

Summary of responses to the consultation on the Designation Orders for the port of: Portland; Grangemouth; Workington; Milford Haven; Liverpool; Tees and Hartlepool; and Aberdeen.

The consultation on the Port Security draft Designation Orders, for the above ports, in relation to the Port Security Regulations 2009 was published on the Department for Transport website and notified to interested parties on 28 March 2012. The consultation closed on the 9th May. There were eleven responses received by the DfT.

Comprehensive pre-consultation discussions were carried out by the DfT with the key stakeholders of the ports who have an interest in the security management at the ports. This involved detailed discussions with the key security personnel at the ports about the content of the draft Designation Orders and the defined boundary of their port.

Representatives from the Department for Transport ran stakeholder workshops for all of the key stakeholders at the ports at which the proposed content of the Designation Order was presented. This was an opportunity for those present to raise any questions about the content of the Designation Order and about how the Port Security Regulations 2009 would be implemented at their port. There was also an opportunity following the workshop for comments to be sent to DfT and any subsequent changes to be made to the proposed boundary and the Order before formal public consultation.

Subsequent to the formal public consultation, the following responses were received in respect of the ports concerned:

Portland

One response received from Weymouth & Portland Borough Council advising they had no objections.

Grangemouth

We agreed to Forth Ports request to extend the consultation deadline to the 11th May. No formal responses were received but at a subsequent meeting with Forth Ports some legal concerns were raised that have been addressed.

Workington

Cumbria County Council responded asking for clarification of the extra costs and additional security measures for which the Port of Workington would be responsible. Those questions were answered to the council's satisfaction.

Milford Haven

We received three responses. One of these, from SemLogistics regarding the boundary plan, has not been resolved. The department continues to work with Stakeholders on this matter and are keen to find a solution which addresses the security requirement without adding burden to operators.

The other responses were from Pembroke County Council. They had two concerns; why only one critical site (SemLogistics) had been included within the boundary plan and; a successful application for Milford Haven waterway to be designated as an Enterprise Zone would need to be considered as part of Port Security Plan.

Liverpool

We received a request from Peel Ports, owners of the Port of Liverpool and the Manchester Ship Canal, to designate a combined Liverpool/MSC PSA. We will discuss with Peel Ports how best to take this forward.

Only one substantive response was received; from ABP Garston, a facility outside the PSA boundary. They asked for confirmation that the PSA would not restrict their operations or result in additional financial cost. The Department has confirmed to ABP that ABP Garston is outside the PSA remit.

Tees & Hartlepool

Three responses were received. One was from the port owner, PD Ports. The other two were from facilities owned by Simon storage. All three were in favour of the proposals.

Aberdeen

No responses were received

We are grateful for the time and effort taken by all those who responded to the consultation. We are also grateful to the local stakeholders who have engaged in the process to date and placed applications for membership of the Port Security Authorities.

The Designation Orders will now be subject to further legal checks before being laid before Parliament. It is envisaged that the first meeting of the Designated Port Security Authorities will take place by the end of 2012.