

**MONACO MANAGEMENT MEETING**  
**Monday 21<sup>st</sup> April 2008**

**TRAINING FOR THE FUTURE:** Are we getting the basics right?  
The STCW dilemma

John Wyborn	Blue Water Yachting
Tim McClement	Flagship Training
Jon Ely	UKSA

**Chairman— Martin Redmayne**  
**Tork Buckley**

Right. Final session for today. I'll make one little comment before we start—this is not a large whisky by the way. Those who are in the room now—obviously we just want to make sure that anyone who's staying in the hotel tonight for dinner, can they let Georgina know, if they haven't already done so. We just want to make sure we have a good group of people for a nice little social gathering. In fact let's do a show of hands. Who's going to stay around for supper tonight? We're just worried you'd all disappear and do silly things like send emails and go and run your businesses. But that's great. Hang around. That's good news.

Obviously the last session has quite a bit of focus on basic training, entry level crew and all these guys coming on board with not a clue how to work on a boat. So we're going to throw this session out to the 3 panellists here—most of you all know the panel, I hope—Sir Tim is flanked by 2 Johns. Jon Ely and John Wyborn. Jon Ely from UKSA—he keeps reminding me it's a charity. I thought my industry was a charity. And then there's John Wyborn from Blue Water Training and Sir Tim from the new Flagship Training Academy—our glorious sponsor. Gentlemen, please, start your engines.

**John Wyborn**     Blue Water Training

Many of you will know about us already; we're based in Antibes, we've got a facility down in Palma where we're just building a new fire ground, we recently set up in Fort Lauderdale, Florida and we already run courses in Viareggio with Agenzia de Felice and we've been established about 18 years providing yacht crew training. We don't train anyone else except yacht crew.

My take on all this? I would love to be the type of training provider that provided courses for chief stewardesses and chief stewards on the correct care of fine cigars and fine cognac and wine. I would love to be providing training to captains on personnel management, conflict resolution, those types of issues, all of which I think are necessary and important. We do run a few courses which are not mandatory, which are not required by the MCA and they are very very difficult to sell. And I think if we ran them at cost people still wouldn't buy them. So that's something I'd like to discuss with you. Because I think that is an area that is important in the industry, there is stuff that needs to be done, and how can we actually achieve a consensus across the industry that it's important. I've got a couple of ideas which I might run through with you in the course of the discussion later. My next little hobby horse is on

STCW95 basic training. I notice on the list of themes, which I think is on the screen behind me, there's a question. Is STCW basic training adequate preparation for yacht crew to go to sea for the first **Time**? My view is yes, but the problem is that when those yacht crew arrive on their yachts very few of them in the sub 55 metre bracket of yachts receive any onboard familiarisation, receive any continuation training in safety and therefore everything that we do in our training facilities is not entirely wasted but it's not made relevant and applicable to the yacht they're working on.

### **Tork**

John, can I just ask you something. You said they don't get familiarisation. Are you talking about the ISM mandated familiarisation or just informal?

### **John**

I'm talking about the necessary familiarisation training which any professional crew member on any size of yacht needs to be a safe and effective member of the ship's crew. Yes, over a certain size yachts that are ISM controlled it happens on large yachts. Large yachts generally speaking are pretty blooming good when it comes to taking this sort of stuff seriously. It's the small commercial vessel code yachts which in my view are the problem. It's not because I think people that work on the smaller yachts are lazy or stupid because I don't think that. But I think there is a cultural issue which we need to address. I'm more and more aware of it as we go through, as we train crew. I ask all of them—I was doing it this morning, I was teaching PSSR this morning. I had 24 students. I asked them how many of them received—half of them were in jobs already—how many of them received on board familiarisation training. Everyone 50 metres plus, yes. But the only 4 who were sub 50 metres, no. So that's something that I would like to broach, I'd like to hear your views on.

### **Tim McClement**      Flagship Academy

I work for Flagship, which has been running for 12 years. It was started by a commercial company to sell off excess Royal Navy training, and it started off selling it to other navies in the world. It then branched out and did training for engineers in the rail industry because the rail industry weren't happy with the artificers training they were getting, (a) the quality of engineering training and (b) in the fact that the kids that were going through didn't have any concept of how to behave when they got to their job. So they also got some training under what the rail industry call a code of conduct. In addition they've also been selling it to P&O large liners, the STCW95, and 2 years ago they looked at the superyacht industry because of the complexity of the big yachts and the size of the crews, and how to get whole crew training or how to help the senior management on board the yacht, the captain, the mate, the senior engineer, etc, deal with the procedures and processes and emergencies, if they have them, in a safe and efficient manner whilst still providing the service to the owner. My experience was 35 years in the Navy, I did a huge amount of training, I had 5 commands, I started off in submarines for 17 years and rode 36 different ships as part of a training regime over a period of 6 years. And it's some of those skills I hope to bring. But key here, and I think it came out in some of the sessions this morning, is not training the senior management, it's helping them work out for themselves how they're going to do it. So I see myself more as a catalyst than as a trainer for whole crew.

Following on John's points, I think the way in which the STCW prepares people—it prepares them to be safe if there is a fire or they have to get off or they have to deal

with first aid, but it doesn't prepare them in any way at all to be a useful member of the crew in anything else. And we need to look at what additional training we as trainers give to these students who come through on the basic STCW95. I'm introducing a 2 hour presentation from someone who's been a steward and someone who's been a captain, to help prepare the students, so that they do understand. We heard this morning too about the foundation course which is 3 weeks long. So I think there's a lot more we can do to help kids be useful members of crew as soon as they arrive. And their safety on board—I can't support you more strongly John. The induction period of how to make sure that these new crew are safe when they get on board. For example how many are taught how to get out of their bed and to the fresh air before they go to sleep for the first night if there's a fire at 2 in the morning. So there's a lot we can do.

**Jon Ely**      UKSA

About 15 years ago I had the great fortune to be employed by the owner of a large yacht. And he came back from one of his voyages and said, do you know, there's a great life out there for young people, it's fantastic. It's got all the things that a young person should have—travel, adventure, learning, responsibility, and he said do you know what—there is also a need for professionally trained crew. He said it's not good enough just for people to walk on board and say hey I can do that. What we need is to train these people, because it would create that opportunity for them. And that was about 15 years ago. And that then became part of his charity—which was the UKSA. And it's set up to provide maritime education and also personal development and the bit that's relevant to this Forum is maritime education. Over 21 years we estimate we've trained about 60,000 into maritime, not just into this sector. That works out at about 400 people into yachting each year, 20% of which probably come into this sector. And these are usually longer term training courses. We train both mandatory training and personal skills, by having a residential facility we're able not only to get the STCW and any other mandatory qualifications that people need. But we're also able to look at people as a person. And when the youngsters go down the pub and have a few too many we're able to bring them back alongside and say hey, you know, let's work on that. How's it going to be in the industry for example. So the shortest course we would do would be STCW over a week. The longest course would be this 3 year sandwich course alongside a degree qualification and my focus and my passion is to make the industry good for new entrants. I believe there's good opportunities there but I don't think it's as strong as it could be against other careers that are on offer for young people. I don't think maritime is on the horizon for young people entering the industry. If you're a sailor, maybe it is. But there's not enough sailors to satisfy the future needs of our industry. So by providing them as we covered this morning, the opportunity to progress, continuing professional development, is something we must do. But I'd also add into there—exit strategies. People don't want to stay at sea all their life, as we've heard. So what do you do. Now when I trained for the merchant navy I left and went to college. And I went to college with every other person who wanted to leave the merchant navy because what can you do when you're qualified to drive a ship. Probably drive a bus was about where we got to. So you have to go to college to retrain. And I'm very keen that the people we should attract into the industry should not only be able to succeed within our industry to the highest level they choose to, or can, but should also be able to step outside it and continue with a life beyond that. And I think if we're able to do that we'll start to crack this volume and quality problem that we have.

**Martin**

Jon thank you. A few questions now to throw at the panel. Tork?

**Tork**

We were talking on Sunday morning about the small boat problem, which is the sort of just over 24 metre loadline length, and the difficulties of operating them. I think your team had a fairly pessimistic view of how well it was actually succeeding?

**John**

It's not that there's anything wrong with the people working in those boats. It's actually that I think there is a particular problem and that's what we've got to actually address. It's perhaps one thing to have a full ISM management setup when you've got a 60 or 70 metre yacht and 15 or 20 plus crew. When you've got 4 crew and you're still expected to have a safety management system I think there's a whole different level of problem that exists there but part of the problem is it might be a failure, as we discussed on Sunday morning, of the MCA to define exactly what type of safety procedures they expect on small commercial vessel yachts.

**Tork**

You're talking in terms of a safety management system ?

**John**

Yes, because the guidance is very woolly. And this feeds into the stuff that I was talking about earlier, about onboard induction training, familiarisation training for new crew—it's all part of the same issue. It's not clearly defined and what one Red Ensign flag will accept doesn't necessarily bear any relation to what another Red Ensign flag will accept.

**Tork**

So I mean we talked a little after the meeting about what you have in mind—I think if I can summarise it is that the MCA should not provide prescriptive regulation as to what mini ISM is but to give guidelines as to how to develop it. Because if I'm correct, the developing of it by the master on board is actually part of the process of creating a good system, because you have to develop it to match your operation.

**John**

Exactly. The MCA made it very clear incidentally, that they had no intention of providing any guidance for the small commercial vessel code on ISM but suggested that the Cayman Islands do it, because most of the yachting tonnage seems to go to the Cayman Islands. So is there anyone from the Cayman Islands there?

**Tork**

No, let's talk about it now—give him a microphone.

**John**

He seemed to be rather keen on the Cayman Islands producing some guidelines. Apparently there is a Red Ensign meeting coming up. And it's on the agenda. I think it's really important.

**Peter Domladis** Cayman Islands Shipping Registry

I have no comment here because this is about training not about safety management systems on board. So we are talking about STCW etc so let's talk about—

**John**

We're talking about training. And I think part of the training the yachting industry needs is not just about training in our classrooms, it's also as Tim here said, it's also what you do on board. And I think that's part of—there needs to be an expectation, which at the moment I think is not being met.

**Peter**

Just one clarification—are we talking about small commercial code or large commercial vessels.?

**Tork**

Under 500 gross tons.

**Peter**

That's different.

**John**

Tork is right. We're talking really under 500 gross tons, below the level of which formal ISM safety management systems are required.

**Peter**

Because I'm not familiar with small commercial code. I'm familiar with large commercial yacht code. So are we talking about Annexe 2, or we are talking about small commercial yacht code?

**John**

Annexe 2.

**Peter**

Annexe 2, large commercial yacht code. Which is applicable to any yacht over 24 metres less than 500 gross tons, engaged in commercial activities.

**Tork**

Yes, but the problem we encounter is that over 500 gross tons many officers and masters working on yachts are familiar with the concept of a safety management system and perhaps have operated and used one. Whereas many mariners involved

in the operation of vessels between 24 metres and 500 gross tons are not. The mini ISM is required to be essentially developed on board. Which is a good thing, but there is no guidance available at this stage—actually John's being a little unfair since the guy from MCA did actually say they'd take it back home and tell them you wanted it. But at the moment there's no guidance from flag state as to what that should comprise.

**Peter**

Not really, because as Annexe2 is written, it's guidance by itself.

**Tork**

Yes that's right. That's the problem. What we're saying is we feel it would be very beneficial if flag could actually give some guidelines to get them started on developing their safety management system.

**Peter**

Maybe you are right. However, as I said before, Annexe 2 is written in the form of guidance.

**John**

There's hardly anything of it. There's a paragraph.

**Peter**

Because it's short. It should be short and sweet because it's tailored for yachts of less than 500 gross tons. And that's the reason why it's written that way, to be short and sweet and understandable to yacht crew of less than 500 gross tons which are not familiar with the requirements of ISM and ISPS. And much less they are not required to have DOC on board, they are not required to have DPA elsewhere.

**John**

But surely they're required to carry out risk assessment. Surely they're required to have standards for onboard familiarisation for new crew members. Surely a lot of the fundamental principles of ISM must still apply otherwise it's a completely meaningless Annexe, if they don't actually have to have—if it's going to be called a safety management system it has to manage safety.

**Peter**

It's called safety management system, it's not called international safety management system because it is applicable to vessels over 500 gross tons. So what we are saying is, whenever I am doing LY Code Compliance Survey on board, every year I am coming on board and I am trying to advise our captains as to where they are going wrong, if they're going wrong, because we are not doing formal audit. We guide them as we are doing annual surveys on board. So there is no written guidance on anywhere published by Cayman Islands but what we are doing, we are going on board and we are invariably promoting safety management conscience and we are—maybe it's too hard to say downgrading our experience on larger vessels to vessels less than 500 gross tons but over 24 metres. Because putting guidance on

our website would be nothing but putting completely safety management system—for example if you Google safety management system on the internet you will get for free, procedures etc etc. This is not what we want to accomplish on our yachts. We want to accomplish that the master—for example, records and maintenance. There are already requirements for emergency drills, abandon ship, man overboard, steering etc. Requirements are already there. There is nothing special they need to put into safety management systems.

**John**

So they don't need to do risk assessment then.

**Peter**

Risk assessment in terms of what?

**John**

In terms of if a deckhand is going to go up the mast, if somebody is going to go into an enclosed space, if somebody is going to launch their tenders. For all the activities they also do on small yachts just like they do on the big ones. There's no requirement for formalised risk assessment and a proper—I mean you either have a safety management system or you don't. It either functions as a proper effective way of controlling the hazards that you have on board or it doesn't.

**Peter**

I am just trying to put in simple words for a simple yachtmaster offshore who will be captain on a 200 gross ton vessel less than 150 miles from offshore. If I start preaching about risk assessment and stuff like that he will be confused. I am trying—

**John**

They're quite intelligent chaps actually.

[From the floor]

He should not be confused on that because if he is, he shouldn't be captain.

**Tork**

Yes, but a lot of this echoes back to the Lady Candida incident, and that was a 25 metre yacht and the problem that was identified by the MEIB was that there was no safety management system in place, albeit that it's required to be an informal one, there was no safety management system, there was no onboard audit, there was no external audit, there was additionally no time or money supplied by the owner to maintain the vessel and he hired somebody who wasn't qualified. So all of those factors should be addressed by the informal ISM system that is required by the Annexe. The problem being that many of the managers, almost all of the owners and quite a lot of the officers and masters are not familiar with a safety management system of any form because they may never have worked on an ISM vessel. So they need some guidance from somebody as to how to develop their own.

**Peter**

Yes I can agree on this one with you. However, problem is that you have many management companies, which they have already prepared safety management system for yachts less than 500 gross ton. What they are doing, they are printing this out and handing over to the captain. And they said this is your safety management system. Then it's my job to come on board and see if this is working and what I'm finding is it is not working. Because it's a generic safety management system and it's not tailored for this vessel. What we are trying to promote is that the captain himself, and we are trying to use as simple words as possible—

**John**

What are you doing to promote that?

**Peter**

First of all it's mandatory. That's it. 1<sup>st</sup> January 2007 Annexe 2 became mandatory. What we are doing whenever we are doing annual surveys we are trying to put as simple as possible—for example the other day on a yacht that I was surveying they had something and they were asking whether this was enough and sufficient. I said it is and it's not. Because it is brought by management company and it was 55 pages of words, just letters on a paper.

**John**

So they need guidance.

**Peter**

Absolutely they need guidance but to actually put guidance together you need resources. You need people, you need time, you need—it's very easy to say yes, they need guidance. But then as yachting is crying for people, administrations are crying for people, ship owners are crying for people, shipyards are crying for people. Everybody's crying for people. Myself, I haven't been at home since January this year. I came here from Newfoundland. I flew there straight from Gulf Port and Louisiana. Before that I was on tanker training. Before that I was audits in Panama, you name it. Every year—

**Tork**

That's a very interesting point—in fact we touched on it this morning. That human resources—it's not just a shortage of crew.

**Peter**

No it's not just the yachting industry is affected by shortage. Everybody is.

**John**

And the MCA are cutting back as well.

**Peter**

So yes, I'm taking your point on board. Guidance should be there. But however, in lack of people to actually sit down and write this guidance, we have 12 or 13 surveyors going every day on board promoting safety management systems. Safety management consciousness verbally. Trying to use as simple words as possible because vessel less than 500 gross tons over 24 metres some of them they have 3½ crew on board. Some of them they have 5 or 6 crew on board.

**John**

So it has to be appropriate.

**Peter**

It has to be tailored specifically for this vessel.

**John**

Notwithstanding your manning problems and I sympathise with that completely, but if this guidance doesn't come from the flag authorities, where is it going to come from?

**Peter**

It will come in due course.

**Tork**

Is there any way that the findings and comments of your surveyors could be made available to the industry that might help people that are trying to develop this?

**Peter**

They are made available to Forums like during Boat Show in Fort Lauderdale—one management company has organised a little forum for their captains and superintendents and we were there, who else—Marshal Islands were there, and—

**Tork**

But is there anything you could maybe give us that we could put on our website or put in our magazine that would just at least help people?

**Peter**

I could give you groups. It's fire fighting, safety equipment, it's training, documentation, document control. It's always the same.

**John**

Please do.

**Peter**

Take tanker, take a little yacht—you will always find the same groups, plus for bigger companies lack of proper management and non conformities within the DOC. I mean you know—not follow up, not closing non conformities from internal audits, not

closing out non conformities for external audits etc etc. We are going around, we are flying around, we are easing major non conformities, we are withdrawing DOCs, we are withdrawing ISSCs, internal ship's security certificates, we are doing whatever possible to make this industry safer in every respect. Unfortunately we've had no time to put together guidelines—it's no big deal, it's not rocket science, I mean basic guidance you have in ISM code, actually, in Part B. There are also guidance for international safety management system—basic how to is in various SMCs which are available on IMO. My problem of the industry is that captain of the yacht has no time basically to go to IMO website and therefore he will look for help from us.

### **John**

I think if that guidance existed it would support the captain, because one of the problems, and one of the reasons for this problem that I highlighted in the first place is that the captain has to fight against the owner, who really doesn't care about all this sort of stuff, a lot of them. They care about whether the air conditioning is working and whether the champagne is cold. And if somebody tells them that this is something you've got to do sir, because it says it here, and this is produced by the Cayman Islands authority, that will help the captain to be able to persuade his owner that it actually really is important and that it really does need to be done. That's notwithstanding what I said though. I also think that as an industry we ought to take responsibility for this as well, and I think this comes into what Sir Tim has been doing with onboard training on yachts. Assisted onboard training is a way that we can help the industry especially in that sector, but also on the large yachts as well, to actually think about how they're doing things on board, and internally. And I think we as an industry have to take some responsibility for this as well. I don't think we can blame it all on the Cayman Islands.

### **Peter**

Absolutely. Because we have 75% of yachts over 24 metres are under Cayman Islands flag. And we are aware of this problem. I will take your point on board and we have REG meeting next week or whatever and I will suggest this—I have meeting with Greg Evans on Wednesday and I will suggest this to him.

### **John**

Thank you.

### **Tork**

And I mean certainly anything that you have, even in an informal way, that you can share with us, we're happy to publish it even if it's not in a fully formed way. We're always happy to help.

### **Peter**

Tork, one of the advantages of Cayman Islands flag is that everything is within family. So we keep everything within our clients and us. So we can provide you with the general—but we like to keep this for ourselves. However we will be happy to share our knowledge with The Yacht Report as may be required.

### **Tim**

Could I just add to that the important thing has been mentioned a number of times—it mustn't be so prescriptive as you said, that's it's no good for a crew of 4 or a crew of 9. It's got to be guidance that the captain can then implement what is right for his crew and his boat. That's key. Otherwise it won't be used.

**Jorg Wendt**          D & B Services

I think there is guidance around. If you look in the code of safe working practice there is a complete form generic about risk management and as John said, the people are not that stupid—even yacht masters, to fill these forms out (especially yacht masters) for their boats. There is the MGN 71 which has guidance, there is the MGN 280 which gives the small boats under 24 metres guidance how to improve safety management on board. But just one question—do you think if in France all the automatic radars would be switched off, that somebody would respect the speed limit? and that's the point that we face in this industry. As we have covered with ISM, ISPS, MGNs, MSMs, etc—we are covered with codes and regulations but as long as nobody gives a clue if something is followed then everybody will just lie back and follow nothing. And that's the point—a very very important point. And that's the thing which comes to port state control, and I do not want to blame Mr Cayman Islands here, because it is port state control as well. As long as nobody goes ahead and makes a port state control or flag state control if applicable, then nothing will change.

**Tork**

Yes. Mind you, having said that, ISM as a concept is about safety culture. It's not about prescription, it's about developing things on board. And once you've developed it you get a bit attached to it, you may even use it. It's one of the reasons for wanting guidelines for mini ISM not rules, because with the guidelines the master and crew must develop a system. Having developed it, they almost cannot help but buy into it.

**Jorg**

Well if you would work on a boat and you would have next week an audit and they would have a look at your guidelines which you developed, maybe if they're imperfect and there's things to improve—once you developed it then the next step is very very easy to make it sort of perfect or foolproof. But the point is that the people do not even start. They do not even start to develop things like that because nobody's asking. Nobody's asking them for these things. They're asking them for paper, but no consequences.

**John**

The yachts do get surveyed and if they were surveyed according to a set of guidelines that's been printed by a flag authority then at least there is something against which they can be checked. But without that of course there is no impetus to create the thing in the first place.

**Peter**

Just a second. A colleague here made an excellent point and that supports state control. Why do you think tankers industry is so well regulated? I mean so well maintained. I mean L+G, LPG bulk carriers etc etc—because of a third factor of control there. You have a flag administration, you have owners, but you have port state control as well. So far what I heard is that proper port state control is carried out

by US Coastguard on East Coast of United States. Also we heard that South of Italy is doing something. Greece is doing something. Croatia is doing something but they are checking more or less only certificates issued to the vessel because they need to obtain some kind of cruising permit through Croatian waters etc. But I haven't seen any port state control from South of France—because they are shiny white boats and everybody is afraid to touch them. So what we need also is third tool of control and this is port state control because port state control—a yacht captain, not knowing when within 24 hours 7 days a week port state control will step on board they will certainly maintain better control over whatever they are doing on board their ships. Like they are doing on commercial vessels.

### **Martin**

Let's get back to the subject. Basic training please.

**Thorsten Bruhn** Wallem Group

No it's to add something to the ISM actually. It's for people who were not in the training session this morning. I attended a port state control and a flag state control meeting in March in Athens. And the findings there were that ISM code failed. You talking about tankers, bulk carriers, LPGs, etc. The findings were—ISM failed. What happened there is they—as an owner I'm not afraid of port state control because my ship is in order. I have all the right things, I have right ships etc. I need that in order to get the commercial factor right, to get the high charter rates. That's why I need that. But the owners who don't want to have process and procedure will always try to bypass them. In any way. They will fall through the network—so the port state control—it ended in that meeting the port state control officers should inspect the ships who are bad, not the good ones. I think that's very important here.

### **Martin**

OK, thank you. Guys—are we getting the basics right in STCW? Tim?

### **Tim**

You have to start somewhere, and so people need to be able to look after the safety of themselves and their crew members and guests and anyone else on board the boat. So the basic of can you fight a fire, do you know how to fight a fire, can you get off if you have to, and help people get off, can you do first aid, and the PSSR are vital. So I think the basic course is absolutely right. Does it prepare people for going on board a yacht, to be a useful member? No, you can do more. And the foundation, as we talked about this morning, is looking to do that. Now that basic fire fighting, for example, is hugely important. In the Royal Navy over the last 20 years 95% of the fires on board naval vessels have been put out by the person who found them, and have not ended up being serious fires. And you need to give them that confidence, the individuals, that they can put out that small fire.

### **Tork**

The basic training course is 5 days, and it's mandated to be a certain number of days by MCA, I can't quite remember.

### **John**

There's a different number of hours for each course, actually.

**Tim**

Each module has a different number of hours, so the PSSR has a minimum I think of 7½.

**Tork**

I had a very interesting conversation with somebody who had attended STCW basic training, which was over 5 days. And they had 3 days of training and they had 2 days of sitting around, because they were told they "had completed everything they had to do and there was nothing else to teach them. But they had to stay there because MCA mandated it was this many hours". I'd be interested in your comments on that.

**Tim**

The MCA do mandate the number of hours for each module. And also they mandate what should be taught in each module and the standard that each individual should reach. And they have to pass a certificate. And therefore it's up to the trainers to work out how to deliver that level of training in the number of hours that they're given.

**Tork**

Are you assuming that if they've actually achieved all that in 3 days wouldn't it be fair for the person who's paying the money to get a little bit extra for the next two days?

**John**

You can only just cram it into 5 days I would say.

**Jon**

There's a huge amount of content to train within a 5 day period so obviously whoever you've spoken to didn't get their money's worth.

**John**

Yes, and if the MCA went in and audited that course, which they are entitled to, and they should do—

**Tork**

How often do they do that?

**John**

We get visited probably once every couple of years? It's required every 5 years but because we're not in the UK I think they pop down and see us a bit more often.

**Tork**

It's a question of location! But do you consider that to be a frequent enough audit? I mean once every 2 years. Surely it should be annual?

**Jon**

It depends what you're auditing and what you're trying to achieve. I think the delivery is about the competence of your training establishment and I think there's much better ways to ascertain when somebody is delivering or not delivering and encourage people to deliver more. If you know you've got a spot inspection—everybody knows when surveys are done on vessels it's entirely possible to get everything in the right order.

**Tork**

But what type of method would you recommend for—

**Jon**

Well collating feedback and surveys of feedback from clients that have come through.

**John**

And of course we're all required to have ISO quality management systems as well which are all about feedback and—

**Tork**

So every training establishment must be ISO 9001—

**Tim**

Yes and the MCA have to check out the person who's instructing as well and they have to approve the instructor. So it's not just the facilities you're using but the person you're using to teach.

**Tork**

But I guess what I'm coming back to is that if this were an approved training establishment which as far as I recall it was, and it clearly seems to not be providing value for money or if not value for money, it doesn't seem to be providing the product, which is good training, is the audit and control system of MCA adequate for the industry as a whole?

**John**

If any of the students on that course reported to the MCA what they experienced, the MCA I can guarantee would definitely investigate.

**Jon**

But it depends on how widespread you're suggesting this is.

**Tork**

Oh this was one particular conversation but I find it quite shocking.

**Jon**

But I think the three of us here find it quite shocking. Because there's also a pass or fail criteria, so not everyone passes. So coming back to value for money, some people can spend their money on a week long course and fail—going back to John's point—an individual module. But if they fail that module they're not qualified. They're also therefore getting value for money, because they have an adequate assessment of their qualities and abilities, and that's how it should be.

**Tim**

Yes it is, but all I'm saying is that if the MCA are coming in, it's coming back to what is mandated. It's not just they have to do so many hours, and follow the criteria. They have to pass the course as well, otherwise they're not competent to go on board that yacht.

**Jon**

It's quite interesting, coming back to the ISM on conversation there—the conversation is about creating a system which is self sustaining, not a book which says this is the way we do things. And I think that is the way the MCA expects an organisation to run. They're setting up a management system, they're making sure the organisation and the lecturers they use are competent and therefore that should be self regulating in a sense and only need sporadic checks to make sure everything is still in place and make the processes and procedures work.

**Tork**

But the mini ISM system is annually audited or surveyed if you prefer to call it that, isn't it?

**Peter**

Back to annual audits of training centres. I'm not familiar with what MCA is doing but I mean if you maintain quality management system, which you have to, then you have annual audit by issuing body. I don't know—DNV, Lloyds Register, ABS or whatever and they will audit every year and they will go through their procedures, and whether they're maintaining etc etc. So training centres are annually audited.

[From the floor]

In fairness, having gone through the MCA approval system last year for an SSO course I have to say from my experience it's extremely rigorous. The documentation and approval process—all course documentation—that's test papers, written content, student notes, every single power point they want bios of all the instructors and they'll come and sit on the whole course for 3 days etc, they'll interview students at the end of that course, they'll want to see debrief sheets from the students etc. So however, in defence of all that, which I think is absolutely the right way to go for any credible training organisation, it doesn't stop people running courses in hotel rooms which we've all heard of, sitting round a laptop, running an SSO course, two people round a laptop. It happens, from people who've also been accredited. So it's difficult to be a policeman everywhere in every single place in the world.

But moving on from that I'd like to ask the panel what they think about including security elements in STCW 95 basic—and I have to say it's something that we've discussed in the past whether they think there should be elements of basic security awareness included in this basic package. Because ultimately sub 500 gross ton yachts have the same security issues as larger ones. In fact one would argue greater, because their crew sizes don't afford them the luxury of maybe having a bespoke security team and there's also a lack of investment from the owners.

**Jon**

I think there's many things you could include in what you might call basic training. I think rightly or wrongly what STCW 95 covers is a focus on safety. If you took ship's security officer which is a very important part of certain vessels, you could also then look at the management stuff we've been discussing this morning, and saying well actually appropriate management is therefore part of the safety management of the vessel. I guess it's where you start and where you stop.

[From the floor]

What we're seeing is a lack of investment in crew training, and I have to say from, having talked to SSOs, I think the weakness in that particular system as with other systems is the quality of the instructor on board. More and more we're getting asked to assist with onboard training because SSOs through no fault of their own, they've completed the mandatory course, they've got their ticket, but they feel inexperienced or unable to run training on board themselves so they call on people with that particular expertise, whether it be safety or security, to assist with that. But it's funding—when you don't have to do something, as we mentioned early this morning, owners and captains won't do it because they don't have to. And I have to say consistently a weakness in a lot of the systems is the training of the crew at a lower level, which are the eyes, the ears and the workhorse that underpin safety and security or any other system on board a yacht.

**John**

I couldn't agree more.

**Jon**

Interestingly enough, within the longer 6 month training courses we've been running we were putting SSO in probably for the last 4 years as a standard course. But about 6 months ago I pulled it out and replaced it with more management training because—I could be shot here—the crew agents or the employers didn't rate the qualification as a desirable qualification. And looking at the desirability of the training that we were providing for our clients coming through, we decided it was more valuable to replace it with something else. So it's very interesting that you should raise the point.

**John**

But there isn't time in a 5 day basic training course to do any more I would suggest.

**Peter**

I don't want to preach here but STC was recently amended and 1<sup>st</sup> January 2008 came into force recent amendments where ship security officer training is part of

STCW and is mandatory course for every ship security officer on vessels which are required to have one. So ship security officer training is in the STCW 78 as amended right now. And if you go to Cayman Islands website you will see how you can transfer or transform your pre certificate for ship security officer issued pre 1<sup>st</sup> January 2008, how you can convert into STCW one, provided that body which issues the ship security officer certificate will continue to be approved by administration on whose behalf the certificate was issued.

[From the floor]

I appreciate that the SSO thing has been done, but at a low level.

**Tork**

Sir Tim, you told me when we were talking in Italy about—you do a little extra at the end of an STCW basic training course. Could that little extra incorporate security elements?

**Tim**

Again, it depends on how much you want. The extra we do is a 2 hour lecture which is how to be useful when you get on board. But it's a key point—what is in the PSSR? Is it adequate, and that's for the MCA—going back to John on my left's point, about you've only got so many hours in the 5 days in which to do the training and what is the SSOs job, and how do you get the kids to understand when they're on board what their responsibility is as a member of the crew. And it also comes back to the point of what are they told when they get there? Yes, we could cover some of the security issues but you don't know which boat they're going to, and if you say this is how it's done they'll get on board their boat and find it's done a different way.

**Tork**

But how about just a simple security awareness? I mean I think that may be what we're just talking about—having a security eye.

**Tim**

And they are taught that. And they're also taught the basics of when they get on board in this lecture whenever you walk from A — B on board your superyacht you look feel and smell.

**Tork**

Hopefully you smell nice.

**Tim**

No, smell the atmosphere to see if there's a fire or something's not running properly etc. So there are things we can do to make it better and make the crew, the newbies, more helpful. But I think the foundation course is a better way to go with a 3 week course, if they can afford to do it. And it's not mandatory.

**Martin**

What is the price?

**Tim**

Of the 3 week course? It's still to be worked out by the foundation but it will be in the order of £2,500.

**John**

It's getting cheaper all the time!

**Barbara Tambani**

Floating Life International SA

We have just gone through the certification of our office and we got in contact with 3 registers to certify our office and the first 2 registers told us the less you write in your ISM manual, the less non conformity reports you will get from the surveyor! So this is what we just said—perhaps they are not the right registers for us. So we went to the third one who made a great job, it cost us €20,000 and we have a person dedicated that turns around our boats, even if they are not 500 gross tons and we just ask the captain and we support the captain to insert in our ISM manual their safety procedure for their boat and we ask them to do drills every month. This is something that costs us a lot of money, it costs us a person dedicated to that, but we just do it because we think human lives are more important than what is written in a manual. But of course you can buy a manual from anywhere, just quite cheap, but this is not what we wanted. We asked them what we wanted to do, we wanted something really worth it but this is what you get from—the less you write, the less non conformity reports you will get from your surveyor and be safe with that.

**Martin**

So who are you with now?

**Barbara**

ABS.

**Martin**

Right. A simple question. I hope someone can answer. How difficult is it to fail STCW?

**Tim**

Well two weeks ago we failed one person who wouldn't jump into the water when they were doing the abandon ship drills. He was frightened of heights. So he failed.

**Martin**

That must be a first?

**Tim**

No, the average failure rate of STCW, not just for the superyacht industry, not just for the courses we run, is 9%.

**John**

STCW is competency based. Which means generally speaking that you have to show you can do something. So you have to be able to wear the BA, you have to be able to jump in the pool, you have to be able to capsize the liferaft. If you can't do any of those things then you can't get through. Now we spend a lot of time and effort—we've got people through who can't swim, who've been terrified of the water, but they've still been able to do what they've needed to do.

**Tork**

Did you just throw them in?

**John**

Yes, we just pushed them in. No we didn't. But you can get people through with a lot of coaching, but sometimes you do get people who just can't do it.

[From the floor]

But should you be getting those people through?

**John**

I think it depends. On the particular situation. There are plenty of seafarers, including the chief examiner of the MCA, who can't swim. So I don't think that's necessarily a disqualification in itself for being able to pass basic training. If you can actually jump into the water wearing a life jacket, and climb into a liferaft and capsize that liferaft, then I think my answer would be yes.

**Rod Hatch**

Vectis Maritime

I'd like to come back to something that Tim said a while back, going back to—is STCW preparing new crew for life on board. And Tim mentioned one word—it's the only time I've heard it mentioned today—behaviour. Now 18-22 year old people can be trained to do amazing things. 22 years old, the Royal Air Force will give you a very expensive jet fighter to fly. The Israeli Army will give you 2 or 3 squadrons of tanks to command. But these people who get there have gone through a very rigorous training and behavioural training programme. Where we are in the yacht industry today, because of this crew shortage situation, we have young people coming in who are going through some very fast training and no behavioural training whatsoever for the most part. And last year for the first time since I've been in this industry a crew recruiter said to me one day you know, I'm getting people coming in here now who are being rude to me. And I said that's not possible—you're dead in the water in this industry if you don't know how to behave. She said no, people are becoming rude and arrogant and demanding. I heard the same again from another crew recruiter. In the Summer I went to Venezia and I know the agent there very well—I heard similar comments from some of the girls in the agency, particularly from young chief stewardesses. I went round to Napoli and in Napoli I've known the Luise family there since 1990. I heard the same comments from them. At the end of the season I had lunch with the family that founded the marinas here along the coast—I was with four of them. And I said I've heard these comments, this Summer, and to me it's unbelievable. And they all said, captain, it's true. People don't know how to behave, they've been given a high position at a very young age, they're surrounded by

money, they're spending big money on behalf of the owners and it's gone to their heads.

**Tork**

Do you think that is a function of having to choose less good crew because there aren't enough around, or is it a broader social phenomenon?

[From the floor]

Some of these rude comments that I've seen and have been involved in these things with crew and so on—on their side of it they're under enormous stress. In the middle of the Summer, just get it done whatever it takes. So that could be the answer—there's no excuse for it however.

**Tork**

I will agree with you and say that I've certainly seen some of the categories of people that were complaining about rudeness occasionally slightly less than polite themselves.

[From the floor]

Sure, and it's coming down from the owners, the new owners, the Eastern European bloc and so on. And really they're quite difficult to deal with and it all flows down. Now the agents—one below the crew—the agents will then get their people to do it. But it's a highly stressful dynamic Summer and you know you meet them in September and they're fine. But during the Summer they're pretty stressed.

**John**

I think there's definitely scope for a course that teaches some of the finer points of courtesy, especially when you're dealing with people from different nationalities with different customs or the yachting industry.

**Tork**

But you couldn't sell it!

**John**

But that's just what I was going to say—I could not give it away. How many deckhands learn on a course how to turn a rope around a bollard or how to tie a bowline or how to mix two part paint, or how to use a bosun's chair? Now I know that some of them that go to Jon over at UKSA yes, I know actually some go through the IYA scheme which is excellent to get that training. But there's plenty that don't. And they don't learn it from us, apart from those that come on yachtmaster—and those bollards are pretty small.

**Tork**

But John, shouldn't that be being taught by the captains?

**John**

Yes. And I think that's part of the issue that I was addressing earlier really. I think the onboard training issue is just something that needs to be fostered. There could also be some role for non mandatory training but yes, we can't give it away. I think perhaps it's on the list of things for us to discuss, some sort of industry body—

**Martin**

Have you tried giving it away?

**John**

Actually no I haven't yet.

**Tim**

But going back to your point Tork. The captains, yes, should teach, and the mates should teach and the bosuns should teach but if it's a really busy season and there's a lot going on, it's how many hours have you got in the day.

**Tork**

That tied into the whole change required within the industry which includes gently persuading—Frank talked about teaching Russian owners how it doesn't work—but it's part of the package. I talked to a captain at one event and he explained to me how John ought to create a new course explaining how to tie bowlines, because you know when he got his seasonal staff for the Summer he had to teach them how to tie a bowline and I said but don't you think you should? He said no no, I want them to be able to do all that basic stuff when they come to me. So I said well hire them a week earlier and spend a week training them? But they don't have time for that.

**Jon**

This is difficult on both sides, because whilst it's difficult for employers and captains looking at crew with this level of performance, I guess if you look at it from a crew point of view, coming into the industry that they don't understand, that they haven't been educated about, it's no wonder they're not sticking with us for a while, because they don't understand it and they're in the wrong space. So we've got to match both up and we've got to find a way to educate people coming in to know what to expect as well as to be able to deliver.

**Tim**

It's also safety, and I agree with you they should be taught, Tork, but it's also their own personal safety on board. How many times have we seen in Monaco boats coming in with their greens actually hanging over the side of the boat thinking they're helping with a fender but actually not realising that their arm is the fender because the fender is too low? And so this is why the Foundation want the week long course called Sea Sense so they'll be taught this, so when they get on board not only will they be of help to the captain but they'll be safe.

**Tork**

Yes, the problem I find with that is that it's a laudable idea but it's an awful lot of investment for someone coming into the industry. That's where we come back to the

point that it has to be part of the package of the boat, and it would be extremely advantageous for the yacht to send someone on this course, but it needs to be tied into the whole structure I think.

[From the floor]

Just moving a little way away from STCW, the types of training that we've been talking about recently, the behavioural training, leadership training, management training and such are soft skills, human factor skills. And it was made abundantly plain to me over lunch and quite rightly so that somebody has to pay for this. I think John has said that he can't give these courses away but the industry needs it. What was told to me over lunch was that the owner pays for that. Ultimately the owner pays for everything. As a kind of off the wall suggestion, which raises more questions than answers I suppose, I would like to suggest that we understand that, going back to the previous session, that this is a transient industry, that individuals within it want to develop, that's what makes them stay within the industry. Within a part of the industry. So I believe that there are a lot of people that want to move through the industry and then move with their skills and take those ashore. Now when they gain skills through the industry, the management skills, the human factor skills and so on, they're of worth to the supporting framework of the industry. That is the insurers, the managers, any number of people that support it. Crew agents indeed. So as I say this will raise more questions than answers. But if there were a levy provided by everybody in the industry that signed up to it, that they had to put money in, to give good quality training, that would help them to bring ashore good quality people to help their own organisations.

**Tork**

Yes, there was a suggestion mooted, and I can't remember who said it, because it was a very brave suggestion—oh it was Phil—to add a very small percentage of the commission gained on charters to improve the industry. Oddly enough, whenever levies have been suggested, nobody's actually said no. Which I actually found quite remarkable. But you'd obviously have to have a very specific and clever way of spending it to ensure that it was actually effective.

[From the floor]

Yes I think greater minds than mine would have to look at it. But I think that if you look at the responsibilities of someone like a crew agent or someone like a trainer—trainers are passionate about what they do. But they can't afford, and neither can the captain, to provide training for the individual. The individual himself, the deckhand, can't afford £2,500.

**Tork**

But the industry can?

[From the floor]

but the industry can. Very definitely.

**Tork**

So it means something like scholarships, or bursaries, or something of that nature?

[From the floor]

Something. And who's chosen to go on that training, that's another simple question.

**Martin**

Terry, you certainly can't afford to do the £2,500 basic training. Why?

[From the floor]

I think if you asked a deckhand, about STCW, to begin with, some deckhands—

**Martin**

If you're serious about a career, surely you'll invest in—

**Tork**

But there's a difference between—we're not talking about basic training, we're talking about an expanded 3 week version of it. And that's quite a big jump.

**Martin**

But if you're really serious about coming into this industry you'll make the investment. 2 months' pay.

[From the floor]

If I may just say that I think that STCW has taken off because it's become mandatory.

**Tork**

It isn't.

[From the floor]

It appears to be mandatory, which is good enough. Now if a deckhand, who knows very little about the industry, which we've already established, wants to enter it, the first thing he recognises when he talks to anybody is hey, to get into this industry I need STCW and I need ENG1. Frankly not everybody—but he doesn't care where he gets it provided he passes that course. He doesn't care whether he gets 95% or 75%. And I would hesitate to suggest that some captains don't care or don't enquire as to how good that mandatory training, if I can put it like that, that training was, provided he has those certificates. And I do take the view that all captains, whatever the size of yacht, should be looking at their induction of individuals and of course their retention.

**Jon**

One of the biggest barriers to entry—there is a financial barrier, but the financial barrier becomes most relevant when someone entering the industry doesn't know much about it and can't see progression and also can't see a destination beyond the industry. And I think if we're going to attract people a fund would help, where people would have to pay less, because training is expensive. The candidates that come

through my 3 year programme pay £24,000. They earn it back during the period of the 3 year training. But they've still got to pitch up with about £15,000 up front, which is a huge commitment. I would say if somebody's committed that much they're very serious in getting to the top. But it's almost blind faith, because there is no progression. There is very little support from yachts or management companies that will enable them to go forward and see where they're going. And that's a real problem. The second point I'd raise is, that the advice we're all giving them, and we're getting better at this now, but if you go back 2 or 3 years, let's say little Johnny turns up with his Mum, Mum's got a duty to make sure her son goes off into a worth while career, comes to me or other training organisations—they'll get different advice from every training organisation. They maybe talk to a captain in the industry who'll give different advice again. And when you're faced with that, against other opportunities for 18—19 year olds, you'll go the other way because the advice is always different. And we just don't seem to have our act together to attract people in.

### **Nick Simmons**

Well this is what I was going to say, is that somehow you've got to have a foundation block of training to get these people into this industry and keep them in this industry. You were saying about your three year course—now we've got a deckhand on board who's done that course; his mother paid £24,000 because that's the only way he could actually get that money together. He's been on board 4 months now and he's mightily annoyed at the amount of money he's spent and the result he's got. And he keeps coming up to me and saying well why didn't I just come down into yachting and learn it that way and save myself £20,000? Yes, you could have done that but that course did get you the job. Now I feel you've still, as UKSA, you've still got to tailor your courses to entry level. Three years is not entry level. He's expecting next year to go off and drive a yacht himself, a 24 metre. Sorry, he can't do that. But his training and his piece of paper thinks he can. Now that's a problem.

### **Tork**

But maybe what's required is it's not just one simple solution. Martin is saying it's not that expensive to have to pay to get into the industry but it kind of is if you don't know if you'll like it. So it requires a sort of contribution from everybody concerned. So maybe it's fair enough to expect everybody to get STCW basic training, that's a small investment to enter the industry. But it might be very advantageous if there's an educational foundation or an enlightened owner who also wants to play their part. And the whole thing gathers commitment out of all the parties involved. Including the industry if they're going to pay some money for an educational foundation. Everybody buys into the deal. I think it's better than one person paying for it.

### **Jon**

But what other industry can you go into without any prior training? Without having to pay for prior training? I can't think of one.

### **John**

Do we think there's a role for the big 5 brokerage and management houses to get together and help to form an industry consensus? Because the problem is there's no industry consensus. We're all in competition with each other, we all talk to each other, we're on good terms.

**Martin**

Well the new Skills foundation is backed by the top 5 brokerage houses.

**John**

But are they the people who actually should be controlling it? They're probably the best place to finance it, but are they the people who should be controlling it?

[From the floor]

It comes back to what was a throw away comment that I made in Amsterdam during the crew debate—the question was who's going to finance—we were actually talking about recruiting crew. And I threw a comment of—perhaps we should get the brokers together and put a small levy on all yacht sales. At the end of the day it's the owners one way or another that are going to pay for this, no matter how you break it up or break it down, they're going to pay for it if we don't do it and they're going to pay for it if we do do it. So we might as well be upfront about it and say OK let's do it this way. Let's raise the finance to attract the people, to train the people, not all training—there should be a commitment from people to train. We shouldn't be taking hundreds of people that think well we'll have a couple of weeks in this industry training then throwing all that money away. There should be a commitment on both sides.

**Tork**

I think the scholarship model is quite a good one. I mean you need to have commitment, and to exhibit commitment to have the assistance. But I think it's good to have the assistance there as well.

**John**

We've got a number of students now who pay us a monthly fee instead of paying us big lump sums up front. They just keep paying us a regular standard monthly allotment and that covers them in a couple of cases all the way through to master.

**Jackie Lyne**     Edmiston Yacht Management

I can only really speak on behalf of Edmiston because I work for them, but I know that Nick certainly is very concerned at the crewing situation in the yachting industry and is very focussed on training to the extent that he's talked to a lot of people about training and to the extent of actually bringing more crew, professionally trained crew, into the industry. So I'm sure I speak on behalf of him that if there was a brokerage incentive or a brokerage led move towards training for crew and certification I know he'd be right behind that. So maybe if it came from the training bodies, maybe if they issued an invitation certainly we would be prepared to attend and certainly he would be prepared to back it.

**John**

Certainly we all talked together in the yacht qualification panel, which meets once every 3 years or something unless there's a reason to meet more often. But I think actually, and I have suggested this in the past, that all of those who are involved in yacht crew training meet more regularly to discuss these sort of issues, and in

conjunction with some sort of industry organisation like that—I tried to get something going in 2004 and it's still stumbling along. But I think it would be a good idea.

**Martin**

OK we have something to do. Phil?

**Phil Rose** IYC/Trinity (representing PYA)

Can I suggest that Tork sits down and puts pen to paper and that we actually get something—

**Martin**

He doesn't use pen and paper any more!

**Phil**

Perhaps he should. But that somebody actually sits down and puts this in print and puts it forward as a serious suggestion to the industry.

**Tork**

I have seriously suggested it in print before. But I'll do it again—I have made the suggestion but the problem is that I can suggest it but it needs concrete action to actually put it together and I'm a bit short of time for that. But I will—since it's clearly the sentiment of the sample we have here, yes I will.

**Phil**

It's not just a training issue, it comes back to the whole of the basis of our industry. We've been talking—everybody was talking about crew shortages when I came into this business and this was just after Noah retired. There was a massive shortage of engineers, of captains, of everybody. And that was nearly 20 years ago now. The situation hasn't changed except the shortage has now become crucial to the point that we're going to very quickly, because of the expansion of the industry, run out of not just people but experienced people. We come back to the training problems that everybody's talking about. We've got inexperienced captains with inexperienced crew taking on kids and there's nobody to teach anybody any more. How many boats can come up with 4 or 5 deckhands now that can paint or varnish? The whole aspect of what used to happen on board a yacht 15 years ago is now dying away and it's—we'll do it in a shipyard, we'll pay someone else to do it—all of the basic skills that used to exist within a crew are ceasing to exist. Because there is now nobody on boat who has the skills who can pass those skills on. It's frightening.

**Tork**

And there's a serious role for industry there? Because I mean he may not be able to give courses away but Awlgrip certainly could, and I think that's going to be a very important contribution from all parts of the industry—you know, the manufacturing part of the industry is actually courses for crew that are completely free, sponsored by Awlgrip or Cathelco—as they do, indeed.

**Tim**

Or the enlightened owner.

**Phil**

As you know within the PYA we aid and we push and we help and we've worked with Cathelco and we help push their courses and we will work with anybody because yes, these skills have to be passed on. But they should be being passed on, on the yachts.

**Tork**

Of course yes. But that's an industry at least can play a role in the interim until at least we can get back on an even keel.

**John**

The shipyards should get stuck in as well—I know Benetti have been working with Tim at Flagship. But I hadn't heard of any of the others? Perhaps you can enlighten me but I've not heard of any particular interest from Feadship or de Vries or Amels in direct crew training. Does anyone know better than I ?

**Tork**

I spoke with Amels the other day and mentioned paint care training, which would obviously be in their interests, because it would reduce warranty claims, and they said they'd give them a CD which they get from Awlgrip. However, they were responsive to the idea—and it's not fair because they're not here to be abused, but I mean they were responsive to the idea, yes.

**Jackie**

Can I just intervene on behalf of Feadship, because I'm doing two projects, one at de Vries and two at Van Lendt and certainly Henk de Vries is very interested in training and they've put together some sort of training along with I think it's Yacht Link, the management software group? To try and educate if you like their captains on the de Vries boats. I'm sure that Van Lendt would, if de Vries decided to do it, I'm sure they would follow very fast behind them because they don't like being left behind. So I think you'd find they'd both are quite keen to move along that path because they feel that their boats and their projects are being, if you like—well, they send their boats out often with crew that they find are quite inexperienced. They've had in certainly the last 6 Feadships I've done 4 of the captains were fired within three months of the build. And that's detrimental for all of us, but especially for them. The next question I wanted to ask you was, what happened about the International Superyacht Diploma that Ian Bowles was actually putting together. Has that ever got off the ground?

**Tork**

Yes, it's still running along. I mean it's true that inexperienced captains are bad for Feadships or any other yacht but it's also a question of actually bringing the crew at the end of the build, and the time being set aside by the owner, the project manager, the owner's representative and the shipyard, for everybody to just have some learning time, with experts from the yard. I mean even if it's a week, that's quite a lot of money, but on the other hand in the advantage for the yard in avoiding warranty

claims and damage and the added pleasure for the owner—I think it would not be that hard to lose in the selling price of a 60 metre Feadship. And Natalie, you've got a point?

**Natalie**

Considering more and more crew are getting access to internet on board, is there scope to do more of an online training course, to be run through your training companies?

**John**

I'm very interested in online training. And I think the problem with that is it's very expensive to set it up in the first place. That's something the industry really could contribute to.

**Natalie**

Is it something that you've been speaking to people before about, or is it just something that you would like to develop.

**John**

It's an ongoing project that I've got going. At an early stage.

**Tim**

I think everyone is doing that. And because the kids nowadays—I speak for myself because I'm very old—I couldn't do it. But you see them now—they learn whilst they've got their iPod on, they're watching a movie and they're doing their revision on the internet. And they learn it. And where I couldn't have done that, they can. In fact if you take the iPod away and the movie away they don't seem to learn. And they like learning in their own time, at 2 in the morning or whatever. So in the training establishments it's accessible to them 24 hours a day. And they come in and use it. And what we won't do is transfer that—at the moment all they have is a CD which they can take with them, but we want to have the interactive learning on the internet.

[From the floor]

There's a quick question I'd like to ask the lady at the end—the Superyacht Diploma—I'd like to know why the PYA don't push that more?

**Jon**

Why the PYA don't push the Superyacht Diploma more? it's been running now for two years.

**Tork**

We have pushed it. But we are not the promoter of the course, nor the creator of the course. We're the professional body that assess its quality. Yes of course we promote it.

[From the floor]

You've endorsed it, I understand.

**Tork**

Yes, as a professional body. It's quite complicated, because of the way that a diploma like that is set up and the relationship between the examining body—there's a university involved, and there's us. We're only part of it. We do promote it.

**John**

We offered a one week modular course in Marine Insurance to support the marine insurance element of the Superyacht Diploma, and we could find only one student that wanted to do it, and that was me. It's too expensive.

**Tork**

There's been a reasonable uptake—we did promote it to members but—

**Martin**

How many people have taken it up?

**Phil**

It's an average of about 20 plus a year. It's improving I understand. I wrote the 11<sup>th</sup> module, the security module, and I receive a regular trickle of TMAs to mark. Which I have to say has increased over the last few months.

**John**

I'm all in favour of it, I think it's a really good thing, and I'd like it to succeed.

**Jon**

But again, the difficulty from my point of view, if you're investing money into developing a course 20 a year or whatever it is, it's not a huge commercial proposition with a return.

[From the floor]

We were approached to modulate our particular module, to put it into a one week course. Which you could do. I have to say we tried to encourage a few other people with money in the industry to look at that as a basis. Twelve modules, broken down over four 3 week blocks throughout a period of time, 2 or 3 years, on a block release and all the subjects, all the disciplines of yachting are included in that. Including interior, maintenance, security, safety, everything. And I have to say it's a good basis on which to build a superyacht course.

**Tork**

It is a good basis—there is a slight complication in that it is actually a commercial enterprise by the publisher so it's not to say it's not a good idea. It is a good idea, it could form a basis for something like that. But I am sure it's not an entry level thing.

It's for somebody who's already qualified, to increase their broad knowledge of the industry. It's not for deckhands.

[From the floor]

I just want to add that I agree with that, it's one of the things that we provided in the past is computer based training to re-certify crew that are already on board, while they're at sea. So it is something that is useful, but for the entry level, the iPod generation, obviously they need multimedia type of training. That's more expensive, that could be funded by other people. But in the past our company has developed computer based training to re-certify engineers while they're at sea so it is possible to do it as part of a standard programme which could be run on a laptop like any other company provides in many other industries.

**Tork**

And is that very expensive for you to do? Is it an expensive product?

[From the floor]

It is expensive. We are talking about multiple hundreds of thousands of euros, but for the professional shipping industry that's not much.

**Tork**

No no it may not be much for us as an industry, but yes, it's that sort of size of investment.

[From the floor]

It's part of the document management and ISM as well so it's all part of the quality training. They can use it onboard continuously.

**John**

I think a 15 minute video costs about €25,000 to make. It's expensive.

**Martin**

OK. So in answer to the question of are we and the basics right, yes. But —there's still a lot more to be done in terms of familiarisation and making people aware of what their responsibilities are and what behavioural patterns should be on board. Something that we'll talk about when we go back to London.

Thank you very much, guys. An hour break now—the bar is open—that's where John Leonida just ran off to. So we'll see you in the bar, the dinner is at 7 o'clock tonight in the Brasserie. Thank you very much everyone.

---