

----- Original Message -----

From: "Michael Schmiechen" <m.schm@t-online.de>
To: "Tsuyoshi Ishiguro" <tsuyoshi_ishiguro@ihimu.ihico.jp>
Cc: "Andreas I. Chrysostomou" <info@imo.org>; "Frank Dau" <nsmt@din.de>; "Gerhard Strasser" <prof.dr.g.strasser@sva.at>; "Giulio Gennaro" <giulio.gennaro@sinm.it>; "Kinya Tamura" <tamurak@jf6.sonet.ne.jp>; "Klaus Wagner" <IKWAG@web.de>; "Kuniharu Nakatake" <nakatake@aquaplala.or.jp>; "Mitsuhiro Abe" <mitsuhiro.abe@pep.ne.jp>; "Naoji Toki" <toki.naoji.mz@ehime-u.ac.jp>; "Stig Sand" <ss@force.dk>
Sent: Thursday, November 14, 2013 10:24 PM

Subject: Revision of ISO 15016

Dear Mr. Ishiguro,

your 'very' recent presentation on the 'Current status on revision work of ISO15016 for EEDI verification - Conduct and analysis procedure of speed trial – ' at the 7th Asian Shipbuilding Experts' Forum November 7th to 8th, 2013, in Kobe has been forwarded to me by a younger colleague.

According to my first impression your account of the current status 'nicely' links up with my current work and publications related to ship powering trials.

Need for revision since 1998

For ready reference I attach the two most recent ones before I knew the current status of the work, in the subtitle explicitly voting 'for a revised, generally acceptable, lasting edition of ISO 15016, concerning not only trials, but also monitoring of the powering performance, meeting theoretical, contractual and legal standards and requirements'.

As I have stated repeatedly, the situation reminds me of the time when railway gauges were selected differently for protective reasons. Not only MARIN is following that stone-age doctrine, but HSVA and SSPA are still working along that line on a joint project to be presented next week at the Annual Meeting of STG here at Berlin.

As a matter of fact I have promoted the revision of ISO 15016 since 1998, long before it became a standard, as documented by the Japan Marine Standards Organisation (JMSA) under ISO/TC8/SC9/WG2/N28 dated 1998-06-23. All the correspondence with Prof. Ikehata, the convener at that time, is 'of course' documented on my website.

Current work on rational procedure

Please find all my current work and related discussions documented also on my website www.m-schmiechen.de, in the Section 'News on ship powering trials' in reverse order under the heading 'From METEOR 1988 to ANONYMA 2013 and further'.

Following my analyses of the ANONYMA trials, documented in every detail (!), I have published the draft of a review of the development of the rational theory of trials with the unmistakable title 'Future Ship Powering Trials Now'. The only substantial written discussion yet is that by Dott. Giulio Gennaro of Genova.

The section 4.3.4 'The Emperor's new Clothes' of that draft, added after the draft was 'finished', provides a rigorous criticism of the STA method aggressively marketed (!) and promoted 'otherwise' by MARIN and followed by a procession of 'specialists', certainly not 'experts', surprisingly without causing any serious professional discussions.

'ITTC 2012 Guidelines' withdrawn

But finally I have convinced the Chairman of the Executive Committee of ITTC to back out of that procession and to abandon the 'ITTC 2012 Guidelines', 'produced' by the ITTC SC PSS and prematurely forwarded to the IMO MEPC by the Executive Committee These Guidelines and consequently the basis of the joint effort of ISO and ITTC are obsolete, not only theoretically, but 'legally' as well!

I shall not repeat here, what I have written in many papers. Please note my latest, rather concise presentation of the essentials, the English translation of which I also append for ready reference as well. Here I just state that the times of Kinya Tamura and Frits Mennen are gone. Their concepts concerning fundamental aspects and problems are not adequate for our problems and purposes at hand.

In particular this concerns the reliable identification of the current. Any responsible expert immediately stops any further analysis, if that problem is not (to be) solved satisfactorily. What I saw on your ppt-presentation is unacceptable. The community 'simply' cannot afford to repeat the ISO 15015: 2002-06 mistakes and wait further decades for the urgently necessary progress.

Time table unrealistic

The time table drafted, evidently under the pressure of the MEPC after I had alerted its Chairman, is definitely too 'narrow'. Please keep in mind, that the 27th ITTC, only that may approve any Guidelines or more likely not (!), will take place at Copenhagen not before September 2014.

And further note, that changes in thinking inherited from our great-grandfathers and still indoctrinated at 'schools' worldwide take much longer. It is twenty-five years since my tests with METEOR, since my rational interpretation of the naive concepts of hull-propeller interaction on full scale, but naval architect still do not take advantage, at least on model scale.

What we urgently need is 'Future now!', conventions that meet all the requirements of all the groups concerned. Always remember: The most

practical tool is a theory based on appropriate principles. 'Consistently' ignoring the state of research, not only in naval architecture, is a self-defeating strategy.

What needs to be done

With only little common sense all experts, not to be confused with 'specialists', know what needs to be done, what can be harmonised and what cannot be 'harmonised'. Evidently there are three or rather four systems of conventions to be clearly and cleanly to be distinguished, 'clare et distincte' as the Romans concisely said.

1. 'Pre-Processing': Conduct of trials, acquisition of data. Concerning this matter all existing conventions can easily be harmonised, differing only very little. But as many trials are performed at ballast conditions these conventions have to be augmented as the ANONYMA trials have drastically shown!

2. Objective, observer independent evaluation at the trials condition. This is the crucial problem, concerning which all traditional conventions in use are unacceptable. They all rely on unreliable prior data, selected 'as required' for the purpose at hand! This has been my central concern and my solution already described in 1998 has been successfully applied many times since.

And my repeated question is, how long will ship buyers accept the same people to provide the predictions, to conduct the trials and to analyse the data 'as well', and even setting the standards! If you think about this situation, you will find it as ridiculous as any layman.

3. 'Post-Processing': Prediction (!!!) of powering at conditions differing from the trials conditions. In this case one 'has to use' prior data, if variations of trials conditions do not permit reliably to identify the relevant parameters. Concerning this point the 'competing' conventions may be harmonised as well, - if one does not prefer to follow my proposal and rely on objective monitoring under service conditions after the 'acceptance' trials.

4. Finally monitoring of powering under service conditions. This very important point has already been mentioned under 3. Any standard not taking care of this fundamental problem is incomplete in my view! I have already published a preliminary exercise, demonstrating what needs to be accounted for.

Specific contributions envisaged

Personally I am ready to contribute to further developments of ISO 15016. The first thing I shall do after November 22, right after the Annual Meeting of STG (Schiffbautechnische Gesellschaft) here at Berlin, will be independently to analyse the set of trials data provided as example with the update of ISO 15016.

I did this already fifteen (!) years ago with the earlier example, demonstrating that the ISO procedure was unacceptable, being inherently wrong, not adhering to first, simple, 'self-evident' principles of common sense.

Looking forward to your mail with trials data 'only', no 'prior' data of model tests or any other (!), I remain with my best regards to your colleagues on the Working Group yours,

Michael Schmiechen.

PS. Please make sure that all colleagues working on the revision of ISO 15016 not only receive, but read [2013-11-15 added 'and understand'] (!) my remarks and maybe some of my papers and detailed analyses.