

# Specialist life vests to improve fishing safety

- £1 million government investment in fishing safety
- free training and hundreds of new life vests for those working in the UK's most dangerous industry
- part of the first Maritime Safety Week, run by the Department for Transport

Almost £1 million in government funding will be spent cutting deaths in the UK's most dangerous industry.

Maritime Minister Nusrat Ghani announced during a meeting with safety experts and coastal MPs that an additional £700,000 will be provided to give more fishing crews potentially life-saving training.

This is on top of an existing £250,000 pot, which is matched by the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund.

The Department for Transport will also work with Seafish Industry Authority to deliver more than 500 personal floatation devices fitted with locator beacons, worth a total of £250,000, to help find people who have fallen overboard – the most common reason for fatalities at sea.

Last year there were 6 fishing fatalities, either through people falling overboard or due to issues affecting the stability of vessels.

Maritime Minister Nusrat Ghani said:

Fishing remains the most dangerous industry in the UK, and so we must keep working to reduce the risks crew members face.

We want to eliminate all preventable deaths by 2027, and the extra training and better equipment I'm announcing today will mean fewer fishing crews getting into danger at sea.

Increasing safety on fishing vessels is one of the priorities of the [Maritime Safety Action Plan](#), which was published by the Department for Transport on 1 July 2019.

The department will also be working with Trinity House and Seafish to promote fishing safety through a targeted radio campaign.

Since 2008, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency has spent £2.75 million to deliver more than 25,000 free safety training sessions to fishing crews.

From 23 October 2019, all small fishing vessels will need to be fitted with an emergency beacon or have personal beacons for every member of crew to

enable rescuers to find them.

The Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) is also looking, by 2020, to require skippers of vessels between 7 metres and 16.5 metres to hold a Skipper's Certificate as well as to implement a new code of practice for fishing vessels under 15 metres which will include stability requirements.

Throughout the past year the UK has implemented new regulations to improve the living and working conditions on board fishing vessels. It also requires crew members to wear personal flotation devices if the risk of going overboard cannot be eliminated.

---

## [Local Land Charges searches for Warwick District Council are now available](#)

### **Help us improve GOV.UK**

To help us improve GOV.UK, we'd like to know more about your visit today. We'll send you a link to a feedback form. It will take only 2 minutes to fill in. Don't worry we won't send you spam or share your email address with anyone.

Email address

Send me the survey [Don't have an email address?](#)

---

## [Britain has a bright future if we seize the potential of innovation](#)

A ploughman, a lamp-lighter and a knocker-upper walk into a bar...

It's a really old joke.

Because those jobs don't exist anymore.

They're obsolete. We don't have ploughmen, lamp-lighters, and knocker-uppers.

Thanks to tractors, electric lighting and alarm clocks, you don't have to pay someone to knock on your window to wake you up in the morning.

Can you imagine what a weird job being a knocker-upper was?

This debate has raged about automation for centuries, and it has been reignited because of artificial intelligence coming down the track, but it's actually an old argument.

Let's talk the truth about technology.

We need to be honest about what obsolete jobs were really like.

Take mining for example. There's a romance to the days of when men went down the pits. I come from Nottinghamshire mining stock, and I feel the proud legacy of our mining industry, and the contribution my forefathers made to making this country what it is – and the economic and political powerhouse the mining industry was.

But does the romance meet the reality?

I remember my grandmother told me how each of her 5 brothers, when they turned 14, were offered jobs down the pit. And I remember her telling me, very clearly, that they knew if they said yes, they'd be down there for life.

They aspired to a better life. And think of it now and this generation.

Would I want my children to do it?

No, and I imagine every parent in the country would say the same.

Because mining is difficult, dangerous, too often deadly work.

And let's not forget the environmental impact – we recently marked, celebrated, a new record in the number of hours without coal-generated energy production in Britain since the Industrial Revolution.

The future is solar: high-tech, safe and clean. If we really want to improve people's lives we need to take this lesson and apply it to our country's future.

While some only focus on the conservation of old jobs, our concern must always be the creation of better new ones.

I use this poignant example of coal mining to make a point because we need to move on to the things that are bigger than Brexit.

What's mission-critical is that we create high-skilled, well-paid, secure jobs, and we equip and empower people to get those jobs.

That's how we build a Britain match-fit for the 21st century.

Now, how do we do that?

We need to see this in the context of what many people call the Fourth Industrial Revolution, because winning the Fourth Industrial Revolution is an economic and geo-strategic imperative.

The First Industrial Revolution, the one powered by coal, saw mechanisation take over from muscle power.

Britain led the world and became the richest and most powerful nation.

In the Second Industrial Revolution, electricity and mass production transformed manufacturing.

And Henry Ford, and the Americans, took the lead.

The Third was electronics and early computers.

And the Fourth is rooted in connectivity, completing the automation of straight-line routine tasks – both physical and mental – essentially leaving to us, humans, what only we can do: the complex, the creative and the caring roles.

History shows us that, on average, new technology invariably creates more jobs than it disrupts. But the geography doesn't always match. The new jobs aren't always in the places where people live and want to be. And this is unsettling and creates profound challenges.

I know this, again, because of my own family history. Two hundred years ago, we, Hancocks, were leading Luddites. My predecessor, Richard Hancock, led a 1,000 strong gang smashing up looms in Nottinghamshire.

He was caught and banished to Australia, but if he was here today, I bet he'd tell you he did it because his family's livelihood was threatened – his family were hand-weavers and the Arkwright loom was destroying his community.

Now, I'm not defending Great Uncle Richard, and we Hancocks have learned a thing or 2 about how the world works, but you can't dismiss his reasons, and how he felt, and we can't dismiss those feelings today.

Your report is absolutely right: the disruption and the opportunities of automation aren't spread evenly across the UK.

The challenge we face as a country is to ensure that Kingston-upon-Thames and Kingston-upon-Hull both benefit from the tech transformation of the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

And there's 3 things I'd like to pick out.

Skills, innovation and making sure the whole country benefits from the coming tech revolution. I'll take each in turn.

First, skills.

In Britain, today, we have a skills shortage.

We don't have enough people with the right skills for the jobs that are being created by our most dynamic companies. Whether it's the Silicon Roundabout, the Golden Triangle, or the Northern Powerhouse, employers are having to recruit from abroad to find staff with the right skills.

Of course, Britain should always be open to the brightest and the best talent from around the world – the NHS certainly is.

While this past decade, we've increased standards in schools, the world is changing and becoming more dynamic, and our education system needs to change too.

The World Economic Forum says the jobs of tomorrow are going to be the complex ones writing the code: AI and machine-learning specialists, big data specialists, automation experts, information security analysts, robotics engineers, machine interaction designers and blockchain specialists.

And it's not just tech.

There's the creative industries that Britain is already a world leader in, and as Culture Secretary I saw first-hand the enormous contribution they make to our economy, from our fashion designers to our game designers, from the National Theatre to, yes, Alex the Glastonbury rapper.

And then there's the caring professions: nurses, doctors, social work and so many services that are the very essence of what makes us human: face to face, empathetic, able to connect in a way that machines can't and probably never will.

So the complex, the creative and the caring.

These are the industries where the jobs of tomorrow are going to be concentrated.

To ensure we're equipping people across the country for these new jobs we need to ensure they get the best possible start at school.

We need to ensure all of our schools are properly resourced, and all of our teachers get the support they need to ensure every child can fulfil their potential.

We need to ensure our universities stay world leaders, but learning shouldn't end there.

We need to change the mindset that skills are something you acquire at the start of your career and then carry with you unchanged until retirement.

That's like buying a smartphone, never updating the software and expecting it to still be working in 50 years' time.

It's not how the modern world works. As jobs require ever greater, and ever changing, skills we must place a greater emphasis on learning how to learn.

I find the Onward proposal for a Retraining Tax Credit, aimed at low-skilled workers, incredibly powerful.

We have tax credits for R&D so why not for retraining?

We need to encourage companies to upgrade the skill-set of their staff.

So investing in people should be seen at least as attractive as investing in research and development.

As someone who oversees the nation's largest employer, I know that it's people who make the NHS what it is. So we must always invest in our people.

As skills minister, I brought in degree-level apprenticeships so we could give people an alternative route into professions like insurance, accounting and the law, if they didn't go to university.

We introduced all-age apprenticeships so you can retrain at any point in your career to get into a well-paid job, because you're never too old to learn new skills.

Retraining is vital. It's a concept we need to embrace across society to ensure everyone has the chance for a well-paid job in the future.

Second, innovation.

How do we create the right conditions for innovation?

Here the government's role is, partly, to incentivise innovation in the private sector, and directly to support innovation across the board.

Let's just pick one example: the NHS.

Since I became Health Secretary, I've "axed the fax", "purged the pager" and made the tech inside the NHS look more like the tech everyone in the outside world uses in 2019.

But the tech of tomorrow isn't something that can be driven from the top – centralised, hierarchical systems are incompatible with rapid innovation, because they assume that the boss has all the answers, when the truth is, we don't even know what all the questions will be in the future.

NHSX, our new specialist tech outfit, officially launches today, and it will take the same approach to innovation that Apple and Google do.

NHSX is going to make the NHS a platform for innovation.

It will radically simplify the system for developers and NHS decision-makers.

NHSX will set national policy, national standards, and ensure systems can talk to each other.

But it will open the door to new ideas and new people, help create a diversity of thought, by constantly welcoming innovators with an outward-

looking approach.

The NHS, historically, has been too closed to innovation from outside – partly that is because new tech has driven up costs, but digital tech can save costs, and make money go further.

What it requires is a completely different approach to innovation. Not the 10-year cycle of creating and testing a drug, which rightly adheres to the precautionary principle, but trying things out, learning as we go along, iterative development.

That's how you innovate. That's how you achieve excellence.

So the role of government is to set the mission and ensure we have the right architecture in place: the right conditions to attract the best global firms, and support British innovators – a way in for the best international talent, and a way up for British people to get the skills and training they need.

But we must go further. The real challenge of our times, as your report nails it, "is how we fix the gap between the headline statistics and the lived reality for people."

How we humanise the statistics.

How we ensure work always pays.

And how we stand up for capitalism and liberal democracy as 2 of the greatest innovations in the history of humanity.

So the third, and final, thing I'd like to talk about is making sure the whole country benefits from our growing economy.

One of the causes of Brexit was the dislocation in this country between those areas, predominantly cities, that are flying high, where a generation of growth, of attracting younger people and of increased diversity and dynamism has separated our cities from their hinterland.

British cities today are more open, liberal and outward-looking than ever before. It's true of London, but it's true of our other big cities too.

For half a century, during deindustrialisation, major British cities, outside of London, became relatively poorer than most of Britain. This isn't the case in other countries.

But that trend is reversing in Britain, as our cities are becoming richer and younger, and creating the high-paid tech-enabled jobs of the future.

A generation ago, the average age of people living in urban areas matched those of rural areas.

Now the average age of Britain's biggest cities is almost a decade younger than in rural areas.

It's driven by many factors.

One is 50% of young people go to university.

And aspirational young people often leave rural areas for the cities.

And here is a conundrum for conservatives: we support aspiration. I support aspiration. The aspiration for all people to reach their potential.

But what happens if all the aspirational people were to leave a community?

What if that is especially true of aspirational young people?

We need to be aspirational not just for individuals but for entire communities.

The purpose of a town is to be somewhere it's easy to live and have a good life: easy childcare and good schools, local businesses providing great services, good connectivity both physical and digital, thriving high streets, high-quality owner-occupied family homes and the support of great NHS and social care.

We have brilliant towns in Britain, and we have some of the most beautiful villages in the world – but not all of them are brilliant. Many haven't seen the benefits of the strong economy we now have.

We haven't done enough to make whole communities aspirational rather than just helping aspirational people move.

So skills, innovation and aspiration for every community.

Now more than ever, this matters. We will deliver on Brexit. And we will move forward.

But to do this – and for Britain to succeed after Brexit – we need to harness it and drive it right across the country. We need to harness the great potential of this technological innovation for every single person.

We must be bold and brave after Brexit.

We can be ambitious and aspirational.

But we must be for the whole country and leave no one behind.

Britain is a union, of nations, of cities, towns, and villages, and each part, each one of us, has a contribution to make to the future of this country.

Each person has value to give.

So we must invest in skills and training.

We must spur innovation and embrace new technologies – as we're doing in the NHS.



And above all, we must ensure everyone shares in the success of this great country.

That's how we make a success of Brexit Britain.

---

## Investing in action to combat climate change

Thank you very much to Sustineri, Accounting for Sustainability and Karen Shackleton of Pensions for Purpose for organising this event and for inviting me. It is great to see the Mayor of London's team here.

I have been in the role of Minister for Pensions and Financial Inclusion for 2 years now, and we are on a journey. Over the last 19 years, we have been fighting to make the case that climate change should be taken seriously, and we have not yet been completely successful. Perhaps everyone in this room accepts that climate change is something we need to tackle, and acknowledges that their funds have a large role to play in doing this. However, the vast majority of the population are not there yet. Education is vital, and those of us in the room have a key role in delivering that message and helping us to change the debate and change the dynamic.

Successive governments have taken climate change seriously. Between 1990 and 2017, the UK reduced its emissions by over 40% while growing the economy by more than two thirds – on latest available data across countries to 2016, the best performance in the G7 on a per person basis. Constituents say that we are doing well, and I celebrate our successes, but at the same time we need to look at what more we can do.

We all know that automatic enrolment has been a huge success, with more than 10 million people newly saving or saving more. Pension investments, with their long time-horizons and wide take-up across the working age population, are ideally placed to win widespread support for investment in action which mitigates and adapts to climate change.

Mercer have reported that in a scenario of a 2-degree increase in global temperatures, a modest estimate suggests that oil and gas will have lost 94% of its value by 2050. It has to be the case that if you are investing via an All Share tracker and 15% of those assets are in oil and gas and you are doing nothing about it then you need to have a long hard look at yourself.

Pensions lawyers say that trustees must abide by the prudent person principle – using the 'care, skill and diligence' a prudent person would exercise when investing for someone for whom they feel 'morally bound to provide'. Let's consider what prudence means in the scenario of those oil and gas holdings and climate change.

Perhaps some of those trustees think they are being prudent by timing the market perfectly and realigning their portfolios just before valuations tumble. But I don't see how every trustee is able to do that.

Perhaps they suspect that governments aren't serious, that we won't meet our targets and that we'll carry on with large net carbon emissions to 2100 and beyond. But the consequences of that are dismal. Parliament is taking action. Last Monday, the House of Commons unanimously passed legislation committed the UK to net-zero carbon emissions by 2050. There absolutely is the political will to address this climate emergency from both the government and all the opposition parties. If those of you in the room ever doubted your individual or collective power, I encourage you to realise it now. This legislation commits the UK to a path that pension funds must play a massive role in.

We also passed legislation last year to require pension schemes to state clearly their policy on how they take account of climate change, and to require defined contribution schemes to publish their policies and report on them annually. These actions closely follow those taken by the Ministers of Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government (MHCLG) and the Local Government Pension Scheme (LGPS). Learning from the LGPS, I intend to use transparency to improve the statement of investment principles which for too long have been formulaic, generic and detached.

I don't want to hear any more that "climate change is important, but we leave it to our investment managers"; if you leave the room saying that then we have all failed. I want to hear what trustees are doing having reached that recognition.

And last month I introduced new legislation which will require defined benefit schemes to publish their policies on climate change too, in the department's transposition of the Shareholder Rights Directive. Many defined benefit schemes are de-risked, but the £1.5 trillion of assets means even small percentage allocations have a significant impact in where investment is directed.

There is a role for defined contribution schemes too. In February I published a consultation on proposals to require larger defined contribution (DC) schemes to have a clear published policy on infrastructure investment and other illiquid investments, and to report on that. I am considering next steps, and would personally like to go much further. I believe that it is the case that investment in infrastructure and housing will increase engagement with members, who are currently often unaware of what their pension is invested in.

Finally, earlier this year I brought into force Governance Regulations, which require trustees both to have an effective system of governance, including consideration of Environmental Social Governance (ESG); and to document how they assess risks from climate change and risks from the low carbon transition.

The Pensions Regulator will produce a Code on these matters which will have

legal standing in the courts. And I'm delighted to announce that we have established, in partnership with The Pension Regulator, a new industry working group to bring together practitioners and policy makers in this space, to produce guidance for pension schemes on carrying out and reporting climate risk assessment, in line with the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosure's recommendations.

This is still the start. Government will be publishing its Green Finance Strategy tomorrow – which will outline further measures we will be taking to accelerate the growth of green finance, and effectively manage climate-related risks across the financial system.

I take this very seriously, and I am very aware of the consequences on not addressing the long-term climate emergency. I hope you look in the mirror and look at what role you can play.

---

## [Changes to our late filing penalties manual](#)



Each year we conduct regular reviews of our practices to make sure customers continue to benefit from our high quality services.

One of the latest reviews focuses on our [late filing penalties manual](#), which is used by our team as guidance when assessing appeals against penalties. We wanted to make sure that the content was up to date and used clear and consistent language throughout. As a result, we've made changes to some of our policies.

The revised manual will come into force on 1 October 2019.

### **What the changes are**

## **Updated the policy for accounts being rejected but not received by the company or presenter**

We will no longer exercise discretion where we've rejected accounts within enough time but they've not been received by the company or presenter. This is because filers are responsible for making sure documents are delivered for registration in an acceptable electronic or paper format.

This is covered in Part 17, Scenario 1 of the manual.

## **Extended the processing times for paper documents**

We've extended the processing period from 5 days to 8 days, to reflect our internal processing target for paper documents more accurately. This means that in the future, if we take longer than 8 working days to examine and reject paper accounts, we may use our discretion not to collect any resulting penalty.

The processing times are covered in Part 17, Scenarios 4, 5 and 6 of the manual.

## **Filing tips and reminders**

We remind all customers to:

- plan ahead – do not leave your accounts until the last minute
- make sure your accounts are correct before you file them
- check the status of all documents you've filed using [Companies House service](#)

You should also use our online filing service wherever possible. It:

- is quicker to complete and register (it can take around 10 days to process paper accounts at peak times)
- uses less paper and is more environmentally friendly
- lowers your risk of getting a penalty, as companies receive electronic confirmation that we've received your accounts and if they've been accepted or rejected
- has lower rejection rates than paper filed accounts (0.5% for electronic accounts against 6% for paper filed accounts)

Published 3 July 2019

Last updated 19 August 2019 [+ show all updates](#)

1. 19 August 2019 Welsh translation added.
2. 3 July 2019 First published.