

Report of the 2012 Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on Fire Safety Systems



August 21, 2013

Executive Summary

The Paris MOU on Port State Control (PMOU) carried out a joint Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) with the Tokyo MOU on Port State Control (TMOU) on fire safety systems between September 1 and November 30, 2012. During the campaign, 27 PMOU and 17 TMOU member states focussed on compliance with SOLAS Chapter II-2 requirements on inspected ships. This report documents the results of the campaign for the PMOU Maritime Authorities. Results for the TMOU Maritime Authorities are documented separately.

A total of 4,014 inspections were carried out with the CIC questionnaire involving 3,985 individual ships. The overall CIC detention rate was 4.0% (160 ships were detained). The CIC-topic detention rate was 2.6% (103 ships were detained). 64% of the detentions were CIC-topic related. The overall number of CIC-topic related deficiencies reported per inspection was 0.49.

Considering both the questionnaire and deficiency data, the most positive results were reported for Question 3, which asked are portable extinguishers ready for use in locations as per fire plan. The least favourable results were reported for Question 12, which asked where a fire drill was witnessed was it found to be satisfactory.

General cargo / multipurpose ships were inspected 1347 (33.5%) during the campaign which was the highest, followed by bulk carriers 766 (19%), container ships 422 (10.5%), chemical tankers 343 (8.5%) and oil tankers with 308 (7.6%) inspections.

Even though dredgers had the highest CIC-topic related detention rate (11.1%), General cargo – multi-purpose ships had the highest number of detained ships 59 (57.2%), then bulk carriers 14 (13.6%). Container ship had the third highest with 9, 4 each for offshore supply and Ro-Ro cargo ships. Younger ships had the lowest detention rate (0.7%) and older ships the highest detention rate (6.6%). The rate increased steadily from ships less than six years old to ships over 35 years old.

Ships from 97 flag states were inspected during the CIC, most of the inspections were carried out on the flag states of Panama 445 (11.1%), Liberia with 308 (7.7%), Malta 306 (7.6%) and Antigua and Barbuda 282 (7%) The flag state with the highest detention rate (CIC-topic related) was Dominica (28.6%), followed by the Sierra Leone (21.2%), Togo (18.2%), the Faroe Islands (14.3%), and Belize (10.5%). 64 of the 97 flag states (69%) did not have any detentions. The overall results of ship detentions was consistent with the risk profiling methodology of the new inspection regime (NIR) – HRS ships comprised the largest percentage of ships detained, LRS ships the lowest, and results for SRS ships fell in between.

Of the PMOU member states, the Netherlands conducted the most inspections (369), followed by Spain (366) and Italy (336). With respect to CIC-topic related detentions, Ireland detained the highest percentage of ships with a rate of 12.8%, followed by Cyprus at 10.5% and Italy at 8%. Eight member states did not detain any vessels for CIC-related deficiencies.

The objective of the CIC was to provide indications as to the industry's level of compliance with specific aspects of SOLAS Chapter II-2 on Fire Protection, Fire Detection and Fire Extinction arrangements vessels regardless of type. New provisions were introduced in July 2002 and deficiencies related to fire safety account for 14% of total deficiencies with the Paris and Tokyo MOU.

The PMOU concludes that the CIC has indeed provided sound evidence supporting that the industry has in general achieved a good level of compliance with the specific provisions of SOLAS Chapter II-2 pertaining to fire safety systems. Despite the fact 64% of the detentions were CIC-topic related, when the overall CIC-topic related detention and deficiency rates are compared to the broader PMOU PSC rates that were published in the 2011 Annual Report on Port State Control, the results are favourable by 21% for detentions and a significant 82% for deficiencies.

Key recommendations pertain to the PMOU continuing, during normal PSC inspections, to put emphasis on the Chapter II-2 requirements that had the least favourable results of the CIC namely, fire drills, fire pumps and pipes, firefighting equipment and appliances and fire control Plan.

Table of Contents

		<u>Page</u>
 Section 1: Introduction		
1.1	Purpose of this Report	5
1.2	Objective of the CIC	5
1.3	Scope of the CIC	5
1.4	General Remarks	6
 Section 2: Summary Analysis, Conclusions and Recommendations		
2.1	Summary Analysis	6
2.2	Conclusions	7
2.3	Recommendations	8
 Section 3: CIC Questionnaire Results		
3.1	Analysis	8
3.1.1	Response to CIC Questionnaire	9
3.1.2	Analysis of Answers to Questionnaire	12
3.1.3	Number of Inspections and Number of Ships in CIC	13
3.1.4	Specification of CIC-Topic Related Deficiencies	14
3.1.5	Analysis of CIC-topic Related Deficiencies (ISM-Related Deficiencies)	15
3.1.6	Number of Ships to Number of Inspections in CIC	17
3.1.7	Number of Inspected Ships per Risk Profile	17
3.1.8	Number of Inspected Ships and Detentions per Ship Type	18
3.1.9	Number of Inspected Ships and Detentions per Flag State	19
3.1.10	Number of Inspections and Detentions per Recognized Organization	20
3.1.11	Ship Age Overview	20
3.2	Results on Former CIC on Same Subject	21
3.3	Results Other CIC Participants	21
 Annex 1: CIC Questionnaire		
Annex 1.1	Inspection Form of CIC	22
Annex 1.2	Table - Inspections and Detentions per Flag State	23
Annex 1.3	Table Inspections and Detentions Per Recognized Organization	28

Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report documents the results of the Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on Fire Safety Systems (SOLAS CH II-2) which was carried out by 27 member Maritime Authorities of the Paris Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) on Port State Control between September 1 and November 30, 2012. The CIC was carried out jointly by the Tokyo MOU on Port State Control which involved 17 additional Maritime Authorities (44 in total). CIC results for the Tokyo MOU are documented in a separate report; however, a summary comparison between the Paris and Tokyo MOU results is provided in Section 3.3 of this report.

1.2 Objective of the CIC

The SOLAS Convention specifies minimum standards for the construction, equipment and operation of ships, compatible with their safety. Ch II-2 relates to Construction - Fire Protection, Fire Detection, and Fire Extinction arrangements on board ships and includes detailed fire safety provisions for all ships and specific measures for passenger ships, cargo ships and tankers.

Revised SOLAS Ch II-2 provisions came into force on July 1, 2002 and apply to all ships, irrespective of type, constructed before, on or after this date. Existing ships are also expected to comply with the requirements of the Convention and regulations as specified.

Principles of the updated provisions include:

- Division of the ship into main and vertical zones by thermal and structural boundaries;
- Separation of accommodation spaces from the remainder of the ship by thermal and structural boundaries;
- Restricted use of combustibile materials;
- Detection of any fire in the zone of origin;
- Containment and extinction of any fire in the space of origin;
- Protection of the means of escape or of access for fire-fighting purposes;
- Ready availability of fire-extinguishing appliances; and,
- Minimization of the possibility of ignition of flammable cargo vapour.

The objective of the CIC was to provide indications as to the industry's level of compliance with specific aspects of SOLAS Chapter II-2 on Fire Protection, Fire Detection and Fire Extinction arrangements on board ships regardless of type. It was also intended to help raise awareness of fire safety related issues. Deficiencies related to fire safety account for 14% of total deficiencies with the Paris and Tokyo MOU and a CIC on the fire safety systems of all types of ships has never been done.

1.3 Scope of the CIC

The CIC targeted 12 aspects of compliance provisions that are considered critical to shipboard fire safety systems. Areas include:

- Compliance with the requirements of the SOLAS convention for fire safety systems;
- Ensuring firefighting equipment is readily available and maintained at all times; and,

- Ensuring the master, officers and crew are familiar with FSS equipment and have received training in carrying out their duties.

The CIC was designed to examine specific areas and not intended to detract from the normal coverage of Port State Control Inspections. As such, it was conducted in conjunction with the regular Port State Control targeting and inspection activities.

Member Maritime Authorities were provided with a standardized questionnaire format to record and report their results against the 12 targeted compliance provisions that comprised the CIC. In addition, Port State Control Officers (PSCOs) were required to indicate if the ship was detained as a result of the CIC. The questionnaire required a "Yes" (Satisfactory) or "No" (Unsatisfactory) response to each question. In some cases a "N/A" (Not Applicable) answer was acceptable. For each "No" answer, participants were directed to document the deficiency using the appropriate deficiency code on Form B of the PSC inspection report. For six of the questions, a "No" answer was serious enough that the ship could be considered for detention.

1.4 General Remarks

General remarks pertaining to this report include:

- For the purpose of this report, a detention is an inspection containing at least one deficiency that is considered a ground for detention.
- With the exception of Table 2, the tables contained in the report take into account only those inspections that were conducted with the CIC questionnaire.

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

2.1 Summary

The following summarizes the results of the CIC:

- 3,985 individual ships and 4,014 inspections were conducted with a CIC questionnaire.
- 160 ships were detained in the CIC. 103 ships or 64% of the detentions were CIC-topic related. The overall detention rate (percentage of detentions per inspection) for the CIC was 4%. The CIC-topic related detention rate was 2.6%.
- Responses to Question 3, which asked Are portable extinguishers ready for use in locations as per the fire plan, reported the most favourable results – only 41 unsatisfactory responses were recorded representing 1.0% of resultant inspections.
- The least favourable results were reported for Question 12, which asked if where a fire drill was witnessed was it found to be satisfactory - 213 unsatisfactory responses were recorded representing 13.6% of resultant inspections. An unsatisfactory response to Question 12 was a potentially detainable violation and 78% of the ships which were found to have this deficiency were detained.
- The overall CIC-topic deficiency rate (average number of deficiencies reported per inspection) was 0.49.
- Deficiency 07113 (related to Question 11), which pertains to fire pumps and its pipes, accounted for the most number of reported inspection deficiencies at 13% of the total. Deficiency 08103 (related to Question 7), which pertains to fire alarms, accounted for the least number of reported inspection deficiencies at 1% of the total.
- By ship type, dredgers had the highest CIC-topic related detention rate (11.1%), followed by livestock carrier ships (7.1%), offshore supply ships (5.1%) and general cargo/multipurpose ships (4.4%). A number of ship types had "zero" CIC-topic related detentions.

- By ship age, younger ships had the lowest detention rate (0.7%) and older ships the highest detention rate (6.6%). The rate increased steadily from ships less than six years old to ships over 35 years old.
- Ships from 97 flag states were inspected during the CIC. With respect to CIC-topic related detentions, the flag state with the highest percentage of ships detained was Dominica (28.6%), followed by the Sierra Leone (21.2%), Togo (18.2%), the Faroe Islands (14.3%), and Belize (10.5%). 64 of the 97 flag states (69%) did not have any detentions.
- The CIC results for the top three flag states with the worst performance aligns well with what would be expected based on the WGB-list ranking – all three are “Black List”. However, the Faroe Islands, which had the fourth worst performance of the CIC, recently (2011) achieved “White List” status, and Belize is on the “Grey List”.
- By ship risk profile categories, the results of the CIC were consistent with what would be expected in accordance with the risk profiling breakdown. These results help support the validity of the risk profiling methodology of the NIR. For both general detentions and CIC-topic related inspections, ships with a high risk profile (HRS) comprised (by far) the largest percentage of ships detained per inspection, ships with a low risk profile (LRS) comprised the smallest percentage of ships detained per inspection, and ships with a standard risk profile (SRS) fell in between.
- There were a total of 3419 inspections of ships where the certificate was recorded as issued by the RO, and a total of 20 CIC-topic related detentions which had a deficiency linked to one of the three certificates. This equates to a detention rate of 0.6% which is significantly lower than the 2.6% rate of detentions for the CIC-topic related detentions as a whole.
- Of the PMOU members states, the Netherlands conducted the most inspections (369), followed by Spain (366) and Italy (336). The least number of inspections were conducted by Iceland (15) followed by Cyprus (19) and Estonia (25). With respect to CIC-topic related detentions, Ireland detained the highest percentage of ships with a rate of 12.8%, followed by Cyprus at 10.5% and Italy at 8%. Eight member states did not detain any vessels for CIC-related deficiencies.

The analysis also revealed there are inconsistencies between the questionnaire data and the deficiency and detention data. These inconsistencies are common in all CICs. Several reasonable explanations exist however which support the conclusion that the questionnaire and the deficiency data are both correct but just not necessarily associated with each other in all cases. Independently and/or taken together, both results provide valuable information to PMOU Maritime Authorities as to the industry's level of compliance with specific aspects of SOLAS Chapter II-2 on Fire Protection, Fire Detection and Fire Extinction arrangements onboard ships.

2.2 Conclusions

The objective of the CIC was to provide indications as to the industry's level of compliance with specific aspects of SOLAS Chapter II-2 on Fire Protection, Fire Detection and Fire Extinction arrangements vessels regardless of type. New provisions were introduced in July 2002. It was also the intent of the CIC to help raise awareness of fire safety related issues.

During the campaign, 64% of the detentions were CIC-topic related, which if considered in isolation would lead to a conclusion that the industry has not achieved an acceptable level of compliance with SOLAS Chapter II-2 requirements.

However, the PMOU now monitors and publishes two key indicators for measuring the compliance performance of ships that are inspected:

1. Number of deficiencies reported per inspection (deficiency rate); and,
2. Percentage of detentions per inspection (detention rate).

With regard to the deficiency rate, the results of the CIC reported an overall rate of 0.49 (CIC-topic related). This result is highly favourable compared to the latest deficiency rate of 2.7 reported for all PMOU PSC Inspections conducted during 2010¹. With regard to the detention rate, the results of the CIC reported an overall rate of 2.6% (CIC-topic related). This also compares favourably to the latest overall PMOU PSC detention rate of 3.28% reported for 2010².

2.3 Recommendations

The follow recommendations are offered for consideration:

1. The PMOU continue, during normal PSC inspections, to put emphasis on the specific areas covered by the CIC that had the least favourable results, namely fire drills, which had the highest negative response during CIC. Also, fire pump and pipes, fire fighting equipment and appliances and fire control plan are additional areas to be emphasized.

CIC Questionnaire Results

3.1 Analysis

¹ PMOU 2011 Annual Report

² PMOU 2011 Annual Report

3.1.1 Response to CIC questionnaire

Table 1 Response to CIC questionnaire

		'YES'		'NO'		N/A		Blank		% 'NO' adjusted ⁽²⁾
		#	% ⁽³⁾ (yes&no)	#	% ⁽³⁾ (yes&no)	#	% ⁽⁴⁾ (total inspected)	#	% ⁽⁴⁾ (total inspected)	
Q1	Does the Fire Control Plan meet the requirements?	3753	93.8%	248	6.2%			13	0.3%	
Q2a	Do the fire fighters' outfits including personal equipment comply with the requirements?	3811	96.5%	137	3.5%	42	1.0%	24	0.6%	
Q2b	Do the Emergency Escape Breathing Devices (EEBD) comply with the requirements?	3859	98.3%	65	1.7%	78	1.9%	12	0.3%	
Q3	Are the portable extinguishers ready for use in locations as per the fire plan?	3939	99.0%	41	1.0%	15	0.4%	19	0.5%	32%
Q4 ⁽¹⁾	Does the test of automatic audible alarm sound prior to release of a fixed gas fire-extinguishing medium into spaces in which personnel normally work?	3472	98.4%	57	1.6%	466	11.6%	19	0.5%	31%
Q5a ⁽¹⁾	Are the fire protection systems, fire fighting-systems and appliances maintained ready for use?	3729	93.6%	254	6.4%			31	0.8%	

		'YES'		'NO'		N/A		Blank		% 'NO' adjusted (2)
		#	% (3) (yes&no)	#	% (3) (yes&no)	#	% (4) (total inspected)	#	% (4) (total inspected)	
Q5b	Is there a maintenance plan onboard to show that fire protection systems and fire-fighting systems and appliances (as appropriate) have been properly tested and inspected?	3844	96.7%	132	3.3%			38	0.9%	34%
Q6 (1)	Is the crew familiar with the location and operation of fire-fighting systems and appliances that they may be called upon to use?	3875	97.1%	116	2.9%			23	0.6%	
Q7	Does the test of the sprinkler system trigger an automatic visual and audible alarm for the section?	923	97.4%	25	2.6%	3040	75.7%	26	0.6%	47%
Q8 (1)	Does the activation of any detector or manually operated call point initiate a visual and audible fire signal at the control panel on the bridge or control station?	3695	98.0%	74	2.0%	212	5.3%	33	0.8%	
Q9	Is the lighting in escape routes, including the Low Location Lighting systems where applicable properly maintained?	3490	98.1%	66	1.9%	435	10.8%	23	0.6%	50%

		'YES'		'NO'		N/A		Blank		% 'NO' adjusted (2)
		#	% (3) (yes&no)	#	% (3) (yes&no)	#	% (4) (total inspected)	#	% (4) (total inspected)	
Q10 (1)	Is the Emergency Fire pump, capable of producing at least two jets of water?	3796	98.8%	48	1.2%	141	3.5%	29	0.7%	
Q11	Are the Isolating valves of the fire main marked, maintained and easily operable?	3506	94.0%	224	6.0%	254	6.3%	30	0.7%	22%
Q12 (1)	Where a fire drill was witnessed was it found to be satisfactory?	1349	86.4%	213	13.6%	2435	60.7%	17	0.4%	
Q13	Was the ship detained as a result of the CIC?	130	3.3%	3869	96.7%			15	0.4%	

1. 'NO' means: the ship may be considered for detention. The details of any detention should be appropriately entered on the PSC report B.
2. "% 'NO' adjusted" = % "[Answer = NO, may be considered for detention]" but the ship has not been detained.
3. "% (yes/no)" are percentages calculated using total yes and no answers only.
4. "% (total inspected)" are percentages of the total number of inspections.

3.1.2. Analysis of answers to questionnaire

Table 1 above reveals that during the period of the CIC, a total of 4,014 inspections were carried out using the CIC questionnaire. The number of unsatisfactory responses per question ranges from 25 to 254 representing from 1.0% to 13.6% of positive or negative responses respectively.

Responses to Question 3, which asked Are the portable extinguishers ready for use in locations as per the fire plan, reported the most favourable results of all questions – only 41 unsatisfactory responses were recorded representing 1.0% of positive or negative responses. Question 10, which asked is the emergency fire pump, capable of producing at least two jets of water, reported the next most favourable results with only 48 unsatisfactory responses representing 1.2% of positive or negative responses.

The least favourable results were reported for Question 12, which asked where a fire drill was witnessed was it found to be satisfactory – 213 unsatisfactory responses were recorded representing 13.6% of positive or negative responses. An unsatisfactory response to Question 12 was a potentially detainable violation and 78% of the ships which were found to have this deficiency were detained.

Question 5a, which asked are the fire protection systems, fire fighting-systems and appliances maintained ready for use, reported the next least favourable results with 254 unsatisfactory responses representing 6.4% of inspections. Responses to Questions 11, which asked if the isolating valves of the fire main were marked, maintained and easily operable, and 1, which asked does the fire control plan meet the requirements, also reported similar results. Question 11 reported 224 unsatisfactory responses (6.0% of inspections) and Question 1 reported 248 unsatisfactory responses (6.2% of inspections).

Please note that although the questionnaire data in Table 1 identifies at Question 13 that 130 CIC-topic related inspections resulted in a ship detention, the actual number of vessels that were detained based on the Form B/Notice of Detention for the Master paperwork was 103. This is the figure that is used throughout the rest of the report. Inconsistencies between the questionnaire data and the Form B data are discussed in more detail in Section 3.1.5.

3.1.3. Number of inspections and number of ships in CIC

Table 2 Number of inspections and number of ships in CIC

	Individual ships inspected with a CIC questionnaire	Inspections performed with a CIC questionnaire	Inspections without a CIC questionnaire
Inspections	3985	4014	468
Inspections with detentions	160	160	21
Detentions with <i>CIC-topic</i> related deficiencies	103	103	6

Table 2 reveals that a total of 4,482 inspections were conducted during the CIC, of which the vast majority were performed with the CIC questionnaire (4,014 or 90%). Of the ships that were inspected with a CIC questionnaire, a total of 160 ships were detained of which 103 were related to CIC-topic deficiencies. CIC-topic related deficiencies therefore accounted for 64% of the total ships detained and the detention rate for CIC-topic related deficiencies was 2.6%.

3.1.4. Specification of CIC-topic related deficiencies

Table 3 Specification of CIC-topic related deficiencies

CIC-topic related deficiencies		Inspections	Detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC- topic related with RO responsibility
		(# of inspections with this deficiency) One inspection can have multiple deficiencies	(# of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention)	(# of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention and RO related)
01309	Fire control plan - all	185	1	1
04102	Emergency fire pump and its pipes	100	18	1
04109	Fire drills	74	34	0
07106	Fire detection and alarm system	214	26	1
07108	Ready availability of fire-fighting equipment	158	33	3
07109	Fixed fire extinguishing installation	184	26	5
07110	Fire-fighting equipment and appliances	216	12	2
07111	Personal equipment for fire safety	138	10	1
07112	Emergency Escape Breathing Device and disposition	72	3	0
07113	Fire pumps and its pipes	256	16	1
07120	Means of escape	119	2	0

CIC-topic related deficiencies		Inspections	Detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC- topic related with RO responsibility
		(# of inspections with this deficiency) One inspection can have multiple deficiencies	(# of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention)	(# of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention and RO related)
07123	Operation of Fire protection systems	85	11	0
07124	Maintenance of Fire protection systems	143	8	0
08103	Fire alarm	14	1	0

3.1.5. Analysis of CIC-topic related deficiencies (ISM-related deficiencies)

Deficiency 07113 (related to Question Q11), which pertains to fire pumps and its pipes, accounted for the most number of reported inspection deficiencies at 13% of the total. This was closely followed by Deficiency 07110 (related to Question 3), pertaining to fire-fighting equipment and appliances, and Deficiency 07106 (related to Question 8), pertaining to fire detection and alarm systems, each of which accounts for 11% of the total reported inspection deficiencies.

Deficiency 08103 (related to Question 7), which pertains to fire alarms, accounted for the least number of reported inspection deficiencies at 1% of the total. Deficiency 07112 (emergency escape breathing device and disposition), Deficiency 04109 (fire drills) and Deficiency 07123) accounted for the next least number of reported inspection deficiencies with each contributing 4% to the total.

Note, this analysis reveals there are some inconsistencies between the deficiency results and the questionnaire results which raise some questions. For example, Question 12 according to the questionnaire reported the least favourable results of all questions; yet, the deficiency results indicate that Deficiency 07108, which is the code for non-compliance with Question 12, was only the 12th most used deficiency code.

Another more extreme example pertains to Deficiency 07110, which is the code for non-compliance with Question 3. According to the questionnaire, Question 3 reported the most favourable results of all questions; yet, the deficiency results indicate that Deficiency 07110 was the second most used deficiency code.

The CIC instructions require that for each unsatisfactory answer in the questionnaire, Inspectors are to provide the detail of any deficiencies on the PSC Form B. The questionnaire also specifically notes for each question, the deficiencies that apply. It is thus reasonable to expect that there should be good correlation between the results of the

questionnaire and the results of the deficiencies in terms of most favourable to least favourable; yet, the correlation is only 0.43.

Chart 2 below shows the comparison of the questionnaire and deficiency results for all CIC questions. It reveals that the number of reported deficiencies exceeds the number of “No” responses in the questionnaire almost 2:1. In some cases, the gap is significant.

CHART 2: Comparison of Questionnaire and Deficiency Results			
Q#	Deficiency Code	Total # Inspections	
		Responding "NO" on Questionnaire	Using Deficiency Code on Form "B"
Q5a	07108	254	158
Q1	01309	248	185
Q11	07113	224	256
Q12	04109	213	74
Q2a	07111	137	138
Q5b	07124	132	143
Q6	07123	116	85
Q8	07106	74	214
Q9	07120	66	119
Q2b	07112	65	72
Q4	07109	57	184
Q10	04102	48	100
Q3	07110	41	216
Q7	08103	25	14

The inconsistencies that exist between the questionnaire data and the deficiency data are found in every CIC. One explanation may be that in some instances PSCOs are completing the questionnaire but are not doing the extra step for the unsatisfactory answers and filling out the PSC Report Form B. Another explanation may be that given that the CIC is carried out in conjunction with the normal PSC inspections, perhaps in some cases PSCOs are filling out the questionnaire independent of the PSC Report Form B. It could also be a combination of both explanations.

The above explanations support that both the questionnaire and the deficiency data are likely correct but just not necessarily associated with each other in all cases. For this reason, it is the opinion of the PMOU that even though the deficiency and questionnaire data is not necessarily consistent, it does not diminish the validity of the overall results of the CIC. Independently and/or taken together, both results provide valuable information to PMOU Maritime Authorities as to the industry's level of compliance with specific aspects of SOLAS Chapter II-2 on Fire Protection, Fire Detection and Fire Extinction arrangements on board ships.

3.1.6. Number of ships to number of inspections in CIC

Table 4 Number of ships to number of inspections in CIC campaign

# of inspections performed per ship	# of ships	% of total
1	3956	99.3%
2	29	0.7%
Total	3,985	100.0%

Table 4 reveals that the vast majority of the ships inspected for the CIC (99.3%) were only inspected once. Less than 1% of ships were inspected twice.

3.1.7. Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

Table 5 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

Ship Risk Profile	# of inspections	# of detentions	detention as % of inspections	detentions CIC-topic related	detentions CIC-topic related as % of inspections
High Risk Ship (HRS)	309	31	10.0%	22	7.1%
Standard Risk Ship (SRS)	3005	115	3.8%	75	2.5%
Low Risk Ship (LRS)	441	6	1.4%	3	0.7%
Unknown	259	8	3.1%	3	1.2%
Total	4014	160	4.0%	103	2.6%

The PMOU introduced a new, risk-based inspection regime (NIR) in January 2011. The NIR makes use of company performance and the Voluntary IMO Member State Audit Scheme for identifying the risk profile of ships together with the performance of the flag State and the recognized organization. The past inspection record of the ship as well as the ship's age and ship type influences the targeting.

The CIC results shown in Table 5 above, which identify the number and percentage of ship detentions falling in each of the ship risk profile categories, are consistent with what would be expected in accordance with the risk profiling breakdown. This helps support the validity of the risk profiling methodology of the NIR. For both general detentions and CIC-topic related detentions, ships with a high risk profile (HRS) comprised (by far) the largest percentage of ships detained per inspection, ships with a low risk profile (LRS) comprised the smallest percentage of ships detained per inspection, and ships with a standard risk profile (SRS) fell in between.

3.1.8. Number of inspected ships and detentions per ship type

Table 6 Number of inspected ships and detentions per ship type

Ship type	# of individual ships	# of inspections	# of detentions	detention as % of inspections	detentions CIC-topic related	detentions CIC-topic related as % of inspections
Bulk carrier	765	766	31	4.0%	14	1.8%
Chemical tanker	342	343	4	1.2%	0	0.0%
Combination carrier	8	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Container	420	422	12	2.8%	9	2.1%
Dredger	9	9	1	11.1%	1	11.1%
Gas carrier	85	86	2	2.3%	2	2.3%
General cargo/multipurpose	1329	1347	78	5.8%	59	4.4%
Heavy load	6	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
High speed passenger craft	2	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Livestock carrier	14	14	2	14.3%	1	7.1%
MODU & FPSO	5	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
NLS tanker	29	31	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Offshore supply	78	78	5	6.4%	4	5.1%
Oil tanker	307	308	4	1.3%	2	0.6%
Other special activities	164	165	7	4.2%	3	1.8%
Passenger ship	39	39	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Refrigerated cargo	95	95	4	4.2%	3	3.2%
Ro-Ro cargo	193	194	8	4.1%	4	2.1%
Ro-Ro passenger ship	28	28	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Special purpose ship	29	29	1	3.4%	1	3.4%
Tug	38	39	1	2.6%	0	0.0%
Total	3985	4014	160	4.0%	103	2.6%

Table 6 reports the number of ship inspections and the number and percentage of ships detained during the CIC by ship type. With respect to CIC-topic related detentions, dredgers

had the highest detention rate (11.1%), followed by livestock carrier ships (7.1%), offshore supply ships (5.1%) and general cargo/multipurpose ships (4.4%). A number of ship types had “zero” CIC-topic related detentions including chemical tankers, combination carriers, heavy load ships, high speed passenger crafts, MODU & FPSO ships, NLS tankers, passenger ships, Ro-Ro cargo ships or tugs.

It is important to note that the sample sizes (number of ships inspected) of the ship types that comprise the top two vessel types that were detained were relatively low compared to the other types. There were only nine inspections of dredgers and only 14 livestock carrier inspections. By comparison there were 78 offshore supply ship inspections (third most CIC-topic related vessel detentions) and 1,347 general cargo/multipurpose ship inspections.

Although smaller sample sizes do not invalidate the results in anyway, it does however provide less certainty as to how widespread a finding may be within a specific ship type. If available, comparing the data in Table 6 with the total number of ships that comprise the overall convention ship fleet by ship type would help improve this uncertainty and bring more precision to the analysis.

If only vessel types with a relatively larger sample size are considered in the analysis, offshore supply ships become the ship type with the highest percentage of detentions followed by general purpose/multipurpose vessels and then refrigerated cargo ships.

3.1.9 Inspections and detentions per Flag State

The table in Annex 1.4 presents the number of inspections and number and percentage of ships detained during the CIC by flag state. It also identifies the “White, Grey, Black (WGB) List” ranking for each flag state. Ships from 97 different flag states were inspected during the CIC.

With respect to CIC-topic related detentions, the flag state with the highest percentage of ships detained was Dominica (28.6%), followed by the Sierra Leone (21.2%), Togo (18.2%), the Faroe Islands (14.3%), and Belize (10.5%). 64 of the 97 flag states (69%) did not have any detentions.

The CIC results for the top three flag states with the highest percentage of CIC-topic related ship detentions aligns well with what would be expected based on the WGB-list ranking – all three are “Black List”. However, the Faroe Islands, which had the fourth worst performance of the CIC, recently (2011) achieved “White List” status, and Belize is on the “Grey List”.

The number of Dominica ships inspected was only 7 compared to 33 Sierra Leone, 22 Togo, 14 Faroe Island and 38 Belize ships. This compares, for example, with 139 Cyprus ship inspections of which 3.6% were detained with CIC-topic related deficiencies, and 129 Hong Kong ships of which none were detained. Again, as mentioned previously, smaller sample sizes do not make the results any less valid but rather reduces the certainty as to how widespread a finding may be, in this case, for a particular flag state. If available, including the number of ships that comprise each flags convention fleet in the Annex 1.4 table would help improve this uncertainty and bring more precision to the results.

3.1.10 Inspections and detentions per Recognized Organization

The table in Annex 1.3 presents the number of inspections (by vessel certificate – 502, 504 and 513) and number of CIC-topic related detentions by Recognized Organization (RO). It shows there were a total of 3419 inspections of ships where the certificate was recorded as issued by the RO and a total of 20 CIC-topic related detentions which had a deficiency linked to one of the three certificates. This equates to a detention rate of 0.58%.

By comparison, the detention rate for the overall CIC (CIC-topic related deficiencies) was 2.6% which means that ships for which ROs have the delegated authority to perform inspections and certifications on behalf of the member Maritime Authority performed relatively better than the overall results of the CIC.

The RO with most inspections (659) and most detentions (6) was Germanischer Lloyd, followed by Bureau Veritas with 463 inspections and 3 detentions and the Russian Maritime Register of Shipping with 431 inspections and 1 detentions. 39 ROs did not have any detentions at all.

3.1.11 Ship age overview

Table 7 ship age overview

Ship age	# of individual ships	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	Detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC-topic related as a % of inspections
< 6 years	990	990	15	1.5%	7	0.7%
6-11 years	925	932	22	2.4%	13	1.4%
12-17 years	657	664	31	4.7%	18	2.7%
18-23 years	430	431	18	4.2%	12	2.8%
24-29 years	353	357	23	6.4%	17	4.8%
30-35 years	344	353	27	7.6%	17	4.8%
> 35 years	286	287	24	8.4%	19	6.6%
Total	3985	4014	160	4.0%	103	2.6%

Table 7 reports the number of ship inspections and the number and percentage of ships detained during the CIC by ship age. By ship age, the data clearly indicates that the rate of ship detention per inspection increases with ship age. For ships less than six years old, the rate of detention was 0.7% and the rate steadily increases to where ships over 35 years old have a rate of detention of 6.6% per inspection.

3.2 Results on former CICs on same subject

Not applicable – this is the first CIC for this subject matter.

3.3 Results other CIC participants

Table 8 Results other CIC participants

	PMOU	TMOU
# of inspections with CIC Questionnaire	4,014	6,606
# of detentions	160	217
Detentions as a % of inspections	4.0%	3.3%
Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies	103	150
Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies as a % of inspections	2.6%	2.3%
Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies as a % of detentions	64%	69%
CIC Question reporting the most favourable results	Q3	Q7
CIC Question reporting the least favourable results	Q12	Q5a and Q11
Ship type reporting the least favourable results*	Cargo/multipurpose ships	Cargo/multipurpose ships
Ship age reporting the most favourable results	< 6 years	<11 years
Ship age reporting the least favourable results	>35 years	> 30 years
RO ships detention rate for CIC-topic related detentions	0.5%	0.09
# of RO responsibility ship inspections during CIC	3419	7787
Most recent published annual detention rate for broader PSC inspection regime	3.28%	5.46%

* Taking into consideration sample sizes.

Table 8 reveals that TMOU member states conducted 39.2% more inspections with CIC questionnaires than PMOU member states during the three months of the campaign. However, detentions as a percentage of inspections were 17.5% higher for the PMOU overall and 11.5% higher for CIC-topic related detentions. Nonetheless, the proportion of detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies as a percentage of total detentions was higher for TMOU inspections by 5%.

Cargo/multipurpose ships were the most problematic ship type for both the TMOU and PMOU and older ships had the highest rate of detention in both cases.

There was a slight difference however in the PMOU and TMOU results with respect to inspections of RO responsibility ships. Although only 3419 RO recorded responsibility issuing ship certificates were conducted by PMOU member states, the detention rate for CIC-topic related deficiencies was five times higher than TMOU. . In stark contrast, TMOU member states inspected 7,043 RO recorded responsibility issuing ship certificates (the vast majority of all ships inspected by TMOU member states) and the detention rate for CIC-topic related deficiencies was low at 0.09%. This result is below the PMOU results for the CIC, but also better than the TMOU broader PSC inspection results reported annually.

Overall, both the PMOU and TMOU CIC results fared better than their respective broader PSC inspection results, thus both authorities conclude that the CIC has indeed provided sound evidence supporting that the industry has in general achieved a good level of compliance with the specific provisions of the SOLAS Chapter II-2 pertaining to fire safety systems.

Annex 1 CIC Questionnaire

Annex 1.1 Inspection form of the CIC

Nieuwe Uitleg 1
P.O. Box 90653
2509 LR The Hague
The Netherlands



Telephone: +31 70 456 1508
Telefax: +31 70 456 1599
E-mail: secretariat@parismou.org
Internet : www.parismou.org

REPORT OF CIC ON FIRE SAFETY SYSTEMS (FSS). from 01/09/2012 to 30/11/2012

Ship's Name/IMO No: Port of Inspection: Date of Inspection:
--

No.	Item	Yes	No	N/A
1	Does the Fire Control Plan meet the requirements? SOLAS Ch II-2/ Reg 15.2.4 and Reg 15.3.2 (Def code 01309)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2a	Do the fire fighters' outfits including personal equipment comply with the requirements? SOLAS Ch II-2/ Reg 10.10 and Reg 14.2.2. (Def code 07111)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2b	Do the Emergency Escape Breathing Devices (EEBD) comply with the requirements? SOLAS Ch II-2/ Reg 13.3.4 and Reg 13.4.3 (Def code 07112)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Are the portable extinguishers ready for use in locations as per the fire plan? SOLAS Ch II-2/Reg 10.3.2.4 (Def code 07110)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*4	Does the test of automatic audible alarm sound prior to release of a fixed gas fire-extinguishing medium into spaces in which personnel normally work? SOLAS Ch II-2/ Reg 10.5. (Def code 07109)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*5a	Are the fire protection systems, fire fighting-systems and appliances maintained ready for use? SOLAS/Ch II-2/ Reg 14.2.1.? (Def code 07108)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5b	Is there a maintenance plan onboard to show that fire protection systems and fire- fighting systems and appliances (as appropriate) have been properly tested and inspected? SOLAS/Ch II-2/ Reg14.2.2 (Def code 07124)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
*6	Is the crew familiar with the location and operation of fire-fighting systems and appliances that they may be called upon to use? SOLAS/Ch II-2/ Reg 15.2.2 (Def code 07123)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7	Does the test of the sprinkler system trigger an automatic visual and audible alarm for the section? SOLAS/Ch II-2/ Reg 10.6 (Def code 08103)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*8	Does the activation of any detector or manually operated call point initiate a visual and audible fire signal at the control panel on the bridge or control station? SOLAS Ch II-2/ Reg 7.4.2 (Def code 07106)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	Is the lighting in escape routes, including the Low Location Lighting systems where applicable properly maintained? SOLAS Ch II-2/Reg 13 (Def code 07120)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*10	Is the Emergency Fire pump, capable of producing at least two jets of water? SOLAS/Ch II-2/ Reg 10.2.2.3.1 and Reg 2.2.4.2 (Def code 04102)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Are the Isolating valves of the fire main marked, maintained and easily operable? SOLAS/Ch II-2/R10.2.1.4 (Def code 07113)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
*12	Where a fire drill was witnessed was it found to be satisfactory? SOLAS Ch II-2/ Reg 15.2.2.5 and SOLAS Ch-III/ Reg 19.3 (Def code 04109)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13	Was the ship detained as a result of the CIC?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

Notes: If the box "No" is ticked off, for questions marked with an "*" the ship may be considered for detention. The detail of any deficiencies should be appropriately entered on the PSC Report of Inspection -Form B and include the deficiency code as indicated in the question.

For questions combined with the conjunction "and" if the box "YES" is checked that means all the parts in the question are in compliance.

Annex 1.2 Inspections and Detentions per Flag State

Table Annex 1.2 Inspections and detentions per Flag State

Flag	# of individual ships	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	# of detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC-topic related as a % of inspections	WGB-list* 2011
Albania	11	11	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	Black list
Algeria	4	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Antigua and Barbuda	279	282	15	5.3%	8	2.8%	White List
Azerbaijan	2	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Bahamas	175	175	5	2.9%	2	1.1%	White List
Bahrain	2	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Bangladesh	2	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Barbados	17	18	1	5.6%	1	5.6%	White List
Belgium	22	22	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Belize	38	38	4	10.5%	4	10.5%	Grey list
Bermuda (GB)	11	11	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	White List
Bolivia	2	2	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Bulgaria	5	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Cambodia	45	45	2	4.4%	2	4.4%	Black list
Canada	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Cayman Islands (GB)	18	18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
China	25	25	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Comoros	30	31	4	12.9%	3	9.7%	Black list
Cook Islands	16	16	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Croatia	6	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Curacao (formerly Netherland	19	19	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list

Flag	# of individual ships	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	# of detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC-topic related as a % of inspections	WGB-list* 2011
s Antilles)							
Cyprus	139	139	6	4.3%	5	3.6%	White List
Denmark	77	79	3	3.8%	1	1.3%	White List
Dominica	7	7	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	Black list
Dominican Republic	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Ecuador	1	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Egypt	6	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Estonia	3	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Falkland Islands (GB)	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Faroe Islands	14	14	2	14.3%	2	14.3%	White List
Finland	13	13	1	7.7%	1	7.7%	White List
France	9	9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Georgia	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Germany	52	52	2	3.8%	1	1.9%	White List
Gibraltar (GB)	57	57	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Greece	72	72	1	1.4%	1	1.4%	White List
Honduras	1	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Hong Kong, China	128	129	3	2.3%	0	0.0%	White List
Iceland	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
India	6	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Iran, Islamic Republic of	2	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Ireland	3	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	White List
Isle of Man (GB)	68	68	2	2.9%	2	2.9%	White List

Flag	# of individual ships	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	# of detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC-topic related as a % of inspections	WGB-list* 2011
Israel	2	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Italy	72	73	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Japan	3	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Jordan	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Kazakhstan	7	7	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Kiribati	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Korea, Democratic People's Republic of	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Korea, Republic of	11	11	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Kuwait	1	1	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Latvia	4	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Lebanon	3	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Liberia	307	308	5	1.6%	4	1.3%	White List
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Lithuania	10	10	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Luxembourg	15	15	1	6.7%	1	6.7%	White List
Malaysia	4	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Malta	305	306	12	3.9%	4	1.3%	White List
Marshall Islands	225	225	6	2.7%	4	1.8%	White List
Mauritius	2	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Moldova, Republic of	54	54	3	5.6%	2	3.7%	Black list
Morocco	3	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Netherlands	206	208	8	3.8%	4	1.9%	White List
Norway	86	86	1	1.2%	1	1.2%	White List

Flag	# of individual ships	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	# of detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC-topic related as a % of inspections	WGB-list* 2011
Pakistan	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Panama	440	445	22	4.9%	17	3.8%	White List
Philippines	12	12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Poland	18	18	2	11.1%	1	5.6%	White List
Portugal	17	17	1	5.9%	0	0.0%	White List
Qatar	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Russian Federation	103	103	5	4.9%	3	2.9%	White List
Saint Kitts and Nevis	30	30	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	64	66	5	7.6%	4	6.1%	Grey list
Saudi Arabia	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Sierra Leone	33	33	9	27.3%	7	21.2%	Black list
Singapore	122	123	4	3.3%	2	1.6%	White List
South Africa	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Spain	16	16	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Sri Lanka	3	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Sweden	15	15	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Switzerland	8	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Syrian Arab Republic	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Taiwan, China	4	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
Tanzania, United Republic of	24	26	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black list
Thailand	6	6	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Togo	22	22	4	18.2%	4	18.2%	Black list
Tunisia	3	3	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list

Flag	# of individual ships	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	# of detentions CIC-topic related	Detentions CIC-topic related as a % of inspections	WGB-list* 2011
Turkey	146	150	7	4.7%	5	3.3%	White List
Tuvalu	3	3	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Ukraine	22	23	1	4.3%	1	4.3%	Black list
United Arab Emirates	1	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Unlisted
United Kingdom	117	117	2	1.7%	2	1.7%	White List
United States	21	21	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Vanuatu	12	12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White List
Viet Nam	2	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey list
Grand Total	3985	4014	160	4.0%	103	2.6%	

* The official WGB-list of the Paris MoU is published in the Annual Report. The scope of this table is only the CIC.

Annex 1.3 Inspections and detentions per Recognized Organization

Table Annex 1.3 Inspections and detentions per Recognized Organization

Issuing authority	Inspection*			Detentions CIC- topic related with RO responsibility**
	502 – Cargo Ship Safety Equipment	504 – Cargo Ship Safety	513 – Passenger Ship Safety	
American Bureau of Shipping	274	3	1	1
Bureau Veritas	349	107	7	3
China Classification Society	42	1	0	
China Corporation Register of Shipping	4	1	0	
Croatian Register of Shipping	6	0	1	
Det Norske Veritas	409	11	9	1
Dromon Bureau of Shipping	27	1	0	
Germanischer Lloyd	623	29	7	6
Global Marine Bureau Inc.	14	0	0	
Hellenic Register of Shipping	1	0	0	
Indian Register of Shipping	1	0	0	
Inspeccion y Clasificacion Maritima (INCLAMAR)	7	1	0	1
International Naval Surveys Bureau	32	0	0	
International Register of Shipping	23	2	0	1
Iranian Classification Society	3	0	0	
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping, S.A.	3	2	0	1
Korea Classification Society	2	0	0	
Korean Register of Shipping	57	0	0	
Lloyd's Register	349	51	7	1
Macosnar Corporation	6	0	0	
Maritime Bureau of Shipping	6	0	0	
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	428	3	0	1
Panama Marine Survey and Certification Services Inc.	3	0	0	

Issuing authority	Inspection*			Detentions CIC- topic related with RO responsibility**
	502 – Cargo Ship Safety Equipment	504 – Cargo Ship Safety	513 – Passenger Ship Safety	
Panama Maritime Documentation Services	2	0	0	
Panama Register Corporation	3	1	0	
Panama Shipping Registrar Inc.	0	0	0	
Phoenix Register of Shipping	12	0	0	
Polski Rejestr Statkow (Polish Register of Shipping)	16	4	2	
Register of Shipping (Albania)	10	0	1	1
Registro Italiano Navale	64	2	5	
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	242	2	1	2
Shipping Register of Ukraine	47	1	2	1
Turkish Lloyd	5	0	0	
Universal Shipping Bureau Inc.	4	0	0	
Unknown	1	0	0	
Other	10	0	0	
Bulgarian Register of Shipping	19	0	0	
International Ship Classification	1	0	0	
Venezuelan Register of Shipping	13	0	0	
Maritime Lloyd - Georgia	11	0	0	
American Register of Shipping	2	0	0	
International Maritime Register	3	0	0	
Union Marine Classification Society	1	0	0	
Maritime Lloyd	4	0	0	
Overseas Marine Certification Services	5	0	0	
Global Shipping Bureau Inc	7	0	0	
Vietnam Register	2	0	0	
Intermaritime Certification Services, ICS Class	1	0	0	
Honduras International Surveying and Inspection Bureau	0	0	0	

Issuing authority	Inspection*			Detentions CIC- topic related with RO responsibility**
	502 – Cargo Ship Safety Equipment	504 – Cargo Ship Safety	513 – Passenger Ship Safety	
Horizon International of Naval Surveying and Inspection Bureau, S.A.	0	0	0	
ASIA Classification Society	0	0	0	
Grand Total	3154	222	43	20

* Number of inspections where the certificate is recorded as issued by the RO

** Number of inspections where the RO issued the certificate and a deficiency covered by that certificate was recorded as detainable and RO related