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The Hue & Cry

The cover photo is Celebrity Solstice pirouetting at the base of Stirling Falls in Milford Sound, like a futuristic space ship exploring our ancient planet. Pilots have to straddle both past and future, reflecting the diversity of ships. Despite great technological leaps, the Human Factor remains the crucial element, until the hypothetical surrender to Artificial Intelligence. Wärtsilä has developed the “SmartDock” as “the perfect combination between an experienced crew and technology”. MSC Opera might be interested.

Two RAF Typhoons (combined cost of $500 Millions) narrowly avoided collision when one pilot checked his instruments; what of “seamless integration of visual and instrument navigation”? Meanwhile, a Russian ship had to take avoiding action when a USN ship failed to follow International Collision Regulations.

Anglophone Governments have become a 5-Eyed monster: sabre-rattling with nuclear weapons endangers the whole planet forever. Trump wants wars with Latin-America, Bolton & Pompeo vs. Iran (and UK’s Jeremy Corbyn), Pentagon vs. China, MSM vs. Russia. The 75th Anniversary of D-Day excluded then-ally Russia, who alone defeated Nazi Germany, paying 95% of the combined Allied “Butcher’s Bill”. NZ’s decision to withdraw troops from Afghanistan is a step in the right direction.

Looking back, 1866 brought both the Whitehead Torpedo and the submarine. Aircraft flew in 1903, and the UK launched aircraft carrier HMS Hermes in 1919. China used rockets a thousand years ago - since improved: the Dong Feng 21 travels at Mach 10 and is specifically designed to destroy US aircraft-carrier groups. Man landed on the Moon in 1969 (same year Jumbo Jet took-off). Electric cars were around 100 years ago: PV cells patented in 1860s, power satellites since 1958 and last 100 years. Technology and strategy evolve slowly. There is nothing new under the sun Ecclesiastes.

Our Human brain was hard-wired for an earlier planet: Pilots still grab ladders one-hand above the other, based on our inherited tree-climbing, but the “2-hands-level grasp” is a potential life-saver. Jeremy Brew (p x) looks for lessons from a recent accident, but discerning root-cause is essential.

Marlborough Harbour Master Luke Grogan expressed concerns about insufficient tidal data in the Tory Channel (see 2018 Pilots Conference) should there be another Azamara Quest incident. The District Council has agreed. Slowly, awareness is growing that the standard SMS does not reflect “Low Probability & High Consequence” e.g. standard risk matrix rated Costa Concordia’s biggest risk as food-poisoning. Unlike poison, ideas and coffee percolate slowly...
2019 PILOTAGE & PORT LOGISTICS conference
Embracing the Future

SAVE THE DATE!

28 OCT – 1 NOV 2019
Doltone House, Jones Bay Wharf
Sydney, Australia

CONFERENCE THEMES INCLUDE:
- Autonomous and Remote Technology
- Preparing for Pilotage in the age of big data
- Cruise Ships, Pilotage
- Towage
- Training
- Human Performance
- Managing Human Factors
- Safety Management Systems
- Safe Pilot Transfer
- New and Emerging Technology and PPU

For more information and to register your expression of interest visit www.ampi.org.au
The last quarter has seen a number of significant developments for our organisation and its members. In April the long-awaited decision of the court was released: NZMPA challenged the decision by the Director Maritime NZ to recognise the holder of a lesser certificate of competency as being equivalent to a Master Foreign-Going qualification. The court supported our claim that the candidate was not equivalent, and also confirmed our interpretation of the requirements for the training of new pilots under Maritime Rule 90. As is so often the case, it is a challenge in itself for a small voluntary organisation like ours to take on a juggernaut like Maritime NZ, who has immense resources compared to our working budget generated from membership subscriptions. It is disappointing that we have severely depleted our reserves to the tune of over $40k, when engagement between stakeholders may well have resolved this situation. I am however optimistic that engagement relating to our current projects will bring about the modernisation of pilotage in New Zealand, as this is clearly needed if we are to respond to the recent recommendations from TAIC.

On a more positive note, Maritime NZ has just released its guidance notes on Proficiency Plans, Annual Assessments, Peer Reviews and Pilot CPE. This is a project that got underway before our seminar/AGM in Christchurch in 2017, where CPD was a major focus during the event. Much work has been put into it by a Senior Policy Advisor, and he consulted with us regularly during the earlier stages of its development. The guidance was released to Marine Managers in time for their recent biannual meeting in Taranaki, and may have been discussed with your teams already. Whilst there are some areas that we feel could have been addressed differently, it does promote higher standards than those that would be achieved by operators who target the minimum requirements of Rule 90 to solely meet compliance. This will be promoted through the Port and Harbour Marine Safety Form.


Sitting alongside the guidance from MNZ, our Good Practice Guide for Pilots (including Passage Planning) will offer up to date guidance from practitioners. This will take into account our better knowledge of Human Factors and emerging available technologies, and if implemented should ensure pilots and operators might withstand the scrutiny that is possible with monitoring and data recording capabilities today. As many of you will have seen, on 2 June the cruise ship *MSC Opera* crashed into a small cruise vessel and the dock in Genoa, and within an hour I was watching the social media material emerging. These recordings came from all sides and on board the vessel, and with it came the numerous arm-chair experts with suggestions of what caused it and the failings of those involved. This should be another incentive for us to ensure that we are above reproach when the scrutiny begins after an incident. Not only do we need to demonstrate Good Practice is being adhered to, but also that the proficiency of the pilots is the result of good training and ongoing professional development.

During the last quarter, I saw John Barker present at Port of Auckland. Firstly on his EMPX demonstrated how technology can be used to combine multitudes of data to enhance safe passages in and out of port. Coupled with the navigation software on PPUs, this greatly enhances the traditional “local knowledge, ship-handling skills and intuition” of old. Although only a few years since I was operating in that traditional way, it already feels as distant as references to sextants to navigate the oceans. Secondly, John presented on the work his port has been doing on modernising pilot training: they have gone back to the drawing board. The systematic way they have designed their new training plan looks to cover all the bases, plus a few I didn’t even know about. The Human Factor is clearly being taken into account, and trained mentors and assessors will be an integral part of their plan to ensure support and oversight for trainees. Inclusion of their newest trainee and a specialist consultant in the project will ensure they do not produce a top-down driven plan, but rather have significant bottom-up input. This will be a first for us who are used to age-old traditional approaches in our industry. I look forward to updates on the progress of this project, and hope members and stakeholders will get the opportunity to see a presentation on it at our seminar in November.

In closing I will not say the traditional “Be careful out there”, but rather a more modern and topical “*Don’t forget your PPU and use all available means out there*”.

Steve Banks, President NZMPA
Introduction

The principal of the pilot/co-pilot system is fundamentally about reducing risk by working in a structured system that defines roles and responsibilities sharing both the workload and responsibility.

For the purpose of the document I will refer to this system of working as the pilotage team or pilot/co-pilot team. The principles closely align with the navigator/co-navigator system widely used on cruise and other merchant vessels. This system is founded on the principles of BRM, namely closed loop communication, challenge and response and thinking aloud.

BRM and the navigator/co-navigator system has been used on Scandinavian ferries and a limited number of cruise vessels for approximately 30 years. Since the Costa Concordia incident the principles of BRM have become more widely used within the industry.

Why have a pilotage team?
The size of vessels relative to the harbours and channels they use has increased incrementally to a point where the tolerances and margin for error are minimal. This is apparent, not just on a horizontal plane with swinging distances but also on the vertical plane with minimal under keel clearance adding further complications when manoeuvring.

This has meant that the job has become more technical, requiring the pilot to have a detailed knowledge of ship handling and a deep understanding of forces acting on a vessel. The pilot must have the experience and ability to perform precise manoeuvres, often in poor weather and at irregular hours.

The decreased appetite for risk in the workplace along with the culpability of both ships crews pilots and management, which, if an incident occurs may result in a criminal conviction and/or a civil liability claim. These factors should make pilots and management more receptive to any tangible processes that can be put in place to reduce risk.

Due to the increased workload on a bridge team, especially in restricted harbours, adverse weather or in areas of high traffic density the workload on both the pilot and bridge teams can be extremely high thus increasing the risk. This is the principal reason for adopting a pilotage team.

As ships have got bigger and technology has improved so has the complexity of the navigational equipment, namely the pilots’ portable unit, the vessels integrated navigation system. This equipment requires pilots and bridge teams to obtain more knowledge, technical skills and experience to operate the equipment.

When critical equipment malfunctions or shows erroneous information this can be a major distraction for the navigator. It requires a very different thought process to decide what is good and what is poor information. Pilotage has historically been done using visual marks and references. Switching between visual and instrument based pilotage can be error inducing as either method requires quite different skills and levels of experience. Another skilled person under less load should be able to filter out the good information from the bad. This could be a role for the co-pilot.
Another benefit from two pilots working as a team is that it has the potential to develop a more trusting, united and stronger pilots group. When the pilots work together and are constantly critiquing each other, development and evolution becomes the norm, therefore when limits are breached the other pilot is more likely to speak up with advice or a challenge. With pilots working together regularly they can develop an understanding of the way the other pilot operates therefore the co-pilot is more likely to pick up deviations at an early stage, allowing for an earlier correction.

The final benefit is that using a pilotage team may allow the pilot to maintain his visual skills. A team can develop a system where the pilot primarily pilots visually and the co-pilot primarily uses the instruments, feeding the pilot with relevant information as agreed in the briefing. This way of working has a couple of benefits. The pilot will not get distracted by possible erroneous information from the PPU and it also maintains his skills with regard to visual pilotage.

How can it work?
It is critical that a robust process is developed covering the procedure, the individual roles for the pilot and co-pilot. It is also important that the level of responsibility each pilot holds during an act of pilotage where two pilots are engaged is determined.

The following is only a guide. Each pilotage area and group is unique, it is important that any system devised should be tailored to the requirements of both the team and the pilotage area.

The Process
A good passage plan must be established which includes a planned corridor, reserve area, no go areas along with defined speed tolerances and danger points.

• Briefing
Prior to any job the pilot should brief the co-pilot of the intended pilotage and manoeuvre which should cover information in the paragraph above, speeds, minimum clearing distances, environmental limits, specific risks (killer items), UKC, use of resources, weather and tides.

Another critical part of the briefing is to discuss what information the pilot would like from the co-pilot. For the system to work most effectively it is important that the pilot is obtaining the most relevant information, important to his style of working. Too much information could be just as distracting and potentially dangerous as too little.

• Debriefing
The final important part of the process it to ensure a debrief between the pilots is carried to out to recognise what went well and if there are any lessons that could be learned and shared with the group. An important part of the debrief is to discuss how effective the communication was between the pilots and how it was received by the bridge team.
• **Communication**

The method of communicating between pilot and co-pilot should be covered in the briefing and ideally there should be a mutual understanding between the pilots of the methods to be used.

The following could be used as a guideline.

Thinking aloud is critical to the operation to ensure there is a shared mental model within the pilotage team and to the wider bridge team. Providing information prior to the intended heading, speed change, use of tugs etc. invites the team to respond or challenge if required.

• **Challenge**

When the co-pilot is giving information to the pilot then he could follow the information with the word ‘good’ to indicate it is information only. Should the word good be dropped then it could be an initial ‘alert’, this should then be followed with pertinent information e.g. ‘Starboard bow is 20m from berth and closing’ or ‘You are slightly inside the first check bearing’. Limits may not be breached at this point but an acknowledgment where practicable should be given by the pilot that he has received and understands the information. Should this information not be acknowledged, the co-pilot must concentrate on the area of concern until reasonable action is taken.

Where it is clear that limits could be breached the co-pilot must alert the pilot of the particular concern and if action is not taken then such words as ‘recommend’ or ‘suggest’ should be used.

From Antonio De Lieto’s paper on mental models in confined waters-

“The challenge should focus on the outcome rather than the action needed to control the ship. This is to avoid the pilot fixating on the specific instructions of the person challenging. It could lead to a situation where the pilot waits for the next instruction before acting. This could mean a ‘de facto’, but not formal taking over of the con.”

If the pilot intends to deviate from the plan for example the unplanned use of the reserve he should advise the co-pilot and the bridge team by thinking aloud, an example could be when rounding a bend with a strong northerly wind, for example:

**Plan:** I intend to keep to the north of the track when on the next course alteration.

**Reason:** Due to the strong northerly wind.

**Outcome:** I intend to keep approx. 80m north of track.

Due to the nature of pilotage and being mindful of over-communicating particularly in a high-workload situation this communication may have to be refined.

• **Designation of roles and responsibilities**

The following is a suggestion of how responsibilities could be delegated between the pilot and co-pilot. This is the model we use at Napier for cruise vessels.

**Pilot**

Conducts master/pilot exchange. Determines mode of operation. Direct or Indirect control Takes con or oversees and provides advice to navigating officer and bridge team

Communicates with co-pilot as agreed
Use of PPU
Issues tug orders

Co-Pilot
Assists and supports pilot to the extent necessary that has been decided in the briefing
Set up and verification of PPU
Provides challenges in a timely manner if required
Assists bridge team as required.
Manages external communication as required by pilot e.g. port control, mooring, office.
Advises pilot with respect to environmental information e.g. changes in wind strength and direction.

The potential challenges of developing of pilotage team

Marine Pilotage is one of the oldest professions. Both the occupation and culture have developed over many centuries. The position of the pilot has historically been the progression from Captain of a vessel. This position of Captain is unique, the Captain is entirely responsible for the crew and ship he commands. With this hierarchical system, coupled with the responsibility, the Captain is likely to be a strong-minded, mostly independent individual. The Captain, while having to engineer and work within a team environment, will understand that he or she is ultimately responsible. It is important to comprehend the history and tradition of the seafarer to comprehend how the navigator/co navigator or pilot co-pilot system could be challenging to adopt.

It is important to discuss the challenges that may be apparent when trying to develop this way of working within a pilotage team. At Napier this method of piloting has been evolving for over 15 years and we are still learning.

A pilotage act using two pilots may be more stressful for the co-pilot than the pilot. Reasons for this could be a lack of trust between the parties, workload on the co-pilot could be higher than that of the pilot. It may also be difficult for the co-pilot to relinquish control to the extent necessary for the system to work successfully.

It is possible that there could be a perceived lack of status e.g. needing another pilot for support.

Power differential- An older, more experienced pilot acting as co-pilot may put the pilot under additional pressure or a young co-pilot may not have the confidence or experience to challenge an older more experienced pilot.

There is a cost to developing this team approach and there has to be a buy in from port management and other stakeholders as it can put strain on existing resources. At Napier we employ this team approach on targeted vessels based on size and manoeuvring margins, when environmental conditions are close to limits and where a job is designated PPU critical or the setup of the PPU could cause a distraction.

A number of these issues could be overcome with proper use of BRM and effective management. These challenges have been have been faced by the airline industry and appear to be managed well.

In summary I believe that a pilot team strategy has its challenges however the benefits for all stakeholders involved in pilotage far outweigh these challenges.
This year’s AMPI Autumn Workshop was held in Newcastle NSW. About a year ago I received a phone call from the AMPI Vice President suggesting that Newcastle would be a great place for a Workshop and would I like to organise it? What he failed to mention was the months of torturous planning, endless emails and non-stop phone calls that go into making it all happen. I’m lucky to have a particularly understanding wife.

Registrations opened at the icebreaker function at a harbour-side bar, where around 70 delegates turned up to a welcome by Craig Carmody, CEO of Port of Newcastle. They then proceeded to consume the entirety of his Gold Sponsorship package.

Another 30 turned up next day thus about 100 delegates. NZMPA was well represented: had it not been for one late drop-out, the Kiwis would have outnumbered the Queenslanders.

After the usual local welcome and Newcastle overview presentations, the workshop got off to a good start. Captain Scott Clinton gave a good presentation on Newcastle’s project to implement active escort towage for arriving loaded tankers, which segued nicely into a presentation from Svitzer (who were also a significant sponsor).

The next session was dedicated to the major themes of the previous NZMPA conference with Ravi kicking-off proceedings. Big Data (i.e. ‘surveillance’) is certainly making its presence felt in our industry, and some are a little slow to appreciate the significance. Steve Banks and Collin Sellars gave us the state of play in New Zealand and the activities of the NZMPA, which by all accounts is doing a fine job.

Backing up the Kiwi themes, we had the Three Mike’s. Not a comedy trio, but Mike Drake from P&O cruises, Mike Prince from the AHO and Mike Holley from the ATSB who emphasised the lessons from recent incidents and gave the their views on the way forward.

The afternoon session took on a more human theme with presentations on cognitive decline, mental health, prescription medicines and pilot boat First Aid.

Earlier this year, a Newcastle Pilot came off the ladder whilst boarding in the early hours of the morning. His injuries left him hospitalised for a week and his rehabilitation is ongoing. In short, he is lucky to be alive, and it was pure luck and split-second decision-making by the pilot boat crew that saved him. The incident brought up a number of things that we hadn’t anticipated. In your own port, you might want to consider the following questions;

- Are your marine team up to speed with trauma first aid? We’re not talking about the run-of-the-mill First Aid & CPR, but compound fractures, arterial bleeding, blunt force trauma, head injuries etc?
- Does your boat have the equipment to deal with these injuries?
- Could the crew administer serious pain relief to an injured person and do you carry it?
- Could your cutter master leave the helm to assist on the foredeck? Is the boat equipped with autopilot?
- How long at slow speed might it take to get back to the berth and what could potentially happen in that time?
- Once back at the berth, how do you get a prone and incapacitated pilot off the boat?

This is not an exhaustive list but just some things to think about.

On that note, we broke for the day and happily anesthetized ourselves at the Newcastle Club. The venue overlooks the port; staff and food were top-notch, and the wine was pretty good too. The after-
dinner speaker continued the Humanist theme, with an inspiring talk on being human. Being intentional about how you are going to BE, not just what you’re going to DO.

The following morning, a few wished they hadn’t woken up. Self-medication was particularly evident with coffee being the drug of choice. The morning saw a complete shift from Human to machine: John Barker dragged the audience into the 21st century with his EMPX. Dr Ben Brooks talked about trust & reliability in technology, and Dale Marsh gave a well-received presentation in the inner workings of PPU.

The next session was great if you like helicopters. Not relevant to all the participants there, but it was important to those who like to board James Bond style. In all seriousness, with all the issues surrounding pilot ladders, more ports should look at the helicopter option.

Mike Drake also slipped in an unscheduled talk about pilot ladder arrangements on low freeboard vessels and the challenges of complying with the current regulations when rigging through a gun port door.

All in all, it was an excellent Workshop (if I do say so myself). Just don’t ask me to organise one ever again! Good luck, Hugh.

---

A BUSMAN’S HOLIDAY (or A WELLINGTON PILOT CRUISES TO FIJI)

(An account of a recent cruise on P&O Australia’s ship Pacific Aria by NZMPA President and cruise-sceptic)

During the last week of May, Maria and I decided at short notice to give cruising a try. When plans for a holiday to the UK were cancelled due to health reasons (where I had hoped to also take in the UK and European Pilots Conference in Liverpool), we opted at short-notice for an 8-night cruise to Fiji on P&O Australia’s Pacific Aria (ex-HAL Ryndam). This change in our plans meant that we would only face a one-hour flight to Auckland, before 8 days of near-total relaxation. The ability to unpack only once for the entire voyage was an immediate attraction to Maria, with the biggest challenge each day being the 150-metre walk from our forward cabin to the restaurants located at the aft end of the vessel. The theatre was just two decks below us and the main pool just one deck above and slightly aft of us.

As I am what Maria describes as an active relaxer, hours on a deckchair beside one of the two pools was not high on my agenda. Hanging off a barstool, or leaning over a Black-Jack table was also not on my list either. I did however manage to satisfy my enthusiasm for professional development by engaging with the bridge team, including observing the departure from Auckland and all subsequent arrivals. This is not an option open to passengers normally, and was facilitated by P&O Australia Director of Operations, Mike Drake. Many members will have met Mike at our Wellington conference, where he presented on A Ship Owner’s Perspective of Pilotage. Mike has subsequently been engaging with NZMPA regarding our work with port passage plans, and will very likely present again at our Napier seminar in November. He has also seconded a master from their fleet to work on a project relating passage-planning & engagement with pilots in Australia and NZ. Captain Tony Herriot will spend a week at the end of June visiting Auckland, Napier and Wellington, where he will observe our work and discuss operations at a local level.

Whilst I enjoyed the vast variety of food and entertainment available, and the luxury of sitting on our balcony having a drink and watching the sun go down, my natural curiosity of things maritime was always there. I enjoyed observing the numerous nautical activities happening around me, but this time however I was an observer rather than a participant and therefore never had the usual weight of
responsibility on my shoulders. This unique position allowed me to observe the activities, before, during and after each port visit. Captain Lorenzo Paoletti was a warm and welcoming host, who invited me to attend all of the pre-arrival briefings for each port, where I gained a new insight into the team-planning that was conducted the day before the pilot stepped aboard. The Senior Second Officer was tasked with passage-planning, and this he presented to a very high standard, with many visual references through a PowerPoint presentation. I was impressed how Captain Paoletti engaged the entire team during the briefings, seeking input from all participants and suggesting alternatives to consider, either to optimise the operation or to consider in case a plan changed during its execution. On the bridge, he generally took the role of an overseer, with the SSO acting as primary navigator during the passage.

In Fiji, I observed pilotage operations which took me back to the practices I remember from my days at sea. Back then PPU, ECDIS, BRM, SA and Shared Mental Model were unknown terms. I could see that there is a huge void between their “local knowledge & intuition” methods of pilotage and the rapidly changing world we are adjusting to in NZ and Australia. My fear is that if they don’t keep abreast of developments, they may find themselves obsolete, as cruise companies install world-wide ports into their simulators. Thus, Pacific Island engagement with NZMPA & AMPI is crucial for them to stay current in our rapidly changing industry.

Over the last couple of years, I have spoken to a number of members who have had the opportunity to visit CSmart, the Carnival Training Centre near Amsterdam. Many have suggested that although the level of training was extremely high, they didn’t see it as a total solution for optimising operations where engagement with pilots is required. I can understand this view after experiencing bridge operations on Carnival, HAL, Cunard, Princess, Seabourn and P&O Australia vessels. Whilst they all train at CSmart, the MO and bridge cultures differ significantly between the various companies from my experiences. I would say however that my experience of P&O Australia vessels is that they operate in a manner that I can very easily assimilate with. Maybe this reflects their continually dealing with Australian and NZ pilots, hence a reasonable appreciation of our culture, attitude and level of training.

My relatively brief 8-night cruise not only gave me a taste for cruising again, but also a better appreciation of the planning and commitment of the P&O team I was fortunate enough to engage with, including the way they warmly welcomed me into their world. Whilst I could have been treated with suspicion, I was welcomed into their group, and was also invited to offer feedback on numerous occasions. On the voyage south, I offered to give a presentation on the work of our passage-planning working group, so the captain organised a conference room and all but those on watch attended what turned into a 2-hour engagement session. The culture that reigned under Captain Paoletti deserves mention, as he was very inclusive in his manner with his team, and this I feel is essential if junior officers, helmsmen and lookouts in particular are to raise concerns without hesitation. As the end of the voyage approached and I was putting my head down for my last night, I thought to myself that although I might not be on a 5-star cruise ship, I would give the ship a 5-star rating when it came to my peace of mind. I cannot say this would be the case for some top-end cruise ships I have piloted lately, where the cost of the ticket did not reflect the level of training, professionalism or the systems that under-pinned the bridge operations.

During the up-coming cruise season, I would suggest to our members who pilot P&O Australia vessels: please remember we are actively engaging with them at a regional level; they will be aware of our work to significantly improve practices for port-passage planning on all types of vessels, and are likely to be receptive to our pilots operating to new standards and practices which ideally will be in line with the Good Practice guidance that we will be releasing later this year.
October 2018 saw Navigation in pilotage waters put on the Watch-list of TAIC, which served as a catalyst and continuing motivation for NZMPA development work. This includes the November 2018 NZMPA conference and seminars, Good Practice Guide working group and Pilotage Planning working group. This article outlines the progress of the latter.

During the 2018 NZMPA conference, it was evident that accident investigators and pilots have differing perceptions. While many Pilots are solely relying on visual pilotage techniques, investigators are expecting: detailed passage plans; PPU use; use of all available bridge equipment; BRM up to international standards and considerable effort in building and maintaining a shared mental model.

This development is reinforced by the findings of recent incident reports. The majority of reports from NZ, AUS and UK have common outcomes: No shared mental model; available technology not used optimally; BRM not up to international standards; loss of situational awareness; pilotage was based primarily on visual cues. Interestingly, from the 19 investigations in recent years, only one can be attributed to technical failure.

In response to TAIC’s watchlist, the development of the Pilotage Plan working group was announced during the 2018 NZMPA seminars. To kick-start the project, a dedicated session was devoted to finding a mandate and foundation for which the group can move forward.

The mandate:

“Safe conduct of a ship through pilotage waters depends on high standards of passage planning. Pilots and the bridge team must share an understanding of the navigation plan and know where the ship is allowed to go. If the ship deviates into unsafe waters, members of the bridge team must be able to challenge those in charge. Also essential is a high standard of bridge resource management and adherence to best practice, as set out in international standards.” - TAIC

Facilitated by Antonio Di Lieto, a seminar session attended by pilots and associated parties developed the following foundations for the Pilotage Plan working group:

A Pilotage Plan is the basis for the conduct of the vessel in pilotage waters. It is a precaution against lack of timely intervention by any member of the bridge team when deviations from the plan occur.

The Pilotage Plan includes:

- a route plan for the track keeping part of the pilotage
- a manoeuvring plan for the dynamic positioning of the vessel in proximity of berths, anchorages, off-shore installations etc.
- a berthing plan for the static positioning of the vessel alongside

A pilotage plan should be defined at a reasonable level of detail, i.e. one that allows any member of the bridge team to intervene in a timely way when deviations to the plan occur at critical stages of the pilotage.

The idea is that defining critical navigational elements (i.e. cross track distance, speed, rate of turn, drift angle, distances off dangers etc.) in terms of an interval of values – rather than single values – may remove the ambiguity to challenge who is conning the vessel.
Critical navigational elements need to be controllable and observable through monitoring by the bridge team, and are determined by:

- an interval of planned values that represent the normality of operations. If everything goes according to plan, none of the planned values would have been exceeded.
- no go areas/values that cannot be exceeded (i.e. non-navigable waters, speeds beyond or below which it is impossible to control the vessel)
- the safety margin, that is the difference between planned values/areas and no-go values/areas. It represents the reserve available for a specific critical element. The reserve can be used intentionally for reasonable adaptations to unplanned situations (i.e. traffic, changes in environmental conditions etc.) or not intentionally. High Density ENCs may help for a more accurate definition of no go areas and, as a result, of the safety margin.

For this concept to work effectively though, critical navigational elements should be planned, agreed and shared in advance between bridge team members. Moreover, it is important to keep the number of critical elements as low as reasonably possible. Applying the concept of the range of values to all possible navigational elements in confined waters may defeat the overall aim of the concept itself, which is the prevention of accidents caused by intentions and/or actions without timely intervention, or without intervention at all.

Using this outline, it is the intention of the working group to develop a ‘Good Practice Guide to Pilotage Planning’. It is important to note that it is not the goal of the working group to reinvent the wheel; but to establish a methodology with a well thought out structure that will aid in reducing the possibility of mistakes and naturally increase situational awareness. The following methodology outlines the group’s current developments.

**Route Plan:**

1. A table of waypoints and navigational data that can be manually entered or formatted for automatic entry into an IMO approved ECDIS and a PPU. This table should also include, as a minimum, turn radii, width of corridors and ECDIS system configuration settings such as safety depth and safety contour.

2. A diagram clearly displaying the above with annotations for critical elements that can be emailed to a vessel, presented electronically, or presented on paper

**Manoeuvre Plan:**

1. A diagram clearly showing the dynamics of the planned manoeuvre and tug usage with annotations for critical elements that can be emailed to a vessel, presented electronically, or presented on paper. It should allow for the plan to be easily adapted as real-time circumstances dictate.

**Mooring Plan:**

1. A diagram clearly showing the position and orientation of the vessel, the disposition of moorings, bollard SWL, and the proximity of other moored vessels that can be emailed to a vessel, presented electronically, or presented on paper.
Dashboard/MPX card:

1. Prioritised exchange information including vessel information, timings, stabilised approach/dynamic risk assessment, UKC, real time weather, tide and traffic information.

Establishing Critical Elements of the Pilotage Plan:

1. Navigational Risks:
   All navigational risks relevant to the pilotage area and route can be defined and listed during appraisal.
2. Navigational control values:
   Navigational risk control values required to eliminate or mitigate risks can be listed and prioritised during appraisal and become the critical elements of your pilotage plan. Risk control values or ‘Critical Elements’ need to be controllable and observable on the Pilotage Plan and be defined as an interval of values rather than one fixed value.
3. Port Risk Assessment:
   The risks identified above can be added to the Port Risk Assessment to assist PHSC compliance.

In order for this methodology to be successful, a few key concepts need to be considered. Firstly, pilotage information needs to be received in advance by the vessel. The pilotage plan is the enabler for development of a shared mental model, and therefore an enabler for good BRM. Sharing in advance provides the bridge team a reasonable chance of understanding the pilots intentions and also an opportunity to load the intended passage into ships equipment. It is arguable that just having pilotage information available for download is not enough. Therefore a system of actively sending information to vessels should be considered. This is intended to remove ambiguities within the pilotage; such as, enabling the plan to be agreed before the pilotage begins, significantly reducing time required for MPX and avoiding multiple plans on the bridge.

Secondly, pilotage routes to each berth are required to be common and agreed by all pilots. Doing so will allow consistency within the pilotage planning structure and remove further ambiguities.

I would like to thank and acknowledge the working group for their commitment and dedication to this project. It is the aim of the working group to present the first version of the ‘Good Practice Guide to Pilotage Planning’ at this year’s NZMPA Conference being held in November in Napier. (Applications on Page 16)

The working group extends an invitation to all members to comment and provide your feedback on the proposed methodology and structure. Please forward all feedback to: ppas@nzmpa.org

Colin Sellars, 
NZMPA VP 
& 
Napier Port Pilot
Preferred booking method: Try Booking

https://www.trybooking.co.nz/BTM

If using Try Booking to book event, there is no need to fill out the below form. Please note that all Try Booking ticket purchases will incur a $0.30 booking fee.

DELEGATE INFORMATION

Name - ________________________________ Occupation/Title - ________________________________
Company - ____________________________ Port - ____________________________
Mobile number - ______________________ Contact email - ____________________________
Address - _____________________________

DELEGATE ACTIVITIES

Conference & seminars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tick option</th>
<th>Social activities</th>
<th>Tick option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference (NZMPA members)</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
<td>Partner attending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference (Pilot non-member)</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
<td>Name -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference (General Admission)</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
<td>Request for partner activity information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Dinner</td>
<td>$ 125</td>
<td>Accommodation information required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct transfer to - 12-3125-0294579-00 Reference: (Include name as reference) ____________________________

Booking confirmation - Amount transferred - ____________________________
Signature - ____________________________ Date - ____________________________

Please fill in details, scan and return to conf2019@nzmpa.org

Please note that NZMPA is a non-profit organisation which will endeavour to run this event with a minimal registration fee. This has been made possible by the generous support of many sponsors, who enable us to host our event which is focused on professional development, and improving safety and operational standards.
Draft articles for publications (NZMPA Magazine, Shipping Gazette)

Maritime NZ has released a pilotage guidance document: *Proficiency plans, annual assessments, peer reviews and pilot CPE*.

The guidance was developed with the Pilotage Project Working Group and in consultation with a significant number of stakeholders.

It has been developed for pilots, pilotage providers, marine operations managers, Pilotage Exemption Certificate (PEC) holders and PEC holders’ employers.

The purpose of the document is to:

- provide guidance on how to produce a good proficiency plan
- outline acceptable means of compliance with maritime rules relating to annual assessments and peer reviews
- list the pilotage tasks and navigation tasks that are referred to in the maritime rules in relation to the conduct of annual assessments of pilots and PEC holders, and
- outline acceptable means of compliance with maritime rules relating to pilot Continuing Professional Education (CPE).

The guidance was identified by the Pilotage Project Working Group as an alternative output to developing a points-based system for CPE, but Maritime NZ remains interested in developing a simple system to support ports and pilots to build bespoke programmes of CPE. This means continuing earlier discussions about how to bring in a tailored competency-based system for CPE that is manageable, sustainable and adds value for ports and pilots.

The document is now being circulated to all relevant stakeholders and can be found on the Maritime NZ website.

If you have any questions in relation to this document, you can contact Senior Operations Advisor, David Mulholland – feedback.guidance@maritimenz.govt.nz
**PAN PAN?**

The radiotelephony message **PAN-PAN** is the international standard urgency signal that someone aboard a boat, ship, aircraft, or other vehicle uses to declare that **they have a situation that is urgent, but for the time being, does not pose an immediate danger to anyone’s life or to the vessel itself.** – Wikipedia. This article is not about the RT message we sailors are familiar with. I recently had the opportunity to attend the 2-day Workshop that AMPI had organised for pilots in Newcastle. I attended a training prior to that workshop on the AMPI’s PAN program that lasted an entire day.

**PAN – PEER ASSISTANCE NETWORK**

According to the AMPI website, AMPI established and continues to finance a professional and confidential Peer Assistance Network or PAN, which is available to all members and their families. "PAN Members" are marine pilots who have undertaken specific training to become peer councillors. AMPI has also retained the services of a professional councillor, Marcus Romanic, who is a trained psychologist and has a practice in Geelong.

The training was carried out by Marcus and was a real eye-opener. PAN receives approximately 1000 calls a year, averaging at about 3 calls a day. A majority of the calls have to do with relationship issues (personal and professional), closely followed by work-related issues. I am sure all NZ ports have an EAP of some form or the other, but how many of the EAP councillors are equipped to handle sailors’ jargon or for that matter how many of them would be able to understand the issues our partners have to deal with? We work in a very specialised field and as pilots have a very specialised skill set. Should logic not dictate that when we seek out someone to talk to, they would need an equally specialised background to understand where we are coming from? After all, a mentally fit pilot is a good pilot. *Watch - Project Wingman – YouTube.*

One of the many topics covered during the day was about the **Iceberg Culture.** It was the first time that I had heard of such a thing and found it to be interesting and very true. "An organization’s culture has a visible component that comprises actions, communications, behaviours and reporting relationships. But like an iceberg, beneath the surface are values, feelings, beliefs, assumptions, and cultural norms that drive the visible behaviours." – Deloitte – recognising signs of toxic culture. *The Culture spectrum 2019.*

There is a certain amount of perceived invasion of privacy and social stigma associated with calling and talking to someone when we need help. As pilots we are trained in decision-making for a variety of complex situations and so most of us would probably think we could tough it out. PAN is meant to be a **confidential** support system for pilots different from the industrial and legal support offered by the relevant industrial associations. During the course of the day we carried out a number of exercises where we each took turns being a caller looking for support and then being a listener on the other end of the phone. The entire point of the exercise was to build a relationship with the person looking for support and to really listen to them in order for them to process the issue at hand. This resulted in individuals talking more about the issues affecting them and opening up about their feelings. Over the period of a few conversations, PAN members, would then be able to help the individuals see the issue for themselves and help the individuals navigate their own way to the solution without telling them how - even if obvious to the listener. (*Watch – It’s not about the nail – YouTube*).

In cases where the situation involves serious mental health issues, the PAN member refers the issue onto the appropriate medical or emergency services including PAN psychologists. I am not sure how many of our Kiwi pilots find the need to be able to just call up and talk to someone about issues facing them; I certainly would like the option. PAN certainly does have a lot of upsides to it with almost no downsides, in my humble opinion, and is something that we as an association perhaps should be looking into a bit more seriously. Any takers?

*Soli deo Gloria, Paul James*
HUMAN vs. ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

After leaving Deep Sea in 1984, I worked offshore as a DP Operator (Dynamic Positioning) i.e. the Human back-up for an automated system. It was 99% boredom and 1% panic when the Operator selected Manual, hit the Dive-Abort button, then held the ship on joystick long enough for the Diver to return to the Bell. Since it seemed my work was dependent on the Human interface with computers, I tried to understand them, but failed dismally (perhaps it was mutual). This feeling of computer inadequacy prompted me to change tack: I moved into sail – a 19th Century technology that I could understand.

I was reminded of this clear division between Manual and Automatic control whilst listening to a recent RNZ interview of Kevin Sullivan, pilot of QF72: in 2008, his A300 Airbus nose-dived twice due to computer malfunction. The Airbus A300 has 3 computers, each one capable of flying the plane, all systems checking each other. However, when the automation suddenly nose-dived the flight, the system did not permit Manual Selection. The pilot had to overcome his immediate inclination to pull back on the joystick and return it to Neutral; only then, was he able to Select Manual. Once stabilised, the aircraft controls were returned to Auto, until it nose-dived for a second time and once again, had to be tricked into Manual Control. Those passengers and crew standing were severely injured. Eventually, Captain Sullivan managed to land the plane at an Airforce base in NW Australia, but his trauma remains. Sullivan wrote “No Man’s Land” to start the debate on how far to allow automation dominance over Human agency and why. Like fire, automation is a good servant, but a bad master.

Almost 3 months after QF72, Flight QF71 had a similar experience in the same area. Australian Pilots felt that the proximity to the US Harold Holt VLF Signal Station may have been significant, but this notion was deemed “highly, highly unlikely” by the manager of the Holt Station facility (that’s alright then…?) because such VLF waves ‘would not penetrate airframes’ (though they can penetrate to 40m deep in the ocean to communicate with US submarines).

The grounding of the Boeing 737 Max fleet in light of the two accidents killing 346 once again highlights the dangers with automation, especially when the system appears to over-ride/interfere with Manual control. But the problems with the 737 Max go very deep and the attached report is a story of unbounded stupidity, greed, bullying, scorn for workers, lack of respect for engineering and a company which lost sight of it’s purpose. (See https://www.bloomberg.com/news/features/2019-05-09/former-boeing-engineers-say-relentless-cost-cutting-sacrificed-safety). Boeing pushed the FAA regulator to cut corners on pilots’ simulator training, asserting that 1-2 hours on an iPad was sufficient for all existing 737 pilots. The company existed to make profits, not aircraft! In the unholy rush to maximise profit, they lost the trust of both workforce and customer. Whistleblowers were sacked, managers were rewarded for cost-cutting and time-saving. The CEO’s salary was a paltry $2 Million, but productivity bonus took that to $24 Million in 2018. Boeing stock value has now lost $34 Billion, to the distress of disingenuous shareholders now suing their own company for dishonesty. Whilst one’s heart bleeds for those poor shareholders, what dollar value for 346 lives? Accountability ought to have moral and financial dimensions.

Finally, Boeing celebrated their centenary in 2018, and the Boeing 747 first took to the skies 50 years ago. Boeing also build Chinook helicopters (1962) which regularly fall out of the skies: ZD576 crashed into the Mull of Kintyre 25 years ago, killing all aboard. The pilots were exonerated in 2011, having been blamed by their Boeing-owned RAF bosses, based on zero evidence. Boeing, Boing, Bong! So much for financial intelligence - but what of its uglier sibling, Military Intelligence?
MILITARY INTELLIGENCE?

(Previously published on Offguardian.com)

I wondered why I was thinking about aircraft carriers until I recalled that at our 2018 NZMPA Conference in Te Papa, Forth Pilot Jeremy Purvis spoke on the “Mobilisation” of aircraft-carrier (AC) HMS “Queen Elizabeth II”. This ship has been in the news ever since, but for all the wrong reasons: recently, her commander was removed by helicopter whilst anchored in the Forth, accused of having used the ship’s car for personal use whilst in the US (maybe he should have used a helicopter?). Even Lord West of Spithead (former head of the RN) expressed his bemusement. But if this really is a question of misuse of MOD funds, then it seems but a drop in several oceans compared with bigger questions - firstly of defence spending, secondly of defence strategy, and lastly of man-management.

Firstly, defence spending: the build cost for these two 65,000T aircraft carriers is about $10 Billion (with such obscene sums of money, the arithmetic is elastic because defence spending is always off-target). This is however a bargain compared with US super-carriers (100,000T) which are nuclear-powered, cost about $15 Billion to build (and $3 Billion to de-commission). The US fields about 10 such ships: they are quite defenceless (thus have to be escorted by various surface escorts and submarines) thus 5-6,000 men. The 2013 cost of clothing, training, feeding, paying such numbers put the daily running costs to USD $6.5 Million (according to Wikipedia). If the Royal Navy deems her Captain over-used the ship’s car, then money must be tight (or they have too many AC commanders?).

But what of the aircraft the ship was built to carry? HMS QEII is supposed to carry 36 F-35Bs (designed for US Marines) built by US firm, Lockheed-Martin. The F-35 programme was 7 years behind schedule and $150 Billion over-budget (perfectly acceptable in defence spending!). Lockheed-Martin are not Boeing - and any reference to their 737 Max would be inappropriate – but when half remain grounded for lack of spares, then one (for-the-price-of-two) costs $300 million. The 72 aircraft for two ships adds $11 Billion. (N.B. these are their off-the-shelf price, not their whole-of-life cost).

Secondly, QE II apparently now has 12 F-35Bs and will be attached to the US Marines. British taxpayers’ money has not been well spent. I don’t know how much a supersonic missile or torpedo costs, nor indeed a swarm of plastic drones, but such an expensive ship makes for a very juicy target. The first aircraft carrier HMS Hermes, was launched in 1919: technology has evolved in 100 years, but not strategy. Carriers’ vulnerability puts a serious counterweight to any ‘prestige’ they might bring to erstwhile superpowers; indeed, the UK’s prostrated serfitude to the US destroys any last pretence of British Sovereignty. All empires fall: losing one may be a misfortune, to lose two smacks of incompetence. Australia, Canada and NZ cling on like drowning men, weighed-down by oxymoronic military intelligence and misplaced political allegiance. Peace benefits Humanity. Wars profit Bankers.

As per the latest NZ Well-being Budget, NZ military will spend $5 Billion, way more than on poverty, health or climate change. Ordered by Lockheed-Martin, we will buy aircraft with anti-submarine capabilities (perhaps subs full of immigrants?) whilst our present (non-A/S) S&R aircraft has been deployed to Japan to enforce US Sanctions (i.e. siege warfare) against already starving North Korean civilians.

Finally, man-management: the Royal Navy in 1757 executed Admiral Byng for ‘failure to do his utmost’. Voltaire thought this the British way “pour encourager les autres”. British Secretary of Defense – Gavin, Stupid Boy, Williamson – walked the plank for breaching Cabinet duplicity - and then denying it (his non-Huawei phone was tapped!), and Mrs. May awaits the next chopper. Napoleon said: Never interrupt the enemy when he is making a mistake. (Josephine, its going to be a long night...)
PORT OTAGO

…And another thing about BRM for the bottom-feeders of the industry is that it’s not very effective outside the wheelhouse is it? If it was then we wouldn’t have huge, sometimes inaccurately-reading clocks staring at us from the overhead instrument panels above our heads and a tiny sometimes-accurately reading rate of turn indicator alongside it, both with dimmer switches designed only for Steve Adams proportioned bridge teams to slam-dunk the adjustment. On the subject of celebrity sports stars, why is the rudder indicator is so often in a position on the deckhead that we have to do an Olga Korbut spine-twister (remember her?) to see it? How many pilots and ships officers are turning up on the bridge without a watch or cellphone these days? Lose the Clapham Junction Station timepiece and stick decent-sized “standard” rudder and RoT indicators up there. Also, if they have to be alongside each other don’t make them appear like monozygotic twins, so the observer spends valuable seconds differentiating between the two …especially in the wee, small hours of the morning. Leading nicely on from the RoT indicators… teach all helmsmen to steer rates of turn. If 95% of the cruise ship industry helmsmen can do it, why can’t the rest? If a ship can’t do less than 5 knots on its Dead Slow Ahead engine setting, don’t let the thing out of the shipyard until it can supply you with a production road vehicle that doesn’t do less than fifty klicks an hour in first gear. If it has more than six deck levels from the main deck to the bridge and there is no elevator, don’t let it out of the shipyard until you find a new-build hotel with six floors and no Schindler’s Shaft-shifter. If a ship is going to comply with new regulations demanding two separate and independent ECDIS systems, then put enough personnel on the bridge to operate and maintain them. Both systems independently howl or flash their own independent UKC alarms but until we get robot ships, which I am regularly assured is imminent, then someone has to action those alarms. Minimum-manning levels are a joke and we all know it.

You may have noticed two things from the opening paragraph; firstly, and it’s an option you may choose, if you insert the words “for fuck’s sake” after every sentence, it still reads correctly but with a tad more passion. Secondly, despite saying that BRM is not effective outside the wheelhouse, most of the rant was about stuff in the wheelhouse. But therein, indeed, lies the rub. This idiocy that we have put up with for years and will continue to put up with, is brought about partly because users in the wheelhouses have little or no contact with, thus input to, the designers in the naval architects’ office well outside the wheelhouses. To be fair to the bottom-feeders of the industry, some modern cruise industry bridge ergonomics can be as poorly thought out as any of the apparently ’70’s heritage bridges we are presented with in other ships.

If BRM wants to go a bit more viral, then it needs to look back up the track in an effort to at least influence, but preferably demand of designers and suppliers, suitable equipment and sufficient resources to run bridges to the standard to which we allegedly aspire. This is done very well, intra-state by such systems as ISO 9001: 2015 but as we know, consensus procurement in the shipping industry is out there with welding jelly to a bulkhead and getting Auckland pilots to agree on a kit-list (we’re the same down here but we’d never admit it). Pilots as a body can do the best they can to continually improve their services (ref: ISO9001: 2015 again) but shipping standards will always be anchored to the bottom with
several shackles in the water until the higher-ups and regulators can cause the competing capitalists to comply. Next issue: “How to design a gangway that can be constructed or deconstructed in only half an hour” and “Rat Guards …should ISO9001:2015 be implemented as a matter of urgency?” (Craig Holmes)

GISBORNE

The numbers are in and what a year it was – again. Despite significant disruption in the log supply chain caused by the floods of June/18 the Port managed to export a freckle under 2.94 million tonnes of logs across our single berth along with a further 15k tonnes of fertiliser, fish, kiwifruit & squash. 140 ships were accommodated, and the in-house dredging operation achieved good results all year. Additionally, there were a record number of cruise ships anchored in the roads across the summer. The Port operation returned EBIT of $26 million, Eastland Group revenue surpassed $97 Million, with profit of $20.1 million leading to a dividend of $12.1 million to our 100% shareholder - The Eastland Community Trust.

The new geothermal power plant, Te Ahi O Maui, is now at full steam pumping out 25 MW of clean green power and is the first major renewable power plant commissioned in New Zealand in the past 4 years. Te Ahi O Maui complements our existing generation facilities; Generation Developments Ltd and the Waihi Hydro scheme. We continue to investigate further sustainable power generation opportunities and technologies. The airport rebuild is well underway and the twin berth development is in the final planning stages. The second berth is the key to unlocking the region’s projected export log tonnage more than 5 million tonnes per annum. The additional capacity will also enable coastal shipping, bulk fertiliser and increased break bulk reecer tonnages. The immediate challenge however will centre around maintaining operations during the rebuild process.

The Port’s Total Recordable Injury Frequency Rate (TRIFR) has been tracking a 12-month rolling average of zero for the past 6 months which is another very pleasing result. We pride ourselves on keeping it simple as a core value in the business, and that approach is at the forefront of our non-negotiable Health & Safety culture.

To current activities; we have just completed our P&HSC SMS joint self-assessment with the Eastland District Council. A thoroughly useful exercise in preparation for an external review later in the year. The Port & Harbour SMS arguably provides more benefit to Pilots and front-line marine staff than the myriad of courses, seminars and simulator sojourns. Nothing can surpass a thorough understanding of one’s local operating environment, the risks and controls inherent therein.

Recent weeks have seen the approaches more resembling a Queensland coal terminal rather than lil’-ole East Coast NZ with up to 8 ships at anchor awaiting berthing opportunities. A week of significant swell and IG didn’t help matters with operations suspended for several days, some vessels are there due to the tyranny of the charter cycle and of course the occasional vessel turns up with borderline standards which reach their nadir once the ship is alongside with a crane survey which condemns 3 of 4 cranes - always leads to a bit of disruption in a single berth port.

John Vitaljich has joined us as tug master. John comes from 20 years or so driving tugs in Port Hedland and he brings a wealth of experience with him. We remain interested in talking to experienced tug masters who may interested in a change of scenery. Enrique Perez has come on board as deck hand and we are interviewing for another deck hand position as this item goes to print. (Chris Kaye)

NAPIER

As I missed Napier Port’s entry in March, I should be able to rattle on for twice as much as usual. Unfortunately it does not seem to work that way, and after reading the almost professional efforts from some of my colleagues in other ports, the easy way out would be to miss June’s entry as well! Probably not going to happen though, as Ed would moan and demand more beer next time we meet!

A quick talk about last cruise season before moving on: Napier was no different to other ports in that we had more Cruise vessels with an increase in average size. For us ‘smaller’ size ports, that is the problem rather than the increase in number. Notwithstanding the technical difficulty in manoeuvring the larger vessels, it is also the clearing of other berths to facilitate the safe passage and berthing of the larger cruise vessels. This creates a heady mix of early morning berth shuffles and a lot of
organising around the larger container vessels that are also unable to depart with the larger cruise vessels on their berth.

As you all know, next Cruise season is gearing up to be even bigger with an increase in number and size. To cope with the increase and to future-proof Marine, we entered into negotiations with management and have managed to almost totally restructure: 24-hour supervised coverage for Port Control will allow the Duty Pilot to concentrate more on driving ships and get more rest. The old position of Executive Pilot has been resurrected, and Robbie Jensen has stuck his head above the parapet and taken it on. Two Marine Officer/Pilots have been taken on to help cover projects and Fatigue planning. Two more Pilots will make a total team of 10 licences. Olexandr Golovonov will be joining us soon. Olexandr was a Pilot in the Middle East after learning his trade in Odessa; he brings a wealth of experience on ships of all sizes, large and small. By the time I return from the UK at the end of next month, he will not be far away, and we should be advertising for our tenth licence.

Our two Marine Officers, David and Mathius, should be getting their first licence well before the end of the year and Colin Sellars will be Unrestricted about the same time.

The planning of the new berth has taken a lot of time and effort for all involved. Simulations at Smartship are still underway and there are still a whole raft of new berth simulations planned between now and Christmas, which will also include bi-annual training and 3rd tug training. Talking of the 3rd tug our new Tractor should be with us soon - unnamed as of yet! The hunt for our next Pilot launch was stalled to complete the 3rd tug project. With the new beast almost here, the launch project is back on, with hopefully a decision on model and propulsion decided in the next few months.

Planning for the 2019 conference is well underway in Napier with venues locked and loaded. Colin leads our team with help from yours truly, Dave and Mathius. It’s going to be a ‘Port’ effort with advice from the Port’s comms team as they are able to do this sort of organising in their sleep. The theme is going to be topical - we have a way to go yet.

Reading back through last quarter’s Ports of Call, I notice we are still talking about the relevance of BRM and good MPX in relation to Cargo vessels, especially the more older and ‘general’ ones - and maybe even some of our Cruise vessels, where the bridge is run by a ‘one man show’. In these instances, the BRM and MPX is more relevant to the pilot. It makes us more aware of the deficiencies of the Master/bridge team and their reluctance to participate in proper planning. Surely there is now plenty of relevance to proper planning: unless we are machines, there is unfortunately always going to be the possibility of some form of over-familiarity or complacency. Maybe a couple of computer-savvy youngsters with joysticks and a big screen is closer than we think unless we keep ourselves ‘relevant’.

From Napier and not so sunny Bristol - Safe Piloting.  

(John Pagler)

BLUFF

Greetings all from the pearl of the South! We have entered what is the quiet period for our port, or at least that’s what it’s supposed to be. It’s a good time to sit back and reflect on all that’s been going on. I had the opportunity to attend the 2 day AMPI workshop in Newcastle a while ago, which was really good. Highlights for me personally were the PAN workshop, commonly prescribed medications and potential side effects, and the talk on medical equipment in pilot launches. It really was an amazing amount of information delivered in a short span of time - so again AMPI, well done!

Mark and I are progressing through our grades, and as part of our on going training, we attended the advanced pilots course in Auckland. It certainly is an interesting time we live in, particularly as pilots in regards to the advancement of technology. This point was steered home with a vessel that recently called our port - a heavy lift ship with a forward accommodation. I had all the calculations in my head with regards to speed converted to m/s, length of the ship, distance from bridge to stern etc. all in a bid to calculate delay in wheel-over order and accurately ascertain vessel’s position. You’re probably thinking: what on earth is he on about? Well, you see, we don’t get too many vessels with a forward accommodation if any, and as opposed to cruise ships in the Fiords, we don’t have much real estate in sunny Bluff. So, there I was on the bridge of the vessel, focussing on my PPU for details I had pre-computed in my brain, trying to use technology first and verifying with visuals - a technique presently being encouraged, and found myself out of sorts. I then decided to switch back to what I knew -
my experience as a Master on car carriers and my time on the Cook Strait ferries combined with technology in my line-of-sight to verify what I was seeing through the window. Upon some reflection, I personally feel that my mind isn’t wired to use electronic navigation as a primary source, as long my eyes are getting feedback from the ambient surroundings. It’s when the information reaching the mind through the window is insufficient, for example in fog or heavy rain, that my mind readily accepts electronic data. Not quite sure why that is and not my field of expertise, so I shall refrain from any further speculation. Don’t misunderstand my use or reliance on the PPU to assist me in doing my job. I am the last one to shy away from technology; but it’s like I have said in the past: the day they stop putting windows on the bridge of a ship is the day I will use electronic navigation as my primary means of ascertaining my vessel’s position.

Soli deo Gloria, (Paul James)

LYTTELTON

For the last couple of months we have had two pilots training, with Richard Hill and George Hadley working the qualifying jobs between them. They have just passed their first exams and await the issue of their Licences - Richard a Class C and George a Class B. It has been a relaxing few months sitting in the bridge chair watching the Bridge Team at work. Soon they will be in the roster and I will have to carry and set-up the PPU by myself. Our new tug Piaka has arrived from Singapore, resplendent in red, while our existing tugs are painted blue. I may be showing my age but I prefer a black hull, white wheelhouse and a bit of buff to finish things off. Once the paperwork is completed and she has been handed-over, our tug-masters will commence familiarisation training. With three tugs in the port, the opportunity will be taken to dock the other two, then the Purau will be sold; any offers considered.

The Nimby’s in the Lyttelton Harbour Basin have been kept busy of late. Our new navigation lights have been compared to Christmas Tree decorations, so luminous they are keeping people awake at night. The Rio class container vessels are pumping-out generator noise that is disturbing sleep and affecting quality of life. For a bit of adventure, an entrepreneur wishes to start a sight-seeing seaplane, landing & taking-off from the harbour. Then there is the pile-driving at the new cruise berth. We have already slowed-down the Pilot Launch to reduce the noise levels. Don’t even mention the sound of steel on steel when skips of scrap are dumped into a ship’s hold. Here was me thinking Lyttelton was a quiet, sleepy village. (Finlay Laird)

WELLINGTON

Having just returned from leave overseas thinking much will have happened during my departure, I was sadly informed that life here in Wellington has just cruised along nicely. The weather has been reasonable, the shipping moderate, no one has been crook, not much training has occurred, we haven’t bought any more tugs, all in all a boring report. I did have a few days at Smartship which is always pleasant and noted that pilots from Auckland had been on the days before and from Napier after us. It has crossed my mind that with so many NZ pilots visiting there maybe the NZMPA should have an apartment to reduce costs but that might be too logical for our ports to work together. The memorable fact about Brisbane was that they had 594 types of rum at the Breakfast Creek pub. I know because Josh and me did our best to sample reasonable cross section...

Winter Solstice, then summer: with a bit more global warming, the Aussies will want to travel here for training. (Lew Henderson)

BRUNSBUTTEL

Refurbished 1883 Pilot Schooner Elbe No.5 – sank after a collision: all survived. She braved North Sea storms for 40 years until bought by American Warwick Tompkins and renamed “Wander Bird” subject of books and films

VENICE

In Venice, all were all looking forward to the Marriage of the Seas Ceremony which has been performed these last thousand years. Serenity was somewhat disrupted by the dramatic arrival of MSC Opera: talk about a prima donna entrance! Reassuringly, the anchors dropped missed all other vessels.

CAPE HORN

Russian adventurer, Fedor Konyukhov arrived on 16th May, 154 days since Dunedin in his rowing boat Akros. Despite atrocious weather and loss of solar panels, Fedor was fit and well, ready for the next challenge...
News from Port Ash

It has been a busy year so far and nearly half gone - not too many shopping days till Christmas! Last summer was a hot one, but the weather generally has been kind with few strong winds until recently - only to be expected with winter upon us. The lake is full; a new ship model is at the planning stage and like all ports, the ongoing maintenance program at Port Ash continues on our vessels and navigation aids, with Plover Point Lighthouse recently receiving a fresh coat of paint and some much needed maintenance. A much easier option being able to pick up one’s lighthouse, remove it to the workshop for chipping and painting before return to its dutiful location, as seen below, with smiles all round from Cliff and Jason!

The 2019 training program commenced with groups from Texas and several new Australian pilots along with the RAN. We have seen much of the RNZN this year with more courses booked in response to new ship deliveries later in the year. By this time next year, every class of ship will have notably different means of propulsion and rudders.

Over the last couple of years, courses at Port Ash have evolved into two distinct groups. The traditional 5-day course in general ship-handling remains popular for most new entrants to the ship-handling profession, along with experienced Pilots who have not completed manned model training previously. The shorter 2 - 3 day CPD/CPL Emergency & Contingency scenario-based training courses are also increasing in popularity.

On this side of the Tasman, AMPI are taking a lead in the Continuous Professional Development/Learning (CPD/CPL) concept. Using the manned ship-models, a course comprising port-specific outcome-based exercises centred on emergency scenarios identified by a port’s risk assessment strategy are developed. The course structure and program are compiled in consultation with the specific port management and pilots, with training outcomes identified and documented. Many of these manned model CPD/CPL courses complement a Port’s emergency and contingency training program using computer-simulation. Many ports choose to use tug assist for at least 2 days of the 2 – 3 day CPD/CPL courses. This may include an introduction to, or CPD/CPL training on azimuthing pods on our 289m cruise ship at customer request.

Where experienced pilots come for the 5-day course in general shiphandling, greater emphasis focusing on emergencies and contingencies occurs during the last 2 days of the course. Seated forward on our conventional bridge-aft manned ship models, the on-board trainer/assessor has the option to apply specific ship system failures, including realistically simulated wrong-way rudder incidents at appropriate moments during an exercise. It is always interesting to observe the human factors component of how individuals react.

Routine training in emergencies and contingencies using manned models and simulators provides ports with realistic examples and practice in event of an incident, with improved outcomes during pilotage emergencies. The compressed time frame of the manned models allows a highly cost effective way of providing a maximum number of exercises during these intense training courses.

We reflect how lucky we are to have the advances in simulation technology, with both manned model and computer-based simulation providing enhanced training exposure to low frequency high consequence events during pilotage operations. With recent advances in human factors knowledge together with improvements in simulation, today’s Marine Pilot is better equipped to deal with the risks associated with ship handling operations.

Port Ash Australia utilises manned ship models to provide real feel, real world training on its purpose built 2 Ha (5 acre) lake, and employs experienced Marine Pilots to provide world class training.

Providing specialised training for:

- Masters
- Officers
- Marine Pilots
- Naval Officers
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PORTABLE PILOT UNITS
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- Coastal Pilotage
- Confined Navigation
- Docking
- Berthing
- Offshore Oil and Gas Manoeuvres
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