



IMO

E

SUB-COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF
TRAINING AND WATCHKEEPING
35th session
Agenda item 4

STW 35/4/2
5 December 2003
Original: ENGLISH

WATCHKEEPING AT ANCHOR

Submitted by the Republic of Korea

SUMMARY

- Executive summary:*** This document provides comments on the advice given by NAV 49 (STW 35/4).
- Action to be taken:*** Paragraph 9
- Related documents:*** STW 34/4/4, STW 34/4/6, STW 34/4/8, STW 34/14 and STW 35/4

1 This document comments on STW 35/4 and is submitted in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4.10.5 of the Guidelines on the organization and method of work of the Maritime Safety Committee and the Marine Environment Protection Committee and their subsidiary bodies (MSC/Circ.1099/MEPC/Circ.405).

2 STCW Code, Section A/VIII/2 part 3-1, paragraph 51 states that "if the master considers it necessary, a continuous navigational watch shall be maintained at anchor. However, Australia *et al* at STW 33rd and 34th sessions, strongly requested that the said regulation about master's discretion should be deleted because the master's discretion is sometimes misused resulting ship's collision or anchor-dragging.

3 STW 34 decided that the consideration of the factors to be taken into account when establishing watchkeeping arrangements is an operational issue, and agreed to invite the NAV Sub-Committee to provide advice on the conditions and circumstances upon which a decision may be made to maintain a continuous navigational watch at anchor to enable the Sub-Committee to develop appropriate guidance to masters.

4 The NAV Sub-Committee at its forty-ninth session (30 June to 4 July 2003), considered the issue and provided the advice requested by the Sub-Committee (STW 35/4)

5 The conditions and circumstances provided by the NAV Sub-Committee are somewhat general, obscure and seem not so useful for master's decision.

6 As some more concrete conditions and circumstances are needed to be presented as Guidance to masters to help them make right decision, The Republic of Korea did questionnaire investigation through total 181 Captains and 34 chief officers to find out conditions and circumstances to be taken into account concerning this issue. The results of questionnaire analysis are provided as annex to this document.

For reasons of economy, this document is printed in a limited number. Delegates are kindly asked to bring their copies to meetings and not to request additional copies.

7 The conditions and circumstances for which more than 50% of the respondents gave affirmative answer are summarized below.

- .1 *When the wind force is over Beaufort Scale 4: Affirmative (54.0%),*
- .2 *When the anchor is liable to be dragged due to strong current and/or strong wind: A (68.8%)*
- .3 *When there's possibility of collision with other vessels because of heavy traffic: A (66.5%)*
- .4 *When VHF watch is required for communication with agent, port control or local pilot etc : A (66.5%)*
- .5 *When the visibility is reduced to below 2 mile: A (50.7%)*
- .6 *When there's possibility of piracy attack: A (68.8%)*
- .7 *When the Security Level is set over 2: A (59.5%)*
- .8 *Whenever Master decides it necessary to maintain navigational watch except above circumstances: A (67.0%)*

8 The questionnaire analysis also shows that the vessels of 500 gross tonnage or more are suitable to be applied the Guidance concerning the conditions and circumstances as presented by (Table 2) of the annex.

Action requested of the Sub-Committee

9 The Sub-Committee is invited to consider the result of questionnaire analysis presented in the annex to develop the Guidance to be inserted in Part B of the STCW Code.

ANNEX

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS

1. Conditions and circumstances for which navigational watch by duty officer to be maintained at open anchorage**(Table 1)**

Possible Circumstances		Negative		Affirmative		No answer		Total	
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq	%
At all times		148	68.8	67	31.2	0	0	215	100
Wind Force (Beaufort Scale)	over 4	99	46.0	116	54.0	0	0	215	100
	over 5	33	15.3	133	61.9	49	22.8	215	100
	over 6	6	2.8	95	44.2	114	53.0	215	100
Dragging Anchor		2	0.9	148	68.8	65	30.2	215	100
Collision		7	3.3	143	66.5	65	30.2	215	100
VHF Watch is necessary		7	3.3	143	66.5	65	30.2	215	100
Low visibility	Below 1mile	5	2.3	132	61.4	78	36.3	215	100
	Below 2mile	68	31.6	109	50.7	38	17.7	215	100
	Below 3mile	108	50.2	107	49.8	0	0	215	100
Piracy attack		2	0.9	148	68.8	65	30.2	215	100
Security Level over 2		23	10.7	128	59.5	64	29.8	215	100
When Master decide necessary except above circumstances		5	2.3	144	67.0	66	30.7	215	100

2. The size of ship to apply the guidance for master's decision**(Table 2)**

Ship's Tonnage	Negative		Affirmative		No answer		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq	%
All ships	155	72.1	56	26.0	4	1.9	215	100
Over G/T 100	144	67.9	67	31.2	4	1.9	215	100
Over G/T 300	124	57.7	76	35.3	15	7.0	215	100
Over G/T 500	35	16.3	145	67.4	35	16.3	215	100
Over G/T 1,000	19	8.8	73	34.0	123	57.2	215	100
Over G/T 1,600	17	7.9	58	27.0	140	65.1	215	100
Over G/T 3,000	0	0	76	35.3	139	64.7	215	100

3. The distribution of respondents

(Table 3-1) LICENCE

Licence	Frequency	Effective Percent	Cumulative Percent
1st class	153	71.2	71.2
2nd class	57	26.5	97.7
3rd class	5	2.3	100
Total	215	100	

(Table 3-2) RANK

Rank	Frequency	Effective Percent	Cumulative Percent
Captain	181	84.2	84.2
Chief Officer	34	15.8	100
Total	215	100	

(Table 3-3) CAREER

Career	Frequency	Effective Percent	Cumulative Percent
below 3 years	2	0.9	0.9
3-5 years	7	3.3	4.2
6-8 years	18	8.4	12.6
9-10years	5	2.3	14.9
over 10 years	183	85.1	100
Total	215	100	

(Table 3-4) MAJOR TYPE OF VESSEL SERVED

Type of Vessel	Frequency	Effective Percent	Cumulative Percent
Container	33	15.3	15.3
Bulker	49	22.8	38.1
Tanker	90	41.9	80.0
Cargo ship	32	14.9	94.9
Passenger ship	1	0.5	95.4
Others	10	4.6	100
Total	215	100	

(Table 3-5) MAJOR VESSEL SERVED

Vessel	Frequency	Effective Percent	Cumulative Percent
Oceangoing vessel	196	91.2	91.2
Seagoing vessel	19	8.8	100
Total	215	100	