



The Scottish Parliament
Pàrlamaid na h-Alba

Net Zero, Energy and Transport Committee

Andrew Miller

Chair

Ferguson Marine Port Glasgow Ltd

5 December 2024

Dear Andrew

Glen Sannox and Glen Rosa

Thank you to you and your colleagues for [giving evidence to the Committee on 26 November](#). The Committee welcomed the opportunity to discuss progress towards completion of the ships. Several matters arose on which we sought further detail. These are listed below, alongside further questions arising from the session.

Evidence given by former Chief Executive

You said at the meeting that the evidence given by former Chief Executive, David Tydeman, at one of the previous evidence sessions with the Committee was “not exactly accurate” and that you had had to write later to partner organisations about it.

- 1. Please set out each point made during the evidence sessions on [24 October 2023](#) or [27 February 2024](#) which you believe were not accurate, alongside what should have been stated.**
- 2. Which partner organisations did you write to?**
- 3. Why did you not also write to the Committee to correct the record?**

Appointment of a new chief executive

Shortly after the 27 February evidence session, Mr. Tydeman was dismissed as Chief Executive. On 26 November, we asked about the recruitment process for a permanent replacement. You said the search for a new Chief Executive had started 12 months ago. This was 5 months before the dismissal of Mr. Tydeman. [Board minutes](#) from March 2024 state external recruitment had not yet begun at that time.

- 4. Please could you confirm when the process of seeking a new permanent chief executive began?**
- 5. If the Board of this publicly owned company did not have confidence in the Chief Executive as early as 12 months ago why did they continue to employ him until March this year?**

Contact: Net Zero, Energy and Transport Committee, The Scottish Parliament, Edinburgh, EH99 1SP. Email netzero.committee@parliament.scot. We welcome calls through Relay UK and in BSL through Contact Scotland BSL.

Information provided to Committee in updates

The Committee welcomes updates on the Glen Sannox and Glen Rosa but it is important that these are not only accurate but also comprehensive. You will recall that during the evidence session in February I had expressed disappointment that it had required close questioning by the Committee to ascertain the full timeline of events regarding the process for obtaining approval for escape routes from the Maritime and Coastguard Agency, and to get some inconsistencies corrected.

The first mention of issues with the Glen Sannox's anchor is in FMPG's [October 2024](#) update, when Mr. Petticrew mentioned this in relation to sea trials in September. At the 26 November meeting, he said:

"The last delay [in delivering the Glen Sannox to CMAL] was caused by the anchor not passing the relevant examination by the Maritime and Coastguard Agency. It was noted that it had been done in the February trials, but it turned out that it had not been done: the anchors had been lowered, but they had not been signed off."

He also said:

"It was very disappointing that in February, it had not been signed off, nor had it been indicated that we had that issue."

And:

"The kit was shown to have been signed off in the February sea trials. When I went to speak to my counterpart at CMAL, he said, "Yes, it has been dropped, but it has not been signed off," and so he wanted to see it dropped again. When it was dropped again, the coupling did not function the way it was supposed to.

On 27 February, David Tydeman had told the Committee there had been no issues arising from the sea trials and they had been "overwhelmingly positive".

- 6. Did the MCA sign or provide any documentation following the February sea trials confirming both anchors had been signed off?**
- 7. Why was the Committee (and the wider public) not informed of issues with the anchor (which caused a delay in delivery of the Glen Sannox) until October? Could we have been informed earlier?**
- 8. When will a permanent fix to the anchor be installed on Glen Sannox, how long will this take, and what impact will this have on its entering service?**

In 2023, the Committee heard from David Tydeman about assumptions made based on MCA approval of emergency exits leading to remedial works. It appears this has also been the case with the anchors. In [October 2023](#), Mr Tydeman said he was not concerned, having spoken to the MCA and Lloyds Register, there would be any further compliance issues. He also said the resignation of the Director of Compliance that year would have "very little" impact on "...the completion of all the ship's documentation, including classification society documents".

On 26 November, John Petticrew said of the anchors:

“We checked the drawings and all the technical data that we had received, and those suggested that it should have worked. When we went down and did some measurements on vital parts, the measurements did not match the drawings that were provided.”


He later confirmed that, although it was the parts which did not match the drawing and having to replace the parts, it was a “design issue”.

9. How is compliance and adherence to design overseen internally at FMPG prior to seeking external views?

10. Have other outcomes of the sea trials in February been re-assessed to confirm there have been no other misinterpretation of the MCA’s view by FMPG?

I would be grateful for a response to these queries by way of the December quarterly update which I request by **19 December 2024**.

Yours sincerely,



Edward Mountain MSP
Convener

ⁱ [Meeting of the Parliament: NZET/27/02/2024 | Scottish Parliament Website](#)