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## NEAR MISS ON A PILOT LADDER

The 1st of October is always an important date for me as it marks the start of the IMPA Pilot ladder survey, this year was a marked with my own near miss on a Pilot ladder when one of the side ropes parted above my head just as I was about to place my hand on it.

It was day light, 20 miles out in the Southern North Sea hanging on one side rope 5 mtrs above the sea. I heard a shout from the deck hand below me "Hang on we are coming
back in", my thoughts at the time was "up or down". I decided to climb down carefully to the Pilot boat. The deck hand assisted me back on board and the skill of the Launch Coxswain in manoeuvring the Pilot boat back alongside prevented a serious outcome. Hanging on one side rope above the North Sea certainly highlights the danger of our job but also the importance of the data gathered in the IMPA annual survey.

Captain Hywel J Pugh


Ladder liberally splattered with 'red lead' paint which should have immediately condemned it.

IMPA 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.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.

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 2020

Minimum acceptable standards related to maritime safety are prescribed by the SOLAS Convention. SOLAS regulation $\mathrm{V} / 23$ and associated supporting IMO Assembly Resolution A.1045(27) as amended by Resolution 1108(29) and MSC.1/Circ. 1428 specifically address pilot ladders. These standards have been adopted by IMO and, by association all Maritime Nations and all NonGovernmental Maritime Organisations.

Annual IMPA Pilot Ladder Surveys repeatedly demonstrate a consistent level of non-compliance with SOLAS regulation $\mathrm{V} / 23$. The 2020 survey returned a record number of reports; disappointingly results remain broadly in line with previous surveys. Furthermore, lives are still being lost.

Every year pilots are killed whilst embarking or disembarking via pilot ladders. One particular death this year highlights the persistent indifference of the industry as a major causal factor. A pilot fell to his death trying to board a ship which presented a proscribed pilot boarding arrangement. Many pilots question why this ship was allowed to trade.

Regrettably, we continue to find an unacceptable proportion of the world's maritime fleet failing to provide safe pilot boarding arrangements. Would such a non-compliance rate with
respect to fire extinguishers in an office be acceptable? Would a similar rate of non-compliance for lifesaving appliances on a vessel be tolerable? We all take considerable measures to avoid having to use firefighting and lifesaving appliances, yet rightly insist that they must meet Convention requirements. Why then, with regard to pilot ladders, which we expect to be used on a daily basis, is the maritime industry so heedless? It is not uncommon for a pilot, having refused a non-compliant ladder, to be then offered a compliant ladder that the Master normally keeps to one side for Port Sate Control inspections.

Sadly, the maritime industry repeatedly fails to implement its own agreed minimum standards. The adoption of IMO Resolutions is not "job done!" It is "job started!" All stakeholders should must ensure that the recommendations and guidelines in Resolutions and circulars are adhered to.

> Keeping mariners safe should not be seen as an optional extra in a modern maritime industry. Ship's Masters, Owners and all regulatory bodies have their part to play. All the photographs of non-compliant arrangements in this report were taken by pilots during the short period of the survey, all of them have had the approval of the Master, Shipowner, Flag State, Port State and Classification Society.

## PARTICIPANTS

The chart below shows 6,394 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 vessel type.


COMPLIANCE AND NON-COMPLIANCE BY VESSEL TYPE



## MEANS OF TRANSFER

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

| MEANS OF <br> TRANSFER | TOTAL <br> NUMBER | COMPLIANT | NON <br> COMPLIANT | NON <br> COMPLIANT <br> AS \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pilot Ladder | 3920 | 3456 | 464 | 11.84 |
| Combination | 1685 | 1443 | 242 | 14.36 |
| Side Door and <br> Pilot Ladder | 525 | 467 | 58 | 11.05 |
| Gangway | 126 | 119 | 7 | 5.56 |
| Helicopter | 92 | 89 | 3 | 3.26 |
| Deck to Deck | 127 | 112 | 15 | 11.81 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{6 4 7 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 6 8 6}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 9}$ |  |



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-COMPLIANT SHIPS IN SURVEY REPORTED | 774 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of defects reported to Authority | 96 |
| \% of ships reported |  |
| \% of ships not reported | 12.4 |



NON-COMPLIANCE BY TYPE OF DEFECT

| NON-COMPLIANT BY TYPE OF DEFECT | TOTAL | AS \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pilot ladder <br> Bulwark/Deck <br> Combination <br> Safety Equipment <br> TOTAL | $\begin{aligned} & 492 \\ & 228 \\ & 141 \\ & 113 \\ & 974 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50.51 \\ 23.41 \\ 14.48 \\ 11.6 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  | adder /Deck nation |
|  | Sa | ment |

The 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 \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not against ship's hull | 69 | 10.36 |
| Steps not of suitable material | 5 | 0.75 |
| Poorly rigged retrieval line | 138 | 20.72 |
| Steps broken | 22 | 3.3 |
| Steps not equally spaced | 29 | 4.35 |
| Pilot Ladder more than 9 metres | 5 | 0.75 |
| Steps dirty/slippery | 29 | 4.35 |
| Sideropes not of suitable material | 8 | 1.2 |
| Pilot Ladder too far forward/Aft | 17 | 2.55 |
| Steps painted | 19 | 2.85 |
| Incorrect step fittings | 34 | 5.11 |
| No bulwark ladder | 7 | 1.05 |
| Steps not horizontal | 121 | 18.17 |
| Other | 163 | 24.47 |
| TOTAL | 666 |  |
| Not against ship's hull | Sideropes not of suitable material |  |
| Steps not of suitable material | Pilot Ladder too farforward/Aft |  |
| Poorly rigged retrieval line | Steps painted |  |
| Steps broken | Incorrect step fittings |  |
| Steps not equally spaced | No bulwark ladder |  |
| Pilot Ladder more than 9 metres | Steps not horizontal |  |
| Steps dirty/slippery |  | Other |
| DEFECTS OF BULWARK / DECK | TOTAL | AS \% |
| No/faulty handhold stanchions | 44 | 17.39 |
| Ladder not secured properly | 183 | 72.33 |
| Other | 26 | 10.28 |
| TOTAL | 253 |  |
| No/faulty handhold stanchions |  |  |
| Ladder not secured properly |  |  |
|  |  | Other |

DEFECTS OF PILOT LADDER


DEFECTS OF BULWARK / DECK


## 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.

| COMBINATION DEFECTS | TOTAL | AS \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accommodation Ladder not leading aft | 2 | 0.81 |
| Lower platform stanchions / rail incorrect rigged | 32 | 12.96 |
| Accommodation ladder too steep (>45 degrees) | 22 | 8.91 |
| Pilot Ladder not attached 1-5m above Accommodation Ladder | 59 | 23.89 |
| Lower platform not horizontal | 31 | 12.55 |
| Ladder(s) not secured to ship's side | 51 | 20.65 |
| Lower platform less than 5 metres above the sea | 26 | 10.53 |
| Other | 24 | 9.72 |
| TOTAL | 247 |  |
| Accommodation Ladder not leading aft | Lower platform not horizontal |  |
| Lower platform stanchions / rail incorrect rigged | Ladder(s) not secured to ship's side |  |
| Accommodation Ladder too steep (>45 degrees) | Lower platform less than 5 metres above the sea |  |
| Pilot Ladder not attached 1.5 m above Accommodation Ladder | Other |  |

COMBINATION DEFECTS


SAFETY EQUIPMENT DEFECTS


| SAFETY EQUIPMENT DEFECTS | TOTAL | AS \% |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Inadequate lighting at night | 36 | 21.43 |
| No lifebuoy with self-igniting light | 49 | 29.17 |
| No VHF communication with the bridge | 10 | 5.95 |
| No heaving line | 36 | 21.43 |
| No responsible officer in attendance | 31 | 18.45 |
| Other |  |  |
| TOTAL | 6 | 3.57 |
| Inadequate lighting at night |  |  |
| No lifebuoy with self-igniting light | $\square$ |  |
| No VHF communication with the bridge | $\square$ |  |
| No heaving line | $\square$ |  |



## THE INTERNATIONAL <br> MARITIME PILOT'S ASSOCIATION

## IMPA OFFICERS
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Captain Simon Pelletier - Canada

## Senior Vice President / Treasurer

Captain Jean-Philippe Casanova - France

Vice Presidents
Captain Alvaro Moreno - Panama
Captain Choi, Yeong Sig - Korea
Captain John Pearn - UK
Captain Oumar Dramé - Senegal
Captain Ricardo Falcão - Brazil

## IMPA SECRETARIAT

## Secretary General

Nick Cutmore

Executive Assistant
Eliane Blanch

