

**Details of The Merchant Shipping (Safety of Navigation) (Amendment) Regulations 2011**

In 2011 the Government implemented an amendment to the 2002 Regulations with the objective of enhancing maritime safety standards by including a number of additional SOLAS V measures.

The Regulations were implemented in order to ensure that the Master's discretion in decision-making is not to be compromised and to stipulate the carriage requirements and necessary performance standards for Long Range Identification and Tracking (LRIT) Equipment.

Background

The International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) governs the majority of safety regulations affecting ships.

Following the events of 11 September 2001, the political profile of maritime security was raised considerably. In 2002, a requirement to fit Automatic Identification Systems (AIS) was introduced. AIS improved navigation safety and enable coastal States to monitor traffic within Very High Frequency (VHF) range of their coasts. However, monitoring of traffic at longer ranges is not possible with AIS.

After discussions at the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the concept of Long Range Identification and Tracking (LRIT) was developed for ships undertaking international voyages. An amendment to the SOLAS convention (the new SOLAS Chapter V Regulation 19-1), which entered into force on 1 January 2008, established a multilateral agreement whereby LRIT information that is transmitted can be shared for security functions as well as for Search and Rescue (SAR) and environmental protection purposes.

The amendment to the SOLAS convention requires certain ships to be fitted with appropriate LRIT equipment when engaged on international voyages.

Affected ships are required to be fitted with the appropriate LRIT equipment in accordance with an implementation timetable based on the age of the ship and the date of the first radio survey after 31 December 2008. The amendment to the SOLAS convention also requires an affected ship to report its identity and position every six hours to the relevant receiving authority.

**Questions in relation to the Merchant Shipping (Safety of Navigation) (Amendment) Regulations 2011**

The Merchant Shipping (Safety of Navigation) (Amendment) Regulations 2011 amended the existing 2002 Regulations. The following questions will help to understand if these amendments resulted in any unexpected costs.

**Do you consider yourself to be representing either?**

Yourself,

Micro Business,

Small Business,

Large Business,

Other

**Question 1 – Familiarisation costs**

1a) How long did it take for your business to understand the amendment? What was the hourly cost to your business of doing so?

1b) Were there any unexpected costs when complying with the new regulations? If yes, please explain.

Yes

No

Comments:

1c) Have any cost increases or savings been passed on to other businesses?

Cost increases: Savings:

Yes  Yes

No  No

Comments:

**Question 2 – LRIT Equipment costs**

The Merchant Shipping (Safety of Navigation) Amendment required ships to carry Long Range Identification and Tracking systems (LRIT).

2a) Did you already have LRIT equipment installed?

Yes

No

Comments:

2b) Were you required to purchase any new equipment or upgrade existing equipment? If yes, how much did this cost?

Yes

No

Cost:

2c) What are the costs related to the maintenance / calibration of the system? How has this been funded?

Costs:

Funded by:

2d) Without the amendment would you have LRIT installed on your vessel?

Yes

No

Comments:

2e) If this amendment was repealed would you continue to operate with LRIT?

Yes

No

Comments:

**Question 3. - Impacts**

3a) Do you believe these regulations in conjunction with the requirement to report have had a positive impact on the safety vessels at sea? If no, please explain.

Yes

No

Comments:

3b) Have you noticed any unintended impacts which have been brought about as a result of the regulation? If yes, please explain.

Yes

No

Comments:

**Question 4.**

4a) Are there ways that the regulation could be improved or that the implementation of the regulation could have been done better? If yes, please explain.

Yes

No

Comments:

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT**

Information provided in response to this exercise, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2004 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004).

If you would like information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

The DfT will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act and in the majority of circumstances this will mean that your personal data will not be disclosed to third parties.

**Conduct of this information gathering process**

If you have any comments on the conduct of this process please email the stakeholder engagement exercise [Coordinator](mailto:consultation.coordinator@mcga.gov.uk).