

Stakeholder Response	PLA HM Response
<p>I have certain concerns which I discussed with Peter Steen when the original document was introduced , and of course post Chiefton. I am afraid I still have those concerns particularly with regard the role of a pilot vis a vis “ conduct of tow or vessel “ with a tow master . I believe the term conduct is quite clear , however the term “ advisory capacity “ or similar phrase leaves concerns of who has “ conduct “ . In the case of a disagreement or worse an incident MIGHT invalidate the pilots insurance or indeed the responsibility over conduct . I would ask that the PLA barrister who represented the PLA at Snaresbrook is included in discussions . Yours sincerely . John Reid JP PLA pilot .</p>	<p>The references to advice have been removed to avoid any ambiguity.</p>
<p>The nature of non routine towage operations that are subject to compulsory or voluntary pilotage, means that having the conduct of the navigation as laid out in the pilotage act has immediate and sometimes far reaching consequences for the safety aspects of the operation.</p> <p>Unlike ship towage operations as done in the main by dedicated harbour tugs with a tractor configuration, the non routine tows are often carried out with the sea configuration bridle and a conventional tug or alternative set up, which has the potential of girting in a very short timeframe.</p> <p>Quite a few of these incidents of girting have resulted in a fatality such as the Chieftain on the Thames, and several other incidents that have been documented, in the U.K. and abroad.</p> <p>A subsequent investigation of an incident of girting of a tug would hopefully find a cause and perhaps, depending on the parameters of the investigation also a portion of blame which could then potentially be brought in a civil court process. For that reason I wish to respond to this consultation in a private capacity.</p> <p>It is my understanding that the role of the Pilot as described in section 1.4 (see section 3.2) can be considered a person dedicated to the entire operation, who is responsible for providing advise and support to the Harbourmaster in the planning and risk assessment and rehearsal of the operation, thereby raising concerns and stipulations for the overall safety of the operation.</p> <p>Whereas the Harbourmaster states the Risk Assessment and Passage Plan are for acceptance only, the Pilot in effect by revising the plan and then joining the tow and taking the conduct is by definition and action taking part and approving the operation and therefore is likely to take a share in the personal responsibility and liability.</p> <p>Given the complex nature of these operations, some risk factors may be overlooked or not anticipated, and my concern is that this proposal neither gives the correct framework nor the resources to ensure an ongoing process of determining risks related to the non routine towage operation.</p>	<p>The term ‘advice’ has been removed from this section.</p> <p>Pilots and harbour masters are involved in the planning of non-routine tows and will have to make an assessment of risk to determine whether they are content for the operation to go ahead. However, the Code has been amended to remove the word advice, in relation to both the tug master and the harbourmaster.</p> <p>The pilot is responsible for conduct of navigation and an additional note has been added to clarify the point that the pilot is not responsible for the risk assessment and towage plan, or for conduct of the towage operation.</p>

<p>Section 2.7 suggests shortening the tow line to enhance control of the tow, any shortening close to or less than half the beam of the tow is dangerous as an engine failure can lead to the tug being overturned or pushed under and sunk by the tow.</p> <p>Also girting has a greater risk factor by a shortening of the tow line as it allows for less time to take corrective action.</p> <p>Section 3.1 allows for pushing and towing, without further Risk Assessment, stern tugs on towing configurations should only provide steering forces to improve directional stability and astern propulsion when required, the forward towing tug should have sufficient power and Bollard Pull to navigate safely.</p> <p>Section 4.3 should include critical dimensions as per each part of the passage plan, air draft, draft, beam, length of tow, displacements, windage etc.</p> <p>It is my recommendation to make all towage operations that involve a conventional tug and exceed a displacement ratio of 1:10 subject to a detailed risk assessment.</p>	<p>The wording of 2.7 has been amended to adjust, instead of shorten. The tow master needs to consider whether the line needs to be adjusted for transit of the barrier, but the towage configuration, including length of tow line remains the responsibility of the tow master.</p> <p>Section 3.1 allows for intra-port operators to include certain operations that are undertaken on a regular basis within their generic risk assessments and plans, rather than having to submit a separate RA, tow plan and passage plan for each voyage. These are operations that have previously been assessed and have tow plans and passage plans and risk assessments in place. Any changes from the configuration that has been previously assessed would require further risk assessment.</p> <p>The wording of 4.3 has been amended to expand the second bullet point., requiring a comprehensive Passage Plan, which includes critical dimensions for each part of the operation. The individual requirements have not been listed, as more or less information may be required, depending on the voyage.</p>
<p>Just reading the proposed Code Craft Towage link below, I have cut and pasted the 1.4 PILOT section this has some alarm bells for me.</p> <p>Highlighted "Advice" as a pilot acting in a compulsory area on a craft that requires compulsory Pilotage then I am not an advisor.</p> <p>If the craft doesn't require a Pilot, then there may be a liability issue. This whole section needs looking into.</p> <p>Also the following form should be included Pilot/MPX check list Hywel J Pugh</p>	<p>The references to advice have been removed to avoid any ambiguity.</p> <p>A note has been added regarding the MPX checklist</p>