

Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2) Issued 25 February 2026

In response to the Examination Authority's second written questions issued on 25 February 2026, the MCA would like to comment as follows at Deadline 5, 10 March 2026.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question	Response from MCA
20. Shipping and navigation			
2SN4	Applicant, Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA), Port of London Gateway Port Ltd, HHA, and other relevant stakeholders	<p>Vessel management plan (VMP) Following the submission of the updated oNIP [REP4-075], provide an update as to whether a VMP is still required and if not explain why not.</p>	<p>It is our understanding that the oNIP [REP4-075] was submitted at the same deadline as MCA's response to the supplementary agenda additional question, in which we had detailed the areas MCA expected to be included within the NIP for it to be considered an acceptable equivalent for a Vessel Management Plan (VMP). The applicant has therefore not had time to incorporate all of our feedback.</p> <p>We have reviewed the current document, and we note that the applicant has added in some additional areas like North Shipwash, KP55-66 as IMO Routeing Measures AoI. However, there are still areas which were detailed in our previous response which we would like the applicant to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The area next to SUNK DW anchorage to start from KP33 and extend all the way to KP70. This is to capture how the work will be managed closer to the anchorage; 2) West of LSH (KP66-70) where there have been frequent transits of dredging vessels; and 3) We would also recommend the NIP includes the area next to Goodwin Knoll (KP105-115) to capture the interactions with traffic coming in and out of Ramsgate. <p>We have noticed some minor inconsistencies in Section 3.10 Safety Zones and 3.11 Exclusion Zones which the MCA has explained directly with the applicant to be addressed in the next update.</p>

2SN5	MCA, United Kingdom Hydrographic Office (UKHO)	<p>Force majeure Considering Trinity House comments on the dDCO [REP4-205] in relation to 'force majeure', MCA and UKHO to provide comments on whether they consider that they should be within scope of condition 9(1) of the dDCO.</p>	<p>The MCA agrees with Trinity House that both the MCA and the UK Hydrographic Office must be notified if the project deposits any part of the authorised deposits within or outside of the order limits because the safety of human life and/or of the vessel is threatened. Further risk mitigation measures may be required such as the issue of Maritime Safety Information by the UKHO and broadcast by HM Coastguard.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant should consider linking this condition with condition 8 (8) regarding the dropped objects procedure: -</p> <p><i>“Force majeure 9.—</i> <i>(1) If, due to stress of weather or any other cause the master of a vessel determines that it is necessary to deposit the authorised deposits within or outside of the Order limits because the safety of human life and/or of the vessel is threatened, within 48 hours full details of the circumstances of the deposit must be notified to the MMO in the manner provided in condition 8 (8).</i> <i>(2) The unauthorised deposits must be removed at the expense of the undertaker unless written approval is obtained from the MMO”.</i></p>
------	--	--	--