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MPA represents the international community of pilots. We use the resources of our membership to promote effective safety outcomes in pilotage as an essential public service

## BELIEFS

The public interest is best served by a fully regulated and cohesive pilotage service free of commercial pressure.

2 There is no substitute for the presence of a qualified pilot on the bridge.

3 IMO is the prime authority in matters concerning safety of international shipping.

4 All states should adopt a responsible approach based on proven safety strategies in establishing their own regulations, standards and procedures with respect to pilotage.

5 Existing and emerging information technologies are capable of enhancing on-board decision making by the maritime pilot.

## IMPA Safety Survey 2022

As with previous years the 2022 Safety Campaign highlights persistent non-compliance. We consider SOLAS regulation V/23, its associated IMO Assembly resolutions, and the ISO 799 series standards as the minimum requirement not an aspirational target.

Ports and pilotage providers are requesting information from ships on the age and certification of their pilot ladders. We are aware of reports of pilots refusing to board ships due to non-compliance with SOLAS regulations and non-conformities with ISO standards. The courage shown by pilots and ports in rejecting ships with non-compliant pilot transfer arrangements is to be admired. We expect more pilots and ports to adopt this approach if the persistence in pilot ladder defects continues. All pilot ladder issues can be fixed easily and cheaply.
IMPA welcomes the proactive approach of some ship owners to pilot transfer safety. Policies and procedures relating to the modification of trap-door arrangements, and giving pilot ladders a finite service life are actions which IMPA applauds.

Sadly, for some of these owners, their actions are undermined by the existence and supply of falsely certified and sub-standard pilot ladders. Self-certification by manufacturers is not a guarantee of quality. We would recommend that those responsible for procuring pilot ladders and associated equipment rely on the services of reputable manufacturers. Pilot ladders should not be accepted if not accompanied by valid third-party certification against both the requirements of SOLAS regulation $\mathrm{V} / 23$ and ISO 799-1:2019.

A high-quality, third-party certified pilot ladder supplied with care and an instruction manual from a reputable supplier costs approximately $\$ 900$. The presentation of a non-compliant pilot ladder speaks volumes about the overall safety culture onboard a ship and in the company responsible for managing it.
Unless those responsible for the design, construction, certification and operation of ships give pilot transfer arrangements the attention they deserve, we will remain concerned about
the unnecessary and persistent human cost. The industry is under pressure to reduce its carbon intensity and cut its greenhouse emissions. What cost will be associated with disruption to otherwise optimised voyages if a ship is unable to embark a pilot because of the condition of transfer arrangements?

We are in no doubt that treating pilot ladders as safety critical consumable items with a finite service life is a necessary step forward. It is in the interests of maritime pilots and shipboard personnel to make the maintenance of pilot transfer arrangements as simple as possible.

Pilots report that the crews they interact with say consistently they are busy people with conflicting priorities and time pressure. Repairing pilot ladders as a matter of routine onboard ships is now a traditional aspect of seamanship that really should be considered a last resort. Replacement is the most effective form of maintenance.

Shipowners need to support their personnel by implementing time-based replacement of pilot ladders and associated equipment. Company procedures contained in approved safety management systems should be clear and effective, at least reflect the latest ISO 799 series standards, and emphasise timely replacement. Far better to replace safety critical equipment too early than a minute too late.
"Replace them early, replace them often" is the best policy anybody involved in ship management can have.

There appears to be a rise in the number of marine pilots responding to social media posts normalising the rejection of non-compliant arrangements. There was unequivocal support at IMO in November 2022 for China's proposal to amend SOLAS regulation V/23. To us, this indicates the days of industry relying on the can-do attitude of marine pilots and their willingness to overlook non-compliant transfer arrangements are numbered.

IMPA looks forward to participation in the IMO's work in 2023 and we hope to make significant progress with amendments to SOLAS regulation V/23 to fully support the provision of safer pilot transfer arrangements.

## PARTICIPANTS

The chart below shows 4664 returns from participating IMPA members which have been grouped into 6 geographical areas.


COMPLIANCE AND NON-COMPLIANCE BY REGION



The following chart shows a breakdown of all returns by ship type.


COMPLIANCE AND NON-COMPLIANCE BY SHIP TYPE


The following chart shows a breakdown of all returns by means of transfer.

| $\quad$MEANS OF <br> TRANSFER | TOTAL <br> NUMBER | COMPLIANT | NON <br> COMPLIANT | NON <br> COMPLIANT <br> AS \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pilot Ladder | 2955 | 2445 | 510 | 17.26 |
| Combination | 1161 | 959 | 202 | 17.40 |
| Side Door and | 376 | 323 | 53 | 14.10 |
| Pilot Ladder |  |  | 1 | 1.89 |
| Gangway | 53 | 52 | 1 | 14.93 |
| Helicopter | 67 | 57 | 10 | 10.91 |
| Deck to Deck | 110 | 98 | 12 |  |



COMPLIANCE AND NON-COMPLIANCE BY MEANS OF TRANSFER



## NON-COMPLIANCE <br> BY TYPE OF DEFECT

The first pie chart shows the percentage of the defects that were reported and not reported to the Authority. The second pie chart shows non-compliance by type of defect. Both the number and percentage are shown.

DEFECTS REPORTED TO AUTHORITY

| TOTAL NUMBER OF NON-COMPLANT IN SURVEY | 783 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Number of defects reported to Authority | 95 |
| \% of non-compliant ships reported | 12.13 |
| \% of non-compliant ships not reported | 87.87 |

\% of non-compliant ships reported

\% of non-compliant ships not reported $\square$


NON-COMPLIANCE BY TYPE OF DEFECT

| NON-COMPLIANT BY TYPE OF DEFECT | TOTAL | AS \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Pilot ladder | 556 | 55.27 |
| Bulwark/Deck | 237 | 23.56 |
| Combination | 88 | 8.75 |
| Safety Equipment | 125 | 12.43 |
|  |  |  |
| Pilot Ladder |  |  |
| Bulwark/Deck $\square$ |  |  |
| Combination |  |  |
| $\square$ |  |  |

## NON-COMPLIANCE

 BY TYPE OF DEFECTThe first pie chart shows the types of defects of the pilot ladder. Both the number and percentage are shown. The second pie chart shows the types of defects of the bulwark / deck arrangements. Both the number and percentage are shown.

| DEFECTS OF PILOT LADDER | TOTAL | AS \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Steps not firmly against ship's hull | 45 | 5.98 |
| Steps not of suitable material | 10 | 1.33 |
| Incorrectly rigged retrieval line | 234 | 31.12 |
| Steps broken | 24 | 3.19 |
| Steps not equally spaced | 21 | 2.79 |
| Climb >9m on pilot ladder | 15 | 1.99 |
| Steps dirty/slippery | 22 | 2.93 |
| Sideropes not of suitable material | 27 | 3.59 |
| Pilot ladder outside mid-ships half length | 15 | 1.99 |
| Steps painted or varnished | 10 | 1.33 |
| Incorrect step fittings | 42 | 5.59 |
| No bulwark ladder | 7 | 0.93 |
| Steps not horizontal | 94 | 12.5 |
| Other | 186 | 24.73 |


| Steps not firmly against ship's hull | Sideropes not of suitable material |
| :---: | :---: |
| Steps not of suitable material | Pilot ladder outside mid-ships half length |
| Incorrectly rigged retrieval line | Steps painted or varnished |
| Steps broken | Incorrect step fittings |
| Steps not equally spaced | No bulwark ladder |
| Climb $>9 m$ on pilot ladder | Steps not horizontal |
| Steps dirty/slippery | Other |


| DEFECTS OF BULWARK / DECK | TOTAL | AS \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| No/faulty handhold stanchions | 72 | 27.17 |
| Ladder not secured properly | 164 | 61.89 |
| Other | 29 | 10.94 |



DEFECTS OF PILOT LADDER



## NON-COMPLIANCE <br> BY TYPE OF DEFECT

The first pie chart shows the combination defects. Both the number and percentage are shown. The second pie chart shows the safety equipment defects. Both the number and percentage are shown.


| SAFETY EQUIPMENT DEFECTS | TOTAL | AS \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Inadequate lighting at night | 19 | 10.27 |
| No lifebuoy with self-igniting light | 66 | 35.68 |
| No communication with the bridge | 20 | 10.81 |
| No heaving line | 42 | 22.7 |
| No responsible officer in attendance | 33 | 17.84 |
| Other | 5 | 2.7 |
| Inadequate lighting at night |  |  |
| No lifebuoy with self-igniting light |  |  |
| No communication with the bridge |  |  |
| No heaving line |  |  |
| No responsible officer in attendance |  |  |
|  |  | Other |

SAFETY EQUIPMENT DEFECTS
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