

## Minutes of the 50<sup>th</sup> POC Meeting

**Date:** 22 September 2006 (Friday)

**Time:** 1030 hours

**Venue:** Conference Room A, 24/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central

---

<b>Present</b>	Mr. Roger TUPPER	<b>Chairman</b>
	Mr. S.C. MO	HK Cargo-Vessel Trader Association
	(On behalf of Mr. Albert WONG)	
	Mr. Harry LAM	HK Container Terminal Operators Association
	Mr. Raymond CHENG	HK General Chamber of Commerce
	(On behalf of Mr. Peter CHEUNG)	
	Mr. Peter NG	HK Liner Shipping Association
	Mr. S.H. PAU	HK Pilots Association
	Mr. Sunny HO	HK Shippers' Council
	Mr. L.C. CHAN	HK Ship Owners Association
	Mr. T.K. CHEUNG	Local Ferry Operators
	Ms. Flora LAU	Oil Industry
	(On behalf of Mr. C.M. KU)	
	Ms. Natalie OR	Wharf and Godown Operators
	(On behalf of Mr. Terence TSE)	
	Mr. David BLOOMFIELD	Civil Engineering and Development Department
	(On behalf of Mr. W.L. LAU)	
	Mr. K.M. LEE	Marine Department
	Mr. Frankie LAM	Secretary

**In Attendance** Mr. W.K. LEE Marine Department  
Mr. Raymond CHUNG Marine Department  
Mr. Patrick CHO Marine Department  
Mr. Jimmy LEUNG Marine Department

**Presenter of POC Paper No. 3/06 :**

Mr. Michael LEE Marine Department

**Presenter of POC Paper No. 4/06 :**

Mr. M.K. CHAN Marine Department

**Presenter of POC Paper No. 5/06 :**

Mr. H.B. CHAN Marine Department

**Apologies** Ms. Janice TSE Economic Development and Labour  
Bureau

**1. Open of Meeting**

1.1 **Mr. Roger TUPPER** (Chairman) welcomed all to the meeting.

1.2 **Mr. TUPPER** introduced the following new comers to the meeting : -  
**Mr. Tony LAI** representing the Dockyard Operators.

**Mr. S.C. MO** acted on behalf of **Mr. Albert WONG** representing the  
HK Cargo-Vessel Trader Association.

**Mr. Raymond CHENG** acted on behalf of **Mr. Peter CHEUNG** representing the HK General Chamber of Commerce.

**Mr. L.C. CHAN** representing the HK Ship Owners Association.

**Ms. Flora LAU** acted on behalf of **Mr. C.M. KU** representing the Oil Industry.

**Ms. Natalie OR** acted on behalf of Mr. Terence TSE representing the Wharf and Godown Operators.

## **2. Confirmation of Minutes of the Last Meeting**

The minutes of the 49<sup>th</sup> POC meeting were confirmed without amendments.

## **3. Follow up of POC Paper No. 1/06 – Hong Kong Section of Hong Kong – Zhuhai – Macao Bridge and North Lantau Highway Connection**

**Mr. TUPPER** advised members that the press reported in August that the HKSARG and Guangdong Government had agreed to build separate checkpoints for the three location points of the proposed HK – Zhuhai – Macao Bridge. The location of the checkpoints were under discussion.

## **4. Follow up of POC Paper No. 2/06 – Revision of Fees and Charges Quarantine and Prevention of Diseases Ordinance Chapter 141**

**Mr. TUPPER** informed members that the Deratting Exemption Certificate had increased from \$1,940 to \$2,130 by the Department of Health in July 2006.

## **5. Declaration of Interest by Members of the POC**

A copy of the Guidelines for Declaration of Interest by Members of the POC was sent to Members. **Mr. TUPPER** briefly explained the guidelines in particular, whenever any conflict of interest warranted, the Member had to make known the conflict before the relevant discussions.

## 6. New Items

### 6.1 POC Paper No. 4/06

#### **Study on the Next Generation of Large Container Ships and its Potential Implications for the Port of Hong Kong**

6.1.1 **Mr. TUPPER** invited **Mr. M.K. CHAN** (Marine Department) to present the paper.

6.1.2 **Mr. CHAN** briefed members on the objectives of the study which was to identify and evaluate the existing and possible future trends of large container ship development and to review its impact on the operation of the Hong Kong Port. In particular, he advised that the “Emma Maersk”, at present the world’s largest Ultra Large Container ship (ULCS), was scheduled to call Hong Kong on 15.10.2006 with principal dimensions as follows :

Carrying Capacity : 13,500 TEUs (maximum)

Length Overall : 397m (LOA)

Breadth : 56.4m (22 rows across)

Summer draft : 15.0m

Design speed : 25 knots

6.1.3 **Mr. TUPPER** said that as usual practice, the study report would be sent to the Port Development Council for endorsement before it was accessible to the industry or public. He also said that the arrival of the ULCS in 2006 was predicted in the study report under the same name furnished by Marine Department in 2001. He invited comments from the floor.

6.1.4 **Mr. Tony LAI** (Dockyard Operators) enquired **Mr. S.H. PAU** (HK Pilots Association) to comment on whether existing tug requirements were adequate to deal with a ULCS having an engine break down in the Kwai Chung Basin. **Mr. PAU** responded that it depended on various factors such as the number of tugs, weather conditions especially-wind and tidal effect. **Mr. PAU** also said that under ideal conditions, 6 tugs would be able to handle a ULCS dead tow. **Mr. TUPPER** pointed out and **Mr. PAU** agreed that the HK Pilots Association was working with Maersk Line on the issue which would be dealt with in

detail in the Pilotage Advisory Committee. **Mr. Harry LAM** (HK Container Terminal Operators Association) said that one of the terminal operators had experienced a ship claiming a 14.8m draft had to wait for the high tide in order to berth in the Kwai Chung Basin. He was also of a view that some of the future ULCS might be drawing 15.5m draft. Also to allow for 10% underkeel clearance, dredging to a depth of 17m might be required. **Mr. PAU** said that the HK Pilots Association took a flexible approach in piloting ships and had experienced no major problems to date as the underkeel clearance of ships was well defined. **Mr. TUPPER** commented that the Study on Underkeel Clearance in 2005 had dealt with this issue in detail and whilst ships with drafts up to 15m could be accommodated on all but the lowest tides, consideration of dredging would need to be taken by the Port Development Council if future ULCS size or design specifications resulted in drafts in excess of 15m. He also said that some experts in classification societies and ship building circles viewed that the latest ULCS had taken the single screw engine ship to the limit. To develop even larger ships, twin screw engines might be required. **Mr. LAM** enquired whether the approach channels would be dredged, and **Mr. TUPPER** responded that the depth to be dredged would be determined based on evaluation of future ship designs. The present report would be forwarded to the Port Development Council who would consider the implications of the report and make decision on whether further study was needed as to whether dredging was required. **Mr. LAM** asked when the report would be available to the industry and **Mr. TUPPER** advised that would depend on the Port Development Council review progress.

- 6.1.5 **Mr. Peter NG** (HK Liner Shipping Association) informed the meeting that the CMA CGM Line's current largest container ship was 349m length overall, 43m breadth, 15m draft which carried 9400 TEUs and a ULCS of 363m length overall, a ship of 15.5m draft which carried 11500 TEUs was under planning and discussion with the shipyard. **Mr. NG** reminded Members that the lead time for the dredging operation to commence should be considered as the depth now had come to the limit for the ULCS. **Mr. TUPPER** agreed and added that there was great environmental concern in dredging operations. However the practical situation for the need of dredging, including contaminated mud would be put forward to the Port Development

Council.

6.1.6 **Mr. L.C. CHAN** (HK Ship Owners Association) said that it would take longer cargo handling time for a ULCS and the vessel's turn around time would also be longer. **Mr. TUPPER** shared with **Mr. CHAN's** views and admitted that the speed of container handling on the shoreside was an important factor. He then asked **Mr. M.K. CHAN** (Marine Department) to incorporate the relevant comments in the study report.

**6.2 POC Paper No. 3/06  
Towing Voyage Survey**

6.2.1 **Mr. TUPPER** invited **Mr. Michael LEE** (Marine Department) to present the paper.

6.2.2 **Mr. LEE** briefed Members on the proposed change for vessels engaged in coastal towage and ocean towage that :

- (a) for coastal towing voyages to mainland ports, surveys conducted by either classification societies or Registered Professional Engineers (Marine Engineering and Naval Architecture discipline) (RPE) could be accepted; and
- (b) for ocean towing voyages to countries other than China, only surveys conducted by classification societies would be accepted.

6.2.3 **Mr. TUPPER** invited comments from the floor.

6.2.4 **Mr. Peter NG** (HK Liner Shipping Association) said that mainland ports were rather diversified, would the RPE do survey for towage voyage to remote ports like Dailian or Tianjin? **Mr. LEE** responded to the concern that Marine Department would agree to revise the survey arrangement or practice similar to that concept for "Coastal class 'A' plying zone" and "Coastal class 'B' plying zone" as proposed in the draft "Code of Practice-Safety and Technical Standard of Coastal Cargo Vessels" (PLVAC Paper 28/04) which was endorsed by the Provisional Local Vessels Advisory Committee (PLVAC) in 2004, so that for ports south of Xiamen (like zone B coastal), they were considered as near coastal voyages and surveys would be attended by RPE or recognized classification societies, and for ports north of Xiamen (like zone A coastal), the survey arrangement would be similar to ocean voyage vessels and attended by only recognized classification societies. Exact revision would be proposed later.

6.2.5 **Mr. T.K. CHEUNG** (Local Ferry Operators) said that in effect, the survey for coastal voyages was outsourced to RPE who had no nautical background e.g. stability intact, charts etc. In this respect, he invited comments from Marine Department. **Mr. LEE** responded that under the Local Vessel Ordinance – safety surveys for local vessels conducted by classification societies or RPE as authorized surveyors would involve largely on marine engineering and ship construction/stability survey items. As for towing voyage survey, only slight content in nautical context was included in the checklist, relevant guidelines would be provided for the surveyors to follow. **Mr. CHEUNG** said that he worried about the towing voyage of a ship going to sea surveyed by RPE and **Mr. TUPPER** said that the voyage was coastal and only went to Xiamen at most.

6.2.6 **Mr. Tony LAI** (Dockyard Operators) enquired whether Marine Department would issue a list of RPE and **Mr. TUPPER** responded that after the enactment came into play in December 2006, the list would be available. He then asked **Mr. Michael LEE** (Marine Department) to incorporate the comments from Members on coastal and ocean towing voyages in the proposal.

(Post-meeting note: **Mr. Jimmy LEUNG** (**Mr. Michael LEE**'s colleague) (Marine Department) advised on 26.9.2006 that with reference to the comments raised in the POC meeting, paragraph 5 of the paper was amended as follows:-

“5. In considering that there is substantial difference in risk levels and competence requirement in conducting survey between vessels engaging on coastal towage and ocean towage, it is further proposed that:

- (a) for short distance coastal towing voyages to Mainland ports within Chinese waters extending from Guangxi to Xiamen (including Macau), surveys conducted by either classification societies or RPE as “authorized surveyor” could be accepted;
- (b) for long distance coastal towing voyages to Mainland ports within Chinese waters extending from Xiamen to Liaoning, surveys conducted by classification societies would be accepted;
- (c) for ocean towing voyages to countries other than China, only surveys conducted by classification societies would be accepted.)”

### 6.3 POC Paper No. 5/06

## **Marine Risks in North Lantau including Ma Wan Fairway**

- 6.3.1 **Mr. TUPPER** invited **Mr. H.B. CHAN** (Marine Department) to present the paper.
- 6.3.2 **Mr. H.B. CHAN** briefed Members on the review on the navigational risks in North Lantau and Ma Wan Fairway, and the measures considered to improve the traffic flow, especially to enable two-way traffic for deep draft vessels in North Lantau. In essence, the proposal to widen the deep draft channel by dredging the northern part of CP5 to CP7 would not be considered at this stage as it would involve intensive dredging given rise to funding and environmental issues. Marine Department would keep in view of the proposed dredging when the opportunity arose. The proposal to realign the deep draft channel by relocating channel buoys CP4, CP5, CP6 and CP8 was considered practicable to provide a better alignment of the deep draft channel hence improving the traffic flow in this area.
- 6.3.3 **Mr. L.C. CHAN** (HK Ship Owners Association) said that he read from some papers that two-way traffic in the Ma Wan Channel was allowed when one vessel had passed the two rocky shoals near Tsing Lung Tau. **Mr. H.B. CHAN** responded the passage rules in the Ma Wan Service Area had been tightened up to allow one-way traffic, and the vessel which arrived the Ma Wan Service Area first would go first.
- 6.3.4 In response to **Mr. Peter NG**'s query (HK Liner Shipping Association) on the extent of dredging to remove the high spots, **Mr. H.B. CHAN** said that there would only be minor dredging required to provide not less than 15 metres depth of water.
- 6.3.5 **Mr. Raymond CHENG** (HK General Chamber of Commerce) enquired whether the deep draft vessels going to lighten cargo at Urmston Road Anchorage before bounding for Shekou would be affected. **Mr. H.B. CHAN** responded that as only one vessel of this kind was allowed to anchor at the Anchorage for not more than 3 days and the relocation of the captioned buoys would be scheduled in stages, the safe passageway of these deep draft vessels would not be affected.
- 6.3.6 The paper was endorsed.

## **7. Any Other Business**

- 7.1 **Ms. Flora LAU** (Oil Industry) said that under the revised MARPOL Annex II, pre-wash for chemical tankers before going to other ports



would be required with effect from 1.1.2007 while there was no collection barge of this kind in the market in Hong Kong. **Mr. Patrick TSO** (Marine Department) responded to the enquiry and stated that the revised MARPOL Annex II would enter into force internationally on 1.1.2007. He informed that the Local Vessel Safety Section of Marine Department had received an application for converting a collection barge from ENVIROPACE Ltd. into a Category 5, Class 1 barge, capable of collecting substances having a flash point below 23 °C. The approval of this conversion project would be completed next week and the drawings would be returned to ENVIROPACE for their follow up. Marine Department was also aware that a local shipyard was appointed for the conversion to be carried out in early December and hopefully be completed before 1.1.2007.

- 7.2 **Ms. LAU** wondered whether only one barge was adequate. **Mr. TSO** said one barge would be converted in the beginning and depending on the market demand, more barges might be converted to cope with the increased demand. He added that Marine Department would closely monitor the situation and issue relevant Marine Department Notice in due course.

#### **8. Date of Next Meeting**

The date of the next meeting would be advised in due course.

#### **9. Close of Meeting**

The meeting closed at 1200 hours.

Confirmed this 14th day of February 2007

---

**Chairman**

---

**Secretary**