Australian Government

Australian Maritime Safety Authority

CHECK PILOT VOYAGE COMPETENCY ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE & CHECKLIST (FORM 15)

Table of Contents

Australian Government

Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Check Pilot Voyage - Competency Assessment Procedure

Introduction

Australian Maritime Safety Authority (AMSA) has developed the 'Check Pilot Voyage' competency assessment framework to monitor and evaluate the performance and professional competence of coastal pilots operating in the Great Barrier Reef and Torres Strait. This system supports maritime safety by ensuring coastal pilots maintain high standards of skill and knowledge. Assessments are carried out regularly by AMSA appointed and licensed Check Pilots, using AMSA Form 15 (Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Checklist) as outlined in Marine Order 54 (Coastal Pilotage) (MO54).

General Information

The check pilot voyage assessment system is designed to verify coastal pilot competency and encourage ongoing professional development. Its success depends on mutual trust, respect, and confidentiality between assessors and pilots. The process is grounded in the principle of one professional mariner assessing another, impartially and objectively.

Role of the Check Pilot

Check Pilots are licensed by AMSA to conduct check pilot voyages in accordance with the relevant sections of MO54. As such, check pilots carry out the performance assessment process on behalf of AMSA, not on behalf of their respective Pilotage Provider.

Check pilots must act professionally, follow regulatory procedures and recognise that the check pilot voyage assessment process and its associated documentation form part of the legal framework governing coastal pilot licensing.

Assessment Principles

The framework aligns with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), which defines competence as the ability to apply knowledge and skills with autonomy, sound judgement, and responsibility in both predictable and changing conditions. To assess this effectively, workplace training standards require performance assessments to follow rules that are valid, sufficient, current, and authentic, and be guided by the principles of validity, reliability, fairness, and flexibility.

Use of Assessment Data

Assessment outcomes are analysed by AMSA to identify trends, common areas for improvement and individual performance gaps. This helps ensure consistent standards are applied by all Check Pilots and supports a system-wide approach to continuous improvement and risk management.

Assessment Stages

The following elements are included in check pilot voyage assessment:

- Planning the assessment
- Pre-briefing the assessment
- Conducting the assessment
- Recording and documenting the assessment
- Debriefing and providing feedback about the assessment

Planning the Assessment

The Check Pilot is to plan the check pilot voyage against the required standards and must use the AMSA-approved Checklist (Form 15) during the assessment in accordance with MO54.

The Check Pilot must:

- be familiar with the various Performance Criteria (PC) categories
- be familiar with all the competency elements listed within each PC category including all 'safety critical' competency elements
- be familiar with the definitions of the performance grades and overall assessment results
- decide on assessment strategies to be used for determining evidence of competency using performance grades for each PC element.
- be familiar with the assessment process and appreciate the implications of recording certain performance grades on the overall assessment result.

Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Checklist Components

The AMSA-approved Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Checklist (Form 15) includes the following components:

- Check Pilot Voyage / Assessment Transit Details sheet.
- Performance Criteria Summary sheet.
- Nine (9) Performance Criteria (PC) Evaluation sheets. Each PC sheet reflects a particular assessment category and includes a comments section.
- Performance Elements. Each element is structured as a question (or prompt) within the respective PC Evaluation sheet. Performance Elements marked with an asterisk (*) indicate a 'safety critical' element.
- Additional Comments page. If insufficient space is provided to enter comments regarding any Performance Criteria, please provide additional comments on this page as required.
- Overall assessment result for the assessed pilot.
- Pilot Declaration sheet. This sheet is to be signed by the Check Pilot and the pilot being assessed for each Check Pilot Voyage completed.

Check Pilots are to complete the Checklist as comprehensively as possible.

Note: Assessments are to include comments for each PC category and **must** have detailed comments regarding any Performance Grades of (1) or (2) accorded against any Performance Element.

Check Pilot Voyage Assessments Rules

The following rules apply with respect to the conduct of Check Pilot Voyage Assessments. These rules should be considered by Pilotage Providers when allocating Check Pilots for the conduct of Check Pilot Voyage Assessments.

- All Check Pilot Voyage Assessments are to be advised to REEFVTS as part of the commencing duties reporting requirements per MO54.
- Under no circumstances is an unsatisfactory Check Pilot Voyage Assessment to be aborted, cancelled or downgraded to a training event.
- All Check Pilot Voyage Assessments must be completed once commenced (other than in extraordinary / emergency circumstances which prevent the completion of the voyage).

- All completed Check Pilot Voyage Assessments must be submitted to both AMSA and the respective Pilotage Provider on completion.
- Pilotage Providers are to clearly advise AMSA of planned Check Pilot Voyage Assessments when submitting their Daily Booking Sheet.
- The practice of 'back-to-back' Check Pilot Voyage Assessments is prohibited, regardless of the timeframe in between such assessments. That is, if 'Check Pilot (A) assesses 'Pilot (B)' (who is also a Check Pilot), Pilot (B) is not able to assess 'Check Pilot (A)' for Check Pilot (A)'s next Check Pilot Voyage Assessment.
- No coastal pilot is to be checked by the same Check Pilot twice in a row.

Performance Grades

A 4-point marking scale is used during Check Pilot Voyage Assessments to document a pilot's performance. The marking scale is used for each Performance Element (PE) contained within the respective Performance Criteria (PC). A mark of four (4) reflects the best possible mark (ie. effective) and a mark of one (1) reflects the worse possible mark (ie. unacceptable).

The marking scale includes both 'technical' and 'non-technical' skill elements. The scale is designed to measure the *quality* of performance, rather than assigning a simple pass/fail, or competent/not competent grade against each criterion.

The use of a 4-point marking scale allows check pilotage voyage assessments to be analysed and trends identified across the coastal pilot cohort.

Reference Level Descriptors

When applying the 4-point marking scale, the check pilot must award the mark that best describes the weakest aspect(s) applicable to the assessed pilot's performance, based on the reference level descriptors shown in Table 1 below.

Each descriptor is to be considered in order to determine the assessed pilot's performance in the context of risk management, situational awareness, individual performance, technical skills and vessel management aspects (as applicable for each Performance Element), with the 'overall result' descriptor corresponding to the 4-point marking scale for each element.

To provide further guidance, the following information provides (non-exhaustive) examples of aspects which are considered to constitute the 'technical skills' and 'vessel management' categories:

<u>Technical Skills</u>:

- Application of Local Knowledge:
  - Demonstrates understanding of local waters, channels and environmental factors.
  - Optimises local knowledge to ensure safe and efficient voyage progress.
- Ship Handling and Manoeuvring:
  - Exercises precise control of the vessel (including consideration of varying draughts and loading conditions).
- Use of Navigational Aids:
  - Effective use of PPU, radar, ECDIS, AIS, GPS and echo sounders for safe navigation.

- Tidal / Current Awareness:
    - Interpretation of tidal data, current predictions and local hydrodynamic influences.
- Passage Planning and Execution:
    - Prepares and executes pilotage plans tailored to vessel characteristics and environmental conditions (including use of the UKCM system where applicable)
- Bridge Resource Management (BRM):
    - Communicates and coordinates with the bridge team to maintain safe navigation.
- Safety Management System (SMS) Compliance:
    - Adheres to company Safety Management System (SMS) procedures and operational protocols at all times.

Vessel Management:

- Speed Management:
    - Maintains a safe and appropriate speed throughout the voyage.
    - Avoids excessive speed or unnecessary delays.
    - Reduces to manoeuvring RPM when transiting navigationally critical areas such as POWC and Howick North Channel.
- ETA Management:
    - Adherence to the Master's voyage ETA and speed requirements.
    - Maintains consistency with the final ETA communicated to the pilot station.
- Bridge Resource Management (BRM):
    - Promotes teamwork and inclusiveness among bridge personnel.
    - Establishes a cohesive bridge team that enhances situational awareness and communication.
- Crew Resource Management (CRM):
    - Effectively manages crew workload to maintain operational efficiency and rest hours.
    - Demonstrates proactive planning to minimise crew fatigue and unnecessary standby times.

      Examples:
        - Arranges pilot ladder rigging during daylight hours if disembarkation is scheduled at night, ensuring crew rest is not disrupted.
        - Keeps deck crew on standby only when operationally required (eg. Goods Is. to Ince Point and vice versa), avoiding unnecessary forward standby during the entire POWC transit.
        - On vessels with forward bridges (eg. RORO, livestock carriers) and short distances to the bow (~25 m), allows crew to remain on standby in the duty mess, ready for rapid deployment when needed etc.

Note: When only two options (1 and 4) are provided for certain Performance Element, 4 is an affirmative (Yes) response and 1 is a negative (No) response.

Grade / Category	4 (Effective)	3 (Acceptable)	2 (Poor)	1 (Unacceptable)
Risk Management	Safety of vessel is assured. Risk is well managed.	Safety of vessel is maintained. Risk is acceptably managed.	Safety of vessel is not compromised. Risk is poorly managed.	Safety of vessel is compromised. Risk is unacceptably managed.
Situational Awareness	Behaviour indicates continuous and highly accurate situational awareness.	Behaviour indicates that situational awareness is maintained.	Behaviour indicates lapses in situational awareness that are identified and corrected.	Behaviour indicates lapses in situational awareness that are not identified or corrected.
Individual Performance	Performance remains well above the minimum required standard.	Performance meets the recognised standard yet may include deviations that do not detract from the overall performance. Minor deviations from the minimum required standard occur and performance remains within prescribed limits.	Performance includes deviations that detract from the overall performance but are recognized and corrected within an acceptable time frame. Occasionally, major deviations from the minimum required standard occur, which may include momentary excursions beyond prescribed limits, but these are recognized and corrected in a timely manner.	Performance includes deviations that adversely affect the overall performance, are repeated, have excessive amplitude, or for which recognition and correction are excessively slow or non-existent, or the aim of the task was not achieved. Unacceptable deviations from the minimum required standard occur, which may include excursions beyond prescribed limits that are not recognised or corrected in a timely manner.
Technical Skills	Technical skills and knowledge exceed the required level of competency.	Technical skills and knowledge meet the required level of competency.	Technical skills and knowledge reveal limited technical proficiency and/or depth of knowledge.	Technical skills and knowledge reveal unacceptable levels of technical proficiency and/or depth of knowledge
Vessel Management	Vessel management skills are excellent.	Vessel management skills are effective.	Vessel management skills are effective but slightly below standard. Vessel handling is performed with limited proficiency and/or includes momentary deviations from specified limits.	Vessel management skills are ineffective. Vessel handling is rough or includes uncorrected or excessive deviations from specified limits.
Overall result	Successful in producing a desired or intended result.	Satisfactory or allowable result.	Worse than is usual, expected or desirable result	Not satisfactory or allowable result.

Table 1 – Reference Level Descriptors

Pre-briefing the Assessment

- The Check Pilot must clearly brief the pilot being assessed of the Performance Criteria (PC) and the assessment methods that will be used during the Check Pilot Voyage.
- Some elements in the PC may require the assessed pilot to answer written and/or verbal questions. Check Pilots must ensure that these requirements are clearly understood by the pilot being assessed as part of the Check Pilot Voyage brief.
- The Check Pilot should provide opportunities for the pilot being assessed to seek clarification on any aspect of the performance assessment *prior* to commencing the Check Pilot Voyage.
- The brief must include an explanation that once the Check Pilot Voyage has commenced, it cannot be cancelled or aborted (other than due to extraordinary or emergency circumstances requiring such) and cannot be changed into a 'training opportunity' or similar, regardless of the performance of the pilot being assessed.

Conducting the Assessment

- Check Pilot Voyage Assessments are to be conducted using the Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Checklist.
- Coastal pilots being assessed must be advised on *how* the assessment will be conducted and the overall objectives of the Check Pilot Assessment Voyage.
- The Check Pilot is required to clarify any aspects regarding the conduct of the performance assessment if requested by the pilot being assessed.
- The performance assessment process should be based on the voyage as it happens, not on what may be learnt afterwards, and should take into account the actual conditions and circumstances at the time of each Check Pilot Assessment Voyage.
- REEFVTS must be informed that a Check Pilot Assessment Voyage is being undertaken as part of the 'commencing duties' reporting requirements (in accordance with MO54 requirements).
- Other than for 'assessment transits' (conducted as part of standard licence progression requirements for a pilot under training), the pilot undergoing the assessment will have conduct of the pilotage during the Check Pilot Voyage at all times (as the Operational Pilot).
- As assessors conducting performance *assessments* (on behalf of AMSA), Check Pilots are not to interfere with or take part in the actual conduct of the pilotage, however, in circumstances where the Check Pilot determines that direct intervention is required for the purposes of ensuring navigational safety, or the safety of personnel or the marine environment, the Check Pilot is empowered to take over the Con (and the role of the Operational Pilot) for the remainder of the voyage. In such circumstances, the Check Voyage Assessment overall result will be unsatisfactory with a remedial training plan required to be implemented for the assessed pilot.
- When conducting performance assessments, Check Pilots must always be mindful of their primary role as an assessor (on behalf of AMSA), and not a trainer (on behalf of a Pilotage Provider), however Check Pilots are able to recommend further training opportunities which may benefit the pilot being assessed, as part of the Check Voyage Assessment process where the overall result is satisfactory.
- The Check Pilot is to remain on the bridge of the vessel under coastal pilotage conditions at all times while the pilot being assessed is on the bridge.

Documenting and Recording the Assessment

Information Management

Coastal Pilotage Providers are responsible for compliance under MO54, including how the pilotage provider's work practices are conducted to ensure safety.

Completed copies of the documentation described below are to be sent to the respective Pilotage Provider to enable them to fulfil their responsibilities under MO54 and to AMSA.

- All sections of Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Checklist including Check Pilot Voyage / Assessment Transit Details sheet, additional comments (if completed), overall assessment result and the pilot declarations page.
- Copies of any other information relevant to the assessment and/or specifically referred to/collected as part of the assessment, including for example, copies of:
    - relevant sections of the coastal pilotage passage plan
    - any preamble or notes accompanying the passage plan
    - any checklist or declaration used by the pilot
    - the Master Pilot Exchange completed for the voyage
    - any written test (if used in association with the assessment)
    - any example questions asked verbally during the assessment.

Note: References to 'passage plan' herein refer to coastal pilotage passage plans and routes contained in the passage plan model defined in MO54 (being the Queensland Coastal Passage Plan (QCPP) published by AMSA).

Completed assessment documents are to be emailed to: coastal.pilotage@amsa.gov.au.

Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Outcomes

- Check Pilots can *recommend* (not mandate) further training or development opportunities against various Performance Elements when the overall Check Pilot Voyage assessment result is 'Satisfactory'.

  In determining whether further training is recommended where the overall result is deemed satisfactory, the Check Pilot must use their professional judgement in the context of the respective Performance Element(s) or where opportunities for improvement are identified.

  Such recommendations are to be entered in the comments section and are considered to complement the assessed pilot's ongoing professional development.

- A Check Pilot Voyage Assessment will be assessed as being 'Unsatisfactory' overall, if ***any*** of the following conditions are met:
    - any 'safety critical' Performance Elements assessed as Performance Grade of one (1) or two (2); or
    - any (non-safety-critical) Performance Element assessed as Performance Grade of one (1); or
    - any two or more (non-safety-critical) Performance Elements assessed as Performance Grade of two (2).

- Overall Assessments of 'Unsatisfactory' necessarily require:
  - a remedial training plan to be implemented for the assessed pilot, which must be coordinated by the relevant Pilotage Provider and approved by AMSA, as a matter of priority; and
  - a subsequent Check Pilot Voyage assessment is to be carried out upon completion of remedial training; and
  - any assessed pilot with an Unsatisfactory (overall) result should not be assigned any further pilotages until the remedial training plan and subsequent Check Pilot Voyage are successfully completed.
- If one (non-safety-critical) Performance Element is assessed as Performance Grade of two (2), the assessed pilot requires:
  - a remedial training plan to be implemented for the assessed pilot, which must be coordinated by the relevant Pilotage Provider and approved by AMSA, as a matter of priority; and
  - a subsequent Check Pilot Voyage assessment is to be carried out within three months of the initial Check Pilot Voyage (which included the Performance Grade of two (2)).

The following table outlines how the **overall assessment result** is determined:

<table>
<tr><th>Performance Element
Performance Grade</th><th>Safety (*) Critical (SC)</th><th colspan="2">Non-Safety-Critical (NSC)</th></tr>
<tr><td>1 - Unacceptable</td><td>Unsatisfactory</td><td colspan="2">Unsatisfactory</td></tr>
<tr><td>2 - Poor</td><td>Unsatisfactory</td><td>Unsatisfactory (if 2 or more NSC Performance Elements are graded 2)</td><td>Satisfactory (if only 1 NSC Performance Element is graded 2) however this still requires a Remedial Training Plan)</td></tr>
<tr><td>3 - Acceptable</td><td>Satisfactory</td><td colspan="2">Satisfactory</td></tr>
<tr><td>4 - Effective</td><td>Satisfactory</td><td colspan="2">Satisfactory</td></tr>
</table>

Table 2 - Overall Assessment Result Determination

Please also refer to the questions on page 39 which help to determine the overall result.

Remedial Training Plan

Any Check Pilot Voyage assessment with a Performance Element assessed as either Performance Grade one (1) or two (2) requires a remedial training plan to be developed and implemented for the assessed pilot.

The remedial training plan should be structured to specifically address the Performance Element(s) which gave rise to the overall assessment result and shall include a subsequent Check Pilot Voyage assessment (focusing on the respective area(s) for improvement) as a minimum.

Subject to AMSA approval, an AMSA-approved full mission bridge simulator may be used to facilitate the desired remedial training.

If appointed, the Pilotage Provider's dedicated 'Training Officer' (or a senior Check Pilot), together with the assessing Check Pilot should be closely involved with the development of any remedial training plan.

On completion of any remedial training and subsequent Check Pilot Voyage assessment, the respective Pilotage Provider is to advise AMSA (in writing) about what remedial training occurred and if the desired training outcomes have been achieved.

Post Voyage Administration

On completion of the Check Pilot Voyage, both the Check Pilot and the assessed pilot are to sign the Declaration Page of the checklist. The completed checklist (and any accompanying documentation) is to be provided to AMSA in accordance with the requirements detailed herein.

A copy of the completed checklist is also to be provided to the assessed pilot.

A copy of all paperwork regarding each Check Pilot Voyage assessment undertaken, is to be retained by the Check Pilot and the Pilotage Provider for a period of at least two years.

Debrief and Feedback of the Assessment

The Check Pilot Voyage Assessment process is an opportunity to identify potential strengths, weakness or areas for improvement, as part of a coastal pilot's ongoing professional development.

On completion of the Check Pilot Voyage, the Check Pilot is to conduct a thorough debrief with the assessed pilot. A full discussion of any deficiencies should be undertaken. Any criticisms or comments related to the assessed pilot's performance should be provided as constructively and respectfully as possible.

The debrief **must** include a discussion about any Performance Elements which were graded as a one (1) or two (2). In such instances, the Check Pilot must advise the assessed pilot the reason for the grade and discussions should be consistent with the comments indicated in the respective Performance Criteria Evaluation sheet.

Where an overall assessment result of 'unsatisfactory' is recorded, or where an assessment requiring a remedial training plan is recorded, this is to be clearly articulated to the assessed pilot, who is also to be advised of the actions intended to be taken by the respective Pilotage Provider.

The Check Pilot must allow the assessed pilot to provide feedback regarding the performance assessment. The Check Pilot must also be prepared to self-assess own performance (as an assessor) for each Check Pilot Voyage undertaken in the interests of continuous improvement.

Legal Liability

In undertaking a Check Pilot Voyage assessment, the Check Pilot is carrying out a task on behalf of AMSA as required by MO54. As a licence-holder under the Marine Order, the Check Pilot is liable to possible regulatory action, should any part of the Check Pilot assessment process be deliberately false or misleading.

A coastal pilot who is subject to a Check Pilot Voyage assessment is also liable to similar regulatory action.

In addition, it is a criminal offence to provide fraudulent information or documentation to a Commonwealth agency in meeting a requirement to provide that information or documentation. Penalties on conviction include imprisonment and/or substantial fines.

AMSA is committed to ensuring that coastal pilotage is undertaken by appropriately skilled, experienced and competent persons and will take the necessary steps to ensure that statutory requirements are being implemented appropriately.

Privacy Statement

Any personal information collected via this form is obtained to deliver AMSA's functions under the Australian Maritime Safety Authority Act 1990, the Navigation Act 2012 and/or the Marine Safety (Domestic Commercial Vessel) National Law Act 2012. Failure to provide personal information may mean we cannot provide a service to you. More details about how we handle your personal information can be found in AMSA's Privacy Policy (visit www.amsa.gov.au/privacy).

Contact AMSA

Please contact AMSA's Principal Advisor - Coastal Pilotage or Manager Coastal Pilotage & VTS for any queries or comments regarding any information contained herein, via email to coastal.pilotage@amsa.gov.au.

Australian Government

Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Details

Name of Assessed Pilot:		
Seafarer ID (Assessed Pilot):		
Name of Check Pilot:		
Seafarer ID (Check Pilot):		
Vessel Name:		
Maximum Draught:		
LOA (m):		
Gross Tonnage (GT):		
Assessed Pilot PPU Trained:	**Yes / No**	
Commenced Duty:	**Location:**	
	Date/Time:	/
Ceased Duty:	**Location:**	
	Date/Time	/
Last Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Date:		
Last Check Pilot Voyage Assessment Check Pilot (Name):		

Performance Criteria (PC) Summary

PC 1: **Personal Safety**: Did the pilot adhere to relevant workplace health and safety (WH&S) practices, including Pilot Advisory Notes (PANs) and best practice standards?

PC 2: **Master/Pilot Exchange (MPX):** Did the pilot demonstrate an effective MPX process?

PC 3: **Passage Planning & Execution:** Did the pilot plan and execute a safe and effective coastal pilotage passage plan?

PC 4: **Nautical Charts & Publications:** Did the pilot have access to up-to-date nautical charts and publications?

PC 5: **VHF Radio Usage:** Did the pilot correctly utilise VHF radio as required?

PC 6: **Bridge Resource Management (BRM):** Did the pilot demonstrate effective BRM practices?

PC 7: **Rest Management:** Did the pilot demonstrate effective practices associated with planning and taking rest?

PC 8: **Shiphandling** & **Navigational Equipment Usage:** Did the pilot demonstrate appropriate shiphandling ability, make effective use of all available aids to navigation and other navigational equipment/systems onboard to support safe navigation?

PC 9: **Contingency Planning**: Can the pilot describe appropriate contingency plans associated with degraded navigation situations and/or emergency situations?

PC 1 – Personal Safety: Did the pilot adhere to relevant workplace health and safety (WH&S) practices, including Pilot Advisory Notes (PANs) and best practice standards?

PC 1 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
* 1.1 - Did the pilot comply with the Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) requirements prescribed in the Pilotage Provider's Safety Management System (SMS)?	☐1			☐4	
* 1.2 - Did the pilot embark and disembark the piloted vessel in accordance the requirements specified in the respective Pilotage Provider's Safety Management System (SMS)?	☐1			☐4	

* *Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS

PC 2 - Master / Pilot Exchange (MPX): Did the pilot demonstrate an effective MPX process?

PC 2 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
2.1 - Did the pilot review the vessel's Pilot Card?	☐1			☐4	
* 2.2 - Did the pilot conduct a Master / Pilot Exchange (MPX) in accordance with the respective Pilotage Provider's approved MPX Checklist?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
* 2.3 - Were the roles of the individual members of the bridge team (including the pilot's expectations) discussed as part of the MPX?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
2.4 – Did the pilot verify the existence (or otherwise) of any engine power limiter (or similar arrangement) onboard the vessel?	☐1			☐4	
2.5 – If an engine power limiter (or similar arrangement) existed, did the pilot verify that the Master and/or bridge team were familiar with the procedure to override the limitation?	☐1			☐4	☐N/A

* *Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS

PC 3 – Passage Planning & Execution: Did the pilot plan and execute a safe and effective coastal pilotage passage plan?

PC 3 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
3.1 - Did the pilot implement a detailed passage plan for the pilotage (using the approved passage plan model specific to the vessel being piloted) as agreed with the Master?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*3.2 - Did the pilot review the planned tracks and waypoints on the vessel's bridge equipment (ie. ECDIS / ENC) and confirm the agreed route/waypoints were correct?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*3.3 - Did the pilot demonstrate ability to follow the QCCP tracks and waypoints throughout the voyage?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*3.4 - Did the pilot consider the vessel's particular manoeuvring characteristics which might be required in the context of the coastal pilotage passage plan?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*3.5 - Did the pilot determine if any gyro error exists, and if so, apply known gyro and/or compass errors throughout the voyage, if required?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
3.6 - Did the pilot determine and/or apply any 'set and drift' corrections to ensure the vessel remained on track throughout the voyage?	☐1			☐4	
*3.7 - Did the pilot indicate relevant cross-track error (XTE) / cross-track distance (XTD) information to the bridge team throughout the voyage as required?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
3.8 - Did the pilot confirm any radar usage requirements per the passage plan (including parallel indices & clearing ranges) were pre-loaded by the vessel on the bridge navigation equipment?	☐1			☐4	
*3.9 - Did the pilot discuss with the Master / bridge team key danger areas, and/or areas of restricted water, and/or no-go areas located adjacent to intended tracks, throughout the voyage as applicable?	☐1			☐4	
*3.10 - Did the pilot discuss with the Master / bridge team areas where potential currents and/or tidal streams may be significant, throughout the voyage?	☐1			☐4	☐N/A

*3.11 - Did the pilot discuss with the Master / bridge team the location of preferred anchorage locations which may be required throughout the voyage?	☐1			☐4	
3.12 - Did the coastal pilotage passage plan reflect any areas where hand steering is intended / required?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
3.13 - Did the coastal pilotage passage plan reflect any areas where a change in main engine status is intended / required?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
3.14 - Did the coastal pilotage passage plan reflect areas dependent on tides to produce sufficient under keel clearance (UKC)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*3.15 - Did the pilot comply with the Under Keel Clearance Management (UKCM) system usage requirements, if applicable?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
3.16 - Did the coastal pilotage passage plan reflect areas where a reduction in speed may be required to ensure sufficient UKC?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
3.17 - Did the pilot possess or have access to the latest weather forecast for the intended voyage?	☐1			☐4	
*3.18 - If any departure from the agreed passage plan was necessary, did the pilot brief the Master and bridge team, as required?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
3.19 - Was the pilot able to describe the reasons for all decisions regarding the use of any alternative tracks chosen?	☐1			☐4	☐N/A
3.20 - Did the pilot utilise all the information provided from onboard equipment / systems, external information resources and the bridge team throughout the voyage?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
3.21 - Did the pilot display a continual awareness of the dynamic operational environment throughout the voyage, including weather conditions, vessel traffic and UKC aspects?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	

***** *Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS – PC3

PC 4 – Nautical Charts & Publications: Did the pilot have access to up-to-date nautical charts and publications?

PC 4 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
* 4.1 - Did the pilot verify that the vessel had up-to-date nautical charts (ENCs) as required for the voyage?	☐1			☐4	
* 4.2 - Were all the electronic charts necessary for the voyage available on the Portable Pilot Unit (PPU) and up to date?	☐1			☐4	☐N/A
4.3 - Did the pilot have access to official tidal (and tidal stream) data for the intended route (as published by the AHO, or as issued by AMSA)?	☐1			☐4	
4.4 - Did the pilot possess the latest Maritime Safety Information (MSI) as required for the intended voyage?	☐1			☐4	
4.5 - Could the pilot access all relevant publications and resources on electronic devices using battery power alone and in the absence of internet connectivity?	☐1			☐4	

* *Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS

PC 5 – VHF Radio Usage: Did the pilot correctly utilise VHF radio as required?

PC 5 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
*5.1 - Did the pilot advise the Master about the ReefVTS reporting requirements (and the main methods of communication with ReefVTS) while in the ReefVTS area?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
5.2 - Did the pilot correctly complete the commencing and ceasing duties reports and provide the specific information required in accordance with MO54 requirements?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
5.3 – If the pilot is transiting Torres Strait and using the UKCM system, did the pilot confirm to ReefVTS that he had an 'active UKCM system transit plan' for the voyage (as part of the commencing duties report)?	☐1			☐4	☐N/A
*5.4 - Did the pilot maintain a listening watch on VHF Channel 16 throughout the voyage (with ample volume)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
5.5 - Did the pilot utilise the correct ReefVTS sector channel (11 or 14) as required throughout the voyage?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*5.6 - Were VHF "All Ships" broadcasts made for transits of Prince of Wales Channel (POWC), Howick Channel or Bond/Bugatti Reef, as applicable?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*5.7 - Did the pilot make early and effective use of VHF radio to address and/or deconflict any potential vessel interaction / COLREGs situation(s)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*5.8 - If a maritime incident (or suspected incident) occurred, did the pilot make the necessary report to ReefVTS?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A

***** *Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS

PC 6 – Bridge Resource Management (BRM): Did the pilot demonstrate effective BRM practices?

PC 6 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
6.1 - Did the pilot establish positive working relationships and active participation with the bridge team in fulfilling tasks?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
6.2 - Did the pilot encourage input and feedback and establish an effective 'challenge and response' framework for bridge team members?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
6.3 - Did the pilot take notice of and consider input / suggestions from the bridge team, even if not in agreement?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
6.4 - Did the pilot offer assistance and provide help to bridge team members in demanding situations?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
6.5 - If applicable, did the pilot remain calm and suggest relevant solutions during any disagreements or conflicts with bridge team members?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
6.6 - Did the pilot demonstrate an appreciation of 'cultural sensitivities' associated with the Master / bridge team (if applicable)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
6.7 - Did the pilot adapt their interpersonal communication style as required to suit the culture and/or demeanour of the Master and/or bridge team?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
6.8 - Did the pilot establish an appropriate balance between assertiveness and fostering bridge team member participation?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
6.9 - Did the pilot prioritise primary and secondary operational tasks and distribute those tasks appropriately among bridge team members?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
6.10 - Did the pilot identify possible future problems and anticipate changes in the operating environment throughout the voyage?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
6.11 - Did the pilot identify any time constraints throughout the voyage and if so, did the pilot discuss contingency strategies with the Master / bridge team, to address these constraints?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A

6.12 - For any particular decision made by the pilot, did the pilot discuss the reasons and state the selected option or agreed action and ensure this was understood by the Master / bridge team, in a timely manner?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
6.13 - For any specific decision made by the pilot in order to address a change in operational circumstance, did the pilot review the outcome of the implemented action against the plan or intended resolution?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*6.14 – Did the pilot establish an effective 'shared mental model' among the Master and bridge team throughout the voyage?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
6.15 – Can the pilot describe actions which can be implemented to address risks posed by complacent crew and/or over-familiarity with the voyage?	☐1			☐4	
*6.16 – Did the pilot apply the following to minimise the risks of single person errors?					
• Use 'closed-loop' communication?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
• Use Standard Marine Communication Phrases?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
• Verify the application of all helm and engine orders?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	

***** *Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS

PC 7 – Rest Management: Did the pilot demonstrate effective practices associated with planning and taking rest?

PC 7 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
7.1 - Did the pilot clearly indicate to the Master and bridge team the location(s) the pilot may leave the bridge for rest (during the initial MPX, or at any other time)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*7.2 - Before taking rest (or leaving the bridge), did the pilot ensure 'Please Call Pilot' (PCP) was conspicuously indicated on the vessel's ECDIS (well before the nearest hazard) and establish procedures to ensure the pilot's prompt recall to the bridge?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*7.3 - Before taking rest (or leaving the bridge), did the pilot discuss the circumstances in which the pilot should be recalled to the bridge and establish procedures to ensure the pilot's prompt recall as may be required?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*7.4 - Before taking rest, did the pilot clearly indicate to the OOW that the pilot is to be called if the OOW has any concerns about any navigational safety matter at any stage during the pilot's absence?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*7.5 - Before taking rest (or leaving the bridge), did the pilot advise the OOW of any vessel traffic (including fishing and sailing vessels), expected tidal streams, potential hazards and procedures in the event of reduced visibility, which may be encountered during the pilot's period of rest?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*7.6 - Before taking rest, did the pilot advise the OOW of the required fixing interval, minimum CPA (for passing vessels), maximum cross-track error and any other particular navigational requirements to be observed during the pilot's absence from the bridge?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
7.7 - Did the pilot set a personal timer / alarm clock associated with the immediate period of rest?	☐1			☐4	☐N/A
*7.8 - If resting on the bridge, did the pilot clearly indicate to the OOW that the pilot no longer had the con?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A

**Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS:

PC 8 – Shiphandling & Navigation Equipment Usage: Did the pilot demonstrate appropriate shiphandling ability, make effective use of all available aids to navigation and other navigational equipment/systems onboard to support safe navigation?

PC 8 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
*8.1 - Did the pilot verify that the vessel's ECDIS safety settings were appropriate for the voyage (including safety depth, safety contour etc.).	☐1			☐4	
*8.2 - Did the pilot demonstrate understanding of bare steerageway and use of appropriate safe speeds to maintain steerage throughout the voyage.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
8.3 - Did the pilot demonstrate the application of appropriate rate of turn (ROT) and use of ROT indicators throughout the voyage (if available on board).	☐1			☐4	☐N/A
*8.4 - Did the pilot operate the PPU in accordance with the requirements specified in the respective AMSA Pilot Advisory Note (PAN) and the Pilotage Provider's Safety Management System (SMS)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*8.5 - Did the pilot's PPU use a positional input source independent of the vessel's positioning system?	☐1			☐4	
*8.6 - Were the safety settings on the PPU appropriate for the voyage (eg. safety depth, safety contour etc.)	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*8.7 - Were the waypoints / courses in the PPU in accordance with the intended QCPP route and the waypoints / courses entered in the vessel's ECDIS?	☐1			☐4	
8.8 - Is the pilot able to demonstrate an understanding of the vessel's ECDIS sensor inputs and their accuracies?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*8.9 - Did the pilot ensure the vessel's position as displayed in ECDIS was actively monitored?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*8.10 - Did the pilot use alternative methods to verify the vessel's position displayed in ECDIS (eg. use of visual and radar correlation / independent PPU)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	

PC 8 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
8.11 - Is the pilot able to demonstrate an understanding of the vessel's ECDIS alarm settings in use (eg. waypoint arrival / guard zones / XTD alarm / sensor failure etc.)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*8.12 - Did the pilot verify the vessel's echo sounder settings (including verification that the sounder was set to 'depth under transducer' mode and depth alarm settings)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
8.13 - Did the pilot continuously monitor the vessel's progress via appropriate use of parallel indices and other radar navigation techniques to support navigational safety throughout the voyage (including via delegation)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
*8.14 - Did the pilot make effective use of the vessel's radar(s) throughout the voyage (including via delegation)? **Note**: Consider effective tuning, target detection / monitoring, use of appropriate range scale, appropriate band selection etc.	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
8.15 - Did the pilot verify the vessel's AIS speed input source is set to GPS (and not the vessel's log)? Note: This is particularly relevant for transits of POWC where use of the UKCM system is required.	☐1			☐4	☐N/A
8.16 - Did the pilot utilise all available equipment in a balanced manner (and not over-rely on any single piece of equipment)?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
*8.17 – Did the pilot demonstrate safe vessel manoeuvring to avoid collision in accordance with the COLREGs (including changes of course and/or speed), if applicable?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A

***** *Denotes a 'safety-critical' performance element.*

COMMENTS

PC9 - Contingency planning: Can the pilot describe appropriate contingency plans associated with degraded navigation situations and/or emergency situations?

PC9 ELEMENTS	PERFORMANCE GRADE				
9.1 - Can the pilot describe appropriate considerations and actions required in the following scenarios? **Note:** Pilots are to describe how they would manage risk and develop / apply appropriate mitigation and management strategies in relation to each contingency category described below.					
• Navigation equipment failure / degraded mode navigation (including GPS / AIS / UKCM / ECDIS / radar failure etc.).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
• Ship emergencies (including main engine failure / generator failure / steering gear failure / fire / etc.).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
• Vessel traffic conflicts (including options to deconflict traffic and actions in the event of a near miss / collision).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
• Proceeding to anchor / weighing anchor (including both planned and emergency anchoring requirements).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
• Cyclone avoidance (including seasonal risks and specific navigation requirements).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	
• UKCM system unavailability (including use of hard-copy transit plan and/or back-up tool).	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	☐N/A
* 9.2 - Is the pilot able to demonstrate appropriate local area knowledge (including the use of virtual & visual aids to navigation, marks, sectors, transits etc.) to supplement safe coastal pilotage throughout the relevant coastal pilotage area by day and/or by night?	☐1	☐2	☐3	☐4	

ACTUAL CONTINGENCIES (IF APPLICABLE)		
9.3 - Did any *actual* extraordinary situation(s) or contingencies occur during the Check Pilot Voyage? If 'YES', describe the situation(s) and the pilot's reactions below.	☐ YES	☐ NO

Additional Comments

If insufficient space is available to provide comments for any Performance Criteria above, please provide additional comments below, or on a separate sheet as required.

PC	Comments

Australian Government

Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Overall Assessment Result

The table below provides guidance about how to determine the Overall Assessment Result and is to be completed and submitted for all Check Pilot Voyage assessments. Please also refer to the information on pages 9-11 for further guidance about the assessment construct and remedial training plan requirements.

1. Did the Check Pilot record a Performance Grade of (1) or (2) for ***any*** 'safety critical' Performance Element? (If yes, the overall result is Unsatisfactory and a remedial training plan is required to be implemented).	☐ YES	☐ NO	
2. Did the Check Pilot record a Performance Grade of (1) for ***any*** 'non safety critical' Performance Element? (If yes, the overall result is Unsatisfactory and a remedial training plan is required to be implemented).	☐ YES	☐ NO	
3. Did the Check Pilot record a Performance Grade of (2) ***more than once*** for any 'non safety critical' Performance Element? (If yes, the overall result is Unsatisfactory and a remedial training plan is required to be implemented).	☐ YES	☐ NO	
4. Did the Check Pilot record a Performance Grade of (2) ***on only one occasion*** against any 'non safety critical' Performance Element? (If yes, the overall result is Satisfactory, however and a remedial training plan is still required to be implemented).	☐ YES	☐ NO	
5. If the Check Pilot recorded a Performance Grade of (1) or (2) for ***any*** Performance Element, has the Check Pilot entered detailed comments for each corresponding Element?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐N/A
6. If the overall assessment result is Satisfactory, did the Check Pilot recommend any further training or development opportunities for the assessed pilot, as a result of this Check Pilot Voyage?	☐ YES	☐ NO	☐N/A
7. If 'Yes' to Q6. above, please detail the recommended training here:			☐N/A

Overall Assessment Result:

SATISFACTORY ☐	**UNSATISFACTORY** ☐

Australian Government

Australian Maritime Safety Authority

Pilot Declarations

Check Pilot Declaration

WARNING: Giving false or misleading information is a criminal offence and may also lead to the cancellation or suspension of your coastal pilot licence.

The information provided in this Check Pilot Voyage assessment is a true and accurate record of observed performance throughout the Check Pilot Voyage in all respects.

..../……/20……

Signature of Check Pilot Date

Check Pilot

Overall Comments:

Assessed Pilot Declaration

WARNING: Giving false or misleading information is a criminal offence and may also lead to the cancellation or suspension of your coastal pilot licence.

The information provided in this Check Pilot Voyage assessment is a true and accurate record of observed performance throughout the Check Pilot Voyage in all respects.

..../……/20……

Signature of Assessed Pilot Date

Assessed Pilot

Overall Comments (if any):