



MARITIME UNION OF AUSTRALIA (MUA)

**SUBMISSION TO THE AUSTRALIAN
MARITIME SAFETY AUTHORITY (AMSA)**

**RESPONSE TO THE CONSULTATION DRAFT
OF MARINE ORDER 3 (SEAFARER
QUALIFICATIONS) 2013 – VERSION 2**

28 AUGUST 2013

Authorised by: Paddy Crumlin
National Secretary
Maritime Union of Australia

MUA submission to AMSA on the Consultation Draft of Marine Order 3 of 2013 (Version 2)

28 August 2013

Introduction

The Maritime Union of Australia (MUA) welcomes the release of the consultation draft of MO3 (Version 2). We consider that its release is long overdue and that the delay in approving a reformed MO3 has meant that Australia has been atypically slow to respond to the globally agreed 2010 (Manila) amendments to the STCW Convention.

It will be important that this version be approved and implemented without delay, having regard to consultation comments, and that all the key stakeholders take the necessary steps to ensure that there are no barriers to it coming into force following finalisation of the Marine Order at the conclusion of the comment period.

The MUA makes the following specific comments on the Consultation Draft.

Career pathways

The MUA is disappointed and concerned that AMSA has not been able to find consensus or majority support among industry stakeholders on the improvements to career progression opportunities for Ratings that were a feature of the consultation draft Version 1 of December 2011.

The union is concerned that some stakeholders appear to have adopted an isolationist approach that was not in keeping with the spirit of the Manila amendments, which have been accepted by all the progressive and forward thinking stakeholders throughout the world, particularly among those representing the workforce.

This failure to reach a consensus reflects poorly on Australian shipping owners and operators who on our observations, failed to promote and advocate this benefit to ship operational productivity and to grasp an opportunity to develop the workforce for the benefit of the industry and to underpin the teamwork concepts that are a feature of the Bluewater Labour Relations Compact agreed as part of shipping reform during 2012.

In fact it is our understanding that some ship owners/operators, members of the Australian Shipowners Association, actively advocated against these career progression opportunities for Ratings and in so doing created the conditions for the issue to become politicised. This has had the consequence that the current draft now denies those opportunities for Ratings. This in our view demonstrates a serious lack of foresight on the part of ship owners and operators and compromises their arguments about lack of productivity improvement in Australian seafaring.

Addressing sections of the draft Marine Order (MO)

Section 6 Definitions

Near-coastal waters means the waters landward of the outward boundary of the EEZ. While we have no problem with the definition, we believe this same definition should be replicated in the National Standard for Commercial Vessels (NSCV) Part B, given the term appears to be used under the National Law and that the term is not defined in the *Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessels) National Law Act 2012*.

Old Marine Order means *Marine Order 3 (Seagoing qualifications) 2004*, as in force on [day before commencement day]. We are strongly opposed to the need to reference a superseded Marine Order to interpret certain provisions in this proposed new Marine Order. The MO should be self contained. For example, the definition of *steering certificate*, which means a certificate issued by a master or an approved seafarer training organisation to a person who meets the requirements mentioned in subsection 39.5 of the old Marine Order, requires the reader to refer back to MO3 of 2004. This is poor drafting practice and should be rectified.

Registered training organisation means a training organisation registered by the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA). Given that Victoria and WA have not agreed to come under the jurisdiction of the national VET regulator i.e. the ASQA, we wondered if the names of those two State VET regulators should be mentioned in the definition.

Vessel endorsement. While this term is defined, we query why there is not a definition of functions “endorsement” such as the endorsement of TAG Book 1 which is required to enable a Rating for example to form part of a navigational watch and engine-room watch on an appropriate ship. The union proposes that a functional definition be included that relates to TAGS Book 1 within the Integrated Rating pathway.

We propose that that having regard to our comments on s54, that the terms *Maritime Training Package, Relevant Industry Skills Council, VET Qualification* and *Skills Set* be defined and included in s6.

Section 8 Application

We query why the MO applies to the owner and not the operator and employer of a person performing or intending to perform, duties or functions as a qualified seafarer on a regulated Australian vessel.

While the term *owner* is defined in s 14(1) of the *Navigation Act 2012* and includes the person with overall general control and management of the operation of a vessel, we believe that the MO should apply to the operator and employer of seafarers on relevant vessels. We therefore propose that the application provision be extended to include operator and employer.

The term Regulated Australian Vessel (RAV)

The introduction of the concept of Regulated Australian Vessel (RAV) by the commencement of the *Navigation Act 2012* is pivotal to the operation of the new marine safety framework in Australia, yet there is no way for stakeholders or

seafarers to know if a vessel is or is not a RAV. Given 2 particular aspects of s15 of the Navigation Act relating to (i) the issuing of Certificates by AMSA; and (ii) declarations by Customs, for which only AMSA and Customs officers have knowledge, there is a serious transparency and accountability gap if AMSA does not publish a list of RAVs and Customs declared vessels.

As a result the MUA requests that AMSA publish in real time a list of RAVs and Customs declared vessels, as for example, it publishes lists of vessels on the AGSR, and as in the past it has published lists of S8A and 8AA declared vessels.

Section 26 Recognition of service on other types of ships etc

The MUA welcomes the flexibility provided by this section. However, we strongly recommend that AMSA develop, in consultation with stakeholders, and then publish, guidelines on how it will interpret sections 26 (Recognition of service on other types of ships), 27 (Equivalence in service) and 28 (Equivalence in training) of the Marine Order.

In relation to section 27, it is our view that AMSA adopt typical Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) or Recognition of Current Competency (RCC) principles and practice in determining equivalency.

Section 42 Approved courses and assessments — timing

The MUA seeks clarification on whether this provision allows for a seafarer training organisation to utilise a recognition of prior learning or recognition of current competency process consistent with the standards in the Maritime Training Package to issue a qualification or statement of attainment for a Unit/s of Competency that would substitute for an approved course.

Schedule 4 (Ratings)

Certificates

The MUA welcomes the new grades of Certificate in the Ratings stream as provided in Division 4.2 Grades of certificates (permitted duties or functions), these being those set out in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Grades of certificates - permitted duties or functions

Grade of certificate	Permitted duties or functions
Marine Cook	Marine cook duties or functions on a vessel
Able Seafarer — Deck	Able seafarer — deck rating duties or functions on vessels of any size in any operating area
Able Seafarer — Engine	Able seafarer — engine rating duties or functions on vessels of any size in any operating area
Electro-technical Rating	Electro-technical rating duties or functions on vessels of any size in any operating area
Integrated Rating	Integrated rating duties or functions in

	any operating area
Chief Integrated Rating	Chief integrated rating duties or functions on vessels of any size in any operating area

The revalidation requirements

The union is supportive of the concept of revalidation as an important quality assurance mechanism to sustain the integrity of the occupational licensing system administered by AMSA.

We nevertheless urge AMSA as the regulator to ensure that the evidence required to demonstrate ongoing competence to be issued with a license (renewal or revalidation) is derived primarily from shipboard (on-the-job) assessment aimed at minimising the time and expense of completing off-the-job refresher training. In that regard, we believe the new MO should specify the types of evidence that will be required, such as a letter from the employer or ship operator, including what would need to be specified in such evidentiary letters.

Where it is considered essential that off-the-job refresher and off-ship training or practical demonstration is required, that any courses developed to deliver such training (and subsequently approved by AMSA) are derived from specified Units of Competency from among those that make up a VET Certificate program (qualification) or a Skill Set drawn from the Maritime Training Package and that the stakeholders be consulted on the courses before being utilised. Further, we propose that AMSA work with the Transport and Logistics Industry Skills Council (TLISC) to ensure, where possible, that Units of Competency that underpin those courses are approved as Skills Sets.

The union also requests that AMSA agree as part of the implementation of the MO to review the published Integrated/Chief Integrated Rating Sea Service Guidelines as a matter of urgency, and that stakeholders be given the opportunity to make submission to that review.

s54 Application process for approval to provide seafarer training course

The MUA proposes that a new section 54.3 be included that specifies that the training course submitted to AMSA for approval by a seafarer training organisation under s54.1 must be based on Units of Competency drawn from the Maritime Training Package administered by the relevant Industry Skills Council (in our case, TLISC) and must comprise an NSSC approved Vocational Education and Training Qualification or Skill Set.

In light of the specification of competencies in the SCTW Code that match the STCW Code competency requirements, and in light of development of the new MAR 13 Maritime Training Package by the Transport and Logistics Industry Skills Council (TLISC) and its publication by DEEWR, we believe that it is logical and appropriate that MO3 acknowledge and recognise the TLISC Units of Competency as the building blocks for AMSA approved courses.

This will require the terms Maritime Training Package, Relevant Industry Skills Council, VET Qualification and Skills Set to be defined in s6 Definitions.

Table 5.2 Eligibility requirements for functions endorsements

We query why a functional endorsement of TAG Book 1, which enables a Rating for example to form part of a navigational watch and engine-room watch on an appropriate ship (current practice) is not listed in Table 5.3 (and in Table 5.4) as a recognised endorsement. We request that this endorsement be included in the MO.

Schedule 7 (Amending Schedule — Marine Cook eligibility requirement)

While we are not advocating a change to the eligibility requirement for Marine Cook, we would request that a note be included under the eligibility requirement that makes clear that the training course in hospitality that AMSA considers provides appropriate training for the performance of the duties or functions of marine cook are derived from the Marine Cook qualification in the Maritime Training Package administered by the Transport and Logistic Industry Skills Council.

Related matters

The National Law, MO505 and the NSCVs - crewing standards

The major concern of the union since AMSA commenced as the single national maritime safety regulator and the *Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012*, related Marine Orders (the 500 series) and the new NSCVs commenced (particular Parts D and E) on 1 July 2013 is the implication for crewing standards and crewing complements in the offshore oil and gas industry. The key concerns revolve around 2 circumstances:

- Vessels that are not Regulated Australian Vessels (RAVs) or foreign registered (flagged) vessels and which therefore fall under the National Law and MO505 for crew qualifications and licensing purposes; and
- Vessels which are RAVs but which AMSA has apparently deemed, due to the tonnage of the vessel (<3,000 GT) and/or area of operation (what AMSA describes as near coastal, which apparently draws on the MO3 definition, being waters landward of the outward boundary of the EEZ), to not be RAVs.

The union is particularly concerned that the Ratings qualification and license in MO505, being a GPH, is patently inadequate in terms of a minimum safety standard and competency for any Ratings crew on offshore oil and gas industry supply and support vessels. The GPH qualification was only ever intended for fishing vessels, marine tourism vessels, ferries and like vessels that operate in inshore waters, sheltered waters or in restricted offshore operations (as defined in NSCV Part B). It was never intended for application to sophisticated offshore supply and support vessels that operate in a wide range of operational conditions in the offshore oil and gas industry, out to 200 NMs.

Consistent with the view put to AMSA in a letter from National Secretary Paddy Crumlin to the CEO of AMSA on 19 July 2013 (see **Attachment A**), the union

requests that AMSA immediately recall the newly issued MSMDs for offshore vessels, and enter into discussions with industry stakeholders about a process and timetable for the safe crewing of offshore vessels.

The union believes that the appropriate standard for Ratings on these vessels is the Certificate of Proficiency in Integrated Rating (underpinned by the VET Certificate Level III qualification of Integrated Rating). The union believes it is within AMSAs existing powers to place conditions in MSMDs that require appropriately qualified and licensed crew and that this should be addressed as a priority.

The union proposes that there is an urgent need to clarify the determination of Minimum Safe Manning for offshore vessels in a way that not only adopts appropriate crewing standards but also resolves the inequity created where the same size and type of vessel can have different manning requirements depending on whether it meets the requirement of S15(1)(c)(ii) of the Navigation Act.

Terminology under the National Law

The union is concerned about the lack of definitional clarity around terminology under the National Law. We propose an urgent review of the MO500 series (and NSCV Part B) and in particular advocate an integration of the NSCVs into the new MO500 series.

In particular we propose that AMSA immediately extend the NSCV review process that is about to commence, so that it includes NSCV Parts D and E, with a view to their integration into MO505.

Integration of licenses and VET qualifications between the Navigation Act/MO3 jurisdiction with the National Law/MO505/NSCV jurisdiction

The union is concerned about the poor integration of licenses and VET qualifications between the Navigation Act/MO3 jurisdiction and the National Law/MO505/NSCV jurisdiction. We urge AMSA to support the MUA proposal for a comprehensive VET qualifications and AMSA occupational licensing structure in the Ratings stream as outlined in a letter from MUA National Secretary Paddy Crumlin to the CEO of AMSA of August 2012 (see **Attachment B**).

The apparent discrepancy between the Skills and Knowledge requirements issued by AMSA and those approved by the NSSC for a GPH Certificate Level 1 VET qualification

The union is concerned that there is an apparent discrepancy between the Skills and Knowledge requirements issued by AMSA and those approved by the NSSC for a GPH Certificate Level 1 VET qualification which requires resolution. It is the union's submission that the AMSA skills and knowledge requirements should refer to the competencies in the Maritime Training Package.

Notwithstanding the requirement for that discrepancy to be rectified, the MUA will only recognize the General Purpose Hand as an entry point qualification in inshore waters, sheltered waters or in restricted offshore operations as defined in NSCV Part B.

Crewing under NSCV Part E

It is our submission that the risk assessment process provided at Clause 2(1)(c) of Schedule 2 Operation requirements is a completely unacceptable process for determining crewing complements. The process places the entire onus on the owner to risk assess and makes no provision for a workforce role (or for representatives of the workforce, which is inferior to the minimum safe manning determination process under MO3, which at least requires the proponent to specify that it has consulted with interested parties. We acknowledge earlier AMSA advise that this risk assessment process is intended to be complimentary to WH&S requirements to provide a safe workplace and that they are not intended to allow operators to circumvent their workplace responsibilities. However, the unilateral nature of the process is inadequate and requires revision. In addition, the appeal process for the workforce and its representatives is not clear and does not make an unambiguous reference to AAT. This also requires revision.

First aid

The union is concerned about the elimination of first aid in the Ratings qualification in MO505/NSCV Part D. We believe it is inappropriate that this is now a risk assessed matter and not mandatory for all qualified crew. Leaving it to owner to risk assess may in certain circumstances result in only the master being trained. We submit that on ferries and like vessels, it is the deck crew who will render the first aid to passengers as the Master will be fully occupied with command functions. Until recently this was a mandatory requirement in the NSW jurisdiction and we believe this standard should be restored.

Transparency of process - determining Minimum Safe Manning

The union proposes that AMSA initiate a new procedure for determining Minimum Safe Manning Documents. The current process lacks transparency yet it is a critical complementary process to the seafarer licensing (or certification) system. The 2 processes are intimately linked yet one remains clouded in secrecy for no apparent reason. It is inappropriate that direct stakeholders are required to use Freedom of Information processes to obtain a copy of MSMDs. While AMSA has given undertakings to redress this lack of transparency, no action has yet been initiated.

It is our submission that AMSA provide the relevant trade unions and the affected workforce with a copy of all applications by a vessel employer, operator, agent or owner for a MSMD or for a variation to a MSMD, to enable those affected stakeholders to comment on the applicant's proposal. We also propose that AMSA then coordinate a two way dialogue with the interested parties in reaching a determination. Furthermore, we propose that AMSA then publish the resultant MSMD on its website and ensure it is publicly available on the ship.

Utilisation of Integrated Ratings skills

The union remains concerned that ship operators and employers of Integrated Ratings have paid insufficient regard to the principles of shipboard teamwork articulated in the Bluewater Labour Relations Compact and as result are denying

the opportunity for Ratings to use the full range of skills and competencies embedded in the Integrated Rating qualification and license. This is particularly prevalent in relation to utilisation of engine room skills. This practice is denying Integrated Ratings the opportunity to expand their career horizons and is reducing shipboard productivity.

The union urges AMSA to undertake an audit of ships on the AGSR and also implement an education campaign to ensure that any artificial and cultural barriers to utilisation of Integrated Ratings skills on board are removed.

Letter from National Secretary Paddy Crumlin to the CEO of AMSA of 19 July 2013 – Minimum Safe Manning on Offshore Oil and Gas Industry Vessels – Post 1 July 2013

Mr Graham Peachey
CEO
Australian Maritime Safety Authority
GPO Box 2181
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Mr Peachey

Re: Minimum Safe Manning – Offshore Oil and Gas Industry Vessels – Post 1 July 2013

I am writing to raise with you my concerns about the approach adopted by AMSA in issuing new Minimum Safe Manning Documents (MSMDs) to vessels operated by Mermaid Marine Australia (MMA), which operates in the Australian offshore oil and gas industry, under the National Law which came into effect on 1 July 2013.

My concern relates to the decision by AMSA to issue new MSMDs to MMA vessels whereby those MMA vessels apparently are no longer required to carry an Integrated Rating and instead a General Purpose Hand (GPH). This decision undermines the historical and well founded minimum standard for Ratings occupations whereby the previous MSMDs specified an Integrated Rating as the minimum VET qualification which underpinned the AMSA license, being a Certificate of Proficiency in Integrated Rating, for such vessels.

The decision also has economic and contracting implications by potentially creating a labour cost competitive advantage for those companies that operate exclusively in certain geographical areas relative to those companies whose vessels undertake international voyages.

I raised concerns about this issue with AMSA in a number of MUA submissions on the National Law and associated Marine orders. For example, in the MUA comment on the Draft Marine Orders under the Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012 of 26 October 2012 I advised as follows:

“The union remains concerned about the interaction of, or lack of integration between, the Certificate structure for the Ratings stream in MO505 and the MO3 Certificate structure for the Ratings stream. Our concerns are that:

- The Elements of Shipboard Safety (ESS) competencies which form the core of the VET Certificate Level I qualification that will underpin the GPH License or Certificate are not integrated with the Certificate of Safety Training (COST) competencies which form the basis for the AMSA COST License or Certificate, which in our view will impede the pathway for a GPH wishing to become an Integrated Rating; and*

- *There is a major gap in recognition of the many industry occupations and job roles that fall between: (i) the basic entry level NSCV GPH (VET Certificate Level I/AMSA GPH Certificate); (ii) the AMSA COST License/Certificate (for which there is no equivalent VET recognition in the form of a VET qualification, though this could (or should) ultimately be recognised by the Transport and Logistics Industry Skills Council [TLISC] as a Skill Set); and (iii) the MO3 Integrated Rating (VET Certificate Level III/AMSA Certificate of Proficiency in Australian Integrated Rating).*

It is for this reason that we foreshadow that MO505 will require amendment, probably in late 2013, to accommodate a possible new license (certificate) or endorsement arrangement, in what we have described as the VET Certificate Level II space in the Ratings stream, arising from progress on the matters raised in my letter to Graham Peachey of 20 August 2012. That letter outlined a proposal on the occupational licensing aspects of a new structure for the Ratings stream in the Maritime Training Package.

This unilateral decision by AMSA, despite having detailed knowledge of the implications as a result of prior MUA representations, to allow replacement of highly qualified and skilled Integrated Ratings (requiring a Certificate Level III qualification to underpin the license) by a General Purpose Hand (which is an entry Level Certificate level I qualification suited to the fishing and like sectors and is unsuitable for major offshore commercial vessels) is an unacceptable outcome and cannot be left to stand. It will create a race to the bottom in terms of skill standards, and undermine the work the industry has embarked upon under the Maritime Workforce Development Forum to raise skill standards.

Such an outcome will also have major industrial implications for the offshore oil and gas industry, just as the parties are about to embark on renegotiation of a new offshore enterprise agreement and as TLISC is about to commence a review process of Ratings qualifications, and your previous commitment to cooperate with that process.

It is disturbing that AMSA has not even enforced its own requirement for consultation by an applicant for a new MSMD (set out in the MSMD application form), so the union did not have an opportunity to put its case, but the decision has completely undermined the occupational and skill standards in the entire offshore oil and gas industry, a matter on which we have been in dialogue with AMSA in relation to FPSO crewing for some 2 years.

Furthermore, the company, MMA, is incorrectly in my view claiming that “*The training requirement to obtain a General Purpose Hand Certificate is to be over 16, have a Declaration of Medical Fitness and a Basic First Aid Certificate*”. This is surely not correct. Marine Order 505 (MO505) introduces a new AMSA Certificate of General Purpose Hand (GPH). Under the new Maritime Training Package, a new qualification of Certificate I in Maritime Operations (General Purpose Hand) requires the following 8 competencies (Units of Competency) which must be held before AMSA would be in a position to issue a GPH Certificate:

Assist with routine maintenance of a vessel
Apply basic survival skills in the event of vessel abandonment
Follow procedures to minimise and fight fires on board a vessel
Meet work health and safety requirements
Survive at sea using survival craft
Work effectively as part of a crew on a vessel up to 80 metres
Apply general purpose hand skills aboard a vessel
Perform basic lookout duties

As far as we are aware, none of the crew on MMA vessels hold this VET qualification, though presumably AMSAs compliance regime will be able to verify or otherwise my understanding. If I am correct, the company could not currently be in compliance with the newly issued MSMDs.

In any case, I am requesting that AMSA immediately recall the newly issued MSMDs for MMA vessels, and enter into discussions about a process and timetable for an orderly transition to the provisions under the new National Law that conforms with the process being undertaken by the Transport and Logistics Industry Skills Council (TLISC) that will address the lack of appropriate VET qualifications and AMSA licensing for occupations on vessels in the offshore oil and gas industry (and other sectors) that I wrote to you about on 20 August 2012.

In the meantime, we intend to enforce the EBA provisions relating to pay and conditions of occupations in the offshore oil and gas industry, and will need to deal industrially with any attempt by MMA to replace Integrated Ratings with GPHs arising from AMSAs actions.

I would request an urgent meeting to discuss the matters raised and to outline both the process we have in place with TLISC and the union's intentions for addressing this set of issues in the upcoming offshore EBA negotiations.

Yours sincerely



Paddy Crumlin
National Secretary

Letter from MUA National Secretary Paddy Crumlin to the CEO of AMSA of 20 August 2012 – MUA proposal for a new structure for the Ratings stream in the Maritime Training Package – occupational licensing aspects

Graham Peachey
Chief Executive Officer
Australian Maritime Safety Authority
GPO Box 2181
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Mr Peachey

Re: MUA proposal for a new structure for the Ratings stream in the Maritime Training Package – occupational licensing aspects

I am writing to outline to you the Maritime Union of Australia (MUA) view on an integrated structure for the Ratings stream in the Maritime Training Package (MTP) on which I am seeking the support of the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA).

The proposed structure has been developed with a number of outcomes in mind, including:

- The need for a 4 level vocational education and training (VET) qualifications structure from Certificate Level I to Certificate Level IV, including agreed Skills Sets as appropriate, to provide VET recognition for the full range of skill levels that are accomplished by Ratings in the regulated training sector.
- To provide the building blocks for an integrated career pathway for Ratings.
- To provide for a closer alignment between the job skills required by industry, the occupational classifications recognised in Awards and Enterprise Agreements and VET outcomes.
- To support the occupational licensing (certification) arrangements managed by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA).
- To establish the foundation (or a basis for modularisation of the Units of Competency in the Maritime Training Package [MTP]) to provide for greater flexibility in the delivery of Ratings training.
- To provide for a new approach to entry of trainees to VET programs delivered by Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) which balances the opportunity for trainees to initiate their own career preparation in the absence of employment at the point of entry to a VET qualification, with the imperative for employment and therefore a training berth on a qualifying ship to complete the seetime component of training at a specified point in

the qualification hierarchy.

- To further advance the competency based principles which underpin training in the Ratings stream, aimed at ensuring that competency is developed and assessed by competent assessors in both the off-the-job and on-the-job settings to deliver highly qualified and competent seafarers for the Australian and international seafarer labour market.
- To provide greater take-up of formal Traineeships.
- To reduce the costs of training to employers.

You are aware that as a result of industry agreement, the current review of the MTP, when considered against the Manila amendments to the IMO Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers 2010 (STCW 2010) that were outlined in the now delayed Marine Order 3 Issue 7 (MO3), and in the certification requirements under the National Standard for Commercial Vessels (NSCV), will result in recognition of qualifications at the Certificate Level I (General Purpose Hand), Certificate Level III (a continuation of the Integrated Rating qualification) and Certificate Level IV (Chief Integrated Rating) – as well as for Marine Cook.

At present there are no structured skill outcomes that equate to the Certificate Level II band, nor formal recognition of required job skills between the Certificate Level I GPH and AMSA Certificate of Safety Training (requiring 4/5 Units of Competency) and the Certificate Level III Integrated Rating qualification/AMSA Certificate of Proficiency in Integrated Rating (requiring 20 Units of Competency [number not yet finalised for MAR12]). However, there are a wide range of industry recognised job classifications and skill requirements on a wide range of vessels such as dredges, work boats, tugs, offshore support vessels, marine tourism vessels and others that are not currently recognised, nor adequately catered for, in the VET system.

The MUA proposal, which is provided at **Attachment A** in diagrammatic form, provides a framework to address these anomalies while at the same time providing for the objectives outlined above.

The essence of the MUA proposal is a packaging of the Units of Competency (based on the proposed MAR12 Units, with some additional Units yet to be developed) in a way that:

- Recognises the key milestones in the pathway towards the core IR qualification and license.
- Embeds each set of Units of Competency representing a qualification or license in the next higher level qualification so as to provide a seamless training, licensing and occupational career pathway.
- Provides exit points that align with job requirements in the industry, and recognises that the traditional Deckhand requires skills (additional Units of Competency) on top of the basic safety requirements specified in the Certificate of Safety Training (COST).

- Establishes a clear delineation in the training delivery process at which point employment and therefore guaranteed access to a training berth on a qualifying ship is required (and at which point a formal Traineeship must be commenced). This is described in the MUA proposal as a Pre-Traineeship, and as can be seen in Attachment A, it coincides with the proposed Certificate Level II exit point.

Importantly, the MUA proposal introduces a new on-board training concept by distinguishing between: (i) a requirement for on-the-job training on board a vessel (for the proposed 6 Units of Competency (on top of COST) that makes up the Deckhand and Pre-Traineeship training) that may not be considered seetime from an AMSA or licensing perspective; and (ii) traditional seetime that is required by the SCTW Convention as legislated in MO3, to become competent in the remaining Units of Competency that fulfil the requirements of the VET Certificate Level III IR and AMSA Certificate of Proficiency.

- We note of course that there may be scope for some of that on-the-job training to reach the Certificate Level II Deckhand qualification might be accepted as seetime under an AMSA equivalency assessment.

I am now seeking AMSA agreement that attainment of competency (determined by assessment undertaken by an approved RTO) at the Certificate Level II exit point also coincide with a new AMSA license or endorsement on an existing license. It is our view that a number of Units of Competency identified in the blue section of the diagram at Attachment A are safety related and warrant incorporation in an AMSA license or endorsement.

I am proposing that AMSA formally adopt the MUA proposal as the overarching framework to guide the licensing framework that will appear in the next version of MO3. I cannot identify any barriers that would inhibit AMSA support for the MUA proposal, which in no way interferes with the STCW 2010 requirements, but which enhances career pathways and assists with integration of regulated (MO3) and near coastal (NSCV licensing) to achieve an integrated system consistent with the objectives of creation of a single national maritime regulatory framework.

I have written to the Transport and Logistics Industry Skills Council seeking its support for the proposal and will similarly be writing to the Australian Shipowners Association (ASA) and to each of the 3 RTOs approved to deliver the VET Certificate Level III IR qualification, also seeking the support of those organisations for the MUA proposal. I will also be briefing the Maritime Workforce Development Forum on the proposal.

I look forward to being advised of AMSA support for the MUA proposal, and to its officers supporting the MUA objective within the TLISC Maritime Training Package (MTP) continuous improvement process.

Yours sincerely



Paddy Crumlin
National Secretary

Diagrammatic representation of MUA proposal for a new structure for the Ratings stream in the Maritime Training Package

Qualification License		Units of Competency	Stream	Notes
CERTIFICATE III FOR INTEGRATED RATING TRAINEESHIP	PRE-TRAINEESHIP & CERTIFICATE II DECKHANDS ETC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survive at Sea in the event of vessel abandonment 	All	Existing COST approx. 2 weeks training
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevent and Fight Fires on board a vessel 	All	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Elementary First Aid (IMPORTED UNIT) 	All	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observe Personal Safety and Social Responsibility 	All	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow Vessel Security Procedures (*) 	All	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Seamanship Skills on Board a Vessel 	All	Proposed pre Traineeship, Deckhand (D), Deckhand (Tug), Deckhand (dredging- Dre), Deckhand (Marine Tourism-Tour). Deckhand (Food Services-FS)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate emergency equipment and apply emergency procedures 	All	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate deck machinery and cargo handling gear and equipment on a vessel , OR 	IR, D Dre Tug	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate Dredging Equipment (NEW UNIT), OR 	Tour FS	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate Towing Equipment (NEW UNIT), OR 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform Marine Tourism (NEW UNIT), OR 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Order Food Supplies (IMPORTED UNIT) 		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow environmental work practices 	All	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate survival craft and other life-saving appliances 	All	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perform routine maintenance on a vessel, OR Food Hygiene (IMPORTED UNIT) 	All FS	Approximately 4-5 weeks training
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Steer vessel under direction of master 	IR	Units for IRs
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to monitoring and controlling a safe navigational watch 	IR	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to monitoring and controlling a safe engine watch 	IR		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate engine equipment and associated propulsion plant 	IR		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to safe cargo operations on oil and chemical tankers 	IR		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contribute to safe cargo operations on liquefied gas tankers 	IR		
	OTHER	IR	Would take 6-7 weeks training	

- A future Unit to meet the STCW 2010 requirement

NB 1: The GPH Certificate Level I is not included in this diagram

NB 2: AMSA Certificates to be discussed and developed for the Certificate Level II exit point

NB 3: Certificate IV for Chief Integrated Rating is still under development by TLISC as part of MAR2012, with an Integrated Rating qualification as a pre-requisite.