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Good evening

Although I share much of the frustration at shifting things to a valid competency model, there are considerations from both a real politic and historical perspectives that we need to understand if we are ever to successfully achieve change. Although I may have been contaminated by the IMO process, I have come to believe that this is the only vehicle that can achieve real change, albeit that this will be frustratingly slow. This is because there are just not a sufficiently large proportion of ship operators who insist on their seagoing personnel being genuinely competent and/or who maintain sufficiently robust systems to ensure that they are so.

This is no way an indictment of the leading employers who live and breathe such approaches or the work of InterManager and Intertanko in promoting systems to achieve this. It is that there are the rest of the ship operators just do not care enough. The consequence is that there is insufficient premium paid to competent seagoing personnel and insufficient premium and differentiation given to those in MET who do ensure that their graduates are capable. The system is therefore in a race to the bottom that can tragically now only be addressed through regulation when it really should be driven by operators.

After all, if companies just stopped employing seafarers from countries and colleges who had not ensured that they were competent, there would be a compelling driver for change. One look at the EU reluctance to apply definitive sanctions in the Philippines in the wake of repeated audit concerns and the willingness of European employers to continue to employ seafarers where they know that the system has not ensured their competence (except for the leading operators who independently assess) this speaks volumes to those who do aspire to better in our industry. The real tragedy in the Philippines case is for the few top quality schools who are as good as anything in the world but who are very much tarred by the lowest common denominator.

I do want to respond to a few of the other thoughts of the day.

Some points of history need to be remembered:

a) The structure of STCW was heavily influenced by Andy Winbow who had been instrumental in pushing the UK system into the VQ system as Chief Examiner in the UK at the time and who wrote many of the initial papers that led to the 95 revision. At the time, I was in very close correspondence with him as we sought to introduce our own competency based approach in New Zealand but avoiding what we believed were major pitfalls in the initial UK VQ approach. Of course, Andy shifted to IMO employment before the revision was finalised and I believe effectively orchestrated the agenda from behind the scenes.

Although the initial 95 revision was heavily influenced by the UK, I can say that there has been relatively little influence by the UK delegations over the Manila review process and in recent years. In fact, the UK has been somewhat out of step in most of the key issues in recent times and is often treated with a level of derision in the working parties and drafting groups where they tend to resist progress vehemently until 5 pm an then go home while everyone else gets on with the work. Of course, UK thinking does have a level of influence given the number of UK based NGOs and red ensign based member states, but this is probably as well balanced in terms of content and assessment by those pushing for a more progressive system.

The bottom line is that the STCW Code and Convention is and was intended to be required as a competency based approach and this is almost never debated...
anymore within the sub committee. The issues arise from ignorance about what this should actually look like and/or a marked reluctance from both many member states and significant NGOs to move forward from traditional cognitive based examinations as a proxy for competence. It is through education about competency based models and convincing the member states that we will make progress.

b) The use of KUPs in STCW 95 were intended to equate to the Knowledge, Skills and Attitude components understood to represent competency in the southern hemisphere interpretation of competency based assessment. There are at least 5 streams of competency based approaches evident across the maritime world, each with its own origin, drafting rules and practice. Having looked in some detail at these systems, my view is that each has roughly equal validity and it would be both somewhat ignorant and it would be naïve for GlobalMET to suggest that any particular model is superior to another. Proficiency within the context of the Convention and Code is intended to convey practical competence, ie, the ability to perform rather than just know. It was intended to encompass the affective and psychomotor components of competence whereas the cognitive elements were intended to be captured in the knowledge and understanding. My own view is that this all needs to be far more holistic, but even the latest competency based variants I have seen at times differentiate knowledge based performance criteria from performance and a case can be made for why this differentiation continues to be important.

c) It is a matter of overarching protocol that no subservient instrument can conflict a UN endorsed international convention. Thus, the STCW Code must be completely consistent with the Convention and Model Courses must be completely consistent with both. Model Course developers can interpret these only to the extent that they do not change what is actually stated in these instruments. Although this frustrated me totally during the 7 series revisions, I do understand the logic. The dangers of creating new regulation through model courses is something that needs to be guarded against, particularly given the illogical and totally incorrect application of model courses by administrations as an approval standard.

The way forward must therefore be to really focus on improving the code and convention, particularly in terms of the competency tables. As I stated earlier, the two left hand columns are not actually the problem although tweaks here would be good. The fundamental issue is the misalignment of the two right hand columns (the methods and the criteria for demonstrating competence) so that these do not consistently require practical competence where they need to. This needs to be the major focus of the next major revision and I have been building a body of support from the more powerful delegations to have a go at this next time around.

Having said that, we were helped somewhat in our leadership of the 7 series model courses because the Code and Convention were intended as competency based instruments. Although there was much that we failed to secure, we did shift these a long way forward during the review simply because no one could argue for example, that the code and convention allowed absolutely no alternative but for the shiphandling manoeuvres required for management level deck officers to be practically demonstrated rather than just talked about. The limitations here were as much about the scarcity of expertise within our own membership as they were difficulty in getting this through the sub-committee. We therefore do need to be somewhat conscious that we are preaching a gospel that is beyond many of our current members.

My final thoughts relate to Chris’ paper and Richard’s response in regards to holistic vs atomistic assessment as this has been the major issue with the initial systems introduced in the UK, NZ, Australia and South Africa who introduced competency based system in that order. Interestingly, these pitfalls were avoided in the European approaches introduced in the Netherlands, Germany and Sweden and also in the U.S. in individual colleges that have gone down the competency route for their internal assessment. As the earliest national system, the UK approach required assessment at individual performance criteria and even across every specific in a range statement.

The result was not just assessment that took longer than actually acquiring competence and an awful lot of paper but also ended up with students who had passed all of the bits but could not put them together in a real life situation.

A frequent challenge to my team at NZMS used to be that given a bridge watchkeeper never applies rule of the road, coastal navigation, electronic navigation, meteorology, watchkeeping practice and bridge emergencies in isolation to each other, how can assessing each component individually have any validity at all? We did evolve the holistic performance model where substantial simulator assessment over 300 hours became required but this was on top of the traditional individual assessments for each topic. At best, the latter had validity only as a formative assessment and a control into who could progress to the holistic assessment. Given that these subject assessments actually provided no insight at all as to how a candidate would perform on the bridge, my challenge was to identify the time at which we should abandon tradition and just stop putting students through what I still maintain was an exercise of no value other than satisfying ourselves, regulators and ‘old salts’ from client employers that we were still doing what had always been done. I do not believe that this can be achieved on a scale other than through extensive simulator training and assessment for deck officers, but can also not accept that the cost and availability of simulators should now be a constraint on going down this route.

By Capt Tim Wilson
A look at the common practice of using portable electronic devices, shaping actors, future trends in training and assessment and high order thinking skills in maritime education and training (MET)?

**Common Practice of using Portable Electronic Devices**

In the author’s opinion, it is wrong to use portable electronic device (PED) whilst training is in session. It is a sign of disrespect for the rules and regulations. In 2012, National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) published an article about the need to eliminate distraction in transportation. We need to put a stop to this menacing behaviour before it ends up on a ship’s bridge and lead to disasters such as M.V Berit in 2006 whereby the watch-keeper was distracted by two text messages on his mobile telephone and missed the course alteration. Mobile phones either in the class room or on the bridge is a source of distraction, say no to violation!

It is a common sight nowadays to see individuals engrossed with their PEDs, especially the i-phone. People love the device so much that they go to bed with it! Many were late for classes or in submitting their assignments since not many observe the bed-time rules anymore.

Teachers used to be the prime sources of information - the expert. Nowadays, you can obtain the latest information on the internet, anytime, anywhere. Students tend to instantly cross-check the information provided in class with the one on the net. Their faces will brim happily if a contradiction occurs and debate will soon ensue.

Common practice does not mean that it is appropriate or accepted as the standard!

The current written assessments may no longer be valid for some competencies in navigation function such as maintain a safe navigational watch, respond to emergencies, respond to a distress at sea, use IMO Standard Marine Communication Phrases and manoeuvre the ship.

The Simulator is one of the methods used to assess the aforementioned competencies. In fact, referring to specification table in Section A-II/1, of the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW) Code, 1978, written examinations are implied only for the followings:

| Case 1 competence | - Ensure compliance with pollution-prevention requirements
| Examination and assessment of evidence from approved training. |

**Shaping the Actors**

Competencies are more on demonstrable behaviours. Assessment is on the behaviours and not knowledge. Currently, approved simulator training is one of the methods used in assessing competencies. It is widely used both ashore and in-service-training; and in meeting the training objectives.

Manned scale model is used in just one of the competencies i.e. manoeuvre the ship. Nothing is mentioned about written assessment in the above competencies; all are practical based.

**Case 2 competence - Monitor compliance with legislative requirements**

Assessment of evidence obtained from examination or approved training.

In lieu of simulator, at operational level, objective evidence from practical training is acceptable in the following competencies:

- respond to emergencies
- respond to a distress at sea
- use IMO Standard Marine Communication Phrases and
- transmit and receive information by visual signalling.

Manned scale model is used in just one of the competencies i.e. manoeuvre the ship. Nothing is mentioned about written assessment in the above competencies; all are practical based.

**Table 1 – Comparison table of IMO required training hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Class hours required as per IMO model course</th>
<th>STCW reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Radar navigation, radar plotting and use of ARPA Radar navigation at operational level</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Table A-II/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Operational use of electronic chart display and information systems (ECDIS)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Table A-II/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>GMDSS general operator’s certificate</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Table A-IV/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>GMDSS restricted operator’s certificate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>239</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very high frequency (VHF) and Global Maritime Distress and Safety System (GMDSS) simulators are excellent tools in achieving the desired outcomes as per the STCW Code.
The time spent for the above-mentioned important training using simulators will be over in less than 2 months. However, on average, cadets spend about 3 to 4 years on campus dealing with other academic topics or subjects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Operate life-saving appliances</td>
<td>Table A-VI/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Apply medical first aid on board ship</td>
<td>Table A-VI/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Contribute to the safety of personnel and ship</td>
<td>Table A-VI/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Redundant trainings under chapter 2, STCW Code

All these competencies reflected under chapter 2 have also been dealt with extensively in chapter 6.

**Future Trends in Training and Assessments**

Could it be that in the near future, all training and assessments for STCW chapter 2 and 3 will be done only on either simulators or training ships? No more lectures. Learning materials are downloaded online, all are accessible from the International Maritime Organisation (IMO) on gratis! Students learn on their own time at home and only attend brief seminars.

Teaching materials are downloaded using a “Dropbox” to allow students to browse through it before coming to class, hence a reduction in class-hours. There is no real need for students to sit in class to acquire knowledge since it is accessible 24/7; anywhere.

Students will take turns keeping a 4-hour watch on campus or on board training ships. Such an exercise will build character and imbue positive values. Objective evidence gathered from the simulation or practical exercises will be more meaningful rather than written or oral assessment. Keeping watches will require students to work in team hence mirroring the ship’s environment.

Gone are the days whereby assessment is done using models of ships on the table!

The maritime academy’s role is to improve the psycho-motor skills of students by the use of simulators and/or conducting exercises using on-board training ships. A realistic learning environment will enhance the retention of the learned skills. Realistic time spent at colleges is mainly to address Chapter IV, V and VI only.

**High Order Thinking Skills (HOT)**

Technology has enabled us to achieve progress never envisioned before. Nowadays people are no longer interested only in the right information - they want it fast. Still, getting the job done is also part of the equation; All tasks are to be completed on time and on budget, every time!

Maritime academies should focus not so much on cognitive but more emotional aspects i.e., the affective domain. Almost all important decisions in life are made based on emotional values. Watch-keepers are essentially decision-makers alone on the bridge or in the control room, watching the monitors and deciding the next course of action. Watch-keepers needs to be trustworthy, self-motivated and dedicated to the tasks on hand.

We should rename Table A - II/1 to specification of minimum standard of competence for decision makers on ships of 500 gross tonnage or more. A skilled-seafarer will be able to make decisions in ensuring safety of navigation. The focus in producing effective decision-makers should be in the psycho-motor aspects and affective domain rather than cognitive. A motivated decision-maker at sea will make difficult situations bearable. A competent decision-maker is what we need to be on watch! A competent decision-maker with sea experience will be well to suited management level and leadership positions. Essentially, maritime academies are mills that generate leaders!

By Capt M H Hamzah, Senior Lecturer, Advanced Nautical Studies Dept, Malaysian Maritime Academy

Edited by Iman Fiqrie, Lecturer, MMA
The ships that are being built today are at the cutting edge of technology. The engines cannot be more powerful, for a given size, because material science is being used to its limit. Therefore we need to “educate” seafarers and ensure that they have the tools to learn for themselves. Simple “memory recall” has its place in the early learning of subject matter, since the building blocks of a higher level synthesis of ideas must have a good foundation upon which to scaffold ideas and synthesise new information.

In the world of engineering, building a high cognitive ability coupled together with practical skill is vital. However, just building a bank of scientific and mechanical knowledge will only partly serve the marine engineer when s/he is trying to gather information from all senses to diagnose a critical fault on a diesel engine in a hostile environment. It will be no good then trying to “phone a friend” due to the final analysis of the situation not being within the grasp of the engineer in question.

Some will say computers complete that work now, while others will look through rose tinted spectacles back to the days when life in an engineroom was not full of instruments and “gadgets”. However if we look carefully at these issues we find that:

a) Machinery will not go back to the days of straight forward mechanical control systems and uninsulated equipment. On the contrary, with the advancement of “waste heat recovery”, the time will come when all machinery is so cocooned in thermal and noise protection that it will be difficult to see or hear any running machinery.

b) Computers are only as good as the information fed in and the algorithms that sort out the information. It is still up to the engineer to ensure that the information is correct, the low level of analysis is accurate and for him/her to then work out what is happening from the information given.

Due to the transition period from fully mechanical systems to the wide scale use of “mechatronics”, our young engineers are struggling with understanding both sides of the equation.

On the one hand they are comfortable with the computerised control systems while on the other (due to the extended time between overhauls) they are not getting the opportunity to view or study the internal mechanical working parts of the plant.

Therefore, now more than ever, we need to build in the high level thinking and imagination of an enquiring mind, so engineers may diagnose faults and foresee dangers in a machinery plant. The vision to be able to comprehend exactly what is happening inside equipment which cannot physically be seen, needs to be part of the engineer’s training. During times of abnormal operation and faults occurring, information will be coming from several sources and the engineer will be swamped with different types and varying amounts of information, where only a small part will be the vital components that s/he wants to make a successful decision.

Memory recall will only be a small part of the engineer’s toolbox at that time, since all the combinations of alarms, meter readings, noises, reports from other staff and ensuring “compliance” with the latest regulations, will be new information not necessarily known to the engineer before that particular emergency. The ability to process information from all sources, analyse it correctly, and make decisions based on previous experience and the engineer’s own understanding of the science behind the operation and the mechanical structures of the plant, is paramount. The term I favour for this is “Mechanical Empathy”.

The writer has just completed a teaching contract at a UK University and been surprised at how little the students are prepared to engage in active thinking for themselves. They constantly scour the internet for answers to questions instead of thinking through problems logically or even offering ideas from their own experience. I also found that given a set of notes/power point printouts or a simulator to work from students will continue to look for the answer in the next slide or page of notes rather than work through the problem themselves.

I do not think the students are lazy it is just that they expect to work in this way. Some of this is down to circumstance. If there are 100 to 120 students in a University lecture then there is not much “active” learning in the form of discussion or an exchange of ideas. The lecturer talks and the students search the internet and hopefully they are looking at the same subject as the lecture. I also found that given a set of notes/power point printouts or a simulator to work from students will continue to look for the answer in the next slide or page of notes rather than work through the problem themselves.

The link between shipping companies providing the “sea experience” and Universities/Colleges providing the knowledge and critical thinking will be the key for producing the seafarers of the future and the structured on-board training programme will be a very important element within that structure.

By Paul Russell MSc BA Hons MIMarEST
MD Thamesview Maritime Limited UK
Dedicated to the professional development of seafarers
Hartmann Reederei, in co-operation with engineering consultants HB Hunte Engineering, has developed a new type of vessel: the ethane-fueled liquefied ethylene carrier ECO STAR 36K with “Svelte”-bow design. The new vessel type differs fundamentally from conventional gas carriers, with its superstructures located at the bow. This results in optimized distribution of weight and, therefore, a reduced demand for ballast water which also supports reduced fuel consumption and emissions at the same time.

The new “Svelte” bow design enables the vessel to improve seakeeping at higher transit speeds and improved fuel efficiency.

The ships will use the latest generation of the MAN B&W dual fuel 2-stroke diesel engine, meeting the requirements of IMO Tier II. The ECO STAR 36K will be able to operate on HFO (heavy fuel oil), MDO (marine diesel oil) and gas oil, as well as LNG, and, as a world novelty, on ethane (C₂H₆). Furthermore, it can utilize the boil-off gas from its cargo.

The vessel’s autonomous gas fuel tanks are constructed for ethane and LNG and enable an operating range of about 10,000 nautical miles. Additionally, the novelty design encompasses heavy fuel tanks for the same distance. If necessary, it is possible to switch over from gas to diesel operation and vice versa immediately.

The propulsion efficiency will be further improved by adopting a MAN Kappel propeller with rudder bulb system and a Twist-flow Rudder developed by HB Hunte Engineering. Ship model tests at Hamburgische Schiffbau-Versuchsanstalt (HSVA) resulted in reduced energy loss and improved propulsion efficiency for this system.

The cargo tanks present another innovation. Compared to conventional gas carriers with cylindrical or bi-lobe tanks, ECO STAR 36K adopts a new tank design developed by Hartmann Reederei: the Star-Trilobe-tank. This design consists of three cylinders combined into one. Due to better room utilization of the cargo holds, this results in higher efficiency and allows an increase in cargo capacity by nearly 30% at the same ship dimensions, leading to reduced shipping costs through higher economies of scale.

The new vessels offer a cargo capacity of 36,000 cbm each for liquefied gas cargoes up to -104°C. Presently, these vessels are the largest LEG-carriers worldwide.

In co-operation with the Norwegian ship owning company Ocean Yield, three vessels of this type have already been ordered at the Chinese shipyard Sinopacific. Their delivery is scheduled from the second half of 2016 onwards.

For the first three vessels of this type, a long-term agreement was secured by Hartmann Group company GasChem Services with Saudi Arabian petrochemical company SABIC. The latter just announced a cracker upgrade to using ethane from the US as feedstock in their cracker in Teesside, United Kingdom.

The Hartmann Group will conduct full vessel management for the ethane shipments, ensuring the regular deliveries to SABIC’s Teesside cracker.

Hartmann Reederei has specialized in the development and management of gas carriers for 30 years. With a fleet of currently 36 gas carriers, it ranges among the largest of its kind in the global market.
Flag State Approvals

Introduction

In this latest Whitepaper, Milind Karkhanis, Vice President, Videotel Training Services takes a whistlestop tour through Videotel’s – now a KVH Company - production history and our continuous striving for improvement, approval and accreditation.

History

In the early 1970s the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (now, of course, the IMO) and the oil majors, recognised the urgent need to provide training on ships. Videotel accepted the challenge with relish and has been making topical, high-quality training programmes for the marine industry since 1973.

The early days used 16mm film, with a typical duration being around 25 minutes. This format rapidly gave way to videotape, CDs, DVDs, E-Learning Computer Based Training (CBT) interactives and now, increasingly, online where the internet is available.

In those first years a simple record of ‘who watched what?’ was logged and signed by the Master or training officer.

However, it wasn’t long before demand grew for a more robust evaluation and assessment of training. This has resulted, amongst other things, in today’s interactive CBT programmes which embed a range of assessment opportunities and strategies. Today, Videotel learners may log on to state-of-the-art software systems using unique ID numbers, can complete tests and assessments online, may print off their results and are able to transmit the data ashore to the company training officer. Videotel has come a long way since 16mm film!

Courses and Portfolio Assessment

As the new millennium approached it became clear that we could do much more than simply provide passive material. Through the intervening years, we have seen an exponential increase in the development of distance learning programmes. These have been extraordinarily successful and have included courses for Safety Officers, Security Officers and those serving on specialised ships such as gas and chemical tankers.

Courses are designed and written meticulously by leading subject matter experts in the field and educational consultants are engaged to ensure material is written to the highest standards. Matters of authenticity and validity are crucially important. No examination system can ever be 100% watertight but Videotel has designed a learner-centred approach that goes a long way in providing reassurance and peace of mind to companies and authorities.

On-screen and self-testing is an important component of all CBT material (see a previous Whitepaper on Distance Learning). A downside is that it is comparatively easy to take someone else’s test for them or to fabricate results. To mitigate this potential flaw we designed our distance learning courses to include written assessment portfolios, as well as witness affidavits and physical examination of work produced. The process is straightforward and simple to administer. By adopting this method our learners can be proud of their achievements and our customers more reassured that the work performed is genuine. The effort is well worth it.

Course Approvals

We are required to obtain approval for courses which are covered by the STCW or other Conventions (for example, the MLC). So an important step in the development of any training course is the securing of Flag State Approval. Seeking approval in a multitude of international administrations is both challenging and time-consuming. The flag states must satisfy themselves that all matters have been addressed. These include course content, enrolment, assessment, evaluation, review, administration and trainer qualifications and experience.

We must also seek approval for those who assess candidate portfolios. When a course is submitted for approval to the Administration, a list of assessors with their C.V. detailing their qualifications and experience is submitted. The Administrations meticulously vet each C.V. and on meeting the required criteria they approve the assessor. Only those assessors who have been approved by the Administration may assess the portfolios.

Approvals are subject to regular audit conducted by the relevant Administration. This may be carried out by sampling the assessed portfolios, records of enrolments and the certification process. It often involves on-site inspection of materials and documentation.

Conclusion

The process of Flag State Administration approvals for courses is quite onerous. This is rightly so since the approved training centres are authorised to issue certificates to candidates who pass the course, stating that the candidates meet the requirements of the STCW Convention. These certificates provide evidence to employers when they gauge the knowledge of existing and potential employees.

Subsequent to the approval, rigorous audits are conducted by the Administration to ensure that the standards are met and maintained by the training provider irrespective of whether it is distance learning or class-room based. This includes measures to prevent fraudulent certificates and to verify records of certificates issued by the training provider. Videotel is very happy to have been complying with the requirements of numerous Flag State administrations for over ten years. We will continue to provide quality training to seafarers and to assist them in making the ships they sail on safer and the sea cleaner.

By Captain Milind J Karkhanis
Captain Sachin Srivastava who was in-charge of product tanker Stena Paris steamed through a stormy sea at full speed for over 13 hours to reach the couple in the brink of time.

A local Noida boy has become an unlikely hero of the high seas after he braved gigantic waves and blinding dark skies to save an elderly couple navigating parts of the planet on their boat which was badly damaged by bad weather on the South Pacific Ocean. Captain Sachin Srivastava who was in charge of product tanker Stena Paris steamed through a stormy sea at full speed for over 13 hours to reach the couple in the brink of time.

Swedish couple-70-year-old Stig and 69-year-old Siv Bodin have been out sailing since 2011, having visited Brazil and the Caribbean and passed through the Panama Canal last Christmas. They were on their way to their next stop-Papeete in Tahiti of the French Polynesia when they got caught in a violent storm 125 nautical miles (231 km) north-east of the Cook Islands.

The Rescue Coordination Centre New Zealand (RCCNZ) detected a beacon alert from the 11.2 metre (37 foot) Blue Horizon at around 5.15 pm on August 5. Satellite phone contact was then established with the yacht via the Swedish Joint Rescue Coordination Centre. RCCNZ Search and Rescue Mission Controller Neville Blakemore said the Swedish couple aboard the yacht was left with a dismasted yacht and feared the broken mast would hole the hull.

An aircraft was dispatched from the Maritime Rescue Coordination Centre in Papeete in Tahiti to over fly the yacht. It confirmed that the nearest rescue vessel was the tanker Stena Paris, around 150 nautical miles (280km) or 10 sailing away. Captain Sachin Srivastava was in charge of Stena Paris.

“The tanker was diverted to rescue the couple and they were successfully taken aboard, uninjured, at round 9am the next morning, thanks to Captain Srivastava,” officials said. In an interview to TOI from Noida.

Sachin’s father Dinesh C Srivastava said he came to know about his son’s heroics when he called the family through a satellite phone on August 8. Dinesh C Srivastava told TOI that Sachin who completed his sailing degree from the Institute of Nautical Sciences in Glasgow spends three months on sea and three months in his house in Noida (UP). He told TOI: “Sachin has been sailing for over 13 years now and is now a Captain. We only get to speak with him when he calls. He called this week to tell us how he steamed through a very choppy sea and treacherous weather to save the couple.

Sachin diverted his course and travelled over 200 km taking him around 13 hours of non-stop sailing to reach the couple and rescue them just in the nick of time. Once they reached, they threw ropes towards the couple and helped them climb onto the ship with the help of hanging ladders.” The incident however “scared” Sachin’s wife Mamta who have been married for the past nine years and has a son. Talking to TOI, Mamta said on Sunday: “Sachin had called me today. I was scared yet proud. I asked him to narrate what happened and he told me that the weather was rough. He didn’t elaborate and said rescuing the abandoned sailors was part of his job. He will be back in Noida in another two months’ time”.

Rescue Mission Controller Neville Blakemore said: “Weather conditions were not great, with swells of around four metres, so it was excellent work by the master and crew of the Stena Paris to get the couple aboard without an incident. This is a good example of RCCNZ working with a number of overseas agencies to ensure a successful rescue”. The Stena Paris has now reached Papeete. The yacht has been abandoned. New Zealand authorities have sent out a warning to other vessels in the area that the Y Blue Horizon is still adrift unmanned in the area.

By Times of India
Ecoships Unveils New Eco-Friendly Bulker Design

September 2, 2014 — Ecoships, the technical ship management arm of London-headquartered Newport Shipping Group, has introduced the Greenlotus 32, a next generation bulk carrier design developed to set the standard in ecologically compatible marine transportation.

Inspired by the low friction to water flow and self-cleaning properties of the lotus flower, the Greenlotus 32, is a 32,500 dwt geared, wide hatched, handy-size bulker, designed to meet existing and future CO₂, NOx and SOx emissions regulations.


“From cost and energy efficiency perspectives, it makes a lot of sense for shipowners to reconsider their aging Handy sizes in favor of the Greenlotus 32. The return on investment is very attractive due to its extremely low fuel consumption and it meets the most stringent emissions reduction requirements.”

The 170.90 m long, 27 m wide hull form has been optimized for energy efficient operation using computational fluid dynamics and finite element analysis. The propulsion arrangement is based around a derated, Tier III compliant MAN B&W S650ME-B9 two-stroke main engine driving a large diameter, fixed pitch propeller.

“This configuration provides a heavy fuel oil consumption of just 15.6 t/day at a service speed of 14 knots and 7.6 t/day at 11 knots. Compared to the daily fuel oil consumption of comparable Handy-size designs, the Greenlotus 32 can generate daily fuel savings of more than US$6,500 on a bunker price of $650t, operating at 14 knots,” says Captain Yilmaz.

The Greenlotus 32 is also equipped with built-in technology for voyage and weather routing, trim optimization and a system to provide real-time analysis of ship data, including bunker quality and emissions.

Additional emissions abatement can be achieved through the optional installation of an exhaust gas scrubbing system and/or a Selective Catalyst Reduction (SCR) unit.

Exhaust gas recirculation and waste heat recovery systems, available with the standard Greenlotus 32 design, add to the vessel’s ecologically-friendly credentials.

“It really does minimize the environmental impact of bulk shipping,” says Captain Yilmaz.

Suitable for the carriage of a variety of cargoes, including coal, grain, ore, direct reduced iron, cement, bauxite and steel coil, across five double skin cargo holds, the eco-smart design features wide, steel-covered hatches in conjunction with the absence of hoppers and lower bulkhead stools to facilitate optimal loading and discharging operations.

Fuel tanks, coffered against cargo Hold 5 to reduce the risk of pollution and to protect heat sensitive cargoes, have been prepared for low sulfur fuel operation.

Fulfilling IMO requirements for permanent means of access for close up survey work and ease of maintenance, service piping and electrical cables run along two side pipe tunnels within the double hull. The arrangement serves as a safe conduit between the superstructure and foredeck during inclement weather.

Ballast and bilge piping has been similarly arranged in a pipe duct running through the double bottom of the vessel.

The tank top has been strengthened to 20 t/sq.m on top of all cargo holds. The vessel is equipped with four sets of deck cranes each with a 30 t safe working load and 36 m outreach. Each crane is supplied with a frequency converter system to ensure optimum energy efficiency.

Harald Lone, CEO, Newport Shipping, says: “Vessels built to this new design will feature advanced energy-efficient technologies making them very cost effective to operate. We have already partnered with shipyards in China, Korea and Turkey to offer competitive pricing structures.”


By Rod Short
Executive Secretary, GlobalMET
The start of newsletter 36, GlobalMET marked a significant shift by the appointment of an Editorial Board to “…assist development of an even more interesting and constructive monthly newsletter…” and, the introduction of a more critical approach to MET by the writing of probing articles and then offering responses and comment from staff and the newly formed Editorial Board in that month’s newsletter.

Iman Fiqrie, Editorial Board

The Purpose of Making Essay Questions

In response to Dr. Haughton’s article, specifically to one question that demanded a list of three requirements of the ISM Code, Dr. Haughton eluded to the questions being shallow and tactically being accepted by students, sponsors and regulators;

Anonymous comment

What is the purpose of making questions easy? Any immoral reason? Asking these questions are enough as far as the above comment is concerned.

Lived experience? We call 1 year of sea time as lived experience. A cadet cannot lower a lifeboat on a F.G. ship if during his training, he has not been exposed to it.

Just going in and out of port for a whole year is lived experience! It is jaw dropping if we consider this as lived experience. We must not forget that the Sewol’s 3rd mate did not have enough steering practice. This is blood on the hands of the certifiers.

Footnote: some ideas for ISM Code Assessment:

Anonymous comment giving examples of assessment questions with comment:

Q. Why did the maritime industry perceive the need to introduce a Safety Management Code? Give a brief account and comment on the circumstances that led to the Code’s introduction.

Q. To what extent is the ISM Code relevant to 21st century shipping? Illustrate your answer with examples from personal experience and/or your research.

Q. Has the ISM Code been effective in reducing accident rates at sea? Discuss.

On the other hand, are our students able to answer questions of the level, shown above? They are introduced in the ISM Code; however, ship owners have a responsibility to improve language as well as attitudes. Students have a problem expressing themselves. Does the blame go squarely on the shoulders of MET? MET can do some damage control, but full recovery is a tall order. The damage was already done prior entry into MET centres.

Professional Mariners who Dictate Educational Policy

With reference to Dr. Haughton’s comment on Schools and colleges seemingly beset by sound and professional mariners who dictate educational policy and not having the foggiest idea of what education is really about;

Anonymous comment:

I sincerely do not think we are dictating educational policy. We are subservient to an agenda that will only see short term gains of solving the shortage of the man power problem. Quality is taking a back seat – not necessarily because the teacher is poor in his teaching methods. If METs were dictating, we would have the following in place:

A foundation programme to address the poor quality of English – This is fundamental for understanding study material. Would sponsors agree because this would mean an additional year?

Extended sea time – Would sponsors agree?

It would seem that some “have not got the foggiest idea of what education is all about”. Hey! (not being rude – just being dramatic) It takes ten minutes to get hard-boiled eggs and not 5 minutes. Teachers cannot deliver in 20 minutes, what actually takes say 1 hour to deliver (regardless of whether latest technology is used) – especially when there is a language handicap. Teachers very often become easy scapegoats for the malaise that affects education.

Met Course has become a de facto requirement

In response to the Model Course becoming the facto standard, replacing design teams and regulatory compliance;

Anonymous comment:

Our marine dept. comes to mind - Form without substance. And he says “professional mariners who dictate educational policy”? Let’s get real please.

It’s ironic that the very instrument industry is leaning towards in order to guarantee currency has obsolescence written into its DNA.

The marine dept. comes to mind again.

A malady of the quality systems and semblance of order, but non-sense when it comes to real work. ISO now micromanages the lives of working adults instead of allowing them to think out of the box.

“It does not compute Mr. Wilson” – quote from Lost in space.

The Complicity of Inaction

In response to Iman Fiqrie’s article Corporate, Organizational Governance and the Future of MET, specifically; seems no manner of article, conference or summit will fix the … problems … as those in position to do so it may … be complicit; maybe not actively, but passively.

Anonymous comment:

Let’s not be complicit. By raising concerns at every possible forum, we do not become complicit.

The Mismatch between Talk and Action

Anonymous responding to Iman’s comments on both MET and the shipping industry having the will power and attitude but the talk not matching behaviour, feedback and implementation systems!

Anonymous comment:

The honest people in MET want extended sea-time while some in the shipping industry only know how to be followers and not leaders and they know who are the easy targets when placing the blame. If the so called professional mariners of the world say that 1 year is enough, the 3rd world mentality is to simply follow without studying the merits of such an idea.

Anonymous goes on to give a somewhat short history lesson on the removal of the Radio Officer to increase shareholder revenues, the increase in paperwork and job scope for the 2nd Mate, all causing less time for the training of cadets and initials in the TARBB that are not earned and don’t build confidence.

There must be a Reason and Full Accounting

In response to the statement of having a reason and need for full accounting of not addressing the issues and new technology on MET;

Anonymous comment:

Why does MET always have to take the blame and the fall? Don’t attitudes of the students and the greed of share market players also have a role in the state of affairs the shipping industry is in? If you tell MET to produce hard boiled eggs in 5 minutes, they are going to keep producing half boiled eggs in that amount of time unless the eggs are in the class of Al Ash or Wei Jien. MET is the convenient punching bag?

Just to remind all, the ‘chalk and talk’ generation are still in demand compared to what is offered today, and this, in spite of the advancement in technology. Not necessarily because the teachers then were better than today.

If we say that generation Y is different from generation X and they should be taught differently, it is because generation X and before have spoilt generation Y – too much freedom, making things too easy for them, etc. This is very irresponsible of us. I sincerely doubt that they can handle family life.

What is the Important Message MET is Currently Sending?

In response to Iman Fiqrie’s query on the important message MET is sending and teaching the next generation, e.g., profits before anything, the cultivation of soft skills and corporate social responsibility being mere lip service and instilling ethics and morals;

Anonymous comment:

It’s a question of conscience of course.

MET Unduly Influenced and Crushed by the Weight of Industry

In response to the title statement above;

Anonymous comment:

It is unduly influenced and crushed but there aren’t many in MET who have the will to speak up on what they know is right – In that sense MET can’t help but be complicit.
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