Please keep up to date on the latest news and the high quality services that AWP marine provided: http://awpmarine.com/

Issue 7

Inspector Bulletin

Latest updates & News feeds for Inspectors. 2nd Aug 2019

• Advice and Guidance • • Regulation Updates

Safety vs Security

VIQ 5.10 Are the crew aware of the requirements to keep external doors, ports and windows closed in port and is the accommodation space atmosphere maintained at a slightly higher pressure than that of the ambient air?

The subject of Safety vs Security was raised at the recent auditors meeting in Windsor and a valuable presentation by Tony Jones highlighted the issues and concerns. Below courtesy of Tony are examples of compromised safety situations on vessels external door preventing access from the outside in an emergency;



VIQ guidance states Doors should not normally be locked in port. However, where there are security concerns, measures may need to be employed to prevent unauthorised access while at the same time ensuring that there is a means of escape for the personnel inside. (ISGOTT 24.1)

Example observation;

Inspector Observations: Accommodation door on main deck Stbd side was locked using a padlock which could be opened from inside by opening a butterfly nut. However the

shore based or emergency response team would require key for access to the accommodation.

Initial Operator Comments: We respectfully disagree with this observation.

The requirement for accommodation doors in ports to be closed as per ISGOTT 24.2 strictly comply and the use of locking device is only in place while there are any security concerns in

order to prevent unauthorized access in the interests of the safety and security of the vessel and its crew.

As witnessed during the inspection the mentioned locking device does not jeopardize with the safety on board; means of escape for the personnel inside are established (see attached

photograph) and all responsible crewmembers on duty are equipped with a key to secure entrance to the accommodation from outside if required.

I believe there is good need to challenge the operators comments here that are highlighted in green as the inspector clearly states the vessel was operating in security level 1 so why should the door be padlocked rather than sealed?

OCIMF response to the issue of safety and security was discussed at the auditors meeting June 2019 and they stated that "security should be ensured, but not at the cost of safety and where situations are encountered onboard that suggest the compromise of safety then this should be recorded in the most appropriate question". This encourages observations to be raised accordingly where compartments are padlocked rather than sealed where there are low security concerns.

VIQ5.26 Is gas welding and burning equipment in good order and spare oxygen and acetylene cylinders stored apart in a well-ventilated location outside of the accommodation and engine room?

Guidance notes make reference to the British Compressed Gases Association Code of Practice CP7 for safe use of oxy-acetylene equipment. CP7 section 6.2 further states "Correct hose connections, properly fitted and tested to BS EN 1256 (43) and retained by suitable clips or ferrules, are essential. Re-usable worm-drive clamps shall not be used."



CP7 Section 5.3 Maintenance Table 1:

REGULATORS and their integral protective devices: Functional tests to ensure correct operation shall be conducted annually by a *suitably trained person*. Typically this will include a creep test to ensure regulator

integrity. *Annual maintenance shall be carried out by a person who has been formally trained to demonstrate that he

(i) Sufficient practical experience of oxy-fuel and related gas equipment,

and

has:

(ii) Theoretical knowledge of the functioning of the equipment, the properties of gases used, the potential defects and hazards which may occur and their importance to the integrity and safety of the equipment.

" Our company goals are simply stated with the target towards No accidents, No incidents and No negative feedback from our customers and Employees "



AWP Marine Consultancy Ltd





Issue 7

Inspector Bulletin Latest updates & News feeds for Inspectors. 2nd Aug 2019

• Experience Transfer

Advice and Guidance
Regulation Updates

MEG4 issues

VIQ 9.7 Is there a policy in place for the testing of winch brakes and are the results recorded?

MEG 4 has introduced new terminology with regards to the rendering of winch brakes and it is good to reiterate this point here for inspectors as we often come across the terms "rendering" and "holding" interpreted in different contexts.

Brake Holding Load

OCIMF recommends a brake holding load setting of 60% of ship design MBL, on the first layer instead of the 80% value in ISO 3730. The brake should have the capability to be set up to the 80% value, to always allow a setting at 60% to be achieved irrespective of wear and tear on the brake.

Rendering Load

Sometimes also known as stall pull or stall heaving capacity.

This is defined as the line pull the winch will exert when the control lever is in heave and the mooring line is held stationary. A high rendering load is desirable to winch a ship onto the pier against high environmental loads. However, the rendering load should not be so high that there is any danger of mooring line breakage and should never exceed 50% of ship design MBL.

The main purpose of brake testing is to verify that the brake will render at a load less than the ship design MBL. (MEG 6.4.6)

Each winch should be tested individually, and test should be carried out prior to the ship's delivery and then every year thereafter following recommendation in the MEG. In addition, individual winches should be tested after completion of any modification or repair involving the winch brakes, or upon any evidence of premature brake slippage or related malfunctions. Brakes should be tested to prove they render at a load that is equivalent to 60% of the ship design MBL (MEG 6.4.6.1)

Line Design Break Force (LDBF) - the minimum force that a new, dry, spliced mooring line will break at when tested according to Appendix B of MEG4. When selecting lines, the LDBF of a line shall be 100%-105% of the ship design MBL.

Working load limit (WLL) - The WLL is expressed as a percentage of ship design MBL and should be used as a limiting value in both ship design and operational mooring analyses. During operation, the WLL should not be exceeded. The WLL value is used as a limit with the standard environmental criteria and mooring layout when designing mooring systems.

The diagram extract from MEG 4 provides a good reference to the various settings;



Ships built post MEG4

Vessels built after MEG4 release should already have a ship design MBL to satisfy OCIMF Standard Environmental Criteria restraint requirements and each mooring line will have a LDBF. Mooring fittings and mooring winch brake rendering values are based on the ship design MBL..

Ships built prior to MEG4

Pre MEG 4 vessels should still follow the same guidance of setting their mooring winch brake rendering values based on the "line MBL" which, should be assumed to be synonymous with the ship design MBL, termed "Design Rope" MBL (See Figure 7,3 in MEG3).

Meg 4 further states;

1.9.1 While all new ships should be able to achieve all parts of the proposed MSMP structure, existing ships may experience limitations particularly in accessing original design information.

It is recommended that existing ships undertake the necessary due diligence to collate required information or align their operating practices with these fundamental safe mooring principles, so far as it is possible and practicable.

5.2.3 Existing ships may have deck equipment that results in a lower D/d ratio than is optimal (D/d ratio is the diameter of the bend divided by the diameter of the mooring line). Any bending of the line will immediately reduce its breaking strength. Repeated bending will reduce the service life of the mooring line. The Did ratio should be as large as possible to maximise mooring line strength and working life.

Operators may be able to address this by either replacing the fittings or adjusting maintenance activities in their LMP to account for the reduction in the service life of lines.



FIGURE 7.3: CALCULATION OF MOORING LINE MBL AND **RELATIONSHIP TO WINCH PARAMETERS**

AWP Marine Consultancy Ltd





Issue 7

Inspector Bulletin Latest updates & News feeds for Inspectors. 2nd Aug 2019

• Experience Transfer

Advice and Guidance
Regulation Updates

Placing Observations under the Most Appropriate Question within the VIQ

Inspectors are often getting challenged by operators where an observation is raised that it does not specifically fit under a VIQ question. During the last OCIMF auditors meeting OCIMF issued interim advice stated as follows "Guidance notes do not form rigid boundaries for the recording of observations and that where inspectors note issues that may not be covered by the guidance then that should not prevent them from recording observations". Hence we suggest to inspectors to take the nearest question suitable and raise the observation under this question. The point here is that the observation should be captured within the SIRE report to ensure that it is acted on and not omitted simply because it does not fit within the VIQ question specifically.

Interesting Observations



Disclaimer: this material discusses OCIMF activities based on personal experience and opinion and not necessarily in agreement with OCIMF or OCIMF members views.

Inspectors are encouraged to share their experiences for us all to learn from here

VIQ 5.47 Is the vessel provided with a safe means of access and are all available means of access (gangway / accommodation ladder / pilot ladder / transfer basket) in good order and well maintained?



In all of the above cases the weight will fall onto the spreader itself rather than the actual ladder ropes.



Pilot ladder secured using ship made brackets. The weight of the pilot will be supported by one step only. The hard edge of the top hull plate may damage the ropes

Pilot ladder should not be secured by shackles or trying to ship side rails. These rails are easily damaged and their strength cannot be guaranteed.

The above methods of securing pilot ladders are incorrect; the correct way to secure a pilot ladder is by the use of rope lashings to the side ropes attached to approved strong lashing points on deck.

The pilot ladder should be directly lashed tightly to a ring plate provided near the ship's side for exclusive service, with no other items connected. If the full length of the ladder is

not used, each of the two stopper ropes of an adequate length should be connected to a rigid structure such as the ring plate

Further on the subject of safe access attached link to Rightship safety circular on the use of accommodation ladders is well worth the read: https://www.rightship.com/wp-content/ uploads/2019/07/Safe-Gangway-Access-Tony-Honeyborne.pdf



Good Practises

Here we have an excellent tag out and lock out system to complement the permit to work onboard;







EMAIL: admin@awpmarine.com TELEPHONE: +44 (0) 151 792 4882