becomes clear that an owner has not completed the questions accurately the inspector will revert to a full inspection.

It is claimed that this initiative is an attempt to shorten the length of inspections, but some owners have expressed the fear that it will simply mean more time for the inspector to spend poking around looking for something to mark the vessel down on. Only time will tell.

Inspector Access to Owners' Comments

The inspectors are to be allowed access to the owners' comments. This follows a proposal from the inspectors' working group and it is stressed that this is purely for the information and education of the inspector, with no question of any dialogue being entered into. Again, only time will tell whether there are any other consequences.

Reference to CDI Publications

Reference is to be made within the SIR to the various CDI publications, including the Best Practice Recommendations for the use of Nitrogen. We have been assured that the questions in this regard only reference the safety aspects of the use of Nitrogen, not the application.

CDI Inspection Costs

Following complaints from owners about the rising costs of CDI inspections, last year the CDI Management issued a warning to inspectors that they must keep their costs at a reasonable level. They now claim that this warning has worked, citing the fact that since November 2013 only a very small number of claims have been received from operators for "motivated reason" to refuse an inspector. Comments from IPTA members would suggest that while in Europe inspection costs do indeed seem to have reduced somewhat, in regions such as Asia and Latin America there are still some inspectors who are charging high sums and refusing to itemise their bills.

CDI advise that their guidance to inspectors includes the instruction to provide an itemised invoice and we would therefore suggest that members ensure that this is a condition of their

agreement with the inspector prior to the inspection being carried out. If they are not satisfied with the quote provided they should contact the CDI management, citing "motivated reason" and advise the IPTA secretariat at the same time.

Cancelled Inspections

It is possible that instead of reporting excessive quotes from inspectors some owners have simply been cancelling the inspection. The CDI management, however, has interpreted the recent high number of cancellations as the owner's fear of the nominated inspector being too strict. Despite there being no data or statistics to back up this assumption, the CDI Executive Board has agreed to a new paragraph being included in the CDI procedures stating that where an inspection is cancelled and a subsequent request made for the same ship in the same area within 30 days, the initial nomination will stand.

CDI Best Practice Recommendations on the use of Nitrogen

The adoption of the SOLAS Amendments in respect of application of inert gas for chemical tankers at MSC 93 in June this year has once more highlighted the anomalies between the mandatory provisions and the CDI Best Practice Recommendations on the Use of Nitrogen. At the last Executive Board meeting we suggested that CDI might now make amendments to their Recommendations in order to remove any inconsistencies. The CDI management, however, continues to assert that SOLAS merely provides minimum requirements and charterers can demand higher standards.

While there is obviously no question that charterers can demand whatever standards they choose, it would appear that most are happy to stick within what will be required under the amended SOLAS provisions. Members report that while many charterers are asking that vessels fitted with nitrogen generators should use them, they do not insist on vessels' purging before commencement of loading, and indeed some are apparently now looking to extend the provision for chemical tankers to dispense with inerting prior to loading also to

Annex I cargoes.

In the meantime one of the chemical industry NGO's has advised the ESPH Group that certain low flash cargoes should not be inerted at all on account of the oxygen level required by the inhibitors in these cargoes to counteract the risk of polymerization, which they claim is in many cases a greater danger than that of explosion. Since this information was provided to the IMO at an extremely late stage, the SOLAS regulations do not provide for any cargoes to be exempted from the requirements to inert, and it is thus apparently going to be necessary to seek a unified interpretation of the regulation, or indeed an amendment to SOLAS (once the regulations have entered into force).

If and when that happens it will definitely be necessary for CDI to amend their Recommendations, since rather than simply going further than the legislation they would actually be in conflict with the regulations.

Two inspections at the same time?

Does the solution to the perennial problem of multiple inspections lie in carrying out two inspections concurrently? The CDI Executive Board has been giving some consideration to this notion following an incident where an inspector was found to have carried out CDI and SIRE inspections on a vessel at the same time, but without informing either agency of the involvement of the other.

The Executive Board agreed that the issue of concern here was not the fact of both inspections being carried out simultaneously, but the deception on the part of the inspector. If all parties were aware of the joint nature of the inspection and did not object, then it should be quite acceptable. IPTA welcomed this decision, pointing out that multiple inspections is one of the major issues that ships and their crews have to deal with today and anything that could reduce the number of individual inspections ships are subject to should be welcomed.

The CDI management remains concerned about this practice, however, and is therefore to seek further advice on the circumstances under which it would be acceptable for inspections to be carried out concurrently for both CDI and SIRE.

Save the Date!

2015 IPTA/Navigate Chemical and Product Tanker Conference

The seventh IPTA/Navigate Chemical and Product Tanker Conference will take place on 17-18 March 2015 at the Grange City Hotel in London. We are in the process of putting together a programme of topics and speakers that we trust will ensure that the 2015 conference will be equally as successful as those of previous years and look forward to the usual impressive turnout of members.

The **Spring General Meeting** will take place on 19 March at the Naval Club, 38 Hill Street, London.

International Parcel Tankers Association, Inc.
Representative Office: Halton Green East, Halton, Lancaster, LA2 6PA, United Kingdom
+44 1524 811892 mail@ipta.org.uk
www.ipta.org.uk