CASE STUDY

This incident reinforces the necessity of ensuring the bridge is manned at all times in accordance with industry requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel type</td>
<td>Offshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue date</td>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case number</td>
<td>56020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incident
On 23 September 2006, whilst transiting between two rigs as part of its supply duties, an AHTSV came into contact with an oil well. The weather was calm and visibility was good. Both radars were in operation and reportedly in good working condition at the time of the incident. The vessel suffered minimal damage however, the oil well was damaged beyond repair.

Observations
At the time of the incident, the night bridge watch was manned by a single watchkeeper. An effective lookout was not being maintained as the Master who arrived on the bridge a few minutes before the incident visually sighted the oil well right ahead and immediately started taking evasive action.

This incident reinforces the necessity of ensuring the bridge is manned at all times in accordance with industry requirements. The lookout must concentrate solely on keeping a proper lookout and should not be distracted by any other unrelated tasks. In the event that he would be required to leave the bridge, he should be properly relieved to ensure that the lookout duties are not interrupted.

Members should ensure that their navigational policy clearly states the adequate bridge manning requirement and the Masters and watchkeepers are fully familiar with this policy. This should also be verified periodically by the shore management whenever the opportunity arises e.g. during internal audits or the superintendent’s regular visits on board.

Financial cost
The total claims costs were US$ 4,559,150.27
CASE STUDY

This incident highlights the severity of the consequences for failing to adequately compensate for prevailing conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel type</td>
<td>Offshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue date</td>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case number</td>
<td>103382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incident
On 18 February 2011, an AHTS was towing an accommodation barge down a Channel on a SW’ly course. At approximately 21:50 the Master on the AHTS alleged that the steering had malfunctioned and was not responding to starboard helm commands. The current (3 kts x S’ly) set the vessel to drift off the channel towards an offshore installation (jacket) on her port side.

By effective use of the engines on the AHTS the Master managed to avoid vessel contact with the jacket. However, the tow wire contacted the jacket legs and the barge was carried away in a southeasterly direction around the jacket. The effect of the current and tension on the tow wire pulled the jacket over to one side slightly misaligning it from vertical.

The AHTS thereafter paid out more of her towline and altered her course to North, albeit with a lot of difficulty, to eventually clear the towline and the barge off the jacket.

Observations
- Detailed investigations by the Member revealed no equipment failure on board and all checks on the steering system also showed no malfunction.
- The towline at the incident was about 50 to 70 metres which, considering the width of the navigable water available, was considered to be long. The towline, at the time of the incident, was also under tension.
- No attempt was made to use the bow thruster.
- The influence of the current and the tow wire under tension were considered as the two factors that hampered the vessel to turn to starboard.

This case highlights the severity of the consequences for failing to adequately compensate for prevailing conditions and not being familiar with own vessel’s manoeuvring characteristics. The importance of proper tug handling, including an initial and ongoing assessment of the length of tow being used, cannot be over-emphasised.

Financial cost
The cost of this claim was US$ 1,602,658.
CASE STUDY

This incident highlights the importance of ensuring the ship’s crew are fully familiarised with all operating modes of the vessel’s Dynamic Positioning System

Category       Navigation
Vessel type     Offshore
Issue date      28/07/2015
Case number    47007

The incident
On 6 July 2005, a supply vessel was discharging pipes to a rig off the Brazilian coast. After discharging the pipes on the port side of the vessel’s main deck, the position of the vessel was changed in order to discharge the pipes on the starboard side. This resulted in the vessel’s bow moving closer to one of the rig’s legs.

Unfortunately due to a loss of GPS signal and despite manual controls being engaged, the vessel was unable to maintain its position in the prevailing heavy swells and came into contact with one of the rig’s legs.

Observations
This incident highlights the importance of ensuring the ship’s crew are fully familiarised with all operating modes of the vessel’s Dynamic Positioning System (DPS) so, if there is a failure in one mode, swift and effective action can be taken to continue the safe navigation of the vessel.

The vessel’s crew should also be fully appraised of the DPS’s operating envelope as laid down in the DPS operating manual, including the weather limits such as wind speed and direction, currents and tides so to be able to assess when the thresholds are being approached.

Additionally, full awareness of the prevailing circumstances of the operation which is being undertaken should be maintained to ensure that the vessel is operating within the company’s procedural limits for the intended operation.

Financial cost
The cost of this claim was US$ 1,200,000.
CASE STUDY

This incident highlights that even a short loss of concentration can have major consequences both financially and to the reputation of the operator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Navigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vessel type</td>
<td>Offshore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue date</td>
<td>28/07/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case number</td>
<td>58479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The incident
On 29 January 2009, a platform supply vessel was involved in a collision with a drilling rig offshore in Brazil. During the process of manoeuvring in the vicinity of the rig, to deliver drill water, the weather conditions were moderate with gusting winds of 15-35 km/h (Beaufort force 3-5). The Master misjudged the prevailing weather conditions, lost control of the vessel and collided with the rig. The rig sustained damage to the lifeboat and its mounting structure; the forward davit.

Observations
This incident highlights that even a short loss of concentration can have major consequences both financially and to the reputation of the operator.

Members should ensure that Masters receive ship familiarisation/handling training and in turn on board crews should try to look at each new assignment with fresh eyes to avoid complacency in routine operations.

Financial cost
The cost of this claim was US$ 1,534,295.
CASE STUDY

This incident reinforces the importance of checking position and ensuring charts and navigational aids are consulted prior to anchoring

Category: Navigation  
Vessel type: Offshore  
Issue date: 28/07/2015  
Case number: 56020

The incident
A supply vessel at anchor 0.145nm from an oil platform was radioed to begin supply operations. The vessel ran out its anchor chain and approached the platform and tied stern. Once unloading was complete the vessel cast off and began to retrieve its anchor. An unusual amount of weight was noted on the chain and when the anchor broke the surface a sub-sea power cable was observed to be caught on the anchor. The platform was notified and after efforts to free the cable by maneuvering the vessel failed, a decision was made to lower the anchor to the seabed and cut the anchor chain. Divers observed the cable had been moved 15ft and noted a severe kink in the cable as well as stripping of the outer cable housing. Power was not lost to the platform but repair of the cable was required.

Observations
The Master claimed the vessel had previously anchored in the same location whilst engaged in the same type of operation, however, after investigation it became evident the anchor had been dropped in an unauthorised position. A spar buoy indicating the cables location was apparently ignored by the vessel and its position was not checked prior to letting go the anchor. In addition, it was also found that the Master had failed to observe key aspects of the oil field operations manual.

Members should ensure that their navigational policy clearly states the adequate bridge manning requirement and that Masters and watchkeepers are aware of it. This should also be verified periodically by the shore management whenever the opportunity arises such as during internal audits or the superintendent’s regular visits on board.

Financial Cost
The total claims costs were US$ 1,374,952.