

## How can port levies help deliver welfare provisions in the MLC, 2006?

ISWAN seminar at the Conference Centre, Baltic Exchange, St Mary Axe, London EC3A 8BH

21 May 2013



This report has been prepared for the International Seafarers' Welfare and Assistance Network (ISWAN) by Michelle Homden. The summaries of discussions have been compiled under the [Chatham House Rules](#) whereby comments may be quoted but not attributed.

### Introduction

As the seminar chairperson, Hennie la Grange welcomed delegates. He referred to the role of the recently formed ISWAN in recognising excellence, especially in port-based welfare provision, and of conducting research into issues of greatest importance. The inspiration for the seminar had been Dr Olivia Swift's 2013 report on [Port levies and sustainable welfare for seafarers](#). This was based on a study commissioned by ISWAN.

According to Hennie la Grange, it was the conviction of ISWAN that, if port levies could be made to work in a way acceptable to all stakeholders, it would be a step forward that would be both just and fair. However, there were various areas that needed consideration, including:

- Administration - responsibility for collection and distribution of levy funds
- Rates - reasonable income but not prohibitive
- Basis e.g. tonnage, number of ship calls, number of seafarers on board
- Capping and possible need to set a percentage
- Governance, accountability and transparency
- Compulsory or voluntary levies
- Use - ensuring that seafarers benefit

### Port levies and sustainable welfare for seafarers. Dr Olivia Swift, report author and Research Associate, Greenwich Maritime Institute

Dr Swift is an economic anthropologist who conducted her doctoral fieldwork in the Philippines. In presenting her report to the seminar, she identified the key question as: how best to support, and pay for, seafarers' welfare. The relevance of the [Maritime Labour Convention \(MLC, 2006\)](#) to levies was outlined. The burden of care must be shared. As such, levies should be seen as a collective endeavour representing value for all stakeholders. In compiling the report, she had looked at three areas:

- Where levies exist
- How levies are managed
- What effect levies have

The research was conducted in the form of an online survey supplemented by interviews and email exchanges. The report itself presents a full summary of the findings. In her presentation, Dr Swift drew attention to certain points of particular interest, namely:

- No reports of levies being abandoned after implementation.
- No correlation between the existence of port welfare committees (PWCs) and national welfare boards (NWBs) and levies.

- The need for transparency in levy administration and governance.
- Lack of clarity, at times, between compulsory and voluntary levies.
- Impact of levies still relatively modest with potential for greater significance.

Dr. Swift's [full presentation](#) can be viewed online.

### Discussion

Delegates were advised that the amounts quoted as the mean, median and mode averages for levies should be treated with caution. In reality, rates vary significantly according to local circumstances. The relatively high rate of payment in ports with voluntary levies is encouraging. Factors such as who receives the invoice for the levy, as well as the method of payment, are significant. In ports with less traffic, it can be easier for welfare workers to liaise directly with companies.

Levies can be voluntary or compulsory. However, it was suggested that there may be some 'grey areas'. For example, where invoices for levies are issued alongside compulsory port charges, it could create the impression that payment of the levy is required for port clearance. This could conflict with the necessary high standards of transparency and accountability. The basis for all charges must be clear, and there must be proof that levies are used to meet the needs of seafarers.

Very few ports limit the use of funds raised by levies, e.g. to capital expenditure only. However, such funds tend to be earmarked for specific purpose such as Wi-Fi or transport. This is important as such services also represent obvious benefits to employers.

Establishing and administering levy systems requires time and effort, with planning necessary for periodic reviews of rates. Depending on local circumstances, receiving houses or other agencies could be used for managing levies. There is potential for more support from port authorities, possibly even in the form of financial support or ship visiting by port authority staff. Welfare providers also have a responsibility to pay a fair contribution towards services.

### Winning and maintaining support for port welfare levies – Yogesh Mehta, President, Kandla Stevedores Association; Trustee, Kandla Seafarers' Welfare Association

Mr Mehta (pictured presenting, right) described the experience of the Kandla Seafarers Welfare Association (KSWA), of which he is a Managing Trustee. Members of the KSWA include stevedores, labour representatives, local doctors and members of port administration. It is chaired by the Chairman of Kandla Port. There are plans to convert the association into a trust, once it has fulfilled the income criteria under Indian law, as this will have tax advantages.

Seafarers' welfare services in the port include the seafarers' centre in the dry cargo terminal that provides various facilities including a Wi-Fi service, and also the on board Wi-Fi service that can be provided to ships alongside.

Seafarers are not charged for Wi-Fi use. In addition, work is under way on a new seafarers' centre that will provide the same facilities in Kandla's oil terminal.



Following discussions with vessel agents, a compulsory levy to support these services was introduced in February 2012. The levy of Rs1,000 (around US\$20) is charged per vessel, per call.

Given the large number of ship calls in the Port of Kandla, annual revenue is predicted to total US\$36-40,000. It is expected to contribute to the self-sufficiency of the existing seafarers' centre. Ship's agents receive an invoice for the levy which they pay along with other port charges, such as pilotage, prior to port clearance. Ship owners or charterers are informed of the payment through a disbursement account that lists all charges. The levy is collected by the port authority and remitted to the account of the KSWA.

So far, there have been no objections to the levy in the Port of Kandla. According to Mr Mehta, the relatively low sum requested means that it 'doesn't hurt'. However, the high level of traffic makes a substantial total. Other Indian ports have expressed interest in replicating the model, with the structure adapted to their rates of traffic. The KSWA is able to offer assistance in this.

For additional information see the Kandla Port case study in Port levies and sustainable welfare for seafarers.

#### **Discussion**

It was suggested that Wi-Fi provision was one of the most important arguments in favour of paying a levy. Access to Skype is among the most valued welfare services. Therefore, the offer of free Wi-Fi in port will result in levies being paid 'eagerly'. Mr Mehta confirmed that, in Kandla, the levy covers the cost of providing free Wi-Fi on board and at the seafarers' centre.

#### **A welfare organisation's perspective on operating a port levy - Duncan Starke, Committee Member of Mission to Seafarers, Durban; Member of the Durban Seaman's Club Management Committee**

Mr Starke described a rather different situation in the Port of Durban. There is a voluntary levy of 225ZAR (around US\$22) per vessel, per call. This rate was fixed by the Management Committee of the seafarers' centre without the involvement of any other stakeholders. Durban has not had a port welfare committee for some years.

The rate of payment is around 70 per cent, giving an average monthly total of 47,000ZAR (around \$4,730). It accounts for some 45 per cent of Mission income: the rest is raised by the Mission itself. The port authority makes no contribution to the cost of welfare services beyond allowing the Mission to rent its premises at a reasonable rate.

Invoices for the levy are issued on a daily basis to all vessels. Payments are made by ship's agents. There is complete transparency. The agents know that the levy is voluntary. Attempts are made to chase payments, even when companies have a history of not paying. Attempts are also made to educate companies about their services and facilities and negotiate with company representatives. There is no possibility of the levy becoming compulsory. However, a new port is being planned for Durban which may bring many changes.

Duncan Starke's [full presentation](#) can be viewed online.

#### **Discussion**

In discussion, it was stressed that the experience in Durban is specific to the context of South Africa. The country is an emerging democracy. Many of the people now working in shipping do not have a

maritime background. There is a focus on the national welfare programme which means that seafarers, as visiting foreigners, are not seen as a priority. Furthermore, volunteers are difficult to find meaning that welfare workers are usually paid.

Among the possible reasons for non-payment of the levy, the number of vessels coming in on charter was cited. Charterers' agents may see the levy as the responsibility of owners. It is worth liaising with all involved, including owners and operators to educate them about the seafarers' centre and the facilities provided. It is also worth trying to negotiate with local representatives even when head offices refuse to pay the levy.

It is possible that the voluntary status of the levy itself may be a reason for companies not to take it seriously. However, the current arrangement is accepted by the agency community. Any attempt at change may threaten the whole principle. The question was asked regarding whether agents expect payment for collecting the levy, to which the answer was no.

It also emerged in discussion that attendance at Durban seafarers' centre was falling dramatically due to visa requirements preventing certain seafarers from going ashore. Lack of access to shore-based facilities would certainly be a disincentive to paying the levy. The question of visas was partly due to a complicated situation regarding port boundaries. It was suggested that this matter might come under ILO Convention 185 (Seafarers' Identity Documents Convention), not yet ratified by South Africa. Lobbying for ratification might yield positive results.

FONASBA, the Federation of National Associations of Ship Brokers and Agents, was cited as an organisation bringing agents together. However, in the case of South Africa, it was felt unlikely that agents would come together to lobby. The question was also raised of creating a NWB, as well as a PWC for Durban. This was felt to be unlikely given the current national context.

### **Port welfare levies and the role of shipping companies - Natalie Shaw, Director Employment Affairs, International Shipping Federation**

Ms Shaw began her presentation by distributing copies of the MLC, 2006 in order to clarify exactly what it has to say on the subject of levies. The relevant section is reproduced here:

#### *Guideline B4.4.4 – Financing of welfare facilities*

*1. In accordance with national conditions and practice, financial support for port welfare facilities should be made available through one or more of the following:*

- (a) grants from public funds;*
- (b) levies or other special dues from shipping sources;*
- (c) voluntary contributions from ship owners, seafarers, or their organisations; and*
- (d) voluntary contributions from other sources.*

*2. Where welfare taxes, levies and special dues are imposed, they should be used only for the purposes for which they are raised*

Ms Shaw also wished to clarify the position of the ISF on seafarers' welfare. Members of the ISF understand the fundamental importance of seafarers' welfare. From the ship owners' perspective, welfare provision provides benefits such as:

- 1) Stronger, fitter crews with the positive mental attitude necessary for handling modern ships;
- 2) The right conditions for attracting better staff, while this is less apparent in the current global crisis the industry had previously had difficulties recruiting to certain positions;
- 3) An efficient means of keeping staff motivated as skilled and experienced crew are more likely to return to sea after a positive experience.

For these and other reasons, many ship owners work directly with welfare providers. Ms Shaw (picture presenting below) herself is Chair of the Sailors Society Welfare and Chaplaincy Committee, and the organisation receives significant revenue from ship owners. Ship owners choose to discharge their corporate social responsibility in different ways, taking into account such questions as tax legislation and local conditions.

On the specific question of levies, it was important to state that these were not the sole responsibility of ship owners. Furthermore, a refusal on the part of a ship owner to pay a voluntary levy should not be interpreted as a lack of commitment to seafarers' welfare. It may be related to a



decision to manage welfare contributions separately, for example, by working directly with the head offices of welfare providers.

Ms Shaw stated the importance of understanding MLC, 2006 correctly as a number of myths had arisen. As of August 2013, the Convention will enter into force only in those countries in which it has been ratified. It contains provisions that are both mandatory and non-

mandatory. The reference to levies, cited above, belongs to Part B of the code which is not mandatory (Art. VI, 1). Therefore, introducing levies is clearly not an obligation under the MLC, 2006, only a recommendation.

The presentation finished with an overview of those 35 countries that have already ratified the convention. According to Ms Shaw, the countries that would be better prepared for implementation would be those that had previously ratified Convention 163 (Seafarers' Welfare Convention 1987, concerning Seafarers' Welfare at Sea and in Port). She suggested that there was scope for a twinning, or mentoring programme whereby countries with a history of providing welfare facilities could assist those less experienced.

Natalie Shaw's presentation [full presentation](#) can be viewed online.

### **Discussion**

In discussion, it was observed that MLC ratification status did not seem to have any correlation with the existence of port levies. It was also suggested that some countries might be reluctant to ratify precisely because of the perceived obligations to provide welfare facilities. In fact, the MLC promotes the provision of facilities in appropriate ports. However, holding consultation on what those ports and facilities might be, is probably not a high priority in the context of the global economic crisis.

In the specific case of levies, governments and other authorities may not want the additional responsibility of collecting them. It was also suggested that the problem of corruption in certain countries could cause reluctance to pay levies if they were unlikely to be used for their intended purpose.

## **The role of welfare levies in delivering decent living and working conditions for seafarers - Peter McEwen, Senior Policy Advisor, Nautilus International**

Mr McEwen picked up the question of Code B of the MLC, 2006. Previously, ILO Conventions came with Recommendations which carried little authority. According to Mr McEwen (pictured presenting below), while some governments may claim that the MLC Guidelines are equivalent to Recommendations, this is categorically not true. Code B is not mandatory but must be taken into consideration. If relevant, Guidelines may be adopted into statute. In addition to levies, the following are all means of funding seafarers' welfare:

- Grants from public funds, the model used in certain Nordic countries where governments traditionally gave funding to seafarers' missions;
- Contributions from companies, usually voluntary, it was suggested that those choosing not to contribute often employ the seafarers with the greatest need;
- Contributions from seafarers who pay for certain services;
- Seafarers' organisations such as the ITF Welfare Fund, ITF Seafarers' Trust and other unions that contribute financially and in kind, giving time, expertise, premises etc.

On the question of levies, they should not be necessary, just as charities should not be necessary. In reality, however, other sources of funding are insufficient. As such, Mr McEwen favours compulsory levies. Their administration should be simple, comprehensive and transparent. Systems should be in place to ensure that they are paid directly to



welfare organisations, and used only for welfare purposes. They must not be used to fund basic services that are the mandatory responsibility of governments and/or port authorities.

The responsibility of port authorities was also raised. Levies should not necessarily fall entirely on ship owners. Port authorities have a responsibility to those using their ports, including seafarers. Some have accepted this responsibility, for example, by providing Wi-Fi for seafarers' use. Others are unwilling to meet such expenditure, a refusal that Mr McEwen considered especially unreasonable where Wi-Fi was already available to port staff.

Another important question raised during the presentation concerned the changing nature of welfare services. Some providers have taken policy decisions not to have seafarers' centres but to concentrate instead on ship visiting. Ship owners may be reluctant to pay voluntary levies without tangible evidence of port-based welfare services. It seemed unlikely that a welfare organisation could successfully engage in fundraising without a permanent physical presence in port.

## **Discussion**

There was some discussion about the perceived lack of importance accorded to seafarers' welfare in the MLC. This was accompanied by the assertion that its welfare provisions were, in some ways, weaker than ILO Convention 163. According to one analysis, flag states had blocked movement on welfare, making it clear that they would not ratify any convention that required governments to fund seafarers' welfare. Even more cynically, some governments were said to have claimed that they provided general welfare services, such as medical treatment, to seafarers. In reality, such services are already an obligation under an existing agreement.

More positively, numerous countries have already ratified the MLC, 2006 and others are expected to follow suit. When the Convention enters into force in August this year, a ship flagged in a state that has not ratified the MLC will be subject to inspection when it enters a port in a state that has. The 'no more favourable treatment clause' means that ships with sub-standard conditions will not represent unfair competition to those of states that have ratified and do provide decent conditions.

**Operating a successful welfare levy in partnership - Dave MacDonald Terminal Manager, ConocoPhillips, & Chairman, Tees and Hartlepool Port Users' Association; Alèxe Finlay, Secretary of the Tees & Hartlepool Port Users Association, UK**

The presentation by Alèxe Finlay and Dave MacDonald was delivered, very successfully, by video conference. The presenters described the situation in the Ports of Tees and Hartlepool, in the north of England. There are four active seafarers' welfare organisations: two branches of Mission to Seafarers (MtS), as well as Deutsche Seemannsmission (DSM) and Apostleship of the Sea (AOS). Between them, they undertake to visit all of the c5000 ships that call each year, offering every seafarer the opportunity to be transported to a seafarers' club.

The port levy has been in place since the mid-twentieth century, the result of a decision to include a small amount for the missions within the port tariff. While the organisations involved may have changed, the ethos has not. The tariff is based on gross tonnage. It is collected from each ship as part of the dues and put into a separate fund that is ring fenced for seafarers' charities. These receive a regular monthly sum. Any surplus is divided up between the missions and can be used as back-up or for additional projects.

This reliable income stream assists the welfare organisations in their planning and budgeting. There are no constraints: funds may be used for capital expenditure, running costs etc. The integration of the ports of Tees and Hartlepool means that robust systems exist to ensure confidence in the levy system. Welfare work is valued, including the work of unpaid volunteers. The presenters felt that their system could be publicised as an example of best practice.

The role of the port authority, PD Ports, was particularly significant in facilitating administration of the system. The port authority collects the levy as ships come in. The commitment of all involved, including harbour masters, also contributed to the success of the system.

The [full presentation](#) can be viewed online, and for additional information see the Ports of Tees and Hartlepool case study in Port levies and sustainable welfare for seafarers.

**Discussion**

This last point was revisited in discussion with an observation on the need for the support and assistance of the port authority. There was a question regarding cost/benefit analysis for the port and whether the cost of administration was met by the levy itself. In response, it was explained that costs were minimal as levies were taken at the same time as other dues. The port authority did not impose any charge for money handling. The benefit to the port authority was clear in that the missions were able to take the burden of welfare service provision.

Questions were also raised about the possible effect on shipping movements and competitiveness. Neither was considered a problem. There may have been a few concerns when the recession hit, but there had not been any serious objections. The modest amount of the levy, between £5-25 (around US\$8-39), meant that a decision not to pay would hardly represent a significant saving. Responsible shipping companies appreciate the high quality of welfare services provided for their seafarers.

One delegate referred to Tees Port as a 'Rolls Royce' example, also citing the strength of the local port welfare committee. However, it was pointed out that, while the system in the Ports of Tees and Hartlepool provided an excellent model, it was operating in a climate of strict governance, where there were demands for accountability and other safeguards.

### **Why port levies are vital to sustainable welfare services for seafarers - Ben Bailey, Public Affairs Manager, Mission to Seafarers**

According to Mr Bailey, Mission to Seafarers is the largest provider of charitable welfare services to seafarers. Given the importance of finding sustainable sources of income, MtS would welcome statutory port levies that afford a minimum level of financial security to welfare providers. Mr Bailey cited several examples of how levies are used to fund MtS operations around the world. In the port of Saldanha Bay, in South Africa, operations are entirely dependent on the levy. The welfare work in the port of Mombasa, Kenya, would not survive without it. The revenue provided by the Tees port levy is proportionally lower but still sufficient to maintain a basic service. All funds raised by levies are deployed locally. The Mission to Seafarers head office in London does not receive any share.

As Mr Bailey pointed out, the remit of welfare workers, including volunteers, is to provide welfare services. They should not be burdened with the task of collecting and managing levies. Indeed, chaplaincy teams should be wholly removed from any financial procedures in order to concentrate on what they do well. Similarly, while there must be monitoring and evaluation in the use of funds raised by levies, seafarers' centres and facilities should not be expected to engage in bureaucracy. This points to the importance of the port welfare committee. It should define the terms of reference of any levy system, and ensure that organisations receiving funds have a demonstrable track record of providing appropriate welfare services. Local welfare providers should certainly be part of the PWC. The negotiations involved in establishing a levy could help to develop relations between the port community and welfare providers.

Ben Bailey's [full presentation](#) can be viewed online.

### **Discussion**

In discussion, it was observed that funding organisations experience huge demand from welfare organisations for financial support for seafarers' centres. However, it is well known that some ports have multiple centres that may not all be necessary. One delegate asked what the faith-based organisations were doing about rationalisation. Mr Bailey responded that MtS always considers existing welfare providers and deploys its own services in a way that avoids duplication, working in partnership where relevant. The organisation held a global review in 2007. As times have changed since then, it is now re-evaluating.

### **General discussion**

The following is a synthesis of points raised during the panel discussion and group activities.

#### **The case against levies**

There was a question regarding whether levies necessarily enhance welfare provision. For a ship owner, payment of a levy might be seen as a sufficient contribution to welfare, discouraging any



further input. Similarly, governments and other authorities might use the existence of a levy as an excuse not to discharge their duties towards seafarers. It was suggested that focusing solely on levies could even damage other types of welfare contribution.

This shows the importance of defining what is meant by 'welfare', and which aspects are delivered in port, on ship and elsewhere. The ILO, for example, would extend the term 'welfare' to cover issues such as pensions: clearly not within the remit of most of the organisations represented in this discussion. Here, it would be useful to refer to Guideline B4.4 of the MLC on shore-based welfare facilities.

### **A global system**

Creating a global fund for welfare was generally considered unrealistic although examples were mentioned that might serve as models, in some respects. These included:

- International Oil Pollution Compensation Funds
- 'Light Dues' levied on commercial vessels in British ports for the General Lighthouse Fund

One delegate suggested avoiding the term 'best practice' as there could be no model appropriate for all situations, preferring instead to refer to an 'accumulation of good practices'.

### **Demonstrating the benefit**

A business case has to be made for any levy system, including an explanation of the costs of providing welfare services, as well as the costs of not providing them. The benefits must be apparent for all stakeholders: seafarers, ship owners, port authorities and welfare providers. Funding organisations expect specific information. For example, in the case of Wi-Fi, it is necessary to explain how it will be provided and maintained, and how usage will be measured and monitored.



**Capt. David Parsons (MNWB) presenting ideas on good practice**

In a very competitive environment, there is a perception that welfare providers sometimes 'chase' revenue streams without focusing on specific needs. Much depends on the situation in individual ports. As such, the business case must be made on a port-by-port basis, including an analysis of what services it would be reasonable and appropriate for each port to provide. Again, this highlights the importance of good working relationships and trust between stakeholders at port level, ideally reflected by a PWC.

### **Seafarers' centres**

The question of the importance of a physical seafarers' centre was raised again in discussion. One delegate observed that these had existed for years and wondered how they were funded in the past. The response was that traditional sources of funding, such as charities, still existed but were no longer sufficient. Concern was expressed regarding what would happen if seafarers' centres

disappear. Welfare workers, such as port chaplains and ship visitors, often cover several ports. As such, it could be difficult to put a case to a port authority for their support.

### **What do seafarers want?**

Consideration of the need for seafarers' centres must be anchored in the needs of seafarers themselves. It was suggested that surveys seem to show that seafarers do not necessarily want centres, especially where time and visa constraints mean that they cannot visit them anyway. It is necessary to demonstrate service provision: this does not have to be a building. Appropriate services might include mobile Wi-Fi provision and 'shops' taken on board.

A means of measuring quality standards would be very useful. Feedback should come from seafarers themselves. For example, it is known that some ship visiting is excellent in terms of the time and care devoted to seafarers and their welfare. Unfortunately, cases are also known of ship visitors going on board, dropping some religious literature and leaving. Being able to demonstrate the quality of welfare services would make a much stronger case for support.

### **Working together**

On the importance of collaboration, one delegate claimed that there were now positive relations between welfare organisations and significant numbers of ship owners. Furthermore, it was felt that many ship owners displayed a good understanding of welfare, and that there was scope for further research on their attitude to levies.

The MLC is tripartite in nature. As such, PWCs should also operate on a tripartite basis. They should have the freedom to decide on their own needs locally, and be trusted to make their own decisions.

A question was raised regarding the employment agencies that supply crew to ship owners, and whether they have a role to play in welfare. In response, it was said that there would be difficulties in identifying them and defining their role; after all, when MLC, 2006 was drafted, there had been considerable difficulty in determining what constitutes a 'ship owner'. It would be more useful to consider developing relations with ship management companies.

### **Request for a manual**

One delegate requested a 'manual' containing practical advice on implementing a levy. This might be similar in format to the advice published on the ISWAN website on how to establish a PWC. This should not be one single set of instructions, but rather a series of suggested steps that could be adopted depending on local circumstances. In response, it was said that any such manual should cover all four avenues of funding stated in MLC Guideline 4.4.4. In some ports, a levy may simply be inappropriate. It was suggested that levies needed to be considered as one tool among many for funding seafarers' welfare, and in future, levies should be placed in this context.

In addition, it was suggested that ISWAN could provide template letters to send to governments and port authorities in support of port levies.

### **The case for levies**

Can port levies help deliver welfare provisions in the MLC? Many of the welfare providers have operated for years. However, traditional sources of funding are less abundant, and they are finding it more effective to seek funding locally for port-based welfare provision. Levies are certainly not a panacea. Nevertheless, they do have the potential to provide significant revenue. As such, they are worthy of further consideration.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, Hennie la Grange urged delegates to focus on the lessons learned from Dr Swift's report and the day's discussion. He expressed his thanks to the ITF Seafarers' Trust for supporting the research and seminar, and to all who had attended the seminar, especially those who had travelled significant distances. Finally, he requested that delegates promote membership of ISWAN: a benchmark for good, if not 'best', practice in seafarers' welfare.

## **Appendices**

**Appendix 1 - Guide to good practice on port levies**

**Appendix 2 - Seminar programme**

## **Appendix 1 – Outline guide to good practice on port levies**

Seminar attendees identified key areas of good practice. This guide is intended to help promote good practice in relation to setting up, administering and operating a port levy. Detailed case studies documenting good practice can be found in [Port levies and sustainable welfare for seafarers](#).

### **Defining welfare**

- Define port-based welfare.
- Refer to ILO Guidelines on welfare (currently in draft).

### **Planning**

- Levies should be part of different funding streams for organisations.
- Business plans should be drawn up by organisations receiving levy funds.

### **Good governance**

- Involve all relevant stakeholders (through a port welfare committee/similar forum).
- Promote working in partnership and cooperation.
- Have a robust decision making body.
- Ensure transparency in decision making & use of levies.
- Have processes for accountability e.g. audits.

### **Administration**

- Administration can be led by a designated PWC member (where in existence, or a designated stakeholder).
- Ensure transparency in administration.
- Have agreed processes for administration.

### **Quality standards for welfare services and facilities**

- Identify seafarers' welfare needs at universal and local levels.
- Ensure international legal standards & guidelines are met.
- Have robust monitoring and evaluation systems & regular reporting on the impact of levy supported services (un/restricted).
- Include independent verification e.g. seafarers' survey.

### **Communication**

- Maintain good communication with stakeholders e.g. seafarers, funders etc.
- Educate stakeholders about seafarers' welfare.
- Describe the benefits of levies for the provision of seafarers' welfare services.
- Share good practice re. levy administration and operation.
- Promote seafarers' centres and services in ports.

## Appendix 2 - Seminar programme

### How can port levies help deliver welfare provisions in the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006?

Conference Centre, Baltic Exchange, St Mary Axe,  
London EC3A 8BH



21 May 2013

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| 10.00-10.10 | Chair – welcome and opening remarks  |
| 10.10-10.30 | Port levies and sustainable welfare for seafarers. Dr Olivia Swift, report author and Research Associate, Greenwich Maritime Institute   |
| 10.30-10.50 | Winning and maintaining support for port welfare levies – Yogesh Mehta, President, Kandla Stevedores Association; Trustee, Kandla Seafarers' Welfare Association, India  |
| 10.50-11.10 | A welfare organisation's perspective on operating a port levy - Duncan Starke, Committee Member of Mission to Seafarers, Durban; Member of the Durban Seaman's Club Management Committee, South Africa                                     |
| 11.10-11.40 | Break  |
| 11.40-12.05 | Port welfare levies and the role of shipping companies - Natalie Shaw, Director Employment Affairs, International Chamber of Shipping  |
| 12.05-12.30 | The role of welfare levies in delivering decent living and working conditions for seafarers - Peter McEwen, Senior Policy Advisor, Nautilus International  |
| 12.30-12.50 | Operating a successful welfare levy in partnership - Dave MacDonald Terminal Manager, ConocoPhillips, & Chairman, Tees and Hartlepool Port Users' Association; Alexe Finlay, Secretary of the Tees & Hartlepool Port Users Association, UK |
| 12.50-13.00 | Chair's summary  |
| 13.00-13.50 | Lunch  |
| 13.50-14.10 | Why port levies are vital to sustainable welfare services for seafarers - Ben Bailey, Public Affairs Manager, Misson to Seafarers  |
| 14.10-14.45 | How can port levies help deliver welfare provisions in the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006? Panel discussion with all speakers  |
| 14.45-15.05 | Break  |
| 15.05-15.50 | Next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ How can we use this report to promote port levies?</li><li>➤ Developing a guide to best practice on port levies</li></ul>   |
| 15.50-16.00 | Chair – closing remarks  |