

Port Marine Safety Code Health Check Trends 2015



Maritime &
Coastguard
Agency

*For all UK Harbour authorities and other marine facilities, berths,
terminals and marinas*

Maritime and Coastguard Agency

Tel 02380 329100

Navigation Safety Branch
Spring Place
105 Commercial Road
Southampton
SO15 1EG

Website:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/maritime-and-coastguard-agency>
Email: navigationsafety@mcga.gov.uk

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Exposure from failing to comply with the Code.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Observed Enhancements.....	5
Observed Best Practice.....	17



“The Port Marine Safety Code (the Code) applies to all Harbour authorities in the UK that have statutory powers and duties. It is also strongly recommended that other marine facilities, berths, terminals and marinas outside of Harbour areas should seek to have safety management systems in place which comply with this code”

Introduction

The Port Marine Safety Code was created under a review of the Pilotage Act 1987 by the then Department for Environment, Transport and the Regions in the aftermath of the Sea Empress disaster of 1996.

Its evolution has matured as a voluntary code since then and is now applicable to both harbour authorities and other marine facilities.

In conjunction with the code, the Guide to Good Practice on Port Marine Operations (GTGP) underpins the ethos of the code by providing guidance and examples, written and agreed by industry, to assist authorities and organisations in promoting and executing safe, efficient and accountable port marine operations based on industry best practice.

The MCA seeks to undertake eight PMSC health check visits annually, aiming to visit a range of different types of organisation across all parts of the UK. A visit may be triggered by: evidence of a problem (or potential problem) at a harbour or facility; self-reported non-compliance with the Code; or a request for assistance. A health check is intended to identify any improvements in compliance and strengths of good practice; it is not a formal inspection or enforcement action.

Future health checks will continue to have a particular emphasis on supporting smaller harbours or ports, particularly under municipal ownership, whilst also including a number of larger ports.



Exposure from failing to comply with the Code:

The following extract is from a successful prosecution of a harbour authority who were found to fail in their duties to adequately implement four foundational elements of PMSC compliance. This case demonstrates the importance that courts may place on authorities / organisations adopting 'industry best practice' and the exposure that they may face if they fail to take adequate steps towards compliance. The harbour authority was subsequently fined for contraventions under section 3(1) of the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974:

To the charge that it was the Port Authority's duty under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974, Section 3, to conduct their undertaking in such a way as to ensure, so far as was reasonably practicable, that persons not in their employment who may be affected by the conduct of the Harbour Authority's undertaking were not exposed thereby to risks to their health or safety.

Part of the indictment read that:

"You failed to provide a safe system of work in that you did fail to provide a Safety Management System to reduce to a level as low as reasonably practicable the risks associated with marine operations in the Harbour Area, in terms of the Port Marine Safety Code, and failed to appoint a suitable individual or individuals to share the function of 'Designated Person' to provide you as the duty holder with independent assurance that your Safety Management System was working effectively and to audit your compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code."



'As a result of the eight health checks conducted during 2015, three organisations were deemed as non-compliant and will receive return visits during 2016 to verify that issues have been addressed'

Executive Summary

This report is designed to provide the industry with some current emerging trends in PMSC compliance. It will also provide examples of enhancements and best practices that have been observed whilst conducting health checks during 2015.

During 2015, the MCA conducted eight PMSC health checks throughout the UK at the following type of ports:

- 1x Private
- 3x Municipal
- 4x Trust

As a result of the eight health checks conducted during 2015, three organisations were deemed as non-compliant and will receive return visits during 2016 to verify that issues have been addressed.

The following issues were all highlighted in last year's report (2014 round of health checks), and are still very much areas highlighted for improvement in a number of cases during the 2015 round of health checks:

- **Duty holder**
- **Risk assessment**
- **Marine safety management system**

Other adverse trends highlighted during 2015 included issues related to:

- **Conducting proper consultation or stakeholder engagement**
- **Information dissemination**

The following summarises some of the issues related to the above five adverse trends identified during last year's round of health checks:



➤ **Duty Holder – issues observed**

- Duty holder awareness of roles & responsibilities under PMSC
- Formal & documented streams of reporting to duty holder
- Duty holder not appointed
- PMSC Training for duty holders

➤ **Risk Assessments - issues observed**

- Define & document review frequency
- Identify ranked hazards and use of ALARP principle
- Review risk assessment post incident / accident report
- No stakeholder engagement when reviewing risk assessments

➤ **MSMS – issues observed**

- No MSMS in place
- MSMS produced but not being used
- No review frequency
- Customs and practices not captured by MSMS e.g. hot works, bunkering, engine immobilisation etc
- Staff roles and responsibilities not defined (inc Harbour Masters)

➤ **Consultation and Information Dissemination – issues observed**

- No consultation during risk assessments
- No user group to help build a consensus on safe navigation
- ALRS vol 6 entry not updated
- No marine / navigational guidance to users

The MCA would encourage the industry to take account of the enhancements mentioned in this report and consider if any might be applicable to their organisations.



'The harbour should encourage clear access and flow of reporting and information directly from the DP to the duty holder and vice versa, this should include the DP meeting the duty holder to provide clear guidance on his roles and responsibilities under PMSC'

Observed Enhancements

The following are the enhancements which were observed during the 2015 round of health checks:

Duty Holder

- *Identify and appoint a duty holder who is accountable, on behalf of the harbour authority, for its compliance with the PMSC, it may be appropriate to consider forming a harbour board or similar governing body to fulfil this function.*
- *The Harbour should confirm their intention to work towards PMSC compliance*
- *The harbour should consider providing the Duty holder with an annual report containing information which would enable the commissioners to 'Publish plans and assessments against their performance in meeting the obligations against the Code at least once every 3 years'. These reports should contain safety information such as reportable incidents and near misses which would allow for year on year comparisons and highlight any emerging trends.*
- *The SMS vol 1 states that 'Board members shall understand the requirements of the code', thought should be given to how this might be formally achieved. Various options were discussed including various courses which are available, using the DP to promote duty holder roles and responsibilities and requiring individual commissioners to sign the SMS.*
- *The harbour should determine how they can comply with the requirement to 'report the harbours performance against the code annually' as prescribed in sect 3.11 of the PMSC. The lack of this report has also been highlighted by a recent DP audit report. It was explained that the gathering of information which would inform this report was already well established e.g. harbour masters monthly reports and associated incident statistics etc, this remaining report on performance would contribute to the final 'closing the loop' element of the process.*



'The agenda for the harbour project board would benefit from having PMSC related topics as a standing agenda item'

- *It was seen that whilst a DP has recently been appointed from an external company, his reports and findings are directed to a 'harbour project board' who then decide what information should be passed up to duty holder level (Managing Director). The harbour should encourage clear access and flow of reporting and information directly from the DP to the duty holder and vice versa, this should include the DP meeting the duty holder to provide clear guidance on their roles and responsibilities under PMSC. This will inevitably promote PMSC compliance moving into the future and also aid future decisions and discussions around PMSC related resource requirements. The current draft MSMS refers to the 'Executive Committee' as being the duty holder. We were later informed that the managing director is the duty holder. The draft MSMS should be amended to reflect this.*
- *Consideration should be given to what proportionate information the HM could provide to the Duty Holder. The information which the MSMS prescribes under 'monthly safety reports' could form the basis of an annual report template to the duty holder, clear benefits would start to emerge after just a few years when year on year comparisons can be made and emerging trends highlighted. This information could also compliment the DP's annual audit report and help to start measuring the harbours own compliance against its MSMS.*
- *The agenda for the harbour project board would benefit from having PMSC related topics as a standing agenda item.*
- *Further consideration should be given as to how the role and responsibilities of the Duty Holder is documented in the SMS (section 3.3).*
- *A standing agenda item on Port Marine Safety related items could be included at each Harbour Management Board meeting and/or Harbour Consultative Group.*



'The SMS should formally document all harbour employees roles, responsibilities (HM and his deputy are featured in the SMS vol 1) as well as qualifications and competencies, this will help to encourage accountability and establish clearer lines of autonomy'

SMS

- *Develop and publish a MSMS for Harbour Authority (guidance on this can be found section 3.9 – 3.12 of the PMSC).*
- *It was felt that the review frequency of the SMS and risk assessments should be more clearly defined rather than relying on statements that refer to things being reviewed periodically. This would help to capture current custom and practice and also provide the individuals responsible for carrying out reviews with greater accountability.*
- *There is a requirement for vessels to seek permission for Hot Works or engine immobilisation etc, however this requirement occurs more as custom and practice rather than because there is a documented requirement or procedure contained within the MSMS. Consideration could be given to formalising and promulgating the requirement for vessels to seek permission for such activities.*
- *The SMS should formally document all harbour employees roles, responsibilities (HM and his deputy are featured in the SMS vol 1) as well as qualifications and competencies, this will help to encourage accountability and establish clearer lines of autonomy.*
- *Sect 9.1 which refers to the safety officer submitting a report to the HM should be reworded as the SMS defines the safety officer as the HM.*
- *The SMS vol 2 prescribes an 'incident / accident reporting procedure'. This procedure should be amended to include guidance on the type of incidents which the MCA should be notified of. This procedure also refers to HM and safety officer, who are one and the same.*
- *The activities governed by the SMS vol 2 should include permit to work for hot work, with a particular emphasis on controls which help to de-conflict various work activities e.g. bunkering and hot work. This topic was discussed at some length and it was encouraging to hear that work is already underway to consider what activities should be governed by such a system.*



'The harbour should place a high priority in publishing the MSMS and other related documentation in order to initiate the move from informal custom and practice to formal risk assessed port marine operations based on standardised processes and procedures'

- *The SMS should include a policy on training to compliment the safety policy which states that the harbour authority is committed to: 'Recruiting and training operational staff to nationally agreed competence levels and ensuring that staff are properly trained for emergencies and contingencies'.*
- *The harbours status as a CHA should be clarified with DfT. An additional entry into sect 1.9 could then clarify the Harbours actual intention regarding pilotage.*
- *Sect 3.2 on Conservancy is blank and needs completing with details and frequency of planned hydrographic surveys.*
- *All PMSC related documentation is in draft form. The harbour should place a high priority in publishing the MSMS and other related documentation in order to initiate the move from informal custom and practice to formal risk assessed port marine operations based on standardised processes and procedures. This will also assist with PMSC visibility at duty holder level.*
- *The harbour should liaise with the MCA Regional Counter Pollution Salvage Officer to clarify whether a specific harbour oil spill contingency plan is required.*
- *It was felt that whilst there is clear guidance on how to give a 'Special Direction', consideration could be given to listing some examples of when Special Directions should be given.*
- *A further para in the SMS should be included to detail the process to be followed for the reporting of incidents / accidents, including reporting accidents to MAIB.*
- *The roles and responsibilities of the Harbour Master and office staff should be included.*
- *It was seen that the Harbour has undertaken external audit activities. However, the policy for conducting this activity should be defined in the*



'The Harbour have appointed a designated person in line with the PMSC. It was felt that the individual appointed to this role could take more of an active role in some of the tasks prescribed in the SMS, especially regarding audit activity'

SMS, including what the Council's internal and external audit requirements are, and the frequency of such activities.

Conservancy

- *Section 3.2 needs to be completed ref survey, including consideration to a policy statement on the frequency of any hydrographic survey activity.*
- *The SMS should refer to the Hydrographic Code of Practice.*

Designated Person

- *A designated person should be appointed to provide the duty holder with independent assurance directly to the duty holder that the MSMS is working effectively (for further guidance see section 2.8 of the PMSC).*
- *The Harbour have appointed a designated person in line with the PMSC. It was felt that the individual appointed to this role could take more of an active role in some of the tasks prescribed in the SMS, especially regarding audit activity. It was seen that very often individuals were left to audit their own areas of responsibility with the DP then taking these audit reports to the appropriate committees.*
- *The harbour may benefit from having the DP attend various commissioner meetings to verbally comment (allowing for face to face questions and answers) on the contents of his written reports. This may help to raise the profile of PMSC at duty holder level.*
- *Further consideration should be given as to how the role and responsibilities of the Designated Person (DP) is documented within the SMS (section 6.6). This should include consideration of activities including the DP's involvement with any ongoing assessment and audit of the effectiveness of the SMS.*



'The harbour should include within the MSMS a list of pre-requisite qualifications and on-the-job training required for all harbour staff. Copies of qualifications and training records should be maintained'

Professional Qualifications and Competencies for Marine Personnel

- *The harbour authority should consider how it could best develop and maintain an appropriate level of maritime expertise in order to discharge and manage some of its port marine related activities.*
- *Consideration should be given to harbour launch crew training requirements and their specific roles and responsibilities with particular reference to any envisaged regulatory or enforcement function.*
- *Having discussed many of the individual marine roles within the port it was clear that management had a good idea about what pre-requisite qualifications certain roles required. A training matrix was seen which records what qualifications individuals hold. It was suggested that the SMS section 4.24 could better define some of the marine roles and prescribe what pre-requisite qualifications / experiences are required as well as any further training which the port may consider being beneficial to employees future development.*
- *All mooring activities within the harbour area are currently undertaken informally by staff from the various berth owners / operators. There are currently no training standards or regulation of this activity in place. The harbour should conduct an assessment to consider what processes may need to be adopted to ensure that appropriately qualified personnel undertake mooring within the harbour.*
- *The harbour should include within the MSMS a list of pre-requisite qualifications and on-the-job training required for all harbour staff. Copies of qualifications and training records should be maintained.*

Consultation and Information Dissemination

- *On reviewing some minutes from a Pilotage Management Committee Meeting in October, it was noted that a significant number of issues are recorded as being 'Open' some dating back as far as June 2013. It was felt that the status of these actions should be reviewed in order to close*



'A port user group should be formed to encourage better formal communications, in the future this type of group could be utilised for reviewing risk assessments and other SMS related reviews. Such a group should consult those who are likely to be involved or affected by the SMS, the aim being to develop a consensus about the safe navigation in the harbour'

out actions in a timely manner and allow future meetings to focus on discussing current issues.

- *A port user group should be formed to encourage better formal communications, in the future this type of group could be utilised for reviewing risk assessments and other SMS related reviews. Such a group should consult those who are likely to be involved or affected by the SMS, the aim being to develop a consensus about the safe navigation in the harbour.*
- *A review of the harbours navigational information in the ALRS vol 6 should be undertaken to capture any appropriate updates, e.g. contact HM on ch 16 in the event of engine failure etc.*
- *The harbour does have a document which informs the master of a vessel about reportable information and activities where permission must be sought from the HM before commencement e.g. Burning, Immobilisation etc. It was reported by the HM that some of these activities are rarely reported suggesting that the requirements of the document are not functioning as intended. The harbour should assist the HM in enforcing the regulation of these activities by raising the awareness of the document with berth owners / operators and the advisory panel to help seek assurances that these activities are being regulated appropriately within their harbour. This is particularly important as the document ('Notice to Masters of Vessels') refers to vessels conducting activities 'in compliance with berth owner / operators instructions where in reality most operators probably don't have instructions in place.*
- *A general assessment of safety related signage should be undertaken to promote awareness of harbour users to specific hazards, and available information. This could include information regarding: General H & S, reporting incidents, wearing lifejackets, HM contact details, speed limits, diving for sport not recommended etc.*
- *The harbour should conduct an assessment to determine what navigational information should be made more publically available, especially to first time visitors to the harbour. This could take the form of entries into nautical publications, visitor packs or website based information etc. Examples could include information on where specific types of vessels are recommended to moor etc.*



'This risk assessment should be reviewed, particularly the control measures, with involvement from as many harbour users or staff who actually use the river or canal as possible'

- *A tour of the harbour authority was conducted from the pilot boat. During this tour, the condition and configuration of a NAABSA berth mooring arrangement was seen to be inappropriate and dangerous especially for the handy size bulk carrier occupying the berth at the time. There was a lack of mooring arrangement to allow for appropriate leads to be maintained and stern lines were shore provided wire mooring ropes secured under the waterline or attached to the river bank. This resulted in lines snagging a derelict timber structure. The above issues have previously been reported to the HM who has raised the issue with the berth owner / operator and the harbour authority. The harbour should urgently follow this issue up and consult with the berth owner / operator to ensure that appropriate mooring facilities are provided to allow visiting vessels to safely operate on the berth. This enhancement should be read in conjunction with the above observation regarding the provision of potentially un-trained mooring gangs in order to fully understand the in-combination hazards that are currently present. The hazards of this complex and awkward mooring arrangement and the fact that untrained personnel are involved in its operation should not be underestimated.*
- *The harbour was unable to confirm when a Notice to Mariners was last issued. A system should be put into place which allows the harbour to efficiently promulgate Notices to Mariners to appropriate stakeholders. Consideration should also take place as to what type of information should be included in future Notices to Mariners. A recent hydrographic survey has been undertaken for example.*

Risk Assessment

- *The current database of hazards considers 18 hazards with 24 accompanying control measures. This risk assessment should be reviewed, particularly the control measures, with involvement from as many harbour users or staff who actually use the river or canal as possible. The harbour should also consider formalising who is responsible for maintaining the database and if any appropriate training needs to be provided. The frequency of when hazards need to be reviewed also needs to be formally clarified ensuring that they are kept*



'The use of stakeholders, other harbour users and harbour staff could be utilised to ensure that both generic and 'harbour specific hazards are considered and mitigated where appropriate'

ALARP. All of these details regarding risk assessment should eventually be referred to in the above mentioned MSMS, including any specific risk assessment procedures or policies.

- *Having reviewed the 46 hazards from the marine risk register it was felt that an entry covering 'leisure', including hazards associated with leisure racing events should be included.*
- *It was seen that, where no incidents have been recorded, all 46 hazards are reviewed annually on the same day. It was felt that these risk assessment reviews could be spread out over a year in groups of maybe five, which could make the task less laborious and also help to enable more individuals to be part of the review process e.g. tug, pilot boat, dredge crew etc*
- *Whilst the ports MSMS sect 5 refers to an aspiration to consider whether risks have been reduced to ALARP, it was seen that out of the port's 107 identifiable hazards, 4 were graded as not ALARP (score 10 or above). Having discussed these 4 hazards it was felt that they may not necessarily be genuine risks which require further review or mitigation to bring them down to ALARP. It was felt that these hazards may benefit from further review to conclude their true status.*
- *The use of stakeholders, other harbour users and harbour staff could be utilised to ensure that both generic and 'harbour specific' hazards are considered and mitigated where appropriate. Some mitigations which are currently logged include measures which are out of the harbours control or jurisdiction e.g. Col regs etc.*
- *Currently the review of the risk assessment is undertaken by the HM and the DP, the DHM and others mentioned above may also benefit from being involved in reviews.*
- *The SMS sect referring to incident / accident reporting should provide for a process where the review of the appropriate risk assessment is triggered on receipt of any reports, ensuring that risk assessments are reviewed regularly (as planned) and when an incident / accident occur.*



'It is recommended that listed Mitigations should be confined to areas that the harbour has control over'

- *The use of stakeholders, other harbour users and harbour staff could be utilised to ensure that both generic and 'harbour specific hazards are considered and mitigated where appropriate. Some mitigations which are currently logged include measures which are out of the harbours control or jurisdiction e.g. masters training / qualifications, Col regs etc the benefit of recording these as mitigations would not appear to add any value to the process. It is recommended that listed Mitigations should be confined to areas that the harbour has control over. In general the navigational risk assessment should be reviewed especially with regard to hazard ranking, grading of ALARP and defining risk category and outcome scores e.g. likelihood, how many years? etc. Many listed hazards were defined as ALARP but carried additional comments reflecting additional (aspirational) mitigations which should be considered, suggesting that they may not actually be ALARP.*

- *It was reported that the Risk Assessment as presented is yet to be completed. Once this task is complete, it will utilise the Council's approach to Risk Assessment, and capture all Port Marine related risks.*

Considerations should be given in the SMS to formally define:

- *The review frequency;*
- *The Council's definition of ALARP which may be associated with the risk score;*
- *The mechanisms to trigger a review e.g. post-accident / incident, change in trade and planned review frequency;*
- *Who is involved with Risk Assessment reviews. For example, the Harbour Consultative Group or other individuals could be utilised to assist with the Risk Assessment reviews.*

Management of Navigation

- *The harbour should consider what appropriate licensing or regulation arrangements may need to be introduced for some of the unlicensed domestic passenger or ferry boats which are currently trading within the harbour (further guidance is available from section 10.2 of the GTGP)*

- *It was explained that staff currently work a 9 -5 regime but that consideration was being given to a tidal working pattern.*



'The harbour should consider what appropriate licensing or regulation arrangements may need to be introduced for some of the unlicensed domestic passenger or ferry boats which are currently trading within the harbour (further guidance is available from section 10.2 of the GTGP).'

We would support this notion as there are clear safety benefits related to the presence of harbour staff when harbour users are most active and may need support or guidance.

Pilotage

- *Whilst it was not envisaged that hours of rest for pilots was currently an issue at the harbour, it was felt that this is something that should be monitored.*
- *The Port Marine Safety Code requires a revalidation process not less than every 5 years. It was noted that this assessment at the port may require a more formal and detailed approach.*
- *Whilst the authority has never been and is currently not a competent harbour authority, it has previously relied on a neighbouring harbour authority to provide pilotage for a specific commercial vessel trading in the harbour. A specific assessment, based on risk, should be undertaken to determine whether the harbour authority needs to apply to be treated as a competent harbour authority under the Pilotage Act 1987. Irrespective of the outcome of the above assessment the above mentioned review of the navigational risk assessment should capture any specific hazards associated with commercial vessels transiting the harbour, highlighting any appropriate mitigations in place or required.*

Marine Services

- *A process of training for mooring personnel was described but does not appear to be documented anywhere. A formalised and documented process should be adopted (possibly referring to the Port Skills and Safety Mooring Guidance ACOP) and referred to in SOP 10.2 'Mooring Operations'.*
- *The harbour should determine what code or licensing regime their work boat should fall under as well as prescribing what qualification / experience coxswains operating the boat should hold.*



'The harbour should determine what code or licensing regime their work boat should fall under as well as prescribing what qualification / experience coxswains operating the boat should hold'

- *The SMS should list and define documented process or procedures related to the full regime of licensing activities.*
- *The work to formalise and document the procedures element of the SMS should define any appropriate permissions or processes regarding marine related activities, such as diving and craning works.*
- *The SMS should be completed by including an appropriate section on procedures / work instructions / checklists which help to regulate the day to day safe operation of the harbour. This could include hot works, permit to works and bunker checklists.*

Duties and Powers

- *The harbour should carry out a review to assess whether it needs to seek powers of general direction under the Marine Navigation Act 2013.*
- *The harbour's jurisdiction could be better represented by inclusion onto an appropriate chart.*
- *The harbour has two byelaws dating back to 1925, it was reported that they have never been exercised in corporate memory (50 years). One of these byelaws refers to a speed limit which does not include the full extent of the harbour, particularly the busiest part. To assist the harbour in moving forward with policies which support modern regulation of navigation within the harbour area, consideration should be given to seeking powers of direction under the Marine Navigation Act 2013.*
- *Whilst it was seen that a list of the relevant national and local legislation was contained in the enforcement policy, it was felt that consideration could be given to listing the harbours applicable legislation somewhere more visible, perhaps near the front of the Navigation Safety Management Plan.*



'It was particularly encouraging to see that a system is in place that captures when a risk assessment has been reviewed as a result of receiving an incident report. The port clearly recognises the benefit of the risk assessment database being a living and evolving system.'

Observed Best Practice

A number of examples of best Practice were observed during the 2015 round of health checks in the following areas:

SMS

- *The SMS was seen to be of a particularly high standard, being well maintained and regularly reviewed. It was clear that much work had been undertaken in establishing the foundational elements of the SMS and that these had been in place for a number of years with the result that the system is now in a mature and robust state.*

Risk Assessment

- *The standard and approach to risk assessment was seen to be of a high standard with many good examples of best practice including:*
 - *Regularly reviewed frequency*
 - *Reviews spread out over appropriate time scales, i.e. not all on one day of the year*
 - *Groups of appropriate individuals from across the organisation used to carry out reviews*
 - *Reviews triggered and recorded as a result of receiving an incident / accident report as well as on a planned basis*
- *It was particularly encouraging to see that a system is in place that captures when a risk assessment has been reviewed as a result of receiving an incident report. The port clearly recognises the benefit of the risk assessment database being a living and evolving system.*
- *Good evidence was seen of appropriate stakeholder engagement when reviewing various hazards, ensuring that the Navigational risk assessment database remains credible and relevant to real time activities at the port.*



‘There appeared to be a good level of understanding and commitment to PMSC compliance from the duty holder. Evidence was seen of good levels of information flow between the duty holder, designated person and the wider marine team. PMSC related topics are discussed at the very top of the organisation and the duty holder has taken time to carry out specific Duty holder training.’

Duty Holder

- *The harbour have introduced an annual training day for both commissioners and stakeholders, this was seen as a good example of effective stakeholder and duty holder engagement, no doubt, this forum maybe key in driving through some of the above enhancements.*
- *There appeared to be a good level of understanding and commitment to PMSC compliance from the duty holder. Evidence was seen of good levels of information flow between the duty holder, designated person and the wider marine team. PMSC related topics are discussed at the very top of the organisation and the duty holder has taken time to carry out specific Duty holder training.*
- *There appeared to be a good understanding and commitment to the PMSC from the duty holder. New commissioners are required to undertake an induction covering their role as duty holder under the code from the Harbour Master.*
- *It was reported that all new members of the Harbour Management Board and the Duty Holder (full Council) are given specific PMSC training on the Port Marine Safety Code and its application. This training is ongoing including some time spent discussing the code with the Harbour Master.*

Consultation

- *The management approach to planning stakeholder meetings and engagement was seen to be well thought out and executed, utilising a simple annual planner listing all the various stakeholder meetings and when they would be scheduled.*



'The management approach to planning stakeholder meetings and engagement was seen to be well thought out and executed, utilising a simple annual planner listing all the various stakeholder meetings and when they would be scheduled.'

Consultation and information dissemination

- *A number of good examples of information dissemination were seen, particularly the Harbour Guide 2015*
- *The Stakeholder Consultative Group was seen as a good example of engaging harbour users, which has been in operation for some time.*

Pilotage and Passage plans

- *The ports passage plan was seen to be of a particularly high standard and also available to the wider ports community free of charge.*

Conclusion

The MCA would encourage the industry to take account of the enhancements mentioned in this report and consider if any might be applicable to their organisations.

Any further enquires or comments related to this report should be directed to the following email address:

navigationsafety@mcga.gov.uk





Tel 02380 329100

Navigation Safety Branch
Spring Place
105 Commercial Road
Southampton
SO15 1EG

Website:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/maritime-and-coastguard-agency>
Email: navigationsafety@mcga.gov.uk

