

General

This paper contains the German comments on the input of other participants of the SDC2 CG on Evacuation Analyses.

Main Author: Tim Meyer-König (tmk@traffgo-ht.com), TraffGo HT, Germany.

1 TOR 1, Amendments to the Guideline

1.1 CLIA

1.1.1 Revised Circular Annex 1, 1.1.4 and 1.1.5

We have added some text (bold) in order to explain it a bit further. We want to encourage people performing these analyses to submit safety relevant results of the analyses to the owners and their crew.

1.1.2 Revised Circular Annex 1, 2.4 and 2.5

These paragraphs have not been edited, just copied and thus are the same as in the original circular.

1.1.3 Revised Circular, Duration/Time

Changing “time” into “duration” is just a formality, since the physically correct word for a time segment is duration, while the current status is called time.

1.1.4 Revised Circular Annex 1, 3.1

Many vessels have special crew assembly stations, which should be clearly defined like the passengers assembly stations. After all, we do simulate part of the crew moving to its assigned assembly station.

1.1.5 Revised Circular Annex 1, 6.9

For some of the vessels analyzed by our experts, especially the day case of RoRo passenger ferries often lead to the scenarios described earlier, where the distribution of the passengers resulted in too many persons per assembly station. This happened, if one MVZ consisted of mainly public spaces. It should at least be noted in an analysis, that actions could be necessary to re-distribute passengers between the assembly stations.

1.2 Japan

1.2.1 Secondary cases for each MVZ

We think, that the additional scenarios proposed by Japan and by China as well, somehow relate to the current secondary cases. Why we think, that expanding these cases to every single MVZ will result in too much effort with regard to results, we do see some compliance to the current secondary cases. Maybe it would be a compromise, to use the current secondary cases, but without alternative 1 (blocking half the stair case capacity). In the current alternative 2, 50% of the passengers from the neighboring MVZ will use the MVZ identified in the primary cases. This partly resembles the additional scenarios proposed by Japan and the SRtP scenarios proposed by China.

1.3 Netherlands

1.3.1 Counter/crossing flows

We were only talking about these analyses (simplified or advanced), so we think, that points where crossing or counter flows occur in the analysis should be pointed out.

2 TOR 4, Additional Scenarios

2.1 China

2.1.1 SRtP scenarios

See 1.2.1.

2.2 CLIA

2.2.1 Embarkation Scenario

Our proposal may have been misleading. We only want to analyze the movement of the persons to the LSA, since this is a logistically challenging process. The speed of boarding the LSA is covered by the type approval tests. We have revised our restructured Circular accordingly.