

SUB-COMMITTEE ON SHIP DESIGN AND  
CONSTRUCTION  
7th session  
Agenda item 15

SDC 7/15  
18 November 2019  
Original: ENGLISH  
Pre-session public release:

## ANY OTHER BUSINESS

### Correction to resolution MSC.62(67) with regard to foot-stops

#### Submitted by IACS

#### SUMMARY

*Executive summary:* This document proposes a minor correction to paragraph 1.2 of annex to resolution MSC.62(67) with regard to provisions for foot-stops

*Strategic direction, if applicable:* 6

*Output:* 6.1

*Action to be taken:* Paragraph 5

*Related document:* C/ES.27/D

#### Introduction

1 IACS notes the following provisions in the *Guidelines for safe access to tanker bows* (resolution MSC.62(67)) and the requirements in the International Convention on Load Lines, 1966, as amended by resolution MSC.143(77) (hereinafter referred to as "ICLL") regarding the provision of foot-stops:

.1 paragraph 1 of the annex to resolution MSC.62(67) states:

"...For tankers constructed on or after 1 July 1998, the access should be by means of either a walkway on the deck or a permanently constructed gangway of substantial strength at or above the level of the superstructure deck or the first tier of a deckhouse which should:

.1...

.2 be fitted at each side throughout its length with a foot-stop and guard rails supported by stanchions..."

.2 ICLL regulation 25-1(2)(e) reads:

"A permanent gangway that is:

(i) located at or above the level of the superstructure deck;

.....

(vii) provided with a foot-stop on each side;" and

.3 ICLL regulation 25-1(2)(f) reads:

"A permanent walkway located at the freeboard deck level, on or as near as practicable to the centre line of the ship, having the same specifications as those for a permanent gangway listed in (e), except for foot-stops..."

## Discussion

2 IACS believes that the provisions in paragraphs (e) and (f) of ICLL regulation 25-1(2) are more appropriate than those in resolution MSC.62(67) since they distinguish between different provisions for foot-stops based on the location of the gangway or walkway, i.e. at or above the level of the superstructure deck or at the freeboard deck level.

3 ICLL is a mandatory instrument while resolution MSC.62(67) is a recommendation referenced in a footnote to SOLAS regulation II-1/3-3.2, which does not appear in the authentic text of the SOLAS Convention. Therefore, IACS is of the opinion that the requirements for foot-stops in paragraphs (e) and (f) of ICLL regulation 25-1(2) cannot be nullified by the corresponding non-mandatory provisions in resolution MSC.62(67).

## Proposal

4 Resolution MSC.62(67) was adopted in 1996. The provisions of regulation 25-1(2) of ICLL, as provided in resolution MSC.143(77), were adopted in 2003 after a lengthy and detailed review of the technical provisions in ICLL. IACS proposes to amend paragraph 1.2 of the annex to resolution MSC.62(67) by replicating the requirements of ICLL regulation 25-1(2)(f) regarding gangway foot-stops as follows (amended text in grey-shading):

"1.2 be fitted at each side throughout its length with a foot-stop and guard rails supported by stanchions. Such rails should consist of no less than 3 courses, the lowest being not more than 230 mm and the uppermost being at least 1 m above the gangway or walkway, and no intermediate opening should be more than 380mm in height. Stanchions should be at intervals of not more than 1.5 m. A permanent walkway located at the freeboard deck level, on or as near as practicable to the centre line of the ship, need not be fitted with foot-stops."

## Action requested of the Sub-Committee

5 The Sub-Committee is invited to consider the proposal in paragraph 4 above. If the Sub-Committee agrees with this proposal, and noting paragraph 3.2(vi) of document C/ES.27/D, i.e.:

"... it being understood that minor corrections/issues could continue to be considered by the committees under the agenda item 'Any other business' ",

the Sub-Committee is further invited to consider if the most efficient means of proceeding would be for the Sub-Committee to provide its technical advice to MSC 102 on this matter so the Committee may decide as appropriate.