



International Regulation of Liability for Multimodal Transport Current liability regime Vs. The RR

Dr. Mahin Faghfour¹

International Multimodal Transport Association (IMMTA)

International Regulation of Liability for Multimodal Transport

Current liability regime Vs. The Rotterdam Rules

Dr. Mahin Faghfour

International Multimodal Transport Association



¹ PhD in Commercial Maritime Law from London University (UCL)
Former Chief of Maritime Legislation Section and the Legal Section of UNCTAD
President of International Multimodal Transport Association

International Regulation of Liability for MT: Current liability regime Vs. The RR

- I. Introduction and background**
- II. Current liability framework**
- III. Attempts at establishing a uniform regime at international level :**
 - 1. 1980 UN Convention on International Multimodal Transport of Goods*
 - 2. 1992 UNCTAD/ICC Rules for Multimodal Transport Documents*
- IV. Existing MT laws: *influenced by the MT Convention***
- V. Convention on Contracts for the International Carriage of Goods Wholly or Partly by Sea (*The Rotterdam Rule*)**

I. Introduction and background

- Growth in containerized trade and multimodal transport
- Need for uniform international legal framework
- Practical aspects: MT and standard term contracts
- Mandatory minimum standards of liability:
Transport conventions

What is multimodal transport?

- No single authoritative definition
- Definitions often based on the MT Convention 1980
- Carriage by *two or more modes of transport*
- Door-to-door transport
- Often under *one contract* and with *one party assuming responsibility throughout*
- One document

II. Current liability framework

- **MT Convention 1980** is not in force
- National, regional, subregional MT laws (**ALADI, Andean Community, MERCOSUR, ASEAN**)
- Localized loss: unimodal Conventions on carriage by sea, road, rail, air
- Otherwise: standard term contract (e.g. **FIATA FBL 92, BIMCO MULTIDOC 95**)

Current liability framework

Liability rules vary depending on:

- *Stage of transport where loss or damage occurs*
- *Applicable regime*
- *Causes of loss or damage*

Diversity of approach on key issues such as liability basis, delay, limitation and time-bar, e.g. limitation amounts vary from 2 SDR (HVR) to 19 SDR (Montreal Convention)

III. Attempts at establishing a uniform regime at international level

1. United Nations Convention on International Multimodal Transport of Goods 1980

- Has not entered into force but has provided a basis for enacting laws on MT at national, regional and subregional level
- Apply mandatorily to *all contracts of MT* between Contracting States
- *Liability rules uniform*, but limitation of liability may vary
- **MTO responsible throughout** (from taking goods in charge until their delivery)

2. UNCTAD/ICC Rules for Multimodal Transport Document 1992

- Contractual rules: *Need to be incorporated into contracts*
- Apply subject to mandatory international convention or national law
- *MTO assumes responsibility throughout*
- Liability system: *“modified uniform”*
 - basis of liability uniform: but exceptions to liability may vary
 - liability limits vary
- Widely used: incorporated in *FIATA FBL 1992 & BIMCO MULTIDOC 1995*

IV. Existing MT laws: influenced by the 1980 MT Convention

- Application *mandatorily* to *all MT contracts*
- MT under one contract, and transport document
- *MTO assuming responsibility throughout*
- *No contracting out of any part of transport or any function*

V. The Rotterdam Rules

- Adopted by the *UN General Assembly* on 11 Dec. 2008
- Was opened for signature on 23 September 2009 in Rotterdam, the Netherlands
- 24 States have signed the Convention, but only one State (Spain) has ratified it
- 20 ratifications required for the Convention to enter into force

What is covered?

The Rotterdam Rules:

- Apply to contracts for carriage of goods by sea and *multimodal transport including an international sea leg*
- Based on maritime concepts and existing maritime liability regimes, but significant changes in structure, substance and drafting
- Many provisions are lengthy and highly complex (96 articles in 18 chapters, only 3 arts. relate to MT)

And:

- Chapters on *jurisdiction* and *arbitration* are: **optional**
- Cover issues not already subject to international uniform law, such as:
 - delivery of the goods,
 - transfer of rights,
 - right of control,
- Provide for electronic communication / electronic transport records
- Permit freedom of contract for “*volume contracts*” in liner trade: *highly controversial*

The Rotterdam Rules: Multimodal application

Highly controversial throughout negotiations

Concerns as to:

- *unsuitability of the liability rules to apply to MT*
- increasing *fragmentation* of the law applicable to MT
- possible *conflict with unimodal conventions*
- desire to apply national laws on MT

A "*maritime plus convention*"

The Rotterdam Rules apply to:

Int. contracts of carriage of goods wholly or partly by sea

Contract of carriage is defined as:

"a contract in which the carrier, against payment of freight, undertakes to carry goods from one place to another. ***The contract shall provide for carriage of goods by sea and may provide for carriage by other modes of transport in addition to sea the carriage***" (art. 1(1))

Sea carriage & MT involving an international sea leg covered

But potential uncertainties:

Would the RR apply if:

- *contract is not "mode specific" but gives option to the carrier as to the modes of MT, Or*
- *contract does not provide for sea carriage but carriage in fact includes a sea leg? Or*
- *contract provided for sea carriage but good were not carried by sea?*

Note:

MT may not be subject to RR but sea carriage of the same MT maybe!

Uncertainty: type of transport document?

Central issues:

1. One party responsible throughout?

A. Period of responsibility: receipt to delivery (art. 12(1))

But may be restricted to cover:

the period from *initial loading* to *final unloading* under the contract of carriage (12(3))

So: Period of responsibility could be:

Sea carriage: *tackle-to-tackle*

MT: *initial loading to final unloading* and not from receipt to delivery

And:

B. Responsibility for certain functions e.g. *loading, handling, stowing or unloading* may be contractually transferred to the *shipper, documentary shipper or consignee* (art. 13(2))

So:

Contracting carrier may not be responsible throughout MT

Q: *identity of the party responsible?*

RR cover: **Performing party & Maritime performing party**

Maritime performing party

Terminal operators, stevedores, warehousemen, cargo terminals engaged in logistics operations...

- May be liable as **maritime performing parties**, and ***subject to same liability regime of sea carriers***
- **Inland carrier:** a maritime performing party if *performs or undertake to perform activities exclusively within a port*
- **Non-MPPs** are excluded

Central issues:

2. Liability system: “minimal network”

Article 26: *Carriage preceding or subsequent to sea carriage*

(give precedence to certain mandatory provisions of unimodal conventions)

Conditions to operate:

1. Loss arising *solely* before or after sea-carriage
2. Other international instrument hypothetically applicable and include:
3. Mandatory provisions on *carrier's liability, limitation of liability and time for suit*

For localized loss

- if there is any unimodal convention *hypothetically* applicable
- provisions dealing with *liability, limitation of liability, and time for suit* of the unimodal convention apply
- *plus remainder of the Rotterdam Rules*

(including provisions relating to: *carrier's obligations, shipper's obligations and liability, delivery, documentation, transfer of rights, right of control*)

For non-localized loss or if no unimodal convention would be applicable:

- *maritime liability rules of the Rotterdam Rules apply*
- *even if goods were carried mainly by land / air*

Note:

Containerized cargo: loss often non-localized

Land transport conventions not globally applicable

Burden of proof: on cargo claimant!

Art. 82: attempt to address issue of *potential conflict with unimodal conventions!*

The Rotterdam Rules

Will provide

no improvement over the existing system:

There will be

- *no uniform liability rules to govern the entire MT*
- *no one party responsible throughout the MT*
- *MT not including a sea leg not covered*
- *further fragmentation of law governing MT*

Substantive liability regime

A. **Obligations and liability of the carrier*** (chapters. 4 & 5)

(*including maritime performing parties)

- Is based on fault (art. 17)
- No liability for delay in delivery unless a *time for delivery has been agreed in the contract* (art. 21)
- Long list of exceptions (art. 17(3))
somewhat based on Hague Visby Rules but with significance differences:
 - deletion of the exemption for “*nautical fault*”
 - fire exemption no longer protecting carrier in case of negligence

But: *new rights and exemptions added* (see articles 15 & 16)

- Burden of proof rules: *changed favouring the carrier*
- Possibility to deliver goods *without presentation of negotiable b/l* under certain conditions

undermining document of title function of the b/l

- **Limits of liability:**
3 SDR per kg. & 875 SDR per pkg

B. Shipper's obligations and liability

(chapter 7)

Obligations and liability:

- more extensive and detailed than in existing conventions

Liability: based on fault

But: strict liability

- Provide *accurate information*: contract particulars
- *Dangerous goods*

N.B: "*documentary shipper*" (e.g. FOB seller) liable in addition to shipper (art. 33)

Shipper's obligations / liability: mandatory

- *May not be contractually excluded or limited* (art. 79(2))
- Substantive provisions more onerous to shippers, and
- ***No monetary limitation on shipper's liability***

Position of freight forwarders

Freight forwarders as:

- **Carriers:** vis-à-vis small shipper
subject to same liability regime of carrier
- **Shippers:** vis-à-vis unimodal carrier, e.g. ocean carrier
subject to same liability regime of shipper

C. Mandatory nature: “Volume contracts”

The Rules primarily establish mandatory liability both for carriers and *shippers*

But: “Volume contracts”

are exempt from mandatory application of the Rules

So:

its provisions could be modified or contracted out under certain condition

New approach: *highly controversial*

Apparent rationale

Argument: “volume contracts” as contracts between *sophisticated parties of equal bargaining power?*

But:

Definition of “volume contract” is ***extremely wide***
may cover ***almost any contract of carriage in liner trade***

And:

No minimum quantity of cargo required

Potential consequences

- Volume contracts *between parties of unequal bargaining power*:
small shipper & large container carrier in liner trade:
 - *Potential for abuse!*
- *Marginal application of the convention*
- Extensive use of volume contracts =
no international uniformity

Potential consequences

- Volume contracts *between parties of unequal bargaining power*:
small shipper & large container carrier in liner trade:
 - *Potential for abuse!*
- *Marginal application of the convention*
- Extensive use of volume contracts =
no international uniformity

