Port Marine Safety Code
Annual Performance Review
Year ending 31st December 2014
Contents

1.0 Introduction: ABP as Harbour Authority ................................................................. 2
2.0 ABP’s Commitment to the PMSC ........................................................................... 2
   2.1 Marine Policy ........................................................................................................ 2
   2.2 Commitment Statement ....................................................................................... 3
   2.3 Audit and Verification .......................................................................................... 3
3.0 Key Personnel - ABP Harbour Authority ............................................................... 6
4.0 Vessel Movement Statistics .................................................................................... 7
5.0 Incident Statistics .................................................................................................... 10
6.0 Key Performance Indicators ................................................................................... 19
7.0 Commentary ............................................................................................................. 24
   7.1 Incident Data ........................................................................................................ 24
   7.2 KPIs ...................................................................................................................... 25
   7.3 2014 Reviewed ..................................................................................................... 26
8.0 Progress Against Objectives Set in Previous Report ............................................. 28
9.0 Future Objectives and Plans .................................................................................. 30
10 Summary .................................................................................................................. 32
11 Public Compliance Statement .................................................................................. 32

Table of Figures

Figure 1: ABP (Harbour Authority) Organisation Chart .................................................. 6
Figure 2: Shipping Movements 2010 to 2014 .................................................................. 7
Figure 3: Annual Shipping Movements by Region 2010 to 2014 ...................................... 8
Figure 4: Shipping Movement Trend 2010 to 2014 ........................................................ 8
Figure 5: Actual Nautical Safety Incidents (2014 compared with 2013) ............................... 11
Figure 6: Actual Nautical Safety Incidents 2014 (By ABP Port) .......................................... 12
Figure 7: Total Navigational Incidents by Port 2010 to 2014 .............................................. 13
Figure 8: Shipping Movements 2014 and 2013 .............................................................. 14
Figure 9: Navigational Safety Incidents per 1000 Vessel Movements 2010 to 2014 ............ 15
Figure 10: Incidents per 1000 Movements - ABP Group 2010 to 2014 .............................. 18
Figure 11: Number of Pilotage Acts per Pilot 2012 to 2014 ............................................. 20
Figure 12: Number of Pilotage and PEC Acts per 1000 Vessel Moves 2014 ...................... 20
Figure 13: Number of Navigational Risk Assessments 2014 ........................................... 21
Figure 14: Risk Scores 2014 ......................................................................................... 21
Figure 15: Risk Assessment Activity 2014 .................................................................... 22
Figure 16: Ratio of Potential to Actual Incidents 2014 ................................................... 22
1.0 Introduction: ABP as Harbour Authority

ABP is ultimately owned by ABP (Jersey) Limited, a limited liability company domiciled and incorporated in Jersey. However, under Part II of the Transport Act 1981 ABP is controlled by Associated British Ports Holdings Ltd (ABPH), a company formed by the Secretary of State. The directors of ABP are appointed by ABPH, but ABPH has no power to give directions to the directors of ABP in respect of the execution of their powers and duties as a Harbour Authority.

ABP is the Statutory and Competent Harbour Authority for the following ports and harbours, although the precise nature of the arrangements varies according to local circumstances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ayr</th>
<th>Goole</th>
<th>King’s Lynn</th>
<th>Southampton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>Swansea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>Troon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>Humber</td>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>Port Talbot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garston</td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>Silloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition Teignmouth Quay Company Ltd. (a wholly owned subsidiary of ABP) is the SHA and CHA for Teignmouth Quays, and the Directors of that company (who are also directors of ABP as defined above), are the “Duty Holder” for Teignmouth Quays. Meetings of the Teignmouth Quay Company SHA take place concurrently with those of ABP, and the company has adopted the same Marine Policy and MSMS as all other ABP ports.

This document reviews the performance of both Harbour Authorities in relation to the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code during 2014, and provides a summary of marine activities at all the locations listed above which are relevant to navigational safety and environmental protection within the diverse Statutory Harbour Areas managed by ABP.

2.0 ABP’s Commitment to the PMSC

2.1 Marine Policy

ABP publishes a Marine Policy, which was last revised during 2014.

The current version can be found on the company web site: http://www.abpmarine.co.uk/

The ABP Marine Policy aims to demonstrate our commitment to the safe and responsible operation of our ports and harbours by detailing areas of primary concern (which are closely based on the requirements of the Port Marine Safety Code). Linked to this policy, and forming an integral part of the overarching “Marine Safety Management System”, ABP has published a Port Marine Operations Manual at Group level, and each ABP port and harbour has prepared plans detailing the manner in which this policy is to be locally implemented.
2.2 **ABP’s Commitment to the PMSC**

The following statement has also been published by ABP on the corporate web site:

> Associated British Ports (ABP) is the Statutory and Competent Harbour Authority for 22 separate ports and harbours located around the UK. The breadth and depth of knowledge and experience that comes from managing these ports and harbours enables ABP to play a leading role in the ongoing development of the Port Marine Safety Code.

> The Port Marine Safety Code, which was last revised in March 2015, serves to highlight the responsibilities that are allied to being a Harbour Authority and establishes a requirement for all Harbour Authorities to formalise their procedures.

> In publishing the ABP Marine Policy we aim to demonstrate our commitment to the safe and responsible operation of our ports and harbours by detailing areas of primary concern and bringing transparency to our work. Linked to this policy, each ABP port and harbour has prepared plans detailing the precise manner in which this policy is to be implemented.

> We have well established reporting procedures and performance targets; and have a designated person to provide assurances that the ABP marine safety management systems are working effectively. We have a clear system for auditing and reviewing our performance against this policy.

> By implementing this policy, ABP continues to build upon its known track record of safe and efficient operations, while endeavouring to identify further opportunities to improve that record whenever and wherever we can.

2.3 **Audit and Verification**

During 2014 the Marine Advisor maintained a programme of audit and verification, to satisfy the Harbour Authority that it is fulfilling its Statutory Duties, and remains compliant with the PMSC.

A formal schedule of internal audits by the Designated Person and his Deputy was undertaken, wherein each ABP Harbour Master and his port(s) are visited once a year, and lessons learned from these assessments are shared with all the Authority's Ports and Harbours. Formal meetings were also due to be held with each of the Port Directors during 2014, in addition to the Harbour Authority meetings. However it was not possible to complete these meetings before the end of 2014 and overdue meetings were completed in early April 2015.

In addition, the Harbour Authority commissions a formal process of annual audit of PMSC compliance by KPMG. The annual audit is targeted to support the programme of internal audits, and ensures that our internal processes are rigorous and efficient: as well as providing independent assurance of PMSC compliance at the chosen port(s). The KPMG audit is conducted at a different Directorate each year on a four-yearly cyclical basis.

During 2014, the audit was undertaken at the Port of Southampton between April 23rd and 25th. A full report was produced for consideration by the Audit Committee.
The Port Marine Safety Code allows for the MCA to undertake occasional compliance audits, now known as “Health Checks” (often triggered by incidents or other causes for concern). One such “Health Check” was undertaken at an ABP port during 2014 at the Port of Fleetwood, but this was not due to any cause for concern. Rather the MCA wished to undertake an audit of a smaller port, and co-ordinate it with other work they had in the area. They therefore asked us if we would be content to host a visit at Fleetwood, and we were pleased to accept and invite them to the port.

The Health Check took place on 31st March / 1st April 2014, and once again allowed a useful external oversight of our MSMS and PMSC compliance. The MCA team concluded that “the evidence indicated that the requirements of the (PMSC) Code were being met”. A number of enhancements to our implementation of the code were suggested and will be acted upon across the whole group through updates to Group Marine Procedures.

In addition, two areas of best practice were identified (the process of reviewing operational manuals, and emergency plans; and the use of the MarNIS system).

A report was submitted to the Harbour Authority for each of their (3) meetings during 2014, highlighting current concerns and issues, and providing statistical indicators of navigational and environmental incidents, including trends categorised by incident type as well as by port (region). Selected Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were also detailed in each four monthly report. Towards the end of 2014, revised KPIs and KPI presentation was agreed by the Harbour Authority Board members, and will be implemented for all reports produced for the 2015 calendar year.

ABP is required to confirm compliance with the PMSC in writing to the DfT (via the MCA) at 3 yearly intervals. The last such request for confirmation was promulgated in late 2014 and a reply sent during March 2015.

The following ports were internally audited by the Marine Advisor and / or his Deputy during 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ayr and Troon</td>
<td>2nd July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth / Teignmouth</td>
<td>6th March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>23rd to 25th April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>12th May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber Ports</td>
<td>20th August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HES</td>
<td>21st August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>17th to 18th June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>18th September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow and Fleetwood</td>
<td>3rd December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silloth</td>
<td>2nd December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s Lynn</td>
<td>25th March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garston</td>
<td>4th December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Port Marine Safety Code allows for the MCA to undertake occasional compliance audits, now known as “Health Checks” (often triggered by incidents or other causes for concern). One such “Health Check” was undertaken at an ABP port during 2014 at the Port of Fleetwood, but this was not due to any cause for concern. Rather the MCA wished to undertake an audit of a smaller port, and co-ordinate it with other work they had in the area. They therefore asked us if we would be content to host a visit at Fleetwood, and we were pleased to accept and invite them to the port.
3.0 Key personnel – ABP Harbour Authority

An organisation chart (correct for 1st January 2015) is shown below in Fig. 1.

- The Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of ABP Harbour Authority is James Cooper.
- During 2014 the ABP Marine Advisor, and Designated Person for all ports except Humber was Capt. Philip Cowing.
- The ABP Deputy Marine Advisor, and Designated Person for Humber was William Heaps.
- From 1st January 2015, Capt. Phil Cowing became the Designated Person for all ABP ports. The previous conflict of interest at Humber Estuary Services was removed when he changed role to Head of Marine, Humber; handing over day to day responsibility of HES to a new Harbour Master Humber, Capt. A. Firman.
- William Heaps remained the Deputy Marine Advisor.
- A new HR Director was appointed at the end of 2014. Kay Penney took up SHA Board membership from 2015.

Fig. 1: ABP (Harbour Authority) Organisation Chart
### 4.0 Vessel Movement Statistics

**Fig. 2: Shipping Movements 2010 - 2014**
Annual Shipping Movements - Derived from PAVIS - not including small vessel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goole</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>1,468</td>
<td>1,465</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>2,451</td>
<td>2,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>5,595</td>
<td>5,677</td>
<td>5,921</td>
<td>5,861</td>
<td>5,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber Estuary Services</td>
<td>29,251</td>
<td>28,531</td>
<td>29,112</td>
<td>28,754</td>
<td>29,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immingham</td>
<td>11,459</td>
<td>13,958</td>
<td>10,862</td>
<td>10,519</td>
<td>10,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>69,145</td>
<td>65,437</td>
<td>64,881</td>
<td>64,848</td>
<td>67,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrow</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleetwood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garston</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td>2,022</td>
<td>1,894</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Lynn</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,602</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silloth</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teignmouth</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troon</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>2,582</td>
<td>2,707</td>
<td>2,541</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>1,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Talbot</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>1,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>132,545</strong></td>
<td><strong>130,747</strong></td>
<td><strong>126,873</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,530</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>69,145</td>
<td>65,437</td>
<td>64,881</td>
<td>64,848</td>
<td>67,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humber</td>
<td>49,581</td>
<td>51,424</td>
<td>49,045</td>
<td>48,948</td>
<td>49,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Wales</td>
<td>5,807</td>
<td>5,873</td>
<td>5,690</td>
<td>4,921</td>
<td>5,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Sea Ports</td>
<td>8,012</td>
<td>8,013</td>
<td>7,257</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>5,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>132,545</strong></td>
<td><strong>130,747</strong></td>
<td><strong>126,873</strong></td>
<td><strong>125,296</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,530</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 3: Annual Shipping Movements by Region 2012 - 2014

Fig. 4: Shipping Movement Trend 2010 - 2014
Numbers of shipping movements have been collated from the ABP PAVIS system to ensure consistency between all the ports. An automated process of generating the necessary reports from PAVIS has been developed to generate KPI statistics, and the reporting procedure was refined during 2014 to remove some minor errors in previous counts. Figures for all years shown in this report have been retrospectively corrected for consistency.

The statistics include only commercial movements and include both inbound and outbound passages, as well as transits through ABP Harbour authority areas to and from non ABP ports (mainly applies to Humber and Southampton).

Where a vessel moves from one ABP Harbour Authority into another (for example from HES into one of the Humber ports, the same vessel will generate a movement count for both ports on the same voyage.

Some ports may have a significant number of other vessel movements which are not recorded, especially small craft (including wind farm vessels and some categories of tug and tows). At present only Humber region records these moves, so for consistency they have not been included for any region in this report. However, the Harbour Authority Board has recognised that such commercial vessel movements are significant when considering Port Marine Safety, and have requested that small vessel moves are recorded and reported on, in the future. This requires a modification to the PAVIS software, which is being implemented during 2015.

Furthermore, many ports have significant numbers of leisure vessel movements which cannot be feasibly recorded. This is particularly true in Southampton where leisure movements are so numerous that it is not possible to even estimate the total number with any degree of accuracy. However, incidents involving leisure craft may be recorded, especially if the incident is significant (threat to life etc.) or involves a commercial vessel. The majority of minor incidents involving leisure craft only, in any of our HA areas, are not notified to the Harbour Authority, and not therefore recorded.

ABP ports handled 127,530 shipping movements during 2014, with a significant majority being in Southampton and the Humber Estuary.

This represents an increase of 2,234, or 1.8% compared with 2013.

Further details of shipping movements per port are illustrated in Figure 9.

5.0 Incident Statistics

ABP assesses all marine risks at each port, and ensures that suitable controls are in place to reduce the risk of any hazard to as low a level as is reasonably practicable – the key principle of the PMSC.

ABP assesses all marine risks at each port, and ensures that suitable controls are in place to reduce the risk of any hazard to as low a level as is reasonably practicable – the key principle of the PMSC.

Any incidents which occur are recorded and investigated. Such investigations will lead to reviews of the associated risk assessments, and recommendations being made to improve control measures and help prevent similar incidents occurring in the future. This process is clearly documented in the ABP Group Port Marine Operational Procedures Manual and implemented at each port and harbour. All ABP ports use the group “MarNIS” incident and risk assessment database (software package) to ensure consistent reporting, investigation and follow up of all incidents. Particular emphasis is placed on reporting and recording potential incidents, which are investigated in the same way as actual events.

Incident numbers and trends are key indicators of the success of the Harbour Authority’s Safety Management System, and as a consequence incident numbers (both navigational safety and environmental) were reported in detail to the Harbour Authority at the four-monthly SHA Board meetings during 2014.

The DfT has also begun a pilot scheme to collect marine incident data from all UK ports, and ABP has contributed to the pilot project helping to develop the collection of data. Our anonymised incident data was reported to this scheme for 2013 (during 2014), and 2014 figures will also be provided when requested.

The following figures have been extracted from the MarNIS incident database, and illustrate some of the key statistics from across the ABP group of ports for 2014, as well as trends over the last 5 years.
Figure 5: Actual Nautical Safety Incidents (2014 compared with 2013)
Figure 6: Actual Nautical Safety Incidents 2014 (by ABP port)
Figure 7: Total Navigational Incidents by Port 2010 - 2014
Figure 8: Shipping Movements 2014 and 2013
Figure 9: Navigational Safety Incidents per 1000 Vessel Movements 2010 - 2014

Navigational Safety Incidents per 1000 Vessel Movements
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Figure 10: Incidents per 1000 Movements - ABP Group 2010 - 2014

Incidents per Thousand Shipping Movements ABP Harbour Authority (All Ports)

- Incidents/1000
- 5 Year Average
- Incident Trend
6.0 Key Performance Indicators

In addition to review of incident statistics, ABP has chosen a number of relevant and measurable indicators to help give regular assurance to the Board that principle objectives of the PMSC are being met.

These indicators give a broad overview of consistency across the varied ports making up the ABP Group, and are not intended to replace regular audit and verification.

The indicators approved by the Board, and reported in full to the four-monthly meeting of the Harbour Authority during 2014 were:

- Shipping movements by port
- Number of pilotage acts
- Number of PEC acts
- Pilotage and PEC acts per 1000 shipping movements
- Number of navigational risk assessments (including number overdue)
- Navigational risk assessments – risk scores
- Number of environmental risk assessments (including number overdue)
- Environmental risk assessments – risk scores
- Risk assessment activity in period
- Number of navigational incidents
- Navigational incidents by incident type
- Navigational incidents per 1000 shipping movements
- Ratio of actual to potential incidents
- Marine environmental incidents
- Marine environmental incidents per 1000 shipping movements
- GLA navigation aid availability
- Number of marine toolbox talks

Not all of these indicators will be applicable to all ports.

Key performance indicators do not confirm compliance with either the MSMS or the PMSC; rather they give timely and measurable indications of changes in trends, allowing more thorough investigation to be initiated should the indicator suggest negative impacts on navigational safety.

The indicators for Pilotage / PEC holders and acts draw attention to changes in business conditions, and give confidence that one of the Authority’s most powerful risk control options (Pilotage, or the PEC process) is being adequately used.

Graphs (summarising the reports given to the HA Board), and showing some of these indicators during 2014 are shown on the following pages. (Those relating to shipping movements / incidents have been illustrated in sections 4 and 5 of this report).

Following discussion at HA Board meetings, and further guidance from the CEO and Director of Compliance, the above indicators are to be further refined in 2015. In particular graphical presentation will be adjusted to more clearly show trends and targets, and the environmental indicators (which are reported separately by the Sustainable Development department) will be dropped to allow greater focus on Port Marine Safety.
Fig. 11: Number of Pilotage Acts per Pilot 2012 - 2014

Fig. 12: Number of Pilotage and PEC Acts per 1000 Vessel Moves 2014
Fig. 13: Number of Navigational Risk Assessments 2014

Navigational Risk Assessments 2014

Fig. 14: Risk Scores 2014

Average MarNIS Navigational Assessment Risk Score
Fig. 15: Risk Assessment Activity 2014

Risk Assessment Activity

Fig. 16: Ratio of Potential to Actual Incidents 2014

Ratio of Potential to Actual Navigational Incidents 2014
7.0 Commentary

This report reviews the performance of the Associated British Ports Statutory Harbour Authority (and Teignmouth Quay Company SHA) across 22 diverse ports and harbours. The report does not seek to replace more detailed reports produced at port and harbour level.

This report has drawn on the reports and data that were routinely collected to produce four-monthly reports to the Harbour Authority meetings, as well as other data collected through ABP’s MarNIS and PAVIS software systems.

7.1 Incident Data

The incident data collected during 2014, when normalised against the number of shipping movements, shows that as a whole the group has an incident rate of 3.82 per 1000 recorded vessel movements. This is an improvement on the figure for 2013 (4.59) and shows a reversing of upward trend that has been evident since 2006. (Note some values are different from 2013 report due to recalculation of shipping numbers). However, as previously suggested, this may be only in part be due to an increase in incidents. It is suggested that the more rigorous collection of incident data in recent years played a part in the increase. However, now that collection of both incident and movement data has been standardised a true trend should develop, and this value forms one of the current key KPI values.

7 ports had incident rates greater than 5/1000 movements, but those with the highest incident rates were all short sea ports with low shipping numbers. In these cases a small number of incidents have a significant impact on the statistics. For example, Barrow has an incident rate of 40.2, but this arises from only 8 incidents throughout the year. As in previous years all of the Humber ports show relatively high incident rates compared with other ABP ports which is attributed to the high proportion of movements through lock entrances, and in shallow waters relative to other regions. In addition there continues to be a very robust level of reporting in this region, but there has been a continued programme of training to ensure all ABP ports report consistently.

Equipment Failure (vessel) remains the most significant incident type, followed by impact with structure (usually lock entrance incidents in those ports with enclosed docks). Equipment failure vessel is most commonly reported at the larger ports, once again indicating that reporting procedures may be more developed at those ports (where often a dedicated staff member is responsible for entering reports into the MarNIS system).

From January 2014 onwards, new guidance issued to users ensured that equipment failure vessel is correctly categorised – and many such incidents were categorised as potential rather than actual events (if no damage or injury occurred). This is clearly seen in the number of incidents reported in the Humber region, where HES, Goole and Grimsby all reported significantly less actual incidents than in 2013, and with Immingham reporting slightly fewer and only Hull reporting more than in the previous year.
7.2 KPIs

Shipping numbers and incidents have been commented upon in previous sections.

The number of acts of pilotage per pilot has been shown for the first time this year. On average, each pilot completes just over 100 acts per year, and the trend over the last three years is generally fairly constant, although downward on the Humber due to changes in working practices. As would be expected those ports with longer pilotage acts (Humber / Wales) have a lower number of acts than those ports with shorter passage times. Furthermore those ports with dedicated pilots also achieve more acts per individual, compared to short sea ports where pilotage may only form part of an individual’s duties.

The most striking anomaly in the chart is the rapid increase in acts per person in Ayr and Troon – resulting from a combination of new pilotage directions in Troon requiring more vessels to take a pilot, and sickness resulting in a significant reduction in the number of available pilots (effectively to one).

The second pilotage graph shows the significance of pilotage as a control factor in many ABP ports with 3 ports (Barrow, Ipswich and Southampton having close to 100% of commercial movements taking place under Pilotage (or PEC holders). The majority of other ports have around 50% or more movements similarly controlled.

With respect to navigational risk assessments, the KPI graphs show a wide disparity in the number of assessments between ports (from less than 10 to more than 100). This is in part explained by size and complexity of ports, but the variance is likely to decrease as guidance is followed to ensure consistency of assessment approach across the group. The same chart shows that while there have been periods when quite large percentages of assessments have become overdue, in every case this is rectified by the next reporting period.

The average risk assessment score again indicates consistency of approach across the group, and highlights a few ports where risk is below group average – the Marine Advisor is reviewing this as part of the audit procedure to ensure risks have not been under-estimated.

Risk assessment activity is a new indicator, and shows how often assessments are looked at in each reporting period of 4 months. For many ports this is a low number and this metric will be monitored – it is suggested that an average of greater than one would be a reasonable absolute minimum.

Finally the ratio of potential to actual incidents remains low. It would always be hoped that for every actual report, a significantly greater number of potential reports would be made, to enable measures to be taken early to help prevent actual incidents occurring. The target figure for this metric is therefore at least 1 (and it would be hoped to increase the target in future. However, during 2014 few ABP ports exceeded a ratio of 1 in any reporting period.
7.3 2014 Reviewed

Once again, the Marine Advisor and / or Deputy visited all ABP ports during 2014, and completed audits of each location with all ABP Harbour Masters. The majority of Deputies, as well as other key staff were also involved.

During 2014, audits continued to focus on ensuring that action points previously identified had been fully addressed. In addition, particular emphasis was placed on looking for evidence that procedures outlined in manuals were actually followed “on the ground”. It was also intended to meet all of the Port Directors on a one to one basis to discuss the audits in their own regions, and PMSC matters in detail. The MCA has previously specifically identified this aspect of our audit process as an example of Best Practice. However, these meetings were again delayed as a result of pressures on staff time with two of the four meetings held in 2014 (SSP and South Wales). The overdue meetings in Southampton / Humber had been completed by the time this report was finalised, and all 4 Directors should be met with again during 2015.

Additional visits were made to ports as required (particularly by the DMA) to offer extra support, training and advice – especially with review of Port Marine Operational Procedures Manuals; and in connection with MarNIS. In the latter case, a newly developed training package was delivered to ADM / AHM grade staff on the Humber and in East Anglia, with the aim of involving more operational staff in MarNIS risk assessment, and especially, incident reporting. The training will be delivered to other ports / regions in 2015.

Following the secondment of the DMA to the SACD project and the MA’s involvement in Humber development projects, 2014 saw an element of “catching up”. However, the audit schedule was maintained, as were reports for Board meetings.

Other achievements were publication of the safety plan, and continuous improvement plan, and update to the marine policy and continued contributions to national committees and advisory boards. Planned reviews of the Group Operational Procedures Manual and Training Policy were not completed but remain in hand for completion during 2015.

During the year, 8 formal “Marine Advisor Notices” were issued to all ports. These covered such matters as safety alerts, and standing instructions to be followed by all ports. All such notices are now time framed, and where appropriate require specific responses to allow the MA to record that notices have been received, and required actions followed up.

The 2014 Harbour Master’s Conference was hosted by Humber Estuary Services, and once again provided an opportunity for all Group Harbour Masters and Deputies to meet and exchange best practice, as well as listen to presentations from external organisations. On the first day of the event a very useful training session was delivered by Andrew Jackson (specialist marine lawyers) which added more detail and practical advice to previous training sessions on the use of Harbour Master Powers, and enforcement techniques.

During the year three new Directors received formal induction training with respect to their duties under the PMSC. This took place as part of the June HA meeting held in Barrow, and thus provided the opportunity for refresher training for the longer serving board members also present.
8.0 Progress Against Objectives Set in Previous Report

As noted above, a formal “Marine Safety Plan” was approved by the HA Board during 2014, and progress against this plan is reported, and discussed at each HA meeting.

In 2013 (prior to publication of the formal plan) objectives for improvement (as required by the PMSC) were identified in the annual report. The following objectives were, and progress against those objectives is noted (in bold):

- Monitor consistent incident reporting, including potential incidents through internal audit of compliance with new MarNIS guidelines. **This formed a key aspect of 2014 port audits**
- Implement new KPIs from January 2014 onwards. **This was achieved**
- Develop a long term plan and clear improvement objectives for the future. **Safety plan and Improvement plan published**
- Make use of shared drive to disseminate best practice, and reports. **Drive set up and in use**
- Improve output of internal audit process with more robust tracking of findings, setting objectives, assigning responsibilities and tracking progress. **Spread sheet based system maintained and improved; however there is recognition that a more professional solution is required**
- Undertake further Harbour Act reviews. **All reviews now complete**
- Review Group Marine Training Policy. **Not completed**
- Review Group Operations Manual / Marine Policy / MSMS overview. **Not completed**
- Complete a further cycle of port audits and follow up findings. **Completed**
- Maintain momentum of Marine Apprenticeship scheme, and investigate feasibility of a Pilot Apprenticeship scheme. **Completed, and pilotage apprentice scheme approved by Board for first intake to commence in September 2015**

As previously noted, two key targets were missed (Operations Manual and Training Policy updates), but otherwise good progress was made against targets, reflecting the additional time available to the small marine advisor team with reduced external pressure from other projects.
## 9.0 Future Objectives and Plans

Future objectives are now identified in the separately published Marine Safety Plan, and progress regularly reported to the Board. The snapshot below represents the status of the plan at the end of 2014:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Time Scale</th>
<th>Progress at 01/02/2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Implement long term plan which focuses on adding value to internal audit process by following up actions and making tangible improvements to the MSMS</td>
<td>Consider sourcing an external tool (software) to track actions / outcomes.</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Spreadsheet developed to track actions. ABPmer has advised on ability to provide a software solution, and will now be asked to provide estimated costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Keep KPIs under review and introduce new / relevant KPIs as appropriate</td>
<td>Monitor KPIs and review as required.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Tool box talk KPI was reviewed at HM Conference 2014 DMA has met CEO and Director, Compliance to discuss future improvements to be implemented from reporting period 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>To ensure that all ports follow the ABP model for the MSMS (consistent documentation with no omissions)</td>
<td>MA to have digital access to all local MSMS documents</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move common themes from regional documents to group document</td>
<td>Ensure all local documents conform to a group template, and do not repeat/contradict group manual</td>
<td>July 2015</td>
<td>End 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>To ensure consistent application / implementation of the MSMS across all ports</td>
<td>Successful annual internal audit at each location– audit actions closed within agreed timescales</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Audit Schedule up to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Review Marine Training Policy</td>
<td>Re-issue policy with focus on evidencing appropriate occupational standards rather than training courses attended.</td>
<td>February 2015</td>
<td>Ongoing – now working in conjunction with newly appointed Marine Training Manager, though unlikely to meet target date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Review Marine Policy</td>
<td>Annual or as required by external factors</td>
<td>End each year</td>
<td>Completed for 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target #</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Time Scale</td>
<td>Progress at 01/02/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Review Group Marine Operations Manual</td>
<td>Annual or as required by external factors</td>
<td>End each year</td>
<td>Commenced for 2014 – not yet complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review effectiveness of marine apprenticeship scheme, and consider introduction of additional schemes (pilot apprenticeship)</td>
<td>Continuation of existing scheme with regular new intakes</td>
<td>2014, 2016</td>
<td>2014 Apprentice intake started Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gain approval for Pilot apprenticeship scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014 Apprentice intake started Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Review Tide and Weather systems (Group wide)</td>
<td>Specify and commission a new system accessible to all ports</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>Scoping of project commenced, awaiting allocation of IT resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implement specified solution</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Harbour Directions</td>
<td>Complete initial application for Powers of Harbour direction</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop group template for required directions and introduce them as required</td>
<td>July 2016</td>
<td>Awaiting DfT Designation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plan is continually reviewed as required, in compliance with the duties of a Statutory Harbour Authority, and the requirements of the PMSC.


10 Summary

This annual review reveals that ABP continues to make best efforts to remain compliant with the Port Marine Safety Code, across a wide range of ports having very different levels of shipping movement numbers, and types of visiting vessels.

ABP, through the Marine Advisor's office, strives for consistent compliance with the code and this report confirms that aim is being achieved.

The Marine Policy also states that ABP will aim for continual improvement in standards of Marine and Navigation Safety, and this report has identified areas where such improvements can be achieved.

11 Public Compliance Statement

Sections 3.20 – 3.22 of the Port Marine Safety Code (and section 2.2 of the Guide to Good Practice) require the Duty Holder to publicly state continued compliance with the Code.

During 2014 ABP policy was revised, and this report is now published on the corporate web site. Furthermore, the Board, as Duty Holder, has approved the following statement which will be published on the ABP Intranet and also relevant external ABP web sites:

"The Directors of Associated British Ports, as Harbour Authority and Duty Holder, recognise that they have a responsibility under the Port Marine Safety Code (PMSC) to publicly report on PMSC performance.

An Annual Performance Review of the Marine Safety Management System at ABP ports and harbours, for the year ended 31 December 2014, was conducted under the direction of the Designated Person Capt. P. J. Cowing, Marine Advisor to the Board.

The Board are pleased to confirm that the Annual Performance Review 2014 indicates that the requirements of the PMSC are being met."