

**Report of the 2014 Concentrated Inspection Campaign
(CIC) on STCW HOURS OF REST**



November, 2015

Executive Summary

In accordance with the decision of the Port State Control Committee made at its 23rd meeting in Singapore in 2013, the Tokyo MOU (TMOU) on Port State Control has now completed a joint Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) focusing on the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1979 (the STCW Code) Hours of Rest. The CIC was conducted over the period September 1 through to November 30 2014. The CIC was completed primarily alongside the member States of the Paris MOU on Port State Control (PMOU), however members from the Viña del Mar Agreement, the Indian Ocean MOU (IOMOU), the Mediterranean MOU (MedMOU) and the Black Sea MOU (BSMOU) also undertook STCW Code CIC inspections.

During the campaign, 19 TMOU and 27 PMOU member states focused their efforts on assessing shipboard compliance with the STCW Code requirements concerning seafarer Hours of Rest. This report documents TMOU results for the campaign, with the associated results for the PMOU and other PSC regions included at paragraph 3.10 to allow comparative analysis.

The objective of the CIC was to gain an understanding as to the shipping industry's level of compliance with the STCW Code. During the CIC, Port State Control Officers (PSCO's) were requested to use a common questionnaire to allow comparative verification of critical compliance issues related to the STCW and the Minimum Safe Manning (as required by SOLAS Ch. V).

A total of 8,182 inspections were carried out by TMOU member States during the CIC, involving 6,392 individual ships (an overall CIC regional inspection rate of 78.1%). The regional detention rate for PSC inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire was 3.2% (i.e. 206 ships were detained by TMOU States during the period), while the detention rate for CIC-specific deficiencies was 0.2% (i.e. 16 ships were detained as a result of CIC-specific deficiencies). 7.8% of all recorded detentions featured CIC related deficiencies.

The format of the CIC Questionnaire featured potential "Yes", "No", and "N/A" answers. "Yes" meaning that the vessel was compliant, and "No" meaning the vessel was non-compliant – with a deficiency raised reflecting this non-compliance. In analysing the CIC data, the most positive results were reported for Question 2 - which asked whether the ship was manned in accordance with the minimum safe manning document (MSMD) equivalent. The least favourable results were reported for Question 4 - which asked if the records of rest been endorsed by an appropriate person, and Question 5 - which asked if the hours of rest records are being recorded correctly.

Offshore service vessels recorded the highest CIC related detention rate (3.85%), followed by 'other' types of ship (1.72%) and vehicle carriers (0.88%), while a number of ship types had "zero" CIC related detentions. Newer ships (0-5 years) had the lowest detention rate (1.6%) whilst older ships (30-34 years) had the highest detention rate (9.1%).

Ships from 76 flag States were inspected during the CIC. Three flag States shared the highest CIC related detention rate, namely Barbados, Estonia and Honduras (each nation recording 100% - i.e. a single ship inspected and subsequently detained), while 34 of the 76 flag States did not record any detentions. The overall number of CIC related detentions remains consistent with TMOU risk profiling methodologies, i.e. High Risk Ships comprised the largest percentage of ships detained per CIC inspection (5.3%).

Of the TMOU member States, Japan conducted the most CIC inspections (1,587), followed by China (1,476), Australia (810) and Philippines (449). The least number of inspections were conducted by Fiji, Marshall Islands and Vanuatu, each recording no CIC inspections.

It is assessed that the CIC has provided sound evidence to generally conclude that Industry is only achieving a poor level of compliance with regard to the specific record keeping provisions of STCW Section A-VIII. Noting that a total of 62.7% of the CIC-specific deficiencies relate directly

to record keeping, it is apparent that improving compliance levels to assure accurate and transparent record keeping continues to be a challenge.

A key recommendation to the TMOU members is to continue during normal PSC inspections to put emphasis on the CIC focus areas (the STCW & SOLAS) that had the least favourable results.

Table of Contents

page

Section 1: Introduction

1.1	Purpose of the Report	5
1.2	Objectives of the CIC	5
1.3	CIC Questionnaire	5
1.4	General Remarks	5

Section 2: Summary Analysis, Conclusions and Recommendations

2.1	Summary	6
2.2	Conclusions	7
2.3	Recommendations	7

Section 3: CIC Questionnaire Analysis

3.1	CIC Questionnaire Responses	8
3.2	Number of Inspections and Ships involved in the CIC	9
3.3	CIC-topic related deficiencies	9
3.4	Number of inspections per ship	10
3.5	Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile	11
3.6	Number of inspected ships and detentions per ship type	11
3.7	Inspections and detentions per Flag State	13
3.8	Inspections and detentions per Recognised Organisation	15
3.9	Ship age overview	17
3.10	PSC Region CIC Comparison	18

Annex 1: CIC Questionnaire	19
----------------------------	-------	----

Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Report

This report documents the results of the TMOU Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on STCW Hours of Rest that was conducted by between September 1 and November 30, 2015. As agreed at PSCC 23, the 17 TMOU member Authorities were joined by the 27 members of the Paris MOU to deliver greatest impact (i.e. 44 port States in total). The CIC Questionnaire focused on assessing compliance with the STCW Code Part A Chap VIII and SOLAS Chap II-1.

1.2 Objectives of the CIC

Fatigue management is recognised as an important contributing factor in maritime casualties and seafarer health problems. The STCW Code Part A Chapter VIII/1 highlights that all Administrations "...shall take account of the danger posed by fatigue of seafarers, especially those whose duties involve the safe and secure operation of a ship." The STCW then identifies that officers in charge of a watch, or ratings forming part of the watch, whose duties involve designated safety, prevention of pollution and security duties shall be provided with a rest period of not less than:

- .1 a minimum of 10 hours of rest in any 24-hour period; and
- .2 77 hours of rest in any 7 day period.

The STCW Code also specifies that Administrations are required to ensure those daily hours of rest be recorded in a standardised format in order to allow compliance monitoring and verification. As such, the CIC Questionnaire was designed to specifically examine shipboard compliance with both the stated requirements, and importantly, the intent of the STCW Code. The nine primary CIC questions were shaped to investigate how shipping companies and ship's crews have implemented the requirements for shipboard record keeping and compensatory rest arrangements. The CIC was conducted in conjunction with regular port State control targeting and inspection activities.

1.3 CIC Questionnaire

The CIC was undertaken on all ships targeted for inspection during period from 1st September 2014 to 30th November 2014.

The questionnaire identifying nine primary areas, against which STCW compliance could be meaningfully assessed, with a tenth question to indicate whether the ship was detained as a result of the CIC. Each question was allocated an appropriate PSC Deficiency Code and Action Code for consistency across all participating States. Four additional 'for information only' questions rounded out the Questionnaire to allow the MOU to better understand regional Bridge and Engineering spaces watch keeping arrangements.

1.4 General Remarks

For the purpose of this report, a "detention" is an inspection containing at least one Code 30 deficiency that is considered serious enough to justify holding the ship in harbour until rectified.

Except for Tables 4 and 7, the assessed percentages referred to in this report reflect analysis taking into account the total number of inspections completed regionally during the CIC, i.e. the combined total of all inspections conducted with and without a CIC Questionnaire. As such the following analysis indicates the total number of detentions against **all** inspections conducted over the 3 month CIC period.

Care should be exercised when reading the following analysis, as the statistical comparison of respective results and root causes are heavily influenced by sample size. By way of example, if an

individual flag State has only a single ship is inspected under the CIC, and that ship is subsequently detained as a result of the inspection, then the CIC 'snapshot' detention rate for that flag State would read 100%. This statistical finding that would not be supported if the sample size were much larger (e.g. ten inspections and a single detention equating to a 10% detention rate), as such some of the following percentages allow the potential of skewing root cause analysis. Where results of this type are identified in the Tables below, a note identifying the potential cause of the statistical outcome is highlighted.

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

2.1 Summary

The following summarises the CIC results:

- A total of 8182 inspections were conducted on 6392 individual ships by TMOU members during the CIC. Of these 6392 inspections were conducted with a CIC Questionnaire (i.e. 78.1% of the total number of inspections conducted during the CIC)
- Of the 6392 PSC inspections conducted with a CIC Questionnaire, 206 ships were detained, of which 16 (7.8%) were detained on the basis of a CIC-related deficiency. The overall detention rate of ships inspected with a CIC Questionnaire (i.e. percentage of detentions per CIC inspection) was 3.2%. The CIC-related detention rate in comparison to all PSC inspections across the region was 0.25%.
- The most favourable results were identified for question **2**, indicating that ships are being correctly manned in accordance with their Minimum Safe Manning Document
- The least favourable result were recorded for questions **4** and **5**, indicating that accurate record keeping is proving to be problematic for Industry to implement.
- Deficiency 01308 - Records of seafarers' daily hours of work or rest, accounted for the most reported inspection deficiency (62.7% of all deficiencies)
- Newer ships (0-5 years) had fewer detentions (1.6%) than older ships (30-34 years) by ship age (9.1%).
- The majority of ships inspected across the TMOU region were only inspected a single time (78.1%)
- The flag State with the highest number of CIC related detentions was Panama, reflecting the greater number of Panamanian flagged ships operating within the region
- As per APCIS Target Factor software Rules, the CIC results are consistent with what would be expected in accordance with normal risk profiling, i.e. the highest number of detentions were found within the High Risk Ships category
- Of TMOU member States, Japan conducted the most inspections (1587), closely followed by China (1476)

2.2 Conclusions

The main objective of the CIC was to assess the level of Industry compliance with regard to the STCW provisions to ensure adequate rest and respite for Watchkeeping personnel. The secondary objective was to assess minimum safe manning in accordance with SOLAS.

As is evidenced by the overall CIC-specific detention rate (0.25% over 8182 inspections), the TMOU concludes that although accurate record keeping is proving problematic and in need of continued attention, overall compliance with the STCW and SOLAS is good.

2.3 Recommendations

The following recommendations emerge from the 2014 CIC on STCW Code hours of rest provisions:

1. TMOU member States continue to focus attention on the importance of crew rest and fatigue issues during normal PSC inspections.
2. TMOU member States continue to emphasise correct and efficient record keeping practices for their respective national fleets as per the stated requirements of the STCW Code and MLC 2006.
3. It is highly recommended that annual CICs continue, preferably in alignment and conjunction with other PSC regions (to ensure maximum compliance and raise awareness of pertinent maritime issues).

CIC Questionnaire Analysis

3.1 CIC Questionnaire Responses

Table 1 Response to CIC questionnaire

	'YES'	'NO'	N/A	BLANK	TOTAL CIC INSPECTIONS	% 'NO' OF TOTAL CIC INSPECTIONS	% 'NO' ADJUSTED**
q1	6229	163	0	0	6392	2.6	2.6
*q2	6362	30	0	0	6392	0.5	0.4
q3	6252	140	0	0	6392	2.2	2.2
q4	6108	284	0	0	6392	4.4	4.4
q5	5458	934	0	0	6392	14.6	14.6
q6	6152	240	0	0	6392	3.8	3.8
*q7	6354	38	0	0	6392	0.6	0.6
q8	3749	101	2542	0	6392	1.6	1.6
q9	6312	80	0	0	6392	1.3	1.3
q10	16	6376	0	0	6392	99.7	99.7
q11	1666	3916	810	0	6392	61.3	61.3
q12	4937	645	810	0	6392	10.1	10.1
q13	2672	2910	810	0	6392	45.5	45.5
q14	2698	277	3417	0	6392	4.3	4.3

* 'NO' means: the ship may be considered for detention. The details of any detention should be appropriately entered on the PSC report B.

** "[% 'NO' adjusted]" = % "[Answer = NO, may be considered for detention]" but the ship has not been detained.

Table 1 indicates that during the CIC a total of 6392 inspections were conducted using the CIC Questionnaire. The number of unsatisfactory responses per question ranges from 30 to 934, representing 0.5% to 14.6% of total inspections respectively (Questions 11-14 were 'for information only').

Question 2, which asked if the ship was manned in accordance with the Minimum Safe Manning Document (MSMD), reported the most favourable results, with only 30 unsatisfactory responses (0.5%), indicating that shipping companies are maintaining satisfactory manning levels for safe shipping.

Question 5, which queried whether records were being recorded correctly, recorded the least favourable level of compliance with 934 ships (14.6%) indicating that they are not maintaining accurate record keeping as required by the STCW. As there is no single ship type, ship age, flag State, or Risk Profile that can be attributed to contributing to this result, it is apparent that a common problem exists across all Industry sectors that will require ongoing attention to improve compliance.

In overall terms, the CIC responses indicate a generally pleasing level of overall compliance (exempt record keeping as mentioned above), indicating that the inherent protections and intent of the STCW are understood by Industry and well implemented by ship's crews.

3.2 Number of Inspections and Ships involved in the CIC

Table 2 - Number of inspections and ships involved in the CIC

	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL SHIPS INSPECTED DURING CIC	NUMBER OF PSC INSPECTIONS PERFORMED WITH A CIC QUESTIONNAIRE	NUMBER OF PSC INSPECTIONS WITHOUT A CIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Total	6392	6392	1790
Detentions	206	206	70
Detentions with <i>CIC-topic</i> related deficiencies	16	16	0

Table 2 indicates that a total of 8182 PSC inspections were conducted across the TMOU region during the period 01 September – 30 November 2014. Of these 6392 inspections were completed using the CIC Questionnaire, with an additional 1790 PSC inspections conducted without a questionnaire. A total of 276 ships were detained during that period by TMOU Authorities, with 206 of these ships detained with a completed CIC Questionnaire. 16 of these ships were detained on the basis of CIC questions.

3.3 CIC-topic related deficiencies

Table 3 - CIC-topic related deficiencies

	CIC INSPECTIONS	CIC DEFICIENCIES	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED WITH RO RESPONSIBLE
	(# of inspections with this deficiency) One inspection can have multiple deficiencies	(# of deficiencies recorded)	(Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as grounds for detention)	(Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as grounds for detention and RO related)
<i>CIC-topic</i> related deficiency 01209 - Legal documentation on work and rest hours (Q2)	19	21	4	0
<i>CIC-topic</i> related deficiency 01306 - Shipboard working arrangements (Q1, Q9)	224	232	0	0
<i>CIC-topic</i> related deficiency 01308 - Records of seafarers' daily hours of work or rest (Q3, Q4)	898	997	10	0
<i>CIC-topic</i> related deficiency 09235 / 18201 – Fitness for duty – work and rest hours (Q6, Q7, Q8)	94	98	1	0

	CIC INSPECTIONS	CIC DEFICIENCIES	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED WITH RO RESPONSIBLE
	(# of inspections with this deficiency) One inspection can have multiple deficiencies	(# of deficiencies recorded)	(Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as grounds for detention)	(Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as grounds for detention and RO related)
<i>CIC-topic</i> related deficiency 09236 or 18202 – Manning specified by the minimum safe manning document (Q5)	231	241	1	0
Total	1466	1589	16	0

As indicated in Table 3, the correct recording of seafarers daily hours of work and rest (Questions 3 and 4) presents as an emergent issue requiring ongoing attention, with this aspect of shipboard operations accounting for 10 detentions. Most of deficiencies recorded indicated that either the shipboard hours of rest were either incomplete or inaccurate, or that they had not been signed by the seafarer as required by the SCTW Code.

Although there was a significant number (241) of deficiencies raised concerning the MSMD, Table 3 indicates that only a single vessel did not meet the SOLAS requirements for safe minimum manning. Equally, 232 deficiencies were raised regarding shipboard working arrangements (though no detentions were recorded), indicating that ship’s Masters and Chief Officers need to pay greater attention to their daily information flow and working schedules.

3.4 Number of inspections per ship

Table 4 Number of inspections per ships

# OF CIC INSPECTIONS PERFORMED PER SHIP	# OF SHIPS	% OF TOTAL
1	6392	100
2	0	0
3	0	0
4	0	0
5	0	0
Total	6392	100

As previously agreed, only a single CIC inspection was conducted aboard each individual ship across the TMOU region, as such all recorded deficiencies and the subsequent CIC analysis should be understood to reflect a ‘snapshot’ with regard each individual ship’s compliance. Noting the snapshot nature of these findings, it would be prudent for the TMOU member States to continue efforts to engender lasting effects through continued monitoring of STCW compliance during normal PSC inspections (Recommendation # 1).

3.5 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

Table 5 - Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

INDIVIDUAL SHIPS	INDIVIDUAL SHIPS	INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS	DETENTION AS % OF INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC- TOPIC RELATED AS % OF INSPECTIONS
HIGH RISK SHIP (HRS)	1875	1875	100	5.3	8	0.43
STANDARD RISK SHIP (SRS)	2527	2527	84	3.3	7	0.28
LOW RISK SHIP (LRS)	1908	1908	21	1.1	1	0.05
Risk unknown (null)	82	82	1	1.2	0	0.00
TOTAL	6392	6392	206	3.2	16	0.25

Table 5 identifies the number and percentage of ship detentions falling in each risk profile category. The results are consistent with what would be expected in accordance with normal APCIS target profiling, serving to support the continued validity of the risk profiling methodology. As can be seen, High Risk shipping still comprises the largest percentage of detained ships.

3.6 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	PSC INSPECTIONS	PSC DETENTIONS	DETENTION AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED AS A % OF INSPECTIONS
bulk carrier	2206	2206	61	2.8	2	0.09
chemical tanker	436	436	7	1.6	1	0.23
combination carrier	7	7	0	0		
container ship	1154	1154	25	2.2	3	0.26
factory ship	0	0	0	0		
gas carrier	140	140	5	3.6		
general cargo/multi-purpose ship	1361	1361	67	4.9	5	0.37
heavy load carrier	26	26	1	3.8		
high speed cargo craft	0	0	0	0		
high speed passenger craft	1	1	0	0		

SHIP TYPE	# OF INDIVIDUAL SHIPS	PSC INSPECTIONS	PSC DETENTIONS	DETENTION AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED AS A % OF INSPECTIONS
livestock carrier	16	16	2	12.5		
MODU or FPSO	0	0	0	0		
NLS tanker	8	8	1	12.5		
offshore service vessel	26	26	3	11.5	1	3.85
oil tanker	367	367	11	3	1	0.27
passenger ship	39	39	3	7.7		
refrigerated cargo vessel	142	142	8	5.6		
ro-ro cargo ship	43	43	0	0		
ro-ro passenger ship	12	120	0	0		
special purpose ship	9	9	0	0		
tugboat	44	44	5	11.4		
vehicle carrier	227	227	3	1.3	2	0.88
wood-chip carrier	70	70	1	1.4		
other types of ship	58	58	3	5.2	1	1.72
Total	6392	6392	206	3.2	16	0.25

Table 6 indicates the number of detentions per ship type. Livestock Carriers and NLS Tankers equalled each other as the highest number of registered detentions (12.5% each), closely followed by Offshore Service Vessels and Tugboats (11.5% and 11.4% respectively).

As identified in Section 2 of this report, it is important to note that the sample size for the top two detained ship types (i.e. Livestock Carriers and NLS Tankers) was very small in comparison to Bulk Carriers, General Cargo/Multi-purpose ships and Container ships. To highlight this statistical aberration, 61 Bulk Carriers and 76 General Purpose ship were detained (from a sample size of 3567 ships), vice just two Livestock Carriers and a single NLS Tanker (from a sample size of 24 ships in total). These relatively small sample sizes do not invalidate the findings; however they do infer due caution in the Committee's ability to draw wider conclusions across the TMOU region with regard ship types. When larger sample sizes are taken into account, then it becomes clear that the majority of detentions were General Cargo ships and Bulk Carriers.

3.7 Inspections and detentions per Flag State

Table 7 - Inspections and detentions per Flag State

FLAG	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL SHIPS	CIC INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS	DETENTION AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	BGW LIST*
Antigua and Barbuda	110	110	4	3.6	1	0.91	G
Bahamas	157	157	6	3.8			W
Bahrain	1	1					
Bangladesh	11	11	1	9.1			B
Barbados	1	1	1	100.0			G
Belgium	4	4					G
Belize	90	90	1	1.1			B
Bermuda (GB)	12	12					W
Cambodia	231	231	28	12.1	3	1.30	B
Cayman Islands (GB)	24	24					W
China	162	162					W
Cook Islands	5	5	1	20.0			G
Croatia	1	1					W
Curacao	2	2					G
Cyprus	116	116	7	6.0			W
Denmark	29	29					W
Dominica	1	1					G
Egypt	2	2					G
Equatorial Guinea	1	1					
Estonia	1	1	1	100.0			
Falkland Islands (GB)	1	1					
France	6	6					W
Germany	31	31					W
Gibraltar (GB)	14	14	1	7.1			G
Greece	76	76	5	6.6			W
Honduras	1	1	1	100.0	1	100.00	
Hong Kong, China	627	627	4	0.6			W
India	11	11					G
Indonesia	29	29	6	20.7	2	6.90	B
Iran	10	10	2	20.0			G
Isle of Man (GB)	37	37					W
Israel	1	1					
Italy	20	20	1	5.0			W
Jamaica	6	6	2	33.3	1	16.67	G
Japan	35	35	2	5.7			W

FLAG	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL SHIPS	CIC INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS	DETENTION AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	BGW LIST*
Kiribati	45	45	4	8.9			B
Korea, DPR	27	27	5	18.5			B
Korea, Rep of	335	335					W
Kuwait	5	5					G
Liberia	506	506	20	4.0			W
Luxembourg	11	11	1	9.1			G
Malaysia	52	52					W
Malta	165	165	4	2.4			W
Marshall Islands	405	405	9	2.2			W
Mongolia	17	17	1	5.9			B
Myanmar	1	1					
Netherlands	32	32					W
Niue	4	4	1	25.0			
Norway	51	51					W
Palau	1	1					
Panama	1913	1913	53	2.8	5	0.26	W
Papua New Guinea	3	3					B
Peru	1	1					
Philippines	50	50	6	12.0			G
Portugal	15	15					
Russian Federation	36	36	2	5.6			W
Saint Kitts and Nevis	7	7					B
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	26	26	1	3.8			W
Saudi Arabia	6	6					W
Sierra Leone	32	32	3	9.4	1	3.13	B
Singapore	455	455	7	1.5			W
Spain	1	1					
Sweden	7	7	1	14.3	1	14.29	G
Switzerland	6	6	1	16.7			G
Taiwan, China	22	22					W
Tanzania	5	5	1	20.0			B
Thailand	57	57	4	7.0	1	1.75	B
Togo	13	13	2	15.4			G
Tunisia	1	1					
Turkey	8	8	1	12.5			G
Tuvalu	14	14	1	7.1			G
United Arab Emirates	1	1					
United Kingdom	39	39	2	5.1			W

FLAG	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL SHIPS	CIC INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS	DETENTION AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	BGW LIST*
United States	10	10					W
Vanuatu	32	32	1	3.1			W
Viet Nam	109	109	1	0.9			B
Total	6392	6392	206	3.2	16	0.25	

Table 7 presents the number of individual ships, CIC inspections, and detentions recorded by flag State during the CIC. Ships from 76 different flag States were inspected during the CIC, with Barbados, Estonia and Honduras presenting as the flag States with the highest detention rates, each having a single ship inspected and subsequently detained. 34 flag States did not record any detentions.

As previously identified, the limited number of ships some flag States have operating within the TMOU region can unintentionally indicate trends not supported by larger fleet sizes. When larger sample sizes are assessed it becomes evident that the Liberian, Cambodian and Panamanian fleets present as the most problematic with regard the CIC focus areas.

3.8 Inspections and detentions per Recognised Organisation

Table 8 - Inspections and detentions per Recognized Organization

ISSUING AUTHORITY	INSPECTION*	CIC REALTED DETENTIONS WITH RO RESPONSIBLE**
American Bureau of Shipping (ABS)	480	0
American Register of Shipping (AMRS)	3	0
Asia Classification Society (ACS)	1	0
Biro Klasifikasi Indonesia (BKI)	8	0
Bureau Veritas (BV)	466	0
C.T.M. Inspection and Classification Company (CTMICC)	1	0
China Classification Society (CCS)	459	0
CR Classification Society (CRCS)	29	0
Croatian Register of Shipping (CRS)	1	0
Det Norske Veritas (DNV)	299	0
DNV GL AS (DNVGL)	215	0
Germanischer Lloyd (GL)	454	0
Global Marine Bureau (GMB)	22	0
Indian Register of Shipping (IRS)	10	0
Intermaritime Certification Services SA (ICS)	47	0
International Naval Surveys Bureau (INSB)	2	0
International Register of Shipping (IS)	13	0
International Ship Classification (ISC)	39	0
Iranian Classification Society (IRCS)	8	0

ISSUING AUTHORITY	INSPECTION*	CIC REALTED DETENTIONS WITH RO RESPONSIBLE**
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping (IBS)	38	0
Korea Classification Society (KCS)	27	0
Korea Ship Safety Technology Authority (KST)	2	0
Korean Register of Shipping (KRS)	633	0
Lloyd's Register (LR)	498	0
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai (NKK)	2040	0
Overseas Marine Certification Services (OMCS)	34	0
Panama Maritime Documentation Services (PMDS)	21	0
Panama Shipping Certificate Inc (PSC)	1	0
Panama Shipping Registrar Inc (PSR)	6	0
Phoenix Register of Shipping (PHRS)	1	0
Polski Rejestr Statkow (PRS)	6	0
Registro Internacional Naval SA (RIN)	3	0
Registro Italiano Navale (RINA)	101	0
Romanian Naval Register (RNR)	1	0
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping (RMRS)	46	0
Ship Classification Society of Malaysia (SCM)	2	0
SingClass International Pte Ltd (SCI)	8	0
Sing-Lloyd (SGL)	17	0
Union Bureau of Shipping (UBS)	55	0
Universal Maritime Bureau Ltd (UMB)	19	0
Viet Nam Register (VR)	78	0
no class	197	0
withdrawn	1	0
TOTAL	6392	0

Table 8 indicates the number of inspections and detention per Recognised Organisation (RO). As can be seen no ROs were found to be responsible for detentions during the CIC, a result that was to be expected given the limited focus of the CIC Questionnaire.

3.9 Ship age overview

Table 9 - Ship age overview

SHIP AGE (YEARS)	# OF INDIVIDUAL SHIPS	# OF PSC INSPECTIONS	PSC DETENTIONS	DETENTION AS A % OF INSPECTIONS	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED	DETENTIONS CIC-TOPIC RELATED AS A % OF INSPECTIONS
0-5	2041	2041	33	1.6	3	0.15
6-10	1893	1892	65	3.4	6	0.32
11-15	764	764	26	3.4	1	0.13
16-20	858	858	28	3.3	1	0.12
21-24	339	339	23	6.8	3	0.88
25-29	302	302	14	4.6	1	0.33
30-34	154	154	14	9.1	1	0.65
35+	41	41	3	7.3	0	0.00
Total	6392	6392	206	3.2	16	0.25

Table 9 reports on the number of CIC inspections within identifiable ship age groupings. The data indicates that the rate of detention is variable across all age groups (when assessed across group sample sizes), serving to confirm the operational and managerial aspects, vice material aspects, of the CIC.

It is interesting to note that relatively new ships (6-10 years old) have recorded the larger percentage of CIC related detentions (as a percentage), potentially indicating a relativistic drop in managerial focus as ships lose their 'new car smell' and commence routine work along well established shipping routes. When sample sizes are again taken into account, the detention percentage would again seem to drop as ship age increases, potentially as a result of greater managerial emphasis and oversight being placed on maintaining operational performance as ship's age.

3.10 PSC Region CIC Comparison

Table 10 – Comparison of CIC results with other participants

	TOKYO MOU	BLACK SEA MOU	INDIAN OCEAN MOU	LATIN AMERICAN AGREEMENT	MED MOU	PARIS MOU
# PSC Inspections	8182	1319	1623	1824	1269	4419
Total PSC Detentions	276	28	117	19	81	139
PSC Detention %	3.37	2.12	7.21	1.04	6.38	3.15
# CIC Inspections	6392	1146	1259	1762	930	4041
# CIC-associated PSC Detentions	206	21	117	19	64	117
CIC-associated PSC Detention %	3.22	1.83	9.29	1.08	6.88	2.90
# Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies	16	6	35	1	28	16
Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies % of inspections	0.25	0.52	2.78	0.06	3.01	0.40
Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies % of detentions	7.77	28.57	29.91	5.26	43.75	13.68

Table 10 indicates overall CIC results by PSC region.

A total of 18636 PSC inspections were conducted by all participating PSC regions during the CIC, with the TMOU completing 43.9% of all inspections and recording the highest number of detentions with CIC related deficiencies (206). Statistically this TMOU result compares well with the PMOU results, inferring that the two regions are applying PSC inspection criteria in a consistent manner.

A total of 15530 CIC Inspections were completed, with the IOMOU recording the highest percentage of CIC related deficiencies and detentions.

Annex 1 CIC Questionnaire

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
ON PORT STATE CONTROL
IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION



CONCENTRATED INSPECTION CAMPAIGN
ON STCW HOURS OF REST
01/09/2014 to 30/11/2014

CIC ON STCW HOURS OF REST

Inspection Authority			
Ship Name		IMO Number	
Date of Inspection		Inspection Port	

Qu AREA
No.

YES NO N/A

1	Is a watch schedule posted in an easily accessible area? STCW Section A- VIII/1 (5). Def code: 01306			
2*	Is the ship manned in accordance with MSMD or an equivalent document? SOLAS 1999/2000 Amend / Chapter V Reg. 14. Def code: 01209			
3	Are there records of daily hours of rest for each watchkeeper? STCW Section A-VIII/1 (7). Def code: 01308			
4	Have the records in Qu 3 been endorsed by an appropriate person? STCW Section A-VIII/1 (7). Def code: 01308			
5	Are records related to hours of rest being recorded correctly? STCW Section A-VIII/1 (7). Def code: 01308			
6	Do rest periods for all watchkeeping personnel comply with STCW requirements, including the weekly requirements of rest? STCW Section A- VIII/1 (2). Def code: 01307			
7**	Will the watchkeepers on the first and subsequent watch after departure have sufficient time to rest? STCW Regl/4 or STCW Reg VIII/1.1.2. Def code: 09235			
8	Is there evidence that on-call seafarers receive adequate compensatory rest periods if disturbed by call-outs to work? STCW A-VIII/1.6. Def code: 09235			
9	Do the records indicate that a bridge lookout is being maintained? STCW Section A-VIII/ 4-1 (14). Def code: 01306			
10	Was the ship detained as a result of this CIC?			

	These questions for information only:			
11	Is there a two watch system on board including the master?			
12	Does the MSMD require an Engineer Officer?			
13	Is the ship designated UMS?			
14	If ship does not have UMS notation, is there more than one certificated engineer on board?			

Any question answered with a "NO" MUST be accompanied by a relevant deficiency on the Report of Inspection. Deficiency codes and convention references are given for each question where appropriate.

Questions marked either * or ** answered with a "NO" may give clear grounds for a detention.

* If the actual crew number or composition is not brought in accordance with the minimum safe manning document or the flag State does not advise that the ship may sail, the ship may be considered for detention.

** If the PSCO determines that a watchkeeper due to take the first or relieving watch at the commencement of a voyage has not had, or will not have, the minimum rest periods required in STCW then the PSCO should consider detention of the vessel until such time as those rest periods have been taken.