

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	IX
<i>Abbreviations</i>	XI

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

1.1. Development of the legal concept of seaworthiness	2
1.2. The importance and relevance of seaworthiness	4
1.3. Definition of seaworthiness	6
1.4. The facets of the vessel's seaworthiness	9
1.4.1. Physical seaworthiness	10
1.4.2. Supply of equipment	11
1.4.3. Crew seaworthiness.....	14
1.4.4. Bunker seaworthiness.....	15
1.4.5. Cargoworthiness.....	16
1.5. The CMI's Work on the Rotterdam Rules.....	20
1.6. The methodology of the research	23
1.6.1. Interpretation of the International Carriage Rules.....	24
1.6.1.1. The use of international conventions	25
1.6.1.2. The use of <i>Travaux Préparatoires</i>	27
1.6.2. The special aspects of interpretation of the Rotterdam Rules.	28
1.7. Conclusion.....	30

CHAPTER TWO THE CONCEPT OF 'DUE DILIGENCE' UNDER THE HAGUE/HAGUE-VISBY RULES AND ROTTERDAM RULES

Introduction.....	36
-------------------	----

Part I THE OBLIGATION UNDER THE HAGUE/HAGUE-VISBY RULES

2.1. The Nature of the Duty	37
2.2. The Obligation to Exercise Due Diligence to Make the Vessel Seaworthy.	38
2.3. The Origin of 'Due Diligence'	38

2.4.	‘Due Diligence’ Defined	41
2.5.	Duration of the Obligation: The Time When the Carrier Must Begin to Exercise Due Diligence	46
2.6.	What is meant by ‘Voyage’?	47
2.6.1.	‘Before’ the Voyage — The Time When the Carrier Must Begin to Exercise Due Diligence.....	50
2.6.2.	‘At the beginning of the voyage’ — Termination of the Obligation.....	58
2.7.	Factors which Determine the Commencement of the Voyage — When Does the Obligation Come to an End?	63
2.7.1.	Operational Requirements.....	63
2.7.1.1.	The Physical Process of Casting the Vessel Off (Undocking).....	64
2.7.1.2.	The Command or Control of the Vessel	68
2.7.2.	Legal Requirements	71
2.9.	Conclusion	79

Part II

THE OBLIGATION UNDER THE ROTTERDAM RULES

2.10.	The Relevant Provisions in the Rotterdam Rules.....	80
2.11.	The Language of Article 14.....	82
2.12.	The Standard and Timing of the Obligation	83
2.13.	The End of the Obligation.....	84
2.14.	Differences between Exercising Due Diligence Before and During the Voyage.....	87
2.14.1.	The Effect of the Extension of the Obligation and the Application of the Duty to ‘make’ the Vessel Seaworthy ‘before and at the beginning of the voyage’	89
2.14.2.	The Effect of the Duty to ‘keep’ the Vessel Seaworthy After the Commencement of, and During, the Voyage on the Required Activity and Standard of Due Diligence — Differences in the Due Diligence Obligation Between ‘before’ and ‘during’ the Voyage.....	96
2.14.2.1.	The Nature of the Defect.....	97
2.14.2.2.	The Possibility of Causing Damage to the Cargo ..	98
2.14.2.3.	What is Required in the Circumstances Depends Upon Access to the Necessary Repair Facility	101
2.15.	Practical Implications of the Extension of the Due Diligence Obligation to Keep the Vessel Seaworthy.....	103
2.16.	Practical Aspects of Remedying Unseaworthiness after the Commencement of the Voyage	106
2.16.1.	First Scenario: A Repairable Defect	106
2.16.2.	Second Scenario: A Repairable Defect which Causes Unreasonable Delay	107
2.16.3.	Third Scenario: A Defect Temporarily Repairable.....	121

2.16.4. Fourth Scenario: A Defect Unrepairable at Sea	122
2.17. Conclusion	126
2.18. Overall Conclusion	131

CHAPTER THREE

BURDEN OF PROOF AND COMMERCIAL RISK ALLOCATION

Introduction	136
--------------------	-----

Part I

**THE BURDEN OF PROOF IN ARTICLE IV R.1
OF THE HAGUE/HAGUE-VISBY RULES**

3.1. Introduction	138
3.2. The Burden of Proof under the Hague/Hague-Visby Rules in General (Article IV r.1 & 2)	140
3.2.1. Phase One: The Cargo-Interests' Prima Facie Case	142
3.2.2. Phase Two: The Carrier's Response — Proof of the Loss Caused by One of the Specific Exceptions	143
3.2.3. Phase Three: Proof of Unseaworthiness — The Claimant's Burden	145
3.2.3.1. The Difficulties Facing the Cargo-claimant at Phase Three	146
3.2.3.2. Possible Solutions	151
3.2.4. Phase Four: The Carrier's Further Defence	163
3.3. The Standard of Proving Due Diligence	164
3.4. Concurrent Causes	165
3.5. Suggested Solution on Concurrent Causes where one is unseaworthiness	167
3.6. Conclusions	169

Part II

THE ROTTERDAM RULES: THE CARRIER'S RIGHTS AND IMMUNITIES

3.7. Introduction	172
3.8. The Language of Article 17	173
3.9. Allocation of the Burden of Proof by Article 17 of the Rotterdam Rules.	175
3.9.1. Phase One: Article 17(1) — The Claimant's Prima Facie Case.	176
3.9.2. Phase Two: Article 17(2) or (3)	179
3.9.2.1. One Approach: Article 17(2) — The Carrier's Burden to Prove Absence of Fault	182
3.9.2.2. An Alternative Approach: Article 17(3) — The Specific Exceptions under the Catalogue of Defences	189
3.9.3. Phase Three: Article 17(5) — The Proof of Unseaworthiness of the Vessel and the Carrier's Proof of Due Diligence	195

3.9.3.1.	Article 17(5)(a): Claimant's Proof that the Vessel was Unseaworthy	196
3.9.3.2.	Determining the 'probable' Standard of Causation.....	197
3.9.3.3.	The Potential Interpretation by the English Courts.....	198
3.9.3.4.	Factors affecting the Level of Probability of Causation.....	203
3.9.3.5.	The Exact Time of the Occurrence of the 'event or circumstance' that caused the Unseaworthiness: Is Proof Required?.....	220
3.9.4.	Phase Four: Article 17(5)(b)(i) and (ii) — Disproving Unseaworthiness	226
3.10.	Proposed Modification — Solution	229
3.11.	Article 17(6).....	230
3.11.1.	Concurrent Combination of Losses, One of which is Unexplained.....	231
3.11.1.1.	The Liability under Concurrent Causes where one of the Causes is Unseaworthiness.....	236
3.12.	The Potential Implicit Burdens that are not mentioned in the Context — Allocation of Responsibility in Cases of Multiple Causation.....	238
3.12.1.	Allocating Responsibility between Both Parties depending on the Decision of the Court	239
3.12.1.1.	The Standard of Proof of the Extent of Liability .	240
3.12.1.2.	The Soundness of this Approach	241
3.12.2.	The Discretion of the Court without Allocating the Responsibility to One of the Parties	243
3.13.	Potential misconception from the imprecise wording	246
3.14.	Assessment of Article 17(6): Is it Sensible to regard paragraph (6) as an Individual Stage in Itself?	247
3.15.	Conclusion	248

CHAPTER FOUR

EFFECT OF SHIPPING STANDARDS ON SEAWORTHINESS

	Introduction.....	251
4.1.	The Relevance and Importance of the Industry Standards	253
4.2.	The Potential Legal Implications of the Industry Standards on Seaworthiness.....	255
4.3.	SOLAS.....	258
4.3.1.	Objectives of SOLAS — Construction and Equipment of the Vessel	261
4.4.	STCW Convention.....	272
4.4.1.	Inadequate Implementation of the STCW Convention — A	

	Factor Requiring different in practical sense Due Diligence in Employing the Crew.....	275
4.4.2.	Inadequate Regulations of the STCW Convention relating to Crew Fatigue.....	286
4.4.3.	Safety Manning Certificates and Crew Fatigue	289
4.5.	General Problems.....	290
4.5.1.	Matters that Reduce the Effectiveness of the Industry	291
4.5.2.	Inadequate Response to Maritime Safety and Seaworthiness .	294
4.6.	Solutions	295
4.6.1.	Extending the Obligation of Due Diligence to Cover the Entire Voyage — A Way to Reduce Gaps Created by Industry Standards.....	295
4.6.2.	Problems of the Current Law and the Need for New Rules...	302
4.7.	Conclusion.....	309

CHAPTER FIVE

THE IMPLICATION OF THE MULTIMODAL ASPECT OF THE ROTTERDAM RULES ON THE SEAWORTHINESS OBLIGATION AND THE CONSEQUENT LIABILITY

5.1.	Introduction.....	312
5.1.1.	Introduction to the Supply of Containers.....	314
5.2.	Problems under the Current Law	317
5.3.	Scope of Application	321
5.4.	The Importance of Extending the Obligation to Land Carriage.....	325
5.4.1.	The Fitness of Containers	325
5.4.2.	Implications of Extending the Obligation of Container Seaworthiness to Inland Carriage	332
5.4.3.	Potential Conflicts as regards the Standard of Liability	338
5.5.	The Effect of Article 82 that deals with Localised/Unlocalised Damage on the Seaworthiness Obligation	345
5.6.	The Standard of the Duty	346
5.6.1.	The Cancellation of the Extended Seaworthiness Obligation..	347
5.6.2.	The Potential Impact on Container Cargoworthiness	349
5.6.3.	The Potential Influence on the Vessel's Seaworthiness	352
5.7.	The Potential Interpretation of the CMNI Convention	353
5.8.	The Indirect Impact on Article 14: The Example of CMR	358
5.8.1.	Standard of Checking the Fitness of the Container in Door-to-Door Carriage.....	360
5.9.	The Implication of the Rotterdam Rules on Unlocalised or Localised Containerised Cargo	363
5.9.1.	Disregarding the Application of the Container Cargoworthiness Obligation	363
5.9.2.	Trans-shipment: Not to the Benefit of the Cargo-interests? ...	364
5.9.3.	Limiting the Carrier's Liability: To the Benefit of the Carrier.	365

5.10.	Recommended Solutions	366
5.10.1.	Recommendations to Modify Certain Provisions of the Rotterdam Rules	366
5.10.1.1.	A Central Liability Provision in All Modes of Carriage vs a Specific Seaworthiness Provision.....	368
5.10.2.	A Non-mandatory Approach	372
5.11.	Conclusion	375

CHAPTER SIX

**THE SUPPLY OF CONTAINERS AND ‘SEAWORTHINESS’:
THE ROTTERDAM RULES PERSPECTIVE**

Introduction.....	378
-------------------	-----

Part I

**SUPPLY OF CONTAINERS AND “SEAWORTHINESS”
UNDER THE CURRENT REGIME**

6.1.	The Legal Status of Containers under the Current Law	380
6.2.	The Standard of Due Diligence in Checking the Fitness of the Container.	395
6.2.1.	Thoroughness of the Inspection	396
6.3.	Imposing the Container ‘Seaworthiness’ Obligation under English Law.	402
6.3.1.	(a) The Container as Part of the Vessel’s Superstructure and Seaworthiness	404
6.3.2.	(b) Container as Equipment.....	410

Part II

**SUPPLY OF CONTAINERS AND ‘SEAWORTHINESS’
UNDER THE ROTTERDAM RULES**

6.4.	The Potential Liability of the Supplying Carrier for Cargo Damage Caused by a Faulty Container.....	413
6.4.1.	Interpreting Article 14(c) of the Rotterdam Rules by Special Reference to Earlier Case Law — The English Court	414
6.4.1.1.	Unseaworthiness without Endangering the Safety of the Vessel	417
6.4.1.2.	No Unseaworthiness or Risk to the Vessel’s Safety.	418
6.4.2.	The Supplying Carrier’s Responsibility for Damage to Containerised Cargo Caused by Defective or Unsuitable Containers; Judgments from Other Jurisdictions on Container Unseaworthiness	422
6.4.2.1.	The American Approach to Unfit Containers: Endangering the Safety of the Vessel	423
6.4.2.2.	The Chinese Approach to Unfit Containers: The Vessel’s Safety is Irrelevant	425

	6.4.2.3. Another Approach from France	427
6.5.	Conclusion	428

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

	Introduction	436
7.1.	The Obligation to Exercise Due Diligence under the Hague/Hague-Visby Rules	440
	7.1.1. What can be done to improve the current situation?	441
7.2.	The Obligation to Exercise Due Diligence under the Rotterdam Rules	443
	7.2.1. The New Uncertainty under the Rotterdam Rules	444
	7.2.2. Solution to the New Uncertainty	446
	7.2.3. The Strictness of the Obligation.....	447
	7.2.4. A New Obligation on the Carrier	449
7.3.	Effect of Shipping Standards on Seaworthiness	451
	7.3.1. The Relevance of Shipping Industry Standards on the Obligation of Seaworthiness	451
	7.3.2. The Potential Legal Implications of the Industry Standards on Seaworthiness.....	452
	7.3.3. What can be done to improve the current situation?	453
	7.3.4. Potential Effect of the Rotterdam Rules on the Obligation of Seaworthiness in Light of Shipping Industry Standards	456
	7.3.5. The Example of the STCW Convention	458
	7.3.6. What can be done to improve the current situation?	459
7.4.	Supply of Containers and Seaworthiness	462
7.5.	The Implication of the Multimodality of the Rotterdam Rules on Seaworthiness	468
	7.5.1. The Importance of Extending the Obligation to Land Carriage.....	470
	7.5.2. The Effect of the Multimodality on the Obligation of Seaworthiness.....	471
	7.5.2.1. Unknown Standard of Care	471
	7.5.2.2. Cancelling Out the Ongoing Obligation of Seaworthiness	472
	7.5.2.3. Derogation of the Standard of Seaworthiness Obligation	473
7.6.	Suggested Modification	474
7.7.	Proposals	478
	7.7.1. Provision for Vessel Seaworthiness and Container Cargoworthiness.....	478
	7.7.2. Provision to Include the Obligation of Container Cargoworthiness to the Inland Carriage when Supplied by the Sea Carrier	479
	7.7.3. Provision for Chemical Container Cargoworthiness.....	479
7.8.	The Burden of Proof and Commercial Risk Allocation	480

7.8.1.	Problems under the Current Law	481
7.8.2.	How can the current principle be ameliorated in order to improve current law?	482
7.8.3.	The Apportionment of Liability	485
7.9.	Burden of Proof under the Rotterdam Rules	486
7.9.1.	The Impact of Codification on Allocation of Risk	487
7.9.2.	The ‘Probable’ Standard of Causation	491
7.10.	The Apportionment of Liability under the Rotterdam Rules	498
7.11.	Concluding Remarks	500
<i>Bibliography</i>		509
Books		509
Journals and articles		512
International reports and documents		516
Miscellaneous: conferences / papers / thesis		518
Online resources		520
<i>Table of legislation</i>		521
<i>Table of cases</i>		523
UK Cases		523
USA Cases		528
France Cases		530
Israel Cases		530
Belgium Cases		530
China Cases		531
Singapore Cases		531
Canada Cases		531
Netherlands Cases		532
New Zealand Cases		532
Australia Cases		532
Mauritius Cases		532