

**Report of the 2024 Concentrated Inspection Campaign
(CIC) on Crew Wages and Seafarer Employment
Agreement (MLC, 2006)**



November 2025

CIC on Crew Wages and Seafarer Employment Agreement (MLC, 2006)

Executive Summary

A Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on compliance with some provisions MLC, 2006 was carried out jointly by the Paris MoU and Tokyo MOU during the period from 1st September 2024 to 30th November 2024.

The purpose of the CIC was to assess seafarers' employment conditions under the MLC, 2006 Convention on board ships of various flag States, ensuring their contracts (Seafarer Employ Agreements (SEAs)) comply with MLC, 2006 provisions. It also aimed to verify that seafarers receive appropriate wages, that shipowners provide financial security for compensation in the event of death, disability, or repatriation, and to raise awareness among shipowners, operators, and seafarers of the specific requirements of the CIC.

A CIC questionnaire and guidance were developed by the Tokyo MOU in collaboration with the Paris MoU. The questionnaire consisted of 10 questions to be answered by Port State Control Officers (PSCOs) when conducting a port State control (PSC) inspection during the CIC period.

The questionnaire was completed on a total of 6,580 ships, given that the CIC was conducted on all ships targeted for inspection within the Tokyo MOU region during the relevant period, but only one CIC report was required per ship in case of multiple inspections.

Overall, the results show a high level of effective implementation of the MLC, 2006 provisions on which the CIC focused. A total of 21 ships out of the total of 6580 ships (0.32%) were detained for at least one CIC-related topic detainable deficiency.

However, in comparison to the same period of the previous year (Sep-Nov 2023), for deficiencies that would have been related to the CIC-questionnaire, the deficiency rate and detention rate increased significantly over the CIC period. Rates of non-compliance during the CIC period were ~400% higher for the rate of deficiencies issued (12% vs 2.7%), as well as the proportion of detainable deficiencies issued for CIC-related topics (0.6% vs. 0.15%).

Table of Contents

CIC on on Crew Wages and Seafarer Employment Agreement (MLC, 2006).....	1
Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	3
1.1 Purpose of this Report	3
1.2 Objective of the CIC	3
1.3 Scope of the CIC	3
1.4 General Remarks	3
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations.....	4
2.1 Summary	4
2.2 Conclusions.....	5
2.3 Recommendations	6
CIC Questionnaire Results	7
3.1 Analysis	7
3.1.1 Response to CIC questionnaire	7
3.1.2 Analysis of answers to questionnaire in relation to detention	9
3.1.3 Analysis of CIC-topic related deficiencies (ISM related deficiencies)	9
3.1.4 Number of inspections in CIC.....	10
3.1.5 Specification of CIC-topic related deficiencies	11
3.1.6 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile	12
3.1.7 Number of inspected ships and detentions per ship type	13
3.1.8 Inspections and detentions per flag State.....	15
3.1.9 Ship age overview	15
Annex 1	16
Annex 1.1 Inspection form for the CIC.....	16
Annex 1.2 Inspections and detentions per flag State (Table Annex 1.2)	17

Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is to present the results of the Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (MLC, 2006) conducted by member Authorities of the Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control in the Asia-Pacific Region (Tokyo MOU).

The CIC questions provided to inspectors are available in Annex 1.1.

1.2 Objective of the CIC

The objective of the CIC was to:

- have a better understanding of the employment conditions of seafarers for each party to the Convention and on board ships of various flags, as well as checking the arrangements made by the shipping company in the fulfilment of their obligations;
- confirm that the SEAs and employment conditions are in conformity with the relevant provisions of MLC, 2006 and the applicable requirements of the flag State;
- confirm that seafarers serving on board receive payments in accordance with their SEAs, collective bargaining agreements and with the MLC, 2006;
- confirm that the shipowners hold the appropriate instruments of financial security for compensation of seafarer death and long term disability, as well as for repatriation of the seafarers; and
- raise awareness of shipowners, operators and seafarers on the specific requirements that the CIC will address.

1.3 Scope of the CIC

The CIC was undertaken on ships targeted for Port State Control (PSC) inspection under the Tokyo MOU NIR within the Tokyo MOU region from 1st September to 30th November 2024. Ships subject to multiple PSC inspections during this time period had the CIC questionnaire completed only once.

1.4 General Remarks

1.4.1 Due to the variety of data collected during a PSC inspection, several measures can be made as to the performance of the ship during the inspection. This includes number of deficiencies, number of deficiencies recorded as detainable (Tokyo MOU action code 30), and whether the ship was detained.

1.4.2 When a CIC questionnaire was completed, additional information is available. This includes the number of questions where a “No” response was recorded, indicating unsatisfactory performance for that CIC question. A completed CIC questionnaire can also indicate whether a “No” response resulted in a detention. CIC related detention numbers are derived from this information.

1.4.3 For the purpose of this report, a detention is an inspection containing at least one deficiency that is considered grounds for detention.

1.4.4 The tables do not consider inspections where the CIC questionnaire was not recorded, with exception of table 2.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

2.1 Summary

2.1.1 The decision to carry out a joint Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) with Tokyo MOU on compliance with MLC, 2006 was taken by Paris MoU Port State Control Committee.

2.1.2 Between 1st September and 30th November 2024, Tokyo MOU member Authorities conducted 8,143 port State control (PSC) inspections on 7,561 individual ships. Of these, 6,580 include completion of a Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) questionnaire examining the ship's compliance with MLC, 2006.

2.1.3 The following summarizes the results of the CIC:

- The highest compliance was generally observed in relation to wage payments (Questions 6-9), where over 99% of the responses were ‘yes’. The second highest compliance was related to Question 3 on whether the seafarers employment agreement and collective bargaining agreement were available in English, where 99.5% responded ‘yes’.
- Compliance on this subject was higher than any CIC completed since 2017, with a 98.85% compliance rate observed for individual questions where an answer was provided.
- The least compliance was noted concerning Question 2, whether the seafarer is able to access information regarding their employment conditions on board, where 3.4% of the responses were ‘no’. The second least compliance related to Question 1 on whether the seafarer was given a SEA signed by both the seafarer and the ship-owner or a representative of the ship-owner, where 2.1% of the responses were ‘no’.
- The overall detention rate based on total CIC inspections was 0.32%.
- Most ships with deficiencies marked as grounds for detention were in the High Risk

Ships category (13/21), or 61% of all detentions).

- By ship type, General cargo/multipurpose ships and Bulk carriers accounted for 55% of all CIC-topic detentions (5 and 6 detentions, respectively) followed by Container ships (3) and Oil tankers (3).
- Ship age did not have a strong correlation with the rate of CIC-topic detentions but did trend up with ship age.
- The highest number of unsatisfactory answers was found on ships flagged to Panama, Liberia and Marshall Islands, consistent with the high number of inspections from these flag States.
- Most flag States which had CIC topic detention were on the Tokyo MOU white list¹.

2.2 Conclusions

2.2.1 The results show a generally high rate of compliance.

2.2.2 While there was generally high compliance with the MLC, 2006, the outcome of the CIC indicates there is still areas for improvement, particularly around the Seafarers' Employment Agreement (SEA). It recommended that vessel owners and operators pay greater attention to compliance with the requirements of the MLC, 2006 when establishing and monitoring compliance with seafarers' employment contracts.

2.2.3 In addition, when comparing the outcome of the CIC with the PSC data for the previous 3 years, it is noted there was a significant difference in deficiency rate between the previous 3 years and the CIC period for almost every question, particularly for those related to SEAs. The rate of deficiencies issued related to the CIC topic during the 3 month period was similar to (or exceeded) the previous 3 year (years affected by COVID-19 excluded) totals of deficiencies issued, an effective 4-fold increase in deficiency rates during the CIC period.

2.2.4 Given that MLC, 2006 is an administrative mechanism which is intended to ensure that seafarers are afforded their minimum rights, the comparison between the CIC results and the past three years is concerning. Unlike previous technical campaign topics, where non-compliance may result from unforeseen machinery failures, non-compliance in this case is more likely due to a lack of operator oversight, failures within operators' systems, or even willful or negligent non-compliance.

2.2.5 Other avenues of analysis did not show any strong correlations or unexpected patterns of non-compliance.

2.2.6 It was noted that through the drafting discussion and experiences of PSCOs, that this CIC was difficult to achieve in the 1-hour time limitation. Furthermore, due to this time

¹ From 1 July 2025, the terminology used will be 'low', 'medium' and 'high performance, instead of 'black', 'grey' and 'white'.

restriction, Question 6 (regarding payment of seafarers in accordance with their SEA) was limited to a spot check. This concession was made due to vigorous discussions at the drafting stage between MOUs, noting the difficulty in a full accounting of all due wages within the allowable time (one hour).

2.2.7 It is also noted that a full accounting of all due wages in accordance with the Seafarers' Employment Agreement (SEA) for all seafarers is an exhaustive process involving cross-checking ship's movements, work-rest hours, and non-routine duties, with SEAs, overtime calculations, and detailed pay slips that conclusively demonstrate a full wage payment. Additionally, Standard A2-1.4 requires the member State to enact laws specifying matters to be captured in the SEA provided that the SEA contains at least the items described in Standard A2-1.4. However, as there are typically a variety of different SEAs for seafarers of different nationalities, combined with no standard mechanism for full accounting of wage payments, achieving a full compliance check of all wages due for all seafarers is in most cases was not feasible within the scope of a routine PSC inspection.

2.2.8 Due to the difficulties and challenges established in the above there is a high probability that non-compliance of payment of all due wages in accordance with the SEA would occur, and this may be more prevalent than was established during the CIC period.

2.3 Recommendations

2.3.1 The Tokyo MOU member Authorities continue, during normal PSC inspections, to put emphasis on the specific areas covered by the CIC that had the least satisfactory results – in particular seafarers being able to access their employment information on board, and seafarers having a signed and valid SEA.

2.3.2 Additionally, it is recommended that flag States and RO's establish and review an effective system for the inspection and certification of MLC, 2006, regulation 5.1.1.2, paying particular attention to the issues relating to SEAs and crew wages raised in this report, and include such information in the Member reports to the International Labour Office in accordance with MLC, 2006, regulation 5.1.1.5.

2.3.3 Finally, vessel owners and operators should pay close attention towards compliance with the requirements of MLC, 2006 when establishing and monitoring compliance with seafarers' employment contracts, especially with regard to compliance of full wage payments of seafarers, in accordance with their SEAs and MLC, 2006.

CIC Questionnaire Results

3.1 Analysis

3.1.1 Response to CIC questionnaire

(Table 1 – on following page)

Table 1: Response to CIC questionnaire

Question Number	CIC Question	YES		NO		N/A		Detained ³	
		#	% ¹	#	% ¹	#	% ²	#	% ²
Q1*	Is the seafarer given a SEA signed by both the seafarer and the ship-owner or a representative of the ship-owner?	6434	97.9%	136	2.1%	11	0.2%	10	0.15%
Q2*	Is the seafarer able to access information regarding their employment conditions on board?	6344	96.6%	222	3.4%	14	0.2%	5	0.08%
Q3	Are standard form of seafarers' employment agreements and parts of any applicable collective bargaining agreements subject to port State control under Reg.5.2, available in English?	6515	99.5%	30	0.5%	35	0.5%	0	0.00%
Q4*	Does the seafarers' employment agreement include all the required elements specified in the MLC, 2006?	6465	98.5%	100	1.5%	15	0.2%	4	0.06%
Q5*	Do particulars included in the seafarers' employment agreement comply with MLC, 2006 requirements?	6469	98.6%	92	1.4%	19	0.3%	4	0.06%
Q6*	Are wage or salary payments made to the seafarer at no greater than monthly intervals?	6506	99.6%	26	0.4%	48	0.7%	3	0.05%
Q7*	Have seafarers been given a status of accounts and wages paid on at least a monthly basis?	6476	99.2%	54	0.8%	50	0.8%	2	0.03%
Q8*	Are wage or salary payments in accordance with any applicable CBA or SEA?	6469	99.1%	61	0.9%	50	0.8%	5	0.08%
Q9*	If payments made to a seafarer include deductions, are they in accordance to the MLC, 2006?	6272	99.9%	8	0.1%	300	4.6%	0	0.00%
Q10a*	Is a certificate or documentary evidence of financial security, issued by the financial security provider, available on board in the event of compensation for death and long-term disability?	4873	99.4%	28	0.6%	1679	25.5%	0	0.00%
Q10b*	Is a certificate or documentary evidence of financial security, issued by the financial security provider, available on board in the event of the repatriation?	4866	99.3%	33	0.7%	1681	25.5%	0	0.00%

* 'If the answer to this question is 'NO' the ship may be considered for detention. The details of any detention should be appropriately entered on the PSC report B.

(1) The percentages are calculated using the total number of inspections where the answer was "YES" or "NO" only (excludes N/A).

(2) The percentages are calculated using the total number of inspections (includes N/A).

(3) Note that some ships were detained due to unsatisfactory results on multiple CIC questions. Total ships detained = 20.

During the period of the CIC a total of 8,143 port State control inspections were conducted by Tokyo MOU member Authorities. Of these, 6,580 (81%) inspections included completion of the CIC questionnaire. From these 6,580 inspections there were 790 questions with an answer of “No”, indicating unsatisfactory performance by the ship in relation to that question. Excluding the 3,902 “Not Applicable*” answers given, this gives an unsatisfactory answer rate of approximately 1.15%. This is a lower rate than any CIC since 2017, although very similar to the results on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping (STCW) in 2022.

The largest number of unsatisfactory results was for question 2 “Is the seafarer able to access information regarding their employment conditions on board?”, followed by question 1 “Is the seafarer given a SEA signed by both the seafarer and the ship-owner or a representative of the ship-owner?”.

*Question 10a and 10b included a significant number of “Not Applicable” answers, which as detailed above were not included in calculating compliance rates. This is a result of port States who were not yet applying the 2022 Amendments to MLC, 2006, as the CIC was run prior to full implementation of these amendments.

3.1.2 Analysis of answers to questionnaire in relation to detention

As detailed in Annex 1 and Annex 1.1, all questions except Q3 could be considered grounds for detention if a “No” answer was recorded. Of these 790 unsatisfactory answers, 33 resulted in the detention of the ship. However, due to some detentions being due to multiples unsatisfactory answers this resulted in a total of 21 ship detentions or 0.32% of CIC inspections. This was 9.3% of total detentions from these 6580 PSC inspections.

Questions 1 resulted in the largest number of detentions, followed by questions 2 and 8.

3.1.3 Analysis of CIC-topic related deficiencies (ISM related deficiencies)

No CIC topic-related deficiencies were also ISM-related deficiencies. As the CIC was intended to focus specifically on the aspects related to MLC, 2006, the CIC guidance did not include instructions to specify when deficiencies were ISM related.

3.1.4 Number of inspections in CIC

(Table 2)

Table 2: Number of inspections and number of ships in CIC

	Inspections Performed with a CIC Questionnaire	Inspections without a CIC Questionnaire
Total	6,580	1,563
Detentions	225	74
Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies*	61	10
Detentions with CIC-topic related deficiencies indicated as grounds for detentions	30	3
Detentions with unsatisfactory CIC questionnaire answers indicated as grounds for detention	21	0

* Includes detention of any CIC-related deficiency, whether they were indicated as grounds for detention or not.

3.1.5 Specification of CIC-topic related deficiencies

(Table 3)

Table 3: Specification of CIC-topic related deficiencies

CIC-Topic Related Deficiencies			Number of inspections with this deficiency ¹	Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention ¹	Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention and RO related
Deficiency		Convention			
01139	Maritime Labour Certificate	MLC 2006	102	1	0
01140	Declaration of Maritime Labour Compliance (part I and II)	MLC 2006, Std.A5.1.3.12	116	2	0
01220	Seafarers' employment agreement (SEA)	MLC 2006, Std.A2	364	22	0
01331	Collective bargaining agreement	MLC 2006, Std.A2.1	43	1	0
01336	Certificate or documentary evidence of financial security for repatriation	MLC 2006, Std.A2.5.2.7	39	0	0
01337	Certificate or documentary evidence of financial security relating to shipowners liability	MLC 2006, Std.A4.2.1.11	33	0	0
18203	Wages	MLC 2006, Std.A2.2	126	8	0
18204	Non- payment of wages	MLC 2006, Std.A2.2	25	3	0
18205	Measures to ensure transmission to seafarer's family	MLC 2006, Std.A2.2	2	0	0
Grand total			850	36	0

(1) One inspection can have multiple deficiencies. One inspection can also have the same deficiency code recorded multiple times.

As shown in Table 3, the most common CIC related deficiency was “01220 – Seafarers’ employment agreement (SEA)”. This deficiency was also the most frequently recorded as grounds for detention (Tokyo MOU PSC Action Code “30” or “46”).

Note that while 36 deficiencies were raised at least once in an inspection as grounds for detention, due to inspections with multiple deficiencies this was from only 29 inspections. Additionally, 21 CIC inspections had unsatisfactory responses recorded as resulting in a detention.

Note that as shown later in Table 4 a total of 903 CIC related deficiencies were recorded during inspections with a CIC questionnaire also completed. As per note (1) this higher number of deficiencies than inspections is due to some inspections having the same deficiency recorded multiple times.

3.1.6 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

(Table 4)

Table 4: Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

Ship Risk Profile	Individual Ships With PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Responses	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²
HRS	3192	3192	2437	431	481	13 (0.53%)
SRS	3953	3953	3316	320	367	7 (0.21%)
LRS	990	990	827	48	56	1 (0.12%)
Unknown	8	8	0	0	0	0 (0.00%)
Total	8143	8143	6580	306	903	21 (0.32%)

(1) Only from inspections where a CIC questionnaire was completed

(2) From CIC questionnaire detentions

The number and outcome of inspections per Ship Risk Profile (SRP) category is presented in Table 4. The results are consistent with what would be expected, with unsatisfactory answer, deficiency, and detention rates highest for ships classified as High Risk Ships (HRS), followed by Standard Risk Ships (SRS), and then Low Risk Ships (LRS).

3.1.7 Number of inspected ships and detentions per ship type

Table 5: Number of inspected ships and detentions per ship type

Ship Type	Individual Ships with PSC	PSC Inspections	PSC Detentions	CIC Inspections	CIC Unsatisfactory Responses	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²	CIC Related Detentions (%) ²
Bulk Carrier	3315	3343	128	2720	259	306	6	0.22%
Chemical Tanker	98	103	2	82	6	8	0	0.00%
Combination Carrier	3	4	1	3	0	1	0	0.00%
Commercial Yacht	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Container Ship	1430	1519	40	1261	148	167	3	0.24%
Fish Factory	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	0.00%
Gas Carrier	201	207	9	176	26	27	1	0.57%
General Cargo/Multipurpose	1153	1340	72	1052	203	226	5	0.48%
Heavy Load	18	18	0	16	3	5	0	0.00%
High Speed Passenger	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0.00%
Livestock Carrier	4	5	0	4	0	0	0	0.00%
NLS Tanker	5	5	1	4	0	0	0	0.00%
Offshore Supply	24	24	0	21	7	6	0	0.00%
Oil Tanker	403	407	20	339	32	37	3	0.88%
Oil Tanker/Chemical Tanker	540	565	7	457	47	56	1	0.22%
Other Special Activities	57	59	3	39	6	8	0	0.00%
Passenger Ship	74	83	2	49	7	9	1	2.04%
Refrigerated Cargo	92	94	2	70	9	10	1	1.43%
Ro-Ro Cargo	30	35	4	27	13	11	0	0.00%
Ro-Ro Passenger Ship	15	21	0	14	7	7	0	0.00%
Special Purpose Ship	8	11	0	3	0	1	0	0.00%
Tug	37	38	1	22	6	6	0	0.00%
Vehicle Carrier	179	184	4	157	9	10	0	0.00%
Woodchip Carrier	65	68	3	63	2	3	0	0.00%
Total	7561	8143	298	6581	789	903	20	0.30%

- (1) Only from inspections where a CIC questionnaire was completed*
- (2) From CIC questionnaire detentions*

As detailed in Table 5, the most common ship types inspected during the campaign timeframe were bulk carriers, container ships, general cargo/multipurpose, and oil tanker/chemical tankers. These ship types also had the highest number detentions, unsatisfactory CIC responses, and of CIC related detentions.

The vessel types with the highest rates of unsatisfactory CIC responses were Ro-Ro passenger ships and Ro-Ro cargo ships. General cargo/multipurpose ships had the highest rate of unsatisfactory CIC responses amongst ship types with more than 50 inspections completed.

3.1.8 Inspections and detentions per flag State

(Ref: Annex 1.2 for flag State table)

Refer to Annex 1.2 for details per flag State of PSC inspections, CIC inspections, unsatisfactory CIC responses, CIC related deficiency, and CIC related detentions.

The flag States with the largest number of unsatisfactory CIC responses and the largest number of CIC related deficiencies are the flag States that had the largest number of inspections.

Flag States with a current WGB status of “Black” had a higher rate of unsatisfactory CIC responses and CIC related deficiencies.

3.1.9 Ship age overview

(Table 6)

Table 6: Ship age overview

Ship Age	Individual Ships with PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	PSC Detentions	CIC Inspections	CIC Deficiencies ⁽¹⁾	CIC Related Detentions
0 - 6	1018	1062	18	892	116	2
7 - 12	1752	1822	33	1498	155	3
13 - 18	2768	3020	115	2436	327	7
19 - 24	1290	1426	74	1133	173	4
25 - 30	562	628	44	492	88	3
31 - 35	111	124	9	85	31	1
Over 35	60	62	5	45	14	1
Total	7561	8143	298	6580	903	21

(1) Only from inspections where a CIC questionnaire was completed

(2) From CIC questionnaire detentions

As detailed in Table 6, the 13-18 year ship age group had the largest number of PSC detentions, CIC related deficiencies, and CIC related detentions.

However, the highest rate per inspection of PSC detentions, CIC related deficiencies, and CIC related detentions was the over 35 year ship age group, followed by 31 – 35 year age group, then the 25 – 30 year age group.

Annex 1

Annex 1.1 Inspection form for the CIC

Questionnaire format for a Concentrated Inspection Campaign

Ship's name	
IMO No.	
Date of Inspection	

QUESTIONS 1 TO 10 ANSWERED WITH A "NO" MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY A RELEVANT DEFICIENCY ON THE REPORT OF INSPECTION.

No.	Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Detention
1*	Is the seafarer given a SEA signed by both the seafarer and the shipowner or a representative of the shipowner?				
2*	Is the seafarer able to access information regarding their employment conditions on board?				
3	Are standard form of seafarers' employment agreements and parts of any applicable collective bargaining agreements subject to port State control under Reg.5.2, available in English?				
4*	Does the seafarers' employment agreement include all the required elements specified in the MLC, 2006?				
5*	Do particulars included in the seafarers' employment agreement comply with MLC, 2006 requirements?				
6*	Are wage or salary payments made to the seafarer at no greater than monthly intervals?				
7*	Have seafarers been given a status of accounts and wages paid on at least a monthly basis?				
8*	Are wage or salary payments in accordance with any applicable CBA or SEA?				
9*	If payments made to a seafarer include deductions, are they in accordance to the MLC, 2006?				
10a*	Is a certificate or documentary evidence of financial security, issued by the financial security provider, available on board in the event of compensation for death and long-term disability?				
10b*	Is a certificate or documentary evidence of financial security, issued by the financial security provider, available on board in the event of the repatriation?				

If the "No" is ticked off for questions with an "*" the ship may be considered for detention.

Annex 1.2 Inspections and detentions per flag State (Table Annex 1.2)

Table Annex 1.2 Inspections and detentions per flag State

Flag	Total PSC Inspections	Inspections with CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Responses	CIC Related Deficiencies	CIC Related Detentions ¹	Current position on WGB list
Antigua and Barbuda	62	49	4	5	0	Grey
Argentina	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Australia	2	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Bahamas	147	121	10	10	0	White
Bangladesh	41	31	5	6	0	White
Barbados	25	21	3	3	1	Grey
Belgium	8	3	0	0	0	Grey
Belize	244	179	37	52	0	Black
Bermuda (UK)	7	6	0	0	0	White
Brunei Darussalam	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Bulgaria	1	0	0	0	0	Not listed
Cameroon	19	11	4	5	0	Black
Cayman Islands (UK)	6	5	0	0	0	White
Chile	2	0	0	0	0	Not listed
China	271	236	17	20	0	White
Comoros	18	9	0	2	0	Grey
Cook Islands	8	5	4	4	1	Black
Croatia	3	2	0	0	0	Grey
Curacao	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Cyprus	107	87	4	5	0	White
Denmark	60	44	2	3	0	White
Djibouti	3	2	0	0	0	Not listed
Dominica	2	1	0	0	0	Black
Ecuador	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Eswatini	3	3	0	0	0	Not listed
Ethiopia	2	2	0	0	0	Not listed
Faroe Islands	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Fiji	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
France	17	15	1	1	0	White

Flag	Total PSC Inspections	Inspections with CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Responses	CIC Related Deficiencies	CIC Related Detentions ¹	Current position on WGB list
Gabon	16	16	1	3	0	Not listed
Gambia	1	1	0	0	0	Black
Germany	13	12	1	2	0	White
Gibraltar (UK)	3	3	0	0	0	Grey
Greece	50	44	5	5	0	White
Guinea	1	0	0	0	0	Not listed
Guinea-Bissau	6	6	1	1	0	Not listed
Guyana	4	3	1	1	0	Not listed
Honduras	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Hong Kong, China	662	560	36	41	0	White
India	20	17	0	1	0	Grey
Indonesia	49	27	2	3	0	White
Iran, Islamic Republic of	5	5	1	1	0	Grey
Isle of Man (UK)	27	24	3	3	0	White
Italy	10	10	1	1	0	Grey
Jamaica	8	8	1	1	0	Grey
Japan	37	33	7	7	0	White
Kiribati	3	2	0	0	0	Grey
Korea, Republic of	252	215	28	31	0	White
Kuwait	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Liberia	1143	928	98	115	3	White
Luxembourg	6	5	0	0	0	Grey
Malaysia	37	31	3	3	0	White
Malta	218	169	10	12	1	White
Marshall Islands	802	643	69	86	2	White
Mongolia	29	12	13	12	3	Black
Netherlands	33	22	1	4	0	Grey
Niue	2	1	1	1	0	White
Norway	73	60	9	10	1	White
Pakistan	2	2	1	2	0	Not listed
Palau	36	23	9	11	0	Black
Panama	2217	1812	242	299	11	White

Flag	Total PSC Inspections	Inspections with CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Responses	CIC Related Deficiencies	CIC Related Detentions ¹	Current position on WGB list
Papua New Guinea	1	0	0	0	0	Not listed
Peru	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Philippines	48	41	3	5	0	White
Portugal	84	64	8	11	0	White
Qatar	1	1	0	0	0	Not listed
Russian Federation	37	34	10	10	1	Grey
Saint Kitts and Nevis	5	4	0	0	0	Black
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	4	3	1	1	0	Grey
San Marino	4	4	0	0	0	Not listed
Sao Tome and Principe	23	10	7	12	0	Not listed
Saudi Arabia	5	5	0	0	0	White
Seychelles	1	0	0	0	0	Not listed
Sierra Leone	104	68	20	31	0	Black
Singapore	539	444	43	55	1	White
Saint Maarten	3	3	1	2	1	Not listed
Sri Lanka	4	4	1	1	0	Not listed
Sweden	3	2	0	0	0	Grey
Switzerland	2	2	0	0	0	Grey
Taiwan, China	24	21	0	0	0	White
Tanzania, United Republic of	35	14	16	16	2	Black
Thailand	56	49	0	2	0	White
Togo	33	25	28	28	2	Black
Türkiye	4	4	0	1	0	White
Tuvalu	20	14	1	1	0	White
Ukraine	4	4	0	0	0	Not listed
United Kingdom	35	29	5	5	0	White
United States	15	15	0	0	0	Grey
Vanuatu	7	3	0	0	0	Grey
Vietnam	211	178	11	19	0	White

(1) *From CIC questionnaire detentions*

Note: The official BGW-list of Tokyo MOU is published in the Annual Report. The scope of this table is only the CIC.
