

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI MESSINA



CENTRO UNIVERSITARIO DI STUDI SUI TRASPORTI  
EUROMEDITERRANEI "ELIO FANARA"

34

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY  
OF THE OBLIGATION OF DUE  
DILIGENCE TO PROVIDE  
A SEAWORTHY VESSEL UNDER  
THE HAGUE/HAGUE-VISBY RULES  
AND THE ROTTERDAM RULES**

by

DR. TALAL HAMAD ALADWANI



GIUFFRÈ EDITORE

# 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 Bur- den 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