

## **Casualty Circular No. 9 of 2009** **(Regulatory/Guidance/Information)**

**NO:11-NT(5)/2006**

**Dated: 17.07.2009**

**Subject: Collision between Multipurpose Cargo Ship, GT-19878 Flag-Foreign, and Bulk Carrier, GT-26341, flag -Foreign at Hazira anchorage in 2006.**

### **NARATIVE**

On 16<sup>th</sup> January, 2006 a Multipurpose Cargo vessel age 6 years, flag - foreign, while proceeding out of Hazira port at a speed of 11 knots collided with a Bulk carrier, age 9 years, flag - foreign at 1030 hrs. The bulk carrier was anchored and engaged in discharging of cargo to the barges along side. After the collision, the Master of the multipurpose cargo did not stop his ship. The port control and the Master of the bulk carrier requested the Master of the multipurpose cargo to stop and anchor the vessel in the vicinity. The Master of the multipurpose cargo responded once and stated that the matter would be settled at Mumbai which happened to his next port of call. The vessel continued her voyage towards Mumbai Port and arrived there on 16.01.2006 at 1930 hrs. In course of collision both the vessels sustained extensive damage to the hull, accommodation ladder, life rafts and other structural areas. There was no loss of life or pollution incident due to this collision.

### **OBSERVATIONS/ANALYSES**

- The bulk carrier which was safely anchored and maintaining position was not at fault.
- There were numerous serious lapses committed by the Multipurpose Cargo vessel which collided with the anchored ship at the speed of 11 knots. List of contributing factors are as follows :
  1. The Passage Plan was not prepared in accordance with International practices, for example, it was not from berth to berth, traffic density, strength of tides and currents were not taken into account.

2. Bridge Team Management was extremely poor because the Master was engaged in preparing messages instead of focusing on navigation of the vessel.
3. Bridge Resource Management was not effective because all available means such as ARPA was not used.
4. The vessel was not proceeding at safe speed.
5. The look out maintained in restricted waters was not adequate.
6. The officer of the watch did not follow rules of the road (ROR) judiciously especially with respect to action to avoid collision in accordance with Rule No. 8.
7. Common seamanship precaution of not passing ahead of an anchored vessel was not followed.
  - The Master failed to discharge his responsibility as stipulated in the National & International Maritime Regulations with the colliding ship in respect of exchanging information and extending assistance to the anchored ship.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS/LESSONS LEARNT**

- It is extremely important for the Bridge Team to recognize the usefulness of comprehensive passage plan and making use of all available means to assess risk of collision (i.e. ARPA, RADAR, GPS, Physical bearing etc) and initiate avoiding action. (by its maneuvers & reduction of speed or both).
- The maintenance of safe speed bearing in mind the prevailing circumstances as specified in Rule No. 6 of ROR can avoid such collision.
- Good look out in accordance with Rule No. 5 of Colliding Regulations 1972 should be strictly complied with by the Navigating watch keeping officers and the Rating forming part of Navigational watch during navigation.
- Avoid passing ahead of anchored vessel.

**Sd/-**

**(Capt. Deepak Kapoor)**

**Nautical Surveyor-cum-DDG (Tech)**