



MINUTES OF THE 1st QUARTER PORT OF DURBAN PORTS CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Held at the TNPA Offices, Ocean Terminal Building

5 June 2014

Members

Mr Lisolomzi Fikizolo	Department of Transport – Chairperson
Ms Selma Schwartz-Clausen	South African Maritime Safety Authority - Secretariat
Captain Mladen Brkovic	South African Maritime Safety Authority
Captain Alex Miya	Transnet National Ports Authority – Harbour Master
Captain Justin Adams	Transnet National Ports Authority
Mr. Khulekani Xaba	Transnet National Ports Authority
Dr Andrew Mather	Local Government: EThekweni Municipality
Ms. Emma Du Plooy	Transnet National Ports Authority
Mr Fanie Pretorius	Port User: Cargo Owners / Freight Forwarders / Road Hauliers / Container Depots
Ms. Bridget Bishenden	Port User: Terminal Operator / Stevedore / Lessee
Mr. Philip Simpson	Shipping Lines / Agents / Oil & Gas / Ship Repairs / Fishing
Mr. Peter Besnard	Port User: Shipping Lines / Agents / Oil & Gas / Ship Repairs / Fishing
Mr. Chris Stretch	Provincial Government: KZN
Mr. Wiseman Phethwa	Labour: SATAWU

Observer Status

Mr. Mahesh Fakir	PRSA CEO
Mr. Chris Lotter	PRSA Representative
Ms. Zinhle Mhlongo	PRSA Representative

Department of Transport

APOLOGIES:

Members:

Port of Mossel Bay PCC 2014/15					
Members	Constituency	1 st Quarter	2 nd Quarter	3 rd Quarter	4 th Quarter
Mr. Thami Ntshingila	TNPA- Port Manager	x			
Ms. Glenn Xaba	Provincial Government	x			
Mr. Mervin Webb	Cargo Owners / FF / Road Hauliers / Container Depots etc.	x			

Observer Status

Ms Jowie Mulaudzi

PRSA Representative

Present

DOT OFFICIALS

Ms Cynthia Molema
Ms. Busisiwe Bedu
Mr Chuma Mpahlwa

Director General's Office
Director General's Office
Maritime Branch

TPT OFFICIALS

Ms. Ntokozo Lingishi

TPT

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
SECTION 1: PROCEDURAL MATTERS		
1.	<p>WELCOME</p> <p>The Chairperson Mr Fikizolo opened the meeting and welcomed all present followed by a round of introductions by all.</p> <p>The Chairperson reiterated the strategic importance of the PCC and Government's commitment thereto. He highlighted attendance from the Director General's office as a response to the issues previously escalated to the NPCC. As was explained to the NPCC the acting Director General will be chairing all the PCC meetings whilst he will chair the PCC meetings. In the absence of the Acting Director General he will chair the PCC meetings. He further explained that the official responsible for strategic planning in the office of the acting Director General was unfortunately called to another meeting.</p> <p>The Chairperson extended a warm welcome to the CEO of the Ports Regulator SA, Mr. Mahesh Fakir.</p> <p>He declared the meeting open and invited everyone to participate in the business of the day.</p>	
1.1	<p>Safety Briefing – Captain Miya</p> <p>A safety briefing was given by TNPA highlighting that everyone should vacate the building calmly in the event of a continuous alarm sound.</p>	
1.2	<p>APOLOGIES</p> <p>Apologies as noted.</p>	
1.3	<p>QUORUM</p> <p>In determining whether the meeting quorate attendance of members was noted, confirming representation in accordance with the Ports Act and Regulations as follows;</p> <p>1.3.1 Transnet National Ports Authority</p> <p>1.3.1.1 Harbour Master representative: Captain Miya</p> <p>1.3.1.2 One Person other than Harbour Master: Deputy Harbour Master – Captain Adams</p> <p>1.3.2 Port Users</p> <p>Mr Fanie Pretorius - Port User: Cargo Owners / Freight Forwarders / Road Hauliers / Container Depots/ etc.</p> <p>Ms. Bridget Bishenden - Port User: Terminal Operator / Stevedore / Lessee</p> <p>Mr. Philip Simpson - Shipping Lines / Agents / Oil & Gas / Ship Repairs / Fishing</p> <p>Mr. Peter Besnard - Port User: Shipping Lines / Agents / Oil & Gas / Ship Repairs / Fishing</p> <p>1.3.3 Provincial Government</p> <p>1.3.3.1 Mr. Chris Stretch</p> <p>1.3.4 Local Government</p> <p>1.3.4.1 Dr Andrew Mather</p> <p>1.3.5 Organised Labour</p> <p>1.3.5.1 Mr. Wiseman Phethwa</p>	

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<p>1.3.6 SAMSA</p> <p>1.3.6.1 Captain Mladen Brkovic</p> <p>1.3.7 Chairperson</p> <p>1.3.7.1 Mr Lisolomzi Fikizolo</p> <p>Confirmation of attendance confirms that the Port of Durban PCC quorate.</p>	
1.4.	<p>ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA of the 5 June 2014</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correction of the date for the next meeting on the Agenda should read 14th August and not 16th August 2014. 2. Page 2: 6.2.1 Labour Feedback: UTATU SARWHU should read as one name without the hyphen. <p>The Agenda of the 5 June 2014 was motioned for adoption by Mr. Pretorius and supported by Mr. Chris Stretch.</p> <p>Declaration of Interest</p> <p>The Secretariat advised that the Declaration of Interest forms will be circulated to be completed by all and handed back after the meeting.</p>	
1.4.1.	<p>ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING 5th FEBRUARY 2014</p> <p>The following amendments were made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pages 1-6 No changes 2. Page 7: Task Team Role players: Mr Paul Sessions and Dr Andrew Mather represents Local Government and not Provincial Government as indicated. 3. Page 8 – 11 No changes 4. Page 12: Grammar - TPT for example was (instead of is) a standing invitee. 5. Page 12: 6.7.1.3 Correction – Organised Labour instead of Organises Labour. 6. Page 13: no changes <p>The Minutes of the 13 February 2014 was motioned for adoption by Mr. Chris Stretch and supported by Mr. Fanie Pretorius.</p>	
SECTION 2: MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MEETING OF 19 FEBRUARY 2014		
2.1	<p>Update on Navis</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Pretorius confirmed that there has been discussions between TPT and industry. He confirmed that TPT is aware of the risks. He noted that industry is aware that TPT is trying to work towards having a contingency plan in place. 2. Following the interaction between the industry and TPT, Industry agreed to not have further engagement on this issue between TPT and TNPA. 3. In so far as the issue being escalated to the NPCC – He noted that the NPCC has been made aware of the associated risks. Industry has agreed to not pursue this issue any further at an NPCC level but will keep a close eye on Navis progress whilst looking to find contingency solutions with TPT. 4. He expressed his appreciation with the way in which TPT has interacted with the industry on this issue although still no technical solution at the time of the meeting. 5. Following discussion it was agreed that this issue remain on the agenda with updates. 	<p>Action: 1</p> <p>Meeting agreed that this issue will remain on the agenda.</p>
2.2	<p>TNPA to share the North Quay berth deepening plans</p> <p>TNPA will provide feedback when presenting the Port Development framework plans under 3.1.3 and 3.1.4</p>	<p>Action 2:</p> <p>Finalised</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
2.3	<p>Heavy lift Cargo</p> <p>1. Issue of heavy lift cargo was previously communicated. Provincial Government will send details of the website with all the embargo dates.</p>	<p>Action 3:</p> <p>No further action required.</p>
2.4	<p>Customs Clearance - City Deep</p> <p>1. The issue related to customs clearance of containers at City Deep remains unresolved. Mr. Pretorius to follow up with SAAFF and provide an update at the next PCC meeting.</p>	<p>Action 4:</p> <p>Mr. Pretorius to provide an update on the issue of customs clearance.</p>
2.5	<p>Landside issues / Port congestion</p> <p>Dr Andrew Mather provided an overview of developments today. The Subcommittee identified the issues which was brought back to the PCC meeting</p> <p>1. Task team met on the 27 March 2014.</p> <p>2. Total of 27 key issues identified which was sub divided into Short / Medium and Long Term priorities.</p> <p>3. Short term - 12 priorities identified</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Proposed driver training induction course – many of the congestion related challenges symptomatic of driver behaviour. Subcommittee proposed that the driver training induction programme be outsourced. Train the trainer approach to be considered. Industry pushing to have all drivers inducted. Letter will be going from the Shippers Council to the TNPA requesting that TNPA makes driver induction compulsory for all drivers entering the port on an annual basis. When things go wrong it is possible to identify the firm and truck but not always the driver who is often the culprit. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. TNPA Planning tried to illustrate the implications of this on a practical level. Two million containers handled by drivers divided by 365 - the number of days per year averaging approximately 5 000 drivers roughly. Worst case scenario this could imply that approximately 5000 drivers per day would have to be inducted as a minimum. ii. He observed that trying to induct all truck drivers is simply not feasible. iii. The Chairperson reflected on the calculation noting that this number may be considerable less due to the likely number of repeat trips by the same driver. iv. Mr. Pretorius and Dr Mather reminded members who were present at the workshop and informed the meeting that the same induction training was proposed to be offered by competent training institutions. v. The same training institutions would have to be vetted and certified / accredited by TNPA as competent to provide the required induction training. vi. Industry has shown willingness / interest to pay for the induction training. vii. Mr. Stretch noted that TPT indicated previously that they have the details of truck drivers at Pier 1 and Pier 2. Less than 3000 truck drivers per day, some of whom are doing as many as 6 trips per day. viii. City and local government keen to see how the carnage on roads can be reduced if not stopped all together and welcome industry's initiatives to look for ways of improving the status quo. ix. Industry proposing a program expediting the induction process for truck drivers. 	

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Depot operating times. Port operates on a 24/7 hour basis with many of the Container depots and other key stakeholders do not operate on that basis contributing to the logistical challenges. c. Compulsory booking system. Not all slots to be allocated upfront; d. Communication: Protocol for communication with industry to be developed. This protocol who address all issues such as potential problems, congestion, Navis down time etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Lack of notices: Concerns expressed when the port suddenly closes due to internal staff meetings. The meeting itself might take an hour but getting operations back on track takes much longer. Mr Brian Molefe’s visit to the port was cited as an example where the port was closed. Port users subsequently send a letter to Mr. Molefe’s office in this regard requesting that a different approach be considered. Awaiting feedback from Transnet. Port users noted that cumulative negative implications on the supply chain is underestimated. ii. Transnet inadvertently benefits from a revenue perspective when inefficient whilst the cost for doing business in SA increases. iii. Current practice is considered to be unhealthy and has to be reviewed. iv. DOT proposed that funding from the Maritime and Road freight chambers - TETA be considered for the training. Harbour carriers association strongly felt that this is a priority hence the initiative to pay for themselves. Funding proposal is welcome and will be conveyed to the Harbour carrier association. TNPA has to take ownership of the problem. v. Issue around driver transgression and demerits – Following driver induction it will be possible to take issue with drive demeanours etc. from a disciplinary perspective. vi. Issue of incident management – poor communication between city department, local police and TNPA which further aggravates congestion issues. Systems to improve communication. vii. Issue of road construction and improvement to be publicise with sufficient notice. e. Item 5: Short term truck parking and holding areas: The 1999 ROD for new berths D-G required that the ports created a truck parking / staging area which has not been actioned. Suggestions that various land parcels be considered. Springfield area reported to have capacity for 50 trucks. The City Police survey of the Springfield truck staging area found more than 500 parked trucks at the time spilling over into the Springfield area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Truck staging area to be linked to the booking system. f. Item 6: Tier for tier allocation system proposed: Harbour Carriers Association operational proposal to speed operations. g. Item 7: Entry / Exit Permits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Discussion with regards to A Check not working effectively. ii. Proposal that a permit system for drivers be put in place. iii. Separate system for vehicles with RTQS checks. iv. System in place to deal with foreign drivers. h. Item 8: Enforcement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Incident Management, parking violations etc. ii. Proposal that an MOU be entered into amongst agencies i. Item 9: Container Release order: Still instances where physical documentation is required. Workshop required between the Container depots, Shipping Lines and TNPA discussing the use of technology at a practical level to ensure fluid movement of cargo. j. Long term capacity issues: k. Item 11: Stacking direction 	<p>Action: 5</p> <p>Port congestion: Captain Miya to convey challenges related to Port congestion to the Port Manger as discussed at the PCC. Furthermore that he is required to chair the subcommittee meeting with the identified challenges as the agenda items for which solutions are to be developed with timelines. Feedback to be provided at the next PCC meeting.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<p>i. Creating alignment between container stacks and the most favourable wind direction. It is anticipated that this alignment should reduce downtime significantly. Issues linked to manoeuvrability.</p> <p>l. Item 12: Overweight containers / vehicles linked to having a weighbridge.</p> <p>i. Proposed weigh in motion sensors to be considered.</p> <p>ii. Other technology includes load cells on existing equipment. Pending legislation will ultimately require that every single container to be loaded would have to have a declaration of its weight. Captain Miya to be party to the discussion to ensure that his proposals are taken into account.</p> <p>4. The chairperson briefly reflected on the issues raised and highlighted the role and importance of the Port Manager in resolving the issues. He extended an invitation to be included in the discussions with the Port Manager where necessary.</p> <p>5. All parties were invited which included the Port Manager, TPT, local police etc. Subcommittee needed to identify the issues which was to be fed back to the PCC which was done.</p> <p>6. The Chairman highlighted that addressing inefficiencies are central to the role of the PCC. He observed that the challenges are at the port itself which requires the Port Manager's intervention. He highlighted that it is important to identify potential solutions alongside the challenges. Role of DOT to regulate with the support of the relevant agencies.</p> <p>7. TPT Planning supportive of the proposal that the subcommittee reconstitute and identify relevant resolutions.</p> <p>8. Dr Mather highlighted that the subcommittee could not for example deal with all the issues of congestion and agreed to deal with the major issues. This was done. This was part of the feedback. He requested that direction be provided to fast track the issues identified. Same was supported. This view was supported.</p> <p>9. The Chairperson stressed the importance of the Port Manager being involved in the process of unpacking challenges within his domain and developing solutions for identified challenges. He noted that the root cause of issues have been identified with the office of the Port Manager represented. Next step is to involve the Port Manager in discussing solutions. Where there are disagreements or impasses reached the issue would have to revert to the PCC.</p> <p>10. Mr. Pretorius stressed that this issue has been long and coming for at least the last 18 months. Supporting the Chairperson he proposed this issue now be handed over to the Port Manager.</p> <p>11. The Chairperson directed that a meeting be convened prior to the 3rd quarter PCC meeting with all parties involved. Aim of the meeting to identify with timelines. He supported the proposal by industry that the Port Manager convene the agreed meeting. Feedback to be provided at the meeting. Following a lengthy discussion it was agreed that the Harbour Master, Captain Alex Miya will convey the urgency of the matter to the Port Manager. It was agreed that it is Port Manager's responsibility to ensure that the Port runs efficiently. Captain Miya pondered the urgency of the matter and the work done by the subcommittee. He highlighted that this is coming to the Port Manager via the PCC and agreed to convey the message and its urgency to the Port Manager.</p> <p>The Chairperson thanked Dr Mather and the Subcommittee for the work done! Next steps to follow as agreed. Port Manager to convene the Congestion analysis discussion with the aim of finding solutions linked to timeframes.</p>	
2.6	<p>Transnet to avail land to the City to develop a truck staging area – Local Government</p> <p>1. City, Metro Police and Transnet aware of congestion and the need for a truck stop. Large sites required for trucking.</p> <p>2. Available land parcels in short supply. Land with the required infrastructure looked at happen to belong to Transnet.</p>	<p>Action 6:</p> <p>Port Manager to convene Congestion Subcommittee of which the truck staging area is part of the agenda.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. As agreed earlier this is one of the issues that will form part of the discussion that will be convened by the Port Manager of Durban. 4. One of the issues recently resolved on road closures: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. One lane road closure requires two weeks' notice. b. Complete closure 4 weeks' notice. c. Mandatory for parties closing the road to provide the requisite notice, put up the posters etc. 5. Dr Mather reflected on the 1999 ROD which required of Transnet to ensure that a Truck staging area was in place just outside the port. That was 15 years ago. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. TNPA Planning confirmed that truck staging areas were subsequently developed inside the port. 6. Chairperson directed that feedback be provided Port Manager who will be convening the Congestion subcommittee meeting. 	<p>Feedback to be provided at the next PCC.</p>
<p>2.7</p>	<p>Terminal Operator Berth Utilisation - Mr. Peter Besnard</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optimization of berths whilst taking out berths central to the discussion. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Satisfaction expressed with the progress on Berths 108 and 109. b. Although the initial agreement was that TNPA would take out 6 berths the current arrangement and ongoing communication serves industry well. Berth 1 taken out as well. c. Reports of dredging of 203-205 given the green light. d. Extension of the quay will provide for more stacking space. e. Main issue was the break-bulk working at Maydon wharf, partial tankers at berth 1 and 2. Fishing fleet at berth 100. f. Work currently being done necessary although not without inconveniences. g. Off Port limit operations – vessel to come into port for inspection which induces strain on already strained resources – tugs, pilots, berthing gangs etc. 2. Captain Miya sought as to how this issue came onto the agenda. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Industry feedback indicate that initial plans did not indicate alternatives. Vessels calling had to be serviced. Meeting between SAASOA and the Port did not produce alternatives. Working better now. Progress reports have become available. 3. Chairman highlighted that the issue of transparency is important to ensure that everyone is on the same page. Currently only Transnet produces reports as an example. Ultimately it is expected from all to produce reports. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. He noted that the Director General requested that all parties be required to make presentations twice a year on their industries. This should be in the format of PowerPoint and or word. b. Important that all should be part of creating solutions. 4. Captain Adams remarked on the many challenges experienced with the Maydon Wharf project. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. He noted that TNPA made efforts to communicate with the affected parties. b. He made reference to some of the discrepancies in the way the project was handled by TNPA which required that the COO, Mr. Herbert Msagala intervenes. c. Initially two berths were going to be taken out. Industry voiced their concerns about the potential impact on business. This resulted in TNPA agreeing to taking out one berth at a time. Contractor was briefed accordingly. d. Berths 12 which was not previously available will also become to industry as a common user berth. e. Currently TPT has sole right to the project due to work at berth 108 and 109. f. Cumulative effect that industry will be getting two berths and taking one away for the berth deepening project. g. Parcel product tankers – arrangements were made with the project team that infrastructure will be catered for at Maydon wharf 1 and 2 when taking out 3 and 4. The rights for accommodation on the berth will continue in line with the Maydon Wharf berthing policy. 	<p>Action: 7</p> <p>Item closed out and could therefore be taken off the agenda.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<p>h. He explained that this was communicated to industry which startled the Harbour Master in terms of it being raised at the PCC.</p> <p>5. Mr. Besnard reflected briefly on the communication breakdown which he was requested to intervene in at which time Mr. Msagala got involved.</p> <p>6. The Chairperson encouraged the meeting whilst it is important to be firm to not be harsh whilst everyone is learning and defining institutional arrangements. He noted that as this process evolves everyone will get onto the same page. He expressed his appreciation for the willingness on everyone part to deal with issues professionally. That in this instance whilst the issue is with the PCC that the PCC be updated on the matter whilst everyone remains aware that the issue is being dealt with at the right level.</p> <p>a. He highlighted that everyone ultimately has the same objective of progressing issues.</p> <p>7. Mr. Pretorius apologised for having brought the matter to the PCC following the prolonged process of not getting straight answers.</p> <p>a. He observed that everyone ultimately wants progress.</p> <p>b. He expressed his appreciation of the progress made and in particular for the ongoing communication.</p> <p>8. The Chairperson briefly reflected on the current DG's way of and culture of getting this done. That he is structures and systematic in his approach and when required DOT will intervene if need be. It was agreed that the issue be taken of the Agenda.</p>	
2.8	<p>Provincial Government Technical Feedback</p> <p>1. Request that this be handled at the 3rd quarter PCC meeting.</p>	<p>Action 8:</p> <p>Provincial Government Technical Feedback - Issue to be handled at the 3rd quarter PCC meeting.</p>
2.9	<p>Island View Report (Action 12)</p> <p>1. Intention was to review the 13/14 financial year projects carried forward into 14/15 and to look at what fell by the way side if any. Secretariat was initially requested to review same with Port Planning as a first step in the previous meeting.</p> <p>a. The Port Planner confirmed that this issue can dealt with outside the meeting.</p> <p>2. Mr Pretorius explained that the Capex process previously had a separate session where PCC members could have a separate discussion linking capital projects to the TNPA's requirements and the following year tariff application.</p> <p>a. Some of the projects discussed previously may not have been carried forward.</p> <p>b. Mr. Govan reflected on the recent PCC roadshow. He explained that the only projects not on the list is the minor works component.</p> <p>c. Mr. Govan extended an invitation to Port users to engage on capital projects.</p> <p>3. The Chairperson reflected on the meeting that was supposed to have happened between the Secretariat and Planning and consolidate and present in the way the PCC would like to see it.</p> <p>a. Mr. Pretorius highlighted that every PCC has a responsibility to carefully unpack all the projects.</p> <p>b. It was clarified that the recent roadshow was a PCC roadshow.</p> <p>4. The Chairperson reopened the Capex issue following the tea break:</p> <p>a. He explained the initial resolution which involved the meeting between the Port Planner and the Secretariat reviewing the Capex issues as outlined in the previous meeting.</p> <p>b. He noted that he is reopening the issue so that the meeting can move forward with the best options available at the time of the meeting.</p>	<p>Action 9</p> <p>Secretariat, Planning and Port users.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. The Chair highlighted again that it is an amending process where we want to make sure that we serve the people of SA in the best way we can which require a willing to revisit issues at times. d. Following heated discussion and a request for order the Chairperson observed that it is both important and required to have honest and transparent discussions. He encouraged honest, brutal and robust debate if it is going to take the PCC closer to solutions. e. He noted that threats may be directed at the Chairperson but not at anyone else if there were to be any. f. Mr. Pretorius highlighted that cargo owners ultimately pay the bills. This he noted is ultimately to ensure that SA is competitive which is not without hitches in the supply chain. He noted the importance to have proper controls in place. g. The issue of protocol was raised. It was noted that the meeting was constituted by nominated representatives of various organisations who are members. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The meeting was opened to observers not mentioned in the Act. ii. It was noted that discussions should be restricted to members only. iii. This was raised as a result of what was considered to be disparate comments being made by non-members not adding value to PCC discussions. iv. An appeal was made to stick to the important business of the day and that member's deal with matters. v. Capex issue: The CEO of the PRSA noted that having attended two of the Capex roadshow he noted that there was a lot to assimilate. Furthermore that port users be afforded an opportunity at a later stage for port users to comment. h. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. He expressed the importance of the ability to comment and provide feedback. ii. He expressed his appreciation that the Chairperson reopened the Capex issue for comment. iii. He noted that the upcoming tariff determination may still be the old capex vs. capex in a seven year timeline. He extended an invitation to all to communicate with the PRSA indicating what is seen as necessary capex or not etc. iv. Capex roadshows held may not necessarily be a critical element in the next tariff determination except in the instances where they are project ready. i. The Chairperson expressed his perspective on observers drawing on his experience locally and internationally both at and individual meeting level and on a country level internationally. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. He noted that observers are allocated time to air their views. In the instances where information can be accessed on the internet it will be specified as members only. ii. He noted that observers may not vote. j. The Chairperson thanked Mr. Pretorius for opening up with regards to the Capex issue. He noted that within the regulations PCC Ad-hoc meetings are allowed. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. He expressed the importance of the packaging of information with the TNPA in the way the meeting agreed previously. He noted that in the spirit of transparency he was happy to review this position when members felt it may be necessary to review this position. ii. Mr. Pretorius supported that there be a preparatory meeting between the Secretariat and the TNPA followed by a PCC Capex discussion. iii. It was agreed that the document be circulated ahead of the PCC Capex meeting. 	

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<p>iv. Main item on the agenda of the ad-hoc PCC Capex meeting will be capex. It was agreed that the date will be communicated accordingly. It was agreed that the meeting should start rather early.</p> <p>v. Agreed that 2 weeks lead time will be given to the members.</p> <p>5. The PRSA CEO enquired whether the PCC Capex ad-hoc process was only applicable to the Durban PCC. The Chairperson responded that it the option is available to all PCCs but that only the Durban PCC has requested to have it in this way.</p> <p>6. The issue of observers was raised from a clarification perspective.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> It was explained that the decision taken at the previous NPCC meeting still holds. When we follow the letter of the Ports Act of 2005 and the Port Regulations of 2007 than the only observer will be the PRSA. Invitees will be allocated a specific slot and be excused thereafter. To date the rules have not been strictly applied as the induction process was still to be finalised. It was noted that everyone is still learning. <p>7. Mr Govan explained that his role was to assist the ports ensuring consistency and taking back issues to be considered by the TNPA in the Application.</p> <p>8. The Chairperson thanked everyone for their inputs and the way in which the discussions was handled. He noted that the discussion served as a reminder that PCC meetings will be closed meetings going forward.</p> <p>Action 13 / 14 / 15</p> <p>Item finalised. Closed out.</p>	
SECTION 3: STANDING ITEMS		
<p>3.1</p>	<p>TNPA –</p> <p>3.1.1 Quarterly Trade & Vessel Traffic</p> <p>3.1.2 Port Performance</p> <p>3.1.3 PDFFP - Progress / Updates</p> <p>The Acting Port Planner provided an overview of the Port of Durban PDF Plans to date. Plans available on www.transnet.net and www.tnpa.co.za ; Mr. Govan explained that the Port development plans are updated on an annual basis. Presentation attached.</p> <p>Comments / Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The PRSA CEO enquired what it is meant by progress on the PDFFP. He noted that progress talks to where you are on delivering on your plan rather than planning itself. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> He questioned whether it is supposed to be progress on planning thinking and or actual delivery on projects previously planned. Ms. Bishenden questioned whether the update suggests that the DDOP plan has been signed-off? Whether what was presented on the DDOP represents the official plan and or whether it is in the official planning of feasibility stage. <p>TNPA Response:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr Govan explained that it is known that Transnet is embarking on the DDOP project. He explained that the project is still at a planning and feasibility stage. 	

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<p>He explained that there are various analyses at different stages. Furthermore that it was not the final plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. The Port Planner explained that TNPA has a project packaging tool ranging from FEL 1 – FEL 6. c. Following a reminder of the PRSA CEO question the Port Planner responded that it refers to progress made. <p>Further comments / questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dr Mather proposed that it might be useful for the PCC to be presented with an idea of the project, timelines and where the project is at. This will assist industry with getting an idea of where and when capacity will become available. b. Ms. Bishenden noted that this would be the progress which industry would want to see. c. Mr. Pretorius enquired as to who is paying for the work being done on the DDOP from a FEL 1 perspective and how this is funded? He further questioned whether groundwork is being done in the port area? <p>The Chairperson clarified whether this was not part of the Capex meeting agreed to be held? It was noted that the question purely looked at FEL 1 with consultancy spent etc.</p> <p>TNPA Response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The development framework plan develops Capex projects. Reporting at the next meeting will contain all the details. b. DDOP expenses are being ring fenced at a Head Office level. <p>PRSA Question:</p> <p>PRSA CEO enquired as to the processes followed by the City when a project does not go ahead?</p> <p>City Response:</p> <p>All costs are required to be covered.</p> <p>3.1.4 Capital Investment Plans - It was agreed that 3.1.4 be removed from the Agenda as this will be dealt with separately at the ad-hoc meeting.</p> <p>3.1.5 TOPS</p> <p>3.1.6 Aids To Navigation</p>	
3.2	LABOUR FEEDBACK	
	<p>3.2.1 UTATU / SARHWU</p> <p>Observation that Labour more often do not have any contribution to make. Intervention required.</p> <p>The Chairperson explained that there will be a collaborated effort jointly with Labour locally and nationally to develop the guidelines. Dates will be circulated.</p>	<p>Action: 10</p> <p>PCC Labour workshop dates to be communicated.</p>
3.3	Port User Feedback	

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<p>3.3.1 Cargo Owners / FF / Road Hauliers / Container Depots</p> <p>No additional feedback</p>	
	<p>3.3.2 Shipping Lines / Agents / Oil & Gas / Ship Repair / Fishing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns previously discussed. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Navis b. Helicopter services c. Congestions etc. d. Maydon wharf challenges 2. No additional issues 	
	<p>3.3.3 Terminal Operators / Stevedores / Lessees</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It was reported that there were lots of engagement and consultation with regards to the TOPS process / benchmark and standards. 	
3.4	Government Feedback	
	<p>3.4.1 Local Government</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No additional items other than that Local Government is committed to resolving challenges. 	
	<p>3.4.2 Provincial Government</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Freight Databank on the KZN website was updated covering all the freight movements. 2. Provincial Government jointly with local government looking at reusing the Bay Head weighbridge. Province plans included installing weighing motion sensors. Statistics will be provided at to the volume of traffic overloading passing through. <p>Questions: Mr. Mpahlwa enquired as to how often Province updates the databank - Province responded every 5 years due to budget constraints.</p>	<p>Action: 11</p> <p>Weighbridge - Overloading stats to be shared once the weighbridge is fully functional</p>
	<p>3.4.3 Department of Transport (DOT)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IMDG Training – Mr. Mpahlwa provided feedback <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. DOT and SAMSA jointly putting a list together. 1.2. SAMSA Training Manual will be circulated. 1.3. Request for training initially received by the PE PCC and Cape Town 1.4. Initial training period considered potentially August 2014 1.5. Train the trainer concept considered. <p>Ms. Du Plooy proposed that the Maritime School of Ports Be considered as well.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. DOT IMDG to be requested to make a presentation at the PCC meeting. 	<p>Action: 12</p> <p>Department of Transport IMDG will be requested make a presentation.</p>
	<p>3.4.4 Other National Departments</p>	
3.5	<p>Ports Regulator South Africa - PRSA CEO</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institutional changes <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Two board members resigned. Mr Mahesh himself being one person following his appointment as the CEO and Mr. Randall Howard the other person. 1.2. Professor Didibhuku Thwala subsequently joined the PRSA board. 	

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	<p>1.3. Advert was put out by the DOT to appoint more board members which has since closed.</p> <p>2. Tariff Methodology</p> <p>3. In the process of being finalised.</p> <p>3.1. ROD for the 2014/15 financial year published.</p> <p>3.2. New methodology takes a multi-year tariff determination approach - awaiting approval.</p> <p>4. Tariff Strategy running concurrently looking at more efficient allocation costs amongst the different user groups amongst other aspects.</p> <p>4.1. Reminder that it does not cover TPT</p> <p>5. Several studies in the process of being completed.</p> <p>5.1. Global Port Pricing Study soon to be published - Preliminary results in trying to rebalance the tariff</p> <p>5.2. Cargo Traffic audit soon to be published. Specifically looking at Liquid bulk.</p> <p>6. Work done with the Dept of Transport towards STER – Single Transport Economic Regulator which would seek to address issues where regulated pricing at TNPA will not give rise to increase in prices at other divisions such as the TFR example mentioned by Mr. Pretorius etc.</p> <p>7. Importance attached to the Capex process within the PCC process considered to be a crucial part of the tariff termination process.</p> <p>8. PRSA closely working with TNPA keeping a close eye on TOPS. Efficiency measures eventually to form part of the tariff setting process.</p>	
3.6	<p>SAMSA</p> <p>1. Some cargoes coming to SA by ships calling with no labels or proper documentation.</p> <p>1.1. Appeal to the industry to closely monitor cargo without the required documentation or labels.</p> <p>1.2. Many operators / agents not aware of the IMDG requirements.</p> <p>1.3. Marine Notices issued and all parties must be trained to further ensure compliance.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>a. Mr. Pretorius observed on the number of road trucks on the roads carrying IMDG cargoes although not the higher classified IMDG goods.</p> <p>b. He reflected on the need for IMDG awareness.</p> <p>c. He briefly discussed his challenge in trying to get a sense of the over boarder cargo volumes and related challenges.</p> <p>PRSA Representative, Mr Lotter briefly explained the process / approach at a treasury level.</p> <p>1. Revenue streams are based on the number of containers moving through a port.</p> <p>2. He noted that there has not been a need to monitor units moving across the border. Customs value of the goods monitored.</p> <p>Mr. Phillips explained the importance of trucks being marked appropriately.</p>	
3.7	<p>PCC ADMINISTRATION</p> <p>1. PCC Induction process</p> <p>a. Protocol of Meetings guiding document – PCC Induction to be schedule ahead of the next meeting.</p> <p>2. Nomination and Election process – where representation gaps across the country</p>	<p>Action: 13</p> <p>PCC Induction process. Dates to be communicated.</p> <p>Action: 14</p> <p>Nomination and Election process where gaps.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
	3. NPCC Election process - NPCC representative and alternate 4. KPI Subcommittee - Dates to be communicated	Action: 15 KPI subcommittee meeting
SECTION 4: COOPERATIVE GOVERNANCE		
4.1		
SECTION 5: NPCC		
SECTION 5: NPCC		
	FEEDBACK: 1. Navis risks were noted at the NPCC – only issue from Durban 2. TOPS presentation – actual measurements and rollout 3. Legislation review – Mr. Dibakwane will be driving this process. An indication will be send out to all PCCs in due time providing an overview of the process. Next NPCC Meeting 20 June 2014	
SECTION 6: NEW ITEMS		
6.1.	New Items No new items were noted.	
SECTION 7: AGREED RESOLUTIONS & ACTION ITEMS		
7.1	1. Issue of Navis – kept on the agenda to keep an eye on developments. 2. North Quay deepening Plans – TNPA will share at the next meeting. 3. Heavy Lift cargo – Provincial Government will put the website, dates and all the detail on the website. Mr. Pretorius agreed to circulate same information to all. 4. Customs Clearance - Mr. Pretorius will engage with customs and provide the meeting with an update. 5. Landside issues - Port manager to convene the congestion meeting. Same meeting to develop solutions. Meeting agreed that the Harbour Master bring this issue and the urgency thereof to the Port Manger’s attention. Meeting to be provided with an implantation plan and timelines. 6. Transnet availing land for a Truck staging area to be included in the congestion discussion above. 7. Terminal Operator Berth utilisation – matter closed. 8. Provincial Government Technical feedback – Matter rolled over to the next PCC meeting. 9. Capex discussion – Secretariat and the TNPA Port Planner to have a prep meeting in terms of all the documentation to be ready on the day if the Capex discussion. Capex discussion date to be confirmed and circulate to all. Lead time of two weeks to be provided. Capex projects the only agenda item on the day. 10. PCC Labour workshop date to be communicated. Involves all PCC labour representatives in all ports and at a national Labour level. 11. PCC Induction and the KPI subcommittee meetings to take place on the same day Dates to be communicated. 12. IMDG Training – Mr. Mpahlwa and the Secretariat to facilitate.	

ITEM	DISCUSSIONS	RECOMMENDATION(S)/ ACTION/S
SECTION 8: ANNOUCEMENTS AND CLOSURE		
8.1	DATE AND VENUE FOR NEXT MEETING The next meeting is scheduled to take place at 09:00 Thursday 29 th August 2014 at TNPA Offices.	
8.2.	CLOSURE The Chairperson thanked everyone for their contributions and inputs. He noted that none of the issues are personal and some required honest discussion. He thanked everyone once more. With no further issues to discuss, the meeting was adjourned.	

Approved by

PCC Chairperson

Date

PCC Secretariat

Date

LIST OF ACTIONS / RECOMMENDATIONS

1. ACTIONS

1.1 Secretariat

1.1.1

1.2 PRSA

1.2.1

1.2.2

1.3 Members

1.3.1

1.4 Others

1.4.1

1.4.2

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1

2.2