Report of the CMI IWG Sub-Group on MASS and Collisions

Luci Carey CMI Tokyo Conference, MASS Session 15 May 2025





Overview

- Background
- Questions Considered by Sub-Group
- Discussion



Q1: How is the term 'vessel' as referred to in Article 3 of the 1910 Convention ("fault of the vessel") to be interpreted in the context of MASS? Does it extend to faults by remote operators, or even by fully autonomous ships?

- 'Vessel' not defined in 1910 Convention
- National courts will define



Q2: Will an owner's vicarious liability for collisions extend to entities such as remote operators, software suppliers, or shipyards whose errors have caused/contributed to the collision?

- Vicarious liability not specific to MASS or collisions
- What is the extent of vicarious liability?



Q3: Would a multi-ship collision involving one or more MASS pose any particular issues under the 1910 Convention?

- Strict liability discussed notions of fairness



Q4: Would article 5 of the 1910 Convention (on pilots) extend to e-pilotage undertaken from shore or to mandatory instructions from coastal authorities?

- Shore-based pilotage exists
- ♣ Pilot as 'crew' unproblematic
- ♣ But.... what if e-pilotage 'industrialised' by coastal state?



Q5: To what extent does the 1910 Convention extend to allisions involving a MASS and a stationary object?

- Only if the stationary object is a 'vessel'
- Is it necessary to extend the 1910 Convention to



Q6: What applies if it is considered that the fault of the MASS was not a "fault of the vessel" under the 1910 Convention?

- No fault of MASS (art 3); No fault of either ship (art 4(1)); cause unknown (art 2(1)



Q7: How does MASS affect the characterisation of fault in the context of collisions?

- Look at outcomes
- Responsibility for the use of technology
- Rules on discovery when collision involves AI
- Defences
- Implications of fault alternative course of action that should have been taken
- Problem of assumption of liability without consideration of fault does not sit easily with Collision
 Convention 1910
- Augmented liability where no crew is on board?



Q8: Would an unidentified programming error in a MASS' computer system lead to equal sharing of liability under Article 4 of the 1910 Convention?

Discussion:

No reason why the rule does not apply to MASS



Q9: Could the 1910 Convention accommodate features such as "cumulative" or "anonymous" culpa, whereby there is no need to identify a negligent individual in order to establish fault of the owner?

- Refers to fault of the VESSEL not a person
- If 'things' can be at fault 1910 Convention is MASSproof



Q11: To what extent does the 1910 Convention (Article 6) rule out (different kinds of) presumptions of fault or liability placed on MASS?

- Rules out LEGAL presumptions
- Domestic legislation presuming MASS at fault would violate the 1910 Convention



Q12: Would a no-fault liability coupled with contributory negligence exception be compatible with the 1910 Convention?

Discussion:

♣ No!

But....contributory negligence could address fairness if MASS has augmented liability thresholds.



Q13: Is there a possibility to apply other liability schemes, such as product liability for equipment manufacturers, in parallel to the 1910 Convention? Discussion:

- 1910 Convention is non-exhaustive
- LLMC may protect shipowners (and certain parties) but not manufacturers
- 1910 Convention can accommodate MASS but if changes are made protocol would be preferable



Any questions?

luci.carey@abdn.ac.uk

