

Title: Revocation of the Means of Access Regulations and the Safe Movement on Board Ship Regulations IA No: Lead department or agency: Maritime and Coastguard Agency Other departments or agencies: Department for Transport	Impact Assessment (IA)		
	Date: 21/10/14		
	Stage: Final (validation)		
	Source of intervention: Domestic		
	Type of measure: Secondary legislation		
Contact for enquiries: Julie Carlton 023 9032 9216			

Summary: Intervention and Options	RPC Opinion: Awaiting Scrutiny
--	---------------------------------------

Cost of Preferred (or more likely) Option			
Total Net Present Value	Business Net Present Value	Net cost to business per year (EANCB in 2009 prices)	In scope of One-In, Two-Out? Measure qualifies as
Neg	£NQ	£0m	Yes Zero Net Cost

What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?

The Merchant Shipping (Means of Access) Regulations and the Merchant Shipping (Safe Movement on Board Ship) Regulations lay down specific requirements for means of boarding ships, and to ensure that people can move safely around ships, including lighting, segregation of vehicles, etc. These provisions mirror the shore-side Docks Regulations 1988, which are being revoked by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). The Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) considers that the Means of Access and Safe Movement on Board Ships Regulations should be revoked in order to keep shore-side and ship-side regulations aligned. Government intervention is necessary to revoke the regulations.

What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?

The policy objective is to remove unnecessary legislation. It is not expected that revoking the Means of Access regulation and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulation would have any adverse impact on safety. There are high-level goal-setting regulations which can ensure the same level of health and safety. Enforcement of safe means of access and safe movement on board ship have been superseded by risk-based health and safety legislation. (The standards in the existing legislation would be moved into a Marine Guidance Note setting out the expected standards to demonstrate compliance with health and safety legislation.)

What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)

Policy option 0: do nothing.

Policy option 1, which is the preferred option, is to revoke the Means of Access regulation and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulation, and move the standards contained in those regulations into a Marine Guidance Note, supported by risk-based statutory health and safety duties. No other policy options have been considered.

Will the policy be reviewed? It will not be reviewed. If applicable, set review date: N/A					
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?				N/A	
Are any of these organisations in scope? If Micros not exempted set out reason in Evidence Base.		Micro Yes	< 20 Yes	Small Yes	Medium Yes
What is the CO ₂ equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO ₂ equivalent)				Traded: N/A	Non-traded: N/A

I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that (a) it represents a fair and reasonable view of the expected costs, benefits and impact of the policy, and (b) that the benefits justify the costs.

Signed by the responsible
SELECT SIGNATORY: John Hayes Date: 8th January 2015

Summary: Analysis & Evidence

Policy Option 1

Description: Revocation of the Means of Access regulation and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulation

FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year 2014	PV Base Year 2012	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: N/A	High: N/A	Best Estimate: NQ

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	N/A	N/A	N/A
High	N/A	N/A	N/A
Best Estimate	Under £1k	£0m	Under £1k

Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

No costs to industry, charities or government have been identified which can be monetised. Section 7.1.2 sets out the likely, negligible cost to MCA of publicising the changes.

Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Industry may incur some costs for staff time to familiarise themselves with the simplified regime. However, as this follows other health and safety legislation in relying on risk-based legislation, and as the standards currently contained in regulations will remain unchanged in the supporting Marine Guidance Notice, these costs are expected to be negligible.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	N/A	N/A	N/A
High	N/A	N/A	N/A
Best Estimate	N/A	NQ	NQ

Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

No benefits to industry, charities or government have been identified which can be monetised.

Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Removing prescriptive regulation in favour of risk-based regulation supported by a statement of best practice will bring these aspects of safety into line with other occupational health and safety legislation, including legislation ashore. This may give employers some flexibility to react to improved technology and to develop innovative safety solutions, where MCA is satisfied that this achieves the same level of safety.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%) 3.5%

It is assumed that industry supports the standards currently in regulations as current best practice, which will continue to be applied through guidance, once the regulations have been revoked. This will be tested during public consultation on the revocation measure.

BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 1)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			In scope of OITO?	Measure qualifies as
Costs: NQ	Benefits: NQ	Net: NQ	Yes	Zero net cost

Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

Title of proposal

Revocation of the Means of Access Regulations and the Safe Movement on Board Ship Regulations

1. Background

1.1 The Merchant Shipping (Means of Access) Regulations 1988 and the Merchant Shipping (Safe Movement on Board Ship) Regulations 1988 were introduced as part of the UK's implementation of the International Labour Organization's Minimum Standards (Merchant Shipping) Convention of 1976 (ILO 147). They are two out of a group of five sets of regulations, the others being –

- The Merchant Shipping (Hatches and Lifting Plant) Regulations 1988
- The Merchant Shipping (Guarding of Machinery and Electrical Equipment) Regulations 1988
- The Merchant Shipping (Entry into Dangerous Spaces) Regulations 1988

1.2 The Means of Access regulation and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulations lay down specific requirements for gangways and other means of boarding ships, and for provisions to ensure that people can move safely around ships, including requirements for lighting, segregation of vehicles, removal of obstacles etc. These provisions seek to maintain on ships the same standards of safety as apply ashore in docks under the Health and Safety Executive's Docks Regulations 1988¹. Consistent regulations are needed because seafarers and docks workers are working alongside each other, for example in cargo operations.

1.3 The merchant shipping legislation requires that employers and masters "take full account of" relevant sections of the Code of Safe Working Practices for Merchant Seamen on means of access and safe movement. The Code of Safe Working Practices for Merchant Seamen ("the Code") is a joint publication agreed between government and industry which contains *de facto* UK health and safety standards for seafarers on UK ships.

1.4 However, since 1988, the UK has implemented a range of goal-setting, risk-assessment based health and safety directives in UK legislation. On land (including docks) the general requirements are set out in the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations (as amended)². For shipping, the general requirements are set out in the Merchant Shipping and Fishing Vessels (Health and Safety at Work) Regulations 1997³. A key requirement of these Regulations is that the employer should carry out a risk assessment and take measures to ensure the health and safety of workers so far as is reasonably practicable.

2. Problem under consideration

2.1 Following the Red Tape Challenge, the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is revoking a number of sector-specific regulations including the Docks Regulations 1988, because these are seen as outdated and unnecessary in the light of the newer risk-based legislation. The Docks Regulations were revoked on 6 April 2014, and a new Approved Code of Practice for Safety in Docks was published, based around the duties in the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 and the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999 (as amended).

2.2 For the same reasons, through the Red Tape Challenge exercise, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) identified the Means of Access and Safe Movement Regulations as candidates for revocation without detriment to safety. Both the Hatches and Lifting Plant Regulations and the Guarding Machinery Regulations have already been revoked, as their provisions were superseded by risk-based legislation on use of equipment.

2.3 For completeness, it should be noted that the Entry into Dangerous Spaces Regulations will be retained as they address a specific and well-recognised risk on ships, which nevertheless continues to claim lives. There is no European Union (EU) legislation highlighting the risks from working in dangerous spaces.

3. Rationale for intervention

3.1 Through the Red Tape Challenge, the Government sought ways to reduce the regulatory burdens on industry. One target was outdated and ineffective legislation.

3.2 The Means of Access and Safe Movement Regulations, in taking a prescriptive approach to health and safety, are out of step not only with most of the merchant shipping health and safety regime, but also with the shore-based health and safety regime.

3.3 More recent UK health and safety legislation for the maritime sector, based on European Directives on occupational health and safety, ensures a comparable level of protection because it applies to all aspects of safety on board ship, including access and safe movement.

3.4 In addition, the Means of Access regulations and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulations do not apply to fishing vessels where safe access and trip hazards etc. on board are a significant problem. There is therefore inconsistency between the regulations which can be applied to fishing vessels and those applying to the merchant fleet. Regulations implementing the EU Occupational Safety and Health Directives apply to all ships on which workers are employed, and can be used to address issues of safe access and safe movement.

3.5 It is therefore considered appropriate to revoke the regulations, which can only be done by government intervention, and move the standards they contain into best practice guidance for industry.

3.6 This will modernise the statute book, and give industry greater flexibility to respond to new developments in operational practice and technology.

4. Policy objectives

4.1 There are two main policy objectives –

- to reduce the regulatory burden on industry by modernising and simplifying legislation; and
- to ensure consistency of approach with other health and safety legislation, including health and safety legislation applying to fishing vessels and health and safety legislation ashore.

4.2 Deregulation

4.2.1 The MCA wishes to revoke the Means of Access regulation and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulation dealing with means of access to ships, and to safe movement on board ships, and to rely instead on existing, more general health and safety duties, under which employers address all aspects of occupational health and safety through risk assessment and mitigating measures. The specific requirements currently in the two sets of regulations would be retained as guidance on best practice, initially in a Marine Guidance Notice, and in due course (when the Code of Safe Working Practices for Merchant Seamen is updated) in the Code.

4.2.2 The Merchant Shipping and Fishing Vessels (Health and Safety at Work) Regulations 1997 require employers to undertake an assessment of the risks arising from their undertaking and to take mitigating measures. Implicit in those general duties is the requirement to ensure provision of a safe working environment, which includes safe means of access and to ensure seafarers can move safely around the ship.

4.2.3 Specific standards contained within the 1988 Means of Access regulations and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulations would be moved into non-mandatory guidance, and would be promulgated as best practice, to avoid a drop in standards and to assist small businesses which may not have their own expertise. However, a risk based approach also allows some flexibility for innovation. Employers will be able to take alternative measure provided that they can demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the MCA, an equivalent level of safety for workers.

4.3 Consistency with other health and safety legislation

4.3.1 There are many situations where seafarers work alongside shore-based workers, for example in cargo operations in ports, and in the offshore industry. In April 2014, the HSE revoked the Docks Regulations 1988, which contain parallel provisions to those in the MCA legislation, and have re-issued

their Approved Code of Practice for Safety in Docks to contain provisions on access to ships and about providing an environment which allows safe movement. To avoid confusion or duplication of effort, it is therefore preferable to maintain consistency as far as practicable between the merchant shipping regime for health and safety and that applying ashore, under HSE's legislation.

4.3.2 Since 1997, the MCA has implemented EU directives on occupational health and safety (OHS) for ships on the UK register ("UK flagged ships"), and for ships not on the UK register when in UK ports. The Merchant Shipping and Fishing Vessels (Health and Safety at Work) Regulations 1997, which introduced risk assessment and goal-based health and safety legislation, implemented the EU OHS "Framework Directive" and subsequent statutory instruments implemented the package of "daughter directives" each detailing with a specific aspect of health and safety – e.g. provision of personal protective equipment, use of work equipment, protection for chemical and biological agents, and from noise and vibration. As a result of that exercise, two other sets of regulations dating from the 1988 package have been revoked. Since employers on ships must approach all aspects of health and safety on ships through the EU-based risk assessment approach, it is desirable also for these two, more prescriptive instruments to be revoked so that means of access on ships and safe movement on board ship can be brought fully within that regime.

(Note: Following the revocation of the two instruments dealt with in this impact assessment (IA), there will be one outstanding instrument from the 1988 package, which deals with entry into dangerous spaces, a serious safety issue on ships. This is being retained, in part because the standards it contains implement international requirements, but also because it addresses a high-risk area of shipboard operations with a high accident rate.)

5. Description of options considered (including do nothing);

5.1 Option 0: Do nothing

This option would not remove the Means of Access Regulations and the Safe Movement on Board Ship Regulations. The regulations would continue to be out of step with other, more recent health and safety legislation on merchant ships, and the safety issues they address would continue to be duplicated by broader, goal-setting, risk-based health and safety legislation. This option would therefore not meet the policy objectives of reducing the existing regulatory burden and ensuring consistency of approach with other health and safety legislation.

The option is the baseline against the other options are considered against.

5.2 Option 1 (preferred option): Revoke the Merchant Shipping (Means of Access) Regulations 1988 and the Merchant Shipping (Safe Movement on Board Ship) Regulations 1988

One policy option has been considered. It is proposed to revoke the Means of Access regulations and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulations, and to ensure that any standards contained in those regulations are published as the benchmark for industry practice. Any employer or shipowner wishing to depart from best practice would have the opportunity to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the MCA that any measure they put in place provided an equivalent level of safety. The "industry standard" would be published in a Marine Guidance Note, and in due course transferred to MCA's Code of Safe Working Practices for Merchant Seamen.

Both the Means of Access regulation and the Safe Movement on Board Ship regulation require the employer to "take full account" of relevant guidance in the Code. That statutory reference to the Code would no longer exist.

6. Consultation

The consultation-stage impact assessment for this proposal, issued as part of the public consultation package, invited consultees to submit additional evidence on the costs and benefits of the proposed revocations. 25 trade organisations, unions and companies were directly notified of the consultation exercise, including the UK Chamber of Shipping which represents a broad cross section of UK shipping companies in all sectors, the British Marine Federation and International Marine Contractors Association. Ten responses were received, mostly from significant players in the industry.

The majority supported the proposed revocation. One organisation raised concerns about the loss of clear cut standards and the need for enforceability, and three organisations opposed on the grounds that enforcement of the current standards for means of access and safe movement on board ship would be difficult without the prescriptive regulations in place. MCA has considered these issues and has modified the Marine Guidance Notes (MGNs), which will contain the standards until the revised Code of Safe Working Practices for Merchant Seamen is published, to address this concern. The introduction to each MGN now makes clear that compliance with the standards in the notice will be deemed to demonstrate that the employer or shipowner is complying with their duties to ensure the health and safety of workers and others, as far as providing for safe access and safe movement is concerned. Any departure from the standards – which industry supports - must be demonstrated to provide an equivalent level of safety to the satisfaction of the MCA. There is little scope therefore for subjective interpretation of the standards, but the flexibility is provided to adopt innovative solutions with MCA agreement. MCA is confident that this makes the “guidance” enforceable and provides an unambiguous steer to industry about the standards to be applied.

7. Costs and Benefits

7.1 Costs of Option 1

7.1.1 The measure is deregulatory, so there would be no costs of compliance for industry. Familiarisation costs are likely to be low, given that the only change is to remove specific statutory duties in favour of goal-setting requirements and guidance, based on the statutory duties which have been revoked. The goal-setting approach, combined with an industry standard, is new in this context, but with clear guidance should not be complex to understand. These costs have not therefore been quantified.

Consultees were invited to provide any evidence of costs arising from the proposed revocation of the regulations, but none was provided.

7.1.2 Costs to government

There will be some cost to MCA in publicising the changes to the legislation, and promoting the relevant standards on means of access and safe movement on board ship. This is expected to involve about two days of staff time, plus the publication cost for two Marine Guidance Notes (about £278 - based on £139 per day -in wage costs based on MCA wage rates uplifted by 30% to account for non-wage costs, plus £150 for publication).

7.2 Benefits of Option 1

Removing a layer of prescriptive regulation which arguably duplicates more general, goal-based regulation may not in itself have any impact on the standards be applied by employers, or the way in which those standards are complied with. It is not therefore expected that there will be any direct cost savings to employers from the change to the regulations.

However, removing the statutory reference to the guidance may provide some greater flexibility in achieving the standards of safe means of access and safe movement on board ship. It may also in future provide for innovative solutions.

In addition, by revoking the regulations, the legislation applying to merchant shipping is brought into line with that for fishing vessels and for workers ashore (e.g. in ports and in the offshore industry).

The government also believes there are benefits to industry in modernising and simplifying the body of legislation which must be consulted on and complied with – see for example

<http://www.redtapechallenge.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/2013/03/20-03-13-government-plans-to-scrap-or-improve-almost-two-thirds-of-maritime-regulations/>.

These benefits cannot however be quantified.

Consultees were invited to provide any further evidence of benefits arising from the proposed revocation of the regulations, but none was provided.

7.3 Comparison with the do-nothing option

The “do nothing” option is for the existing regulations to remain in force. While there are by definition no costs arising from the “do nothing” option, the potential benefits of a modernised, streamlined body of legislation, consistent with that for other sectors, would not be realised.

7.4 “One in Two-out” (OITO)

The measure would revoke two sets of regulations, but is only expected to bring minimal non-quantifiable benefits. It therefore qualifies as an “OUT with Zero net cost”.

7.5 Monitoring and enforcement

The current regulations are enforced on UK ships through health and safety inspection as part of an inspection of living and working conditions on board under the ILO Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (MLC). Where applicable, this is carried out in conjunction with audits of the ship’s safety management system, under the IMO International Safety Management Code, which would also cover safe procedures for boarding and leaving the ship.

This inspection will be unchanged as a result of the revocation of the regulations, but any necessary enforcement would be carried out under the Merchant Shipping and Fishing Vessels (Health and Safety at Work) Regulations 1997 (as amended) or other relevant statutes, rather than the specific regulations, now revoked.

8. Rationale and evidence that justify the level of analysis used in the IA (proportionality approach);

This is a deregulatory measure with little immediate impact in practical terms on the standards to be applied on board ships. It is therefore considered that there would be little financial impact to businesses in the UK. In addition, initial discussion with industry has confirmed that in principle, and subject to more detailed information, the proposals are supported by industry. Further analysis of the impacts is not therefore considered necessary.

9. Risks and assumptions.

This assessment is based on the assumption that UK shipping companies comply with the existing regulations and accept the standards they impose as common good practice. This appears to have been borne out by responses to public consultation none of which took issue with the draft MGNs. There would therefore be no reason to expect changes in provision as a result of revoking the regulations.

There is a risk that employers see the revocation of the regulations as a signal that current standards as regards means of access and safe movement on board ship longer apply, and seek to take cost-cutting measures which might reduce safety. This has been addressed by reviewing the wording of the MGNs to make clear that the standards are not “simply guidance” but represent industry consensus on appropriate standards which meet the employers’ and shipowners’ obligations to provide a safe working environment. Ultimately, this would be addressed by MCA taking enforcement action where standards did not meet industry norms. However, to seek to prevent this risk to safety standards occurring, information and guidance on the intended impact of the regulations will be widely circulated.

10. Direct costs and benefits to business calculations (following OITO methodology);

10.1 As explained in section 5 of this IA, the cost of the proposal to businesses is expected to be very small or negligible and has not been quantified. As there are no monetised costs, the proposal is classified as an OUT with zero net cost.

11. REDUCING REGULATION POLICY

11.1 Direct costs and benefits to business calculations (following OITO methodology)

It is considered that the Regulations qualify as an “OUT with Zero net cost”.

11.2 Copy out

The 1988 regulations were based on ILO Convention No. 152 on Safety in Dock Work and the supporting recommendation, although the UK did not ratify that Convention, but copy-out principles were not applied at that time. Copy out is not relevant to the revoking the regulations

11.3 Alternatives to regulation

Option 1 removes prescriptive regulation, and relies on overarching, risk-based health and safety duties (which already exist) to support non-mandatory guidance on industry good practice. MCA believes that this can achieve the same level of safety with less regulation.

11.4 Review clauses (N/A)

This is a fast track measure under the Red Tape Challenge and does not therefore require a review clause.

12. SPECIFIC IMPACT TESTS

12.1. Equalities Assessment

Seafarers are recognised as a vulnerable group of workers. However any change to the regulations governing their working environment would impact equally on all workers, regardless of their age, ethnic origin, gender, nationality, race, sexual orientation or disability. These proposals are therefore considered to have no adverse impact as regards statutory equality duties.

However, as explained in previous sections, MCA does not consider that Option 1 (revoking the regulations containing prescriptive statutory standards) will have any detrimental effect on safety.

12.2. Competition Assessment

The 1988 regulations are based on international Convention and recommendations, and it is therefore expected that the standards they contain are applied to ships in all ports worldwide. They are not therefore thought to disadvantage UK shipowners in competition with ships of other flags.

The Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, which is currently in force for those countries which ratified it 12 months or more ago, includes provisions on health and safety, requiring ratifying States to promote guidelines on many issues, including means of access. As the application of the Convention spreads internationally, it is expected that current international standards, introduced under ILO 152 will continue to be applied.

Revoking the regulations is not therefore expected to bring any immediate competitive advantage. However, by revoking prescriptive requirements in favour of risk-based safety duties, it provides a more flexible regime which will be able to adapt to new developments and may benefit UK shipowners in future.

Consultees were invited to offer any additional evidence on the potential for revocation of the Regulations to impact on competition, but none of those responding commented on this point.

12.3. Small and Micro-business assessment

It is appropriate that the working conditions for all workers should be underpinned by common minimum

standards regardless of the size of the company for which they work. The 1988 regulations include more prescriptive requirements for ships over a certain size and to that extent assist small businesses, who generally (but not exclusively) operate smaller ships.

The MCA has in force Codes of Practice for small commercial vessels, which are intended as a “one stop shop” for small businesses operating commercial vessels under 24 metres in length and carrying not more than 12 passengers. These Codes incorporate relevant requirements from the 1988 regulations - the prescriptive standards do not apply to vessels under 24 metres.

Consultees were invited to provide any additional evidence on the potential impacts of revocation of the Regulations on small firms. No evidence was provided.

12.4. Health Impact Assessment

The 1988 regulations provide for safe means of access and safe movement on board ship. The revocation of the regulations is not therefore expected to have any impact on health.

12.5. Human Rights

Since revocation of the regulations is not expected to have any impact on safety standards for seafarers at work, there are no Human Rights compatibility issues arising from these Regulations.

12.6. Justice System

Revocation of the regulations would remove 13 potential offences for employers, 11 for masters and 2 for shipowners. The main enforcement mechanism for these proposed Regulations would be through the inspection and certification of UK ships by MCA surveyors. While MCA's preferred method of enforcement where deficiencies are found on board ships is to use improvement notices, prohibition notices, and in very serious cases detention of the ship, in order to secure rapid rectification of the deficiency, there are also offences and penalties laid down in the Regulations, which are available to MCA to take enforcement action after the event if this is considered justified. These are in line with the penalties in place for corresponding or similar offences in pre-existing Regulations.

The same methods of enforcement would be used for breach of the Merchant Shipping and Fishing Vessels (Health and Safety at Work) Regulations 1997.

12.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As the Regulations only affect seafarer health and safety and no significant additional costs are anticipated, it is not expected to affect maritime transport volumes. Therefore, no change in greenhouse gas emissions is expected.

13. Summary and preferred option

13.1 Option 1 would revoke two sets of health and safety regulations dating from 1988. The standards they contain would be published as industry best practice, supported by risk-based and goal-based health and safety duties. Revocation of the regulations would reduce the amount of maritime health and safety legislation and mirror the revocation of the Docks Regulations which apply to shore-based workers. It would also bring health and safety legislation applying to merchant ships into line with that for fishing vessels. No monetised costs or benefits have been identified as a result of this proposal.

Option 1 meets the policy objectives in Section 2 of this IA and is the preferred option.

14. Implementation plan.

14.1 Consultation took place on Option 1 together with draft MGNs giving guidance on appropriate standards, in summer 2014.

14.2 Appropriate standards for safe means of access and safe movement on board ship would be enforced through the general duties in the Merchant Shipping and Fishing Vessels (Health and Safety at Work) Regulations 1997, and through inspections of health and safety under the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006.

References:

1. The Docks Regulations 1988: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1988/1655/contents/made>
2. The Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1999/3242/contents/made>
3. The Merchant Shipping and Fishing Vessels (Health and Safety at Work) Regulations 1997 -
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/1997/2962/contents/made>