

**Report of the 2025 Concentrated Inspection Campaign
(CIC) on Ballast Water Management Convention (BWMC)
2004**



October 2026

CIC on on Ballast Water Management Convention (BWMC, 2004) 2025

Executive Summary

A Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on compliance with selected provisions of the Ballast Water Management Convention (BWMC), 2004 was carried out jointly by the Paris MoU and Tokyo MOU during the period 1st September 2025 to 30th November 2025. During this period, Member Authorities focused on compliance with areas specified by the CIC during PSC inspections. This report documents the results of the campaign for the Maritime Authorities of the Tokyo MOU.

The purpose of the CIC was to determine if ships meet the mandatory requirements for Ballast Water Management (BWM) as prescribed in the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments, 2004 (BWMC). Taking into account that a CIC on this topic has never been carried out before, this 2025 campaign was initiated in order to promote the effective and consistent implementation of the BWM Convention.

Following the entry into force of the Convention, the Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC), through Resolution MEPC.290(71), established an Experience-Building Phase (EBP) to assess implementation challenges and technological developments related to the Ballast Water Management Convention.

At the time the Paris MoU and Tokyo MOU Members decided to conduct the CIC, their understanding was that the EBP would conclude in 2024. However, the EBP has since been extended and is now expected to run until 2026, with a full revision of the Convention anticipated to be completed by 2028.

The CIC sought to verify that ships have the proper certification for BWM Convention; approved and updated Ballast Water Management Plan (BWMP); crew familiarisation in the implementation of the BWMP; Ballast Water Management System (BWMS) approval and its operation; records of Ballast Water Record Book (BWRB); ballast water sediment management; and valid exemptions, if any granted.

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.

A total of 8,517 distinct ships and 9,244 distinct inspections were inspected during this period. During the campaign, 6,930 inspections included a CIC questionnaire. A further 2,314 inspections were conducted without one; however, 607 of those ships had already been inspected under the CIC. Therefore, 1,587 ships which received inspections during this period did not undergo any CIC inspection.

Within Tokyo MOU Members, China reported the highest number of CIC-related deficiencies, with 1,057 deficiencies identified during 2,262 CIC inspections. This was followed by the Republic of Korea, with 141 deficiencies issued during 427 CIC inspections, and Japan, with 125 deficiencies issued during 942 CIC inspections.

In terms of enforcement outcomes, China also reported the highest number of CIC-related detentions, with 22 detentions arising from CIC-related deficiencies, followed by the Republic of Korea (3 detentions) and the Russian Federation (3 detentions). The overall number of CIC-related detentions recorded during the campaign was 30, representing 0.43% of the 6,930 CIC inspections conducted.

Overall, the results show a high level of effective implementation of the BWMC, 2004 provisions on which the CIC focused. A total of 20 ships out of the total of 6,930¹ ships (0.29%) were detained where a specific CIC question was indicated as unsatisfactory and grounds for detention – these detentions were noted on the CIC form. In addition, 9 ships had a CIC topic-related deficiency leading to detention which was not recorded accordingly in the CIC form. Furthermore, there was 1 ship with a detention issued relating to Q7 of the CIC, for which there was no option to record the same in the CIC form. There were an additional 4 detentions, where inspections were carried out without a CIC questionnaire being submitted, but the detention was CIC topic-related deficiencies as grounds for detentions. Taking the above into account, the total of 30 ships out of the total of 6,930 ships (0.43%) were detained under this campaign. Finally, there was 94 detentions with CIC topic-related deficiencies² that include the aforementioned 30³ detained vessels.

Favourable responses for questions 1 to 9 of the CIC questionnaire (question 10 was not considered as it is not essentially on related to compliance) were high, with an average compliant outcome of 94.82%. Finally, there were 1,239 ships which were issued with CIC related deficiencies. As such, 81.99% of the ships that were inspected with a CIC questionnaire were issued with no deficiencies related to the CIC.

¹ Of this 6,930 ships, there was total of 184 ships that was detained during this CIC period.

² CIC topic-related deficiencies refer to deficiencies associated with Ballast Water Management Convention CIC Deficiency Codes (01136, 14801, 14806, 14812, 14811, 14813, 14802, 14805 and 14809).

³ For the purposes of this report a total of only 30 ship detentions (20 + 9 + 1) are considered for which CIC form was completed.

Table of Contents

CIC on on Ballast Water Management Convention (BWMC, 2004) 2025	1
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	4
1.1 Purpose of this Report	4
1.2 Objective of the CIC	4
1.3 Scope of the CIC	4
1.4 General Remarks	5
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	5
2.1 Summary	5
2.2 Conclusions	7
2.3 Recommendations	9
CIC Questionnaire Results	10
3.1 Analysis	10
3.1.1 Response to CIC questionnaire	10
3.1.2 Number of inspection and number of ships in CIC	13
3.1.3 Specification of CIC topic-related deficiencies	14
3.1.4 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile	15
3.1.6 Ship age overview	18
3.1.7 Inspections and detentions per Flag State	19
Annex Inspection form for the CIC	24

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 Ballast Water Management Convention 2004 (BWMC) conducted by Members to 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.

1.2 Objective of the CIC

1.2.1 The BWM Convention entered into force on 8 September 2017. The primary objective of this Convention is to combat the spread of invasive alien species and pathogens by mandating that ships effectively remove or neutralise any water-borne organisms and pathogens present in ballast water before its release elsewhere.

1.2.2 The BWM Convention serves as a vital tool in protecting marine ecosystems and reducing the ecological risks associated with ballast water discharge. It emphasizes the need for ships to employ approved Ballast Water Management Systems (BWMS) or alternative measures to achieve compliance with the Convention's standards.

1.2.3 There was a transitional period for full compliance, which has now been completed, and all ships should comply with the new standard by September 8, 2024. However, the Experience Building Phase (EBP) (Resolution MEPC.290(71)) has been extended and is now expected to run until 2026, with a full revision of the Convention anticipated to be completed by 2028.

1.2.4 A CIC on this topic had never been held, and in order to gather and analysis data for the EBP, a CIC on Ballast Water Management in 2025 was decided. The objective of the CIC was to promote implementation of the BWM Convention in an efficient and effective manner and to confirm if ships are equipped, managed, and operated in accordance with the standards established to prevent the spread of harmful aquatic organisms through ballast water discharge.

1.3 Scope of the CIC

1.3.1 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 2025 to 30th November 2025. Ships subject to multiple PSC inspections during this time period had the CIC questionnaire completed only once.

1.3.2 The CIC was aimed to verify that the ship has proper certification for BWM Convention; approved and updated Ballast Water Management Plan (BWMP); crew familiarisation in the implementation of the BWMP; Ballast Water Management System (BWMS) approval and its operation; records of Ballast Water Record Book (BWRB); ballast water sediment management; and valid exemptions, if any.

1.3.3 The inspection was performed in accordance with the relevant established Memorandum of Understanding's (MOU) procedures for the BWM Convention. The CIC does not affect the type of inspection to be conducted in accordance with the procedures. Rather, it consists of a series of questions to be answered in addition to the inspection. The CIC does not limit the PSCO during the regular inspection to check further compliance with all the relevant IMO instruments regarding safety and marine environment protection in general. When necessary, the PSCO was also provided with a guidance document with respect to how they will answer the CIC questions related to ballast water management.

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 For the purposes of this report, a total of 30 ships were detained for CIC-related deficiencies during the CIC period. This include 20 ships where a deficiency was recorded as "grounds for detention" on the CIC form, and 9 ships which had a CIC topic-related deficiency leading to detention, but was not recorded accordingly in the CIC form. In addition, 1 ship with detention issued relating to Q7 of the CIC for which there was no option to record the same in the CIC form was also included. 4 ships which were detained where inspections were carried out without a CIC questionnaire being submitted, but the detention was CIC topic- related deficiencies as grounds for detentions, were not considered.

1.4.3 These measures are used in different combinations depending on the format template as directed by MOU Standing Document No. 12, "POLICY ON CONCENTRATED INSPECTION CAMPAIGNS," or as appropriate to best describe the performance of inspected ships during the CIC time period. Notes indicating considerations for conditions or applicability of data for a particular column are provided where appropriate.

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 BWMC, 2004 was taken by Paris MoU and Tokyo MOU Port State Control Committee.

2.1.2 Between 1st September and 30th November 2025 Tokyo MOU Members conducted port State control (PSC) inspections on 8517 individual ships. Of these, 6,930 include completion of a Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) questionnaire examining the ship's compliance with the BWMC, 2004.

2.1.3 The following summarizes the results of the CIC:

- The highest compliance was generally observed in relation to having a valid International Ballast Water Management Certificate (IBWMC) on board, approved Ballast Water Management Plan (BWMP) on board, Ballast Water Management System (BWMS) approved by the Administration/Organization and the Ballast Water being managed according to the BWMP (Question 1,2,5 and 7) were over 97% of the responses were recorded as 'yes'.
- The second highest compliance was related to updated Ballast Water Management Plan (BWMP) to reflect the applicable requirements to manage Ballast Water as required by the Convention, BWMS operational, and officers and crew familiarity with their duties in the implementation of the BWMP (Question 3, 4 and 6) were over 94% of the responses were recorded as 'yes'.
- Compliance rate for the Ballast Water Record Book (BWRB) being properly filled, exemptions, and the crew management of sediments in ballast water tanks in accordance with the BWMP (Question 8 and 9) also received more than 87% of the responses recorded as 'yes'.
- The CIC also shows that Exemptions (Question 10) were granted to about 10.72%, or 743 of the ships inspected and issued with CIC. However, 697 such ships were also recorded to have been installed with BWMS. There seems to have been some errors or misunderstanding in recording of this portion of the CIC.
- A total of 20 ships out of the total of 6,930 ships (0.29%) were detained where a specific CIC question was indicated as unsatisfactory and grounds for detention – these detentions were noted on the CIC form. In addition, there were 9 ships which had CIC topic-related deficiency leading to detention and were not recorded accordingly in the CIC form. Furthermore, there was 1 ship with detention issued relating to Q7 of the CIC for which there was no option to record the same in the CIC form.
- It is also noted that, most of the detentions based on the CIC, were under the deficiency code 14811 (Q6 – Is the BWMS operational?) underscoring the fact that the operation and maintenance of BWMS onboard remains a critical area for the effective implementation of the intent of the Convention.
- Most ships with CIC topic-related deficiencies marked as grounds for detention

were in the High Risk category (26/30), or 86.6% of all detentions.

- By ship type, General Cargo/multipurpose ships accounted for 43.0% of all CIC-topic detentions (13 detentions) followed bulk carriers (4), Oil tankers (5), Gas carriers (3), Oil Chem (3), Container Ships and other special activities (1) each.
- Ship age did show a correlation with CIC-topic detention rate. Most of the detentions were recorded for ships aged between 19 – 24 years of age.
- The highest absolute number of CIC-related deficiencies was recorded on ships flagged to Panama (475), Liberia (234) and Marshall Islands (168). This reflects the high inspection exposure of these flag States during the campaign (i.e. 1,983, 1,279 and 923 respectively). When normalised against the number of inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire, the corresponding deficiency ratios were 23.95%, 24.42% and 24.59%, respectively.
- When applying a minimum threshold of at least 10 CIC inspections, the highest proportional occurrence of CIC-related deficiencies was observed for Saint Kitts and Nevis (70.0%), Togo (61.9%), Palau (55.81%), Comoros (53.84%) and Sierra Leone (39.65%).
- A total of 30 inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire resulted in detention where CIC-topic deficiencies were indicated as grounds for detention (0.43% of 6,930 CIC inspections). An additional 4 such detentions were recorded in inspections conducted without a CIC questionnaire. The majority of flag States associated with CIC-topic detentions were listed on the Tokyo MOU High Performance List⁴.

2.2 Conclusions

2.2.1 The 2025 CIC on BWMC, 2004 demonstrates that, overall, ships trading in the Tokyo MOU region show a generally high level of documentary compliance with the core requirements of the BWM Convention. Certificates and approved Ballast Water Management Plans were present and valid in the vast majority of cases, reflecting that the regulatory framework is widely recognized and formally implemented across the shipping industry. The relatively low CIC-related detention rate of 0.43% further indicates that most deficiencies identified were not of a nature serious enough to justify detention. The results show a generally high rate of compliance.

2.2.2 While there was generally high compliance with the BWMC 2004, the outcome of the CIC indicates that areas for improvement remain – particularly related to BWMS operation (deficiency code 14811), for which 279 inspections recorded this deficiency code, resulting in 19 detentions, and the presence of an approved BWMP on board (deficiency

⁴ From 1 July 2025, the terminology used is 'low', 'medium' and 'high performance, instead of 'black', 'grey' and 'white'.

code 14801), for which 287 inspections recorded this deficiency code, resulting in 6 detentions. Deficiencies related to records maintained within the BWRB (deficiency code 14802) were recorded on 646 inspections. This indicates that while ships may be appropriately certified, equipped with approved systems and plans, consistent and correct operation of BWMS and compliance with BWMP, and proper recordkeeping remains a practical challenge on board.

2.2.3 Operational shortcomings and crew familiar with their duties in the implementation of the BWMP pose significant risk to ensure the effective implementation of the primary objective of this Convention, which is to combat the spread of invasive alien species and pathogens, by mandating that ships effectively remove or neutralise any water-borne organisms and pathogens present in ballast water before its release elsewhere.

2.2.4 Exemptions were not applicable to most of the ships inspected (6185 ships were indicated as N/A in the CIC questionnaire) and only two deficiencies recorded related to conditions of exemption not complied with. However, there are 743 ships recorded as granted exemption under regulation A 4 of the BWMC, 2004. When checked at the IMO GISIS there were 70 ships recorded with exemptions under Regulation A4 of the BWMC and none of these ships were inspected during the CIC. It is likely that there may have been some misunderstanding regarding the requirement of this question in the CIC questionnaire by the PSCO. Alternatively, it is also likely that administrations are not reporting the exemptions to IMO GISIS as required under regulation A4 of the BWMC, 2004.

2.2.5 Data trends related to ship type, age, and risk profile indicate that compliance challenges are not evenly distributed. General cargo/multipurpose ships and bulk carriers accounted for largest proportion of detentions, and vessels above 12 years of age showed the highest number of detentions. Detentions were also the highest for High-Risk Ships, while Standard Risk Profile ships represented the largest portion of deficiencies, highlighting that compliance improvement efforts should not focus solely on traditionally higher-risk categories.

2.2.6 These results must be interpreted against the backdrop of the ongoing EBP. Given that the BWM Convention operates within a developmental framework where practical knowledge and technological capabilities are still being refined, disparities in equipment effectiveness, personnel competency, and procedural execution are naturally occurring. The prolonged EBP period reflects the reality that regulatory bodies and maritime operators continue to navigate emerging technical specifications and operational insights, thereby contributing to the persistent compliance issues documented throughout this campaign initiative.

2.2.7 It is to be noted that as part of this CIC no ballast water sample was tested to measure the efficacy of the BWMS meeting the performance standard of the BWMC, 2004. Recognising that most of the outcome of the CIC indicates there are still that areas for improvement remain – particularly related to BWMS operation (deficiency code 14811), a future CIC may be considered on sample and analysis of ballast water.

2.2.8 In summary, the CIC demonstrates that while the basic framework for BWM compliance has been established, the shift from regulatory adherence to reliable practical application aboard vessels continues to evolve. Key priorities for advancing the Convention's environmental goals include enhancing crew competency programmes, and boosting the operational dependability of BWMS technology. Sustained collaboration among flag authorities, port authorities, equipment suppliers, and vessel operators will prove vital in ensuring that regulatory conformity delivers tangible safeguards to meet the primary objective of the BWMC.

2.3 Recommendations

2.3.1 The CIC findings reveal that although BWMS are typically fitted and paperwork is mostly complete, the main deficiencies lie in system functionality and crew competence. Industry efforts must continue to pivot from achieving theoretical compliance to delivering practical effectiveness. Ship owners, operators, managers, and training organisations need to prioritise hands-on, equipment-specific crew education, especially regarding system operation, fault diagnosis, and emergency procedures for BWMS. Furthermore, enhanced preventive maintenance schedules and performance tracking protocols are essential to minimise operational breakdowns.

2.3.2 The CIC findings also indicate that PSCO's should also be properly trained for consistent implementation of not only the BWMC but also CIC. Inspections without CIC should be reduced as far as practical for ships that did not undergo at least 1 CIC during the period. During this campaign there were 1587 ships of the 8517 ships inspected without a CIC questionnaire, a lost opportunity for data collection and analysis. To this effect, the secretariat could consider BWMC as an important topic for training during seminars and other Tokyo MOU's training outreach programmes.

2.3.3 The secretariat could also consider collection, monitoring and evaluation of BWM-related PSC information beyond the CIC timeframe and submit to the IMO as Tokyo MOU's, valuable contributions to IMO deliberations regarding Convention review and related guidance.

CIC Questionnaire Results

3.1 Analysis

3.1.1 Response to CIC questionnaire

(Table 1 – on following page)

Table 1: Response to CIC questionnaire

This table summarises the CIC questionnaire responses by question number across 6,930 inspections; the counts (Yes/No/N/A/Det) and corresponding percentages are calculated against the total inspections for each question (Row Total = Yes + No + N/A + Det)

Question Number	CIC Question	Yes		No		N/A		Detained ⁵	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
q1*	Is a valid International Ballast Water Management Certificate (IBWMC) on board? (01136 - BWM 2004 / Reg. E-2)	6761	97.56%	14	0.20%	153	2.21%	2	0.03%
q2*	Is the approved Ballast Water Management Plan (BWMP) on board? (14801- BWM 2004 / Reg. B-1)	6791	97.99%	25	0.36%	112	1.62%	2	0.03%
q3*	Is the BWMP up to date to reflect the applicable requirements to manage Ballast Water as required by the Convention? (14801- BWM 2004 / Reg. B-1)	6607	95.34%	207	2.99%	115	1.66%	1	0.01%
q4*	Are officers and crew familiar with their duties in the implementation of the BWMP? (14806 - BWM 2004 / Reg.B-6)	6566	94.75%	243	3.51%	117	1.69%	4	0.06%
q5*	Is the Ballast Water Management System (BWMS) approved by the Administration/Organization, as appropriate? (14812 - BWM 2004 / Reg. D-3 or BWMS Code Section 4)	6768	97.66%	38	0.55%	123	1.77%	1	0.01%
q6*	Is the BWMS operational? (14811 – BWM 2004 / Reg. D-2 or BWMS Code Section 4)	6599	95.22%	188	2.71%	132	1.90%	11	0.16%

⁵ Includes only those ships where a specific CIC question was indicated as unsatisfactory and grounds for detention – these detentions were noted on the CIC form.

Question Number	CIC Question	Yes		No		N/A		Detained ⁵	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
q7	Was the Ballast Water managed according to the BWMP? (14813 - BWM 2004 / Reg. B-1)	6771	97.71%	36	0.52%	123	1.77%	0	0.00%
q8	Is the Ballast Water Record Book (BWRB) properly filled including exemptions if granted? (14802- BWM 2004 / Reg. B-2 & Reg. A- 4.4)	6196	89.41%	575	8.30%	159	2.29%	0	0.00%
q9*	Is the crew managing Ballast Water sediments in accordance with the BWMP? (14805 - BWM 2004 / Reg. B-5)	6080	87.73%	31	0.45%	819	11.82%	0	0.00%
q10*	If an exemption has been granted, are the conditions of exemption implemented? (14809 – BWM 2004 / Reg. A-4)	743	10.72%	2	0.03%	6185	89.25%	0	0.00%

If “No” is ticked for questions marked with an asterisk “*”, the ship may be considered for detention

3.1.2 Number of inspection and number of ships in CIC

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

This table compares inspection and detention outcomes for inspections conducted with and without a Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) questionnaire. Results are based on distinct inspections and show the total number of inspections, total detentions, detentions involving CIC topic-related deficiencies, and detentions where CIC topic-related deficiencies were indicated as grounds for detention. Where indicated, counts based on IMO numbers represent unique ships, whereas other counts represent detention events

* CIC topic-related deficiencies refer to deficiencies associated with Ballast Water Management Convention CIC Deficiency Codes (01136, 14801, 14806, 14812, 14811, 14813, 14802, 14805 and 14809).

** 9 inspection reports have been identified with CIC topic-related deficiency leading to detention and not been recorded appropriately in the CIC form. 1 inspection report has been identified with detention issued relating to Q7 but no option to record the same in the CIC form.

Column1	Inspections Performed with a CIC Questionnaire	Inspections without a CIC Questionnaire
Total	6930	2314
Detentions	184	119
Detentions with CIC topic-related deficiencies*	94	15
Detentions with CIC topic-related deficiencies indicated as grounds for detentions	30**	4
Detentions with unsatisfactory CIC questionnaire answers indicated as grounds for detention	20	0

Detentions with CIC topic-related deficiencies:

Any detention where the vessel had a recorded BWMC related deficiency, whether that deficiency was related to the detention or not. The BWMC related deficiency does not need to relate to a CIC question, or be from an inspection where a CIC questionnaire was completed.

Detentions with CIC topic-related deficiencies indicated as grounds for detentions:

Any detention where the vessel had a recorded BWMC related deficiency, and that deficiency was described as being grounds for detention. The BWMC related deficiency does not need to relate to a CIC question, or be from an inspection where a CIC questionnaire was completed.

Detentions with unsatisfactory CIC questionnaire answers indicated as grounds for detention:

Any detention where a specific BWMC question was indicated as unsatisfactory and grounds for detention – these detentions were noted on the CIC form, and so are only related to inspections where a CIC questionnaire was completed.

3.1.3 Specification of CIC topic-related deficiencies

Table 3: Specification of CIC topic-related deficiencies

This table presents CIC topic-related deficiencies by deficiency code and convention reference. It shows the number of distinct inspections (InspID) where each deficiency was recorded, the number of inspections where the deficiency was a ground for detention and the number of such detentions that were RO-related.

CIC topic-related Deficiencies	Convention	Number of inspections with this deficiency	Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention	Number of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention and RO related
01136	BWM 2004 / Regulation E-2	30 (4)	2 (0)	1 (0)
14801	BWM 2004 / Regulation B-1	266 (21)	4 (2)	0 (0)
14802	BWM 2004 / Regulation B-2 & Regulation A-4.4	615 (31)	0 (0)	0 (0)
14805	BWM 2004 / Regulation B-5	33 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)
14806	BWM 2004 / Regulation B-6	265 (15)	4 (0)	0 (0)
14809	BWM 2004 / Regulation A-4	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
14811	BWM 2004 / Regulation D-2 or BWMS Code Section 4	255 (24)	18 (1)	1 (0)
14812	BWM 2004 / Regulation D-3 or BWMS Code Section 4	42 (4)	2 (1)	0 (0)
14813	BWM 2004 / Regulation B-1	38 (3)	1 (0)	0 (0)
No of distinct InspID		1239 (85)	30 (4)	2 (0)

Figures are presented separately for inspections where the CIC questionnaire was conducted and for inspections where it was not conducted (shown in parentheses). The row “No of distinct InspID” reflects the total number of distinct inspections in which at least one CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded, including those leading to detention and those identified as RO-related.

3.1.4 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

Table 4: Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

This table summarises the results of the CIC on Ballast Water Management by Ship Risk Profile (SRP). It presents the number of individual ships inspected, total PSC inspections, and inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire. Figures in parentheses refer to inspections where the CIC questionnaire was not conducted.

Ship Risk Profile	Individual Ships with PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²
HRS	3185	3698	2711 (987)	625 (55) - 23.05%	803 (69)	26 (3) - 0.96%
SRS	4063	4180	3215 (965)	507 (25) - 15.77%	635 (28)	4 (1) - 0.12%
LRS	1334	1362	1004 (358)	107 (5) - 10.66%	139 (7)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Unknown	3	4	0 (4)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Total	8517	9244	6930 (2314)	1239 (85) - 17.88%	1577 (104)	30 (4) - 0.43%

For inspections with a CIC questionnaire, the table shows:

CIC Unsatisfactory Response – inspections where at least one CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded with an assessment. The percentage represents the rate based on inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire within the respective SRP.

CIC Related Deficiencies¹ – total number of CIC topic-related deficiency records (row-based count; no percentage calculated).

CIC Related Detentions² – inspections where a CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded as grounds for detention. The percentage reflects the detention rate relative to inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire within the respective SRP.

Figures in parentheses for Unsatisfactory Responses and Detentions indicate cases identified outside CIC questionnaire inspections and are excluded from percentage calculations.

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

This table summarises the results of the CIC on Ballast Water Management by Ship Type. It presents the number of individual ships inspected, total PSC inspections, and inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire. Figures in parentheses refer to inspections where the CIC questionnaire was not conducted.

ShipType	Individual Ships With PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²
Bulk carrier	3446	3751	2825 (926)	442 (33) - 15.65%	578 (47)	4 (2) - 0.14%
Container ship	1724	1853	1436 (417)	308 (14) - 21.45%	373 (15)	1 (0) - 0.07%
General cargo/multipurpose	1214	1400	1052 (348)	204 (22) - 19.39%	252 (23)	13 (1) - 1.24%
Oil tanker/Chemical tanker (OILCHEM)	633	667	491 (176)	56 (5) - 11.41%	74 (5)	3 (0) - 0.61%
Oil tanker	455	474	365 (109)	99 (2) - 27.12%	123 (2)	5 (0) - 1.37%
Gas carrier	244	255	216 (39)	53 (2) - 24.54%	70 (4)	3 (1) - 1.39%
Vehicle carrier	210	219	150 (69)	24 (2) - 16.00%	31 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Refrigerated cargo	96	98	65 (33)	6 (1) - 9.23%	7 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Passenger ship	82	90	39 (51)	6 (2) - 15.38%	8 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Chemical tanker	82	85	71 (14)	4 (0) - 5.63%	7 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Woodchip carrier	74	79	61 (18)	6 (0) - 9.84%	8 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Other special activities	61	62	40 (22)	3 (0) - 7.50%	4 (0)	1 (0) - 2.50%
Ro-Ro cargo	41	42	37 (5)	12 (0) - 32.43%	16 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Tug	35	35	13 (22)	1 (0) - 7.69%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Offshore supply	33	33	11 (22)	1 (0) - 9.09%	4 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Heavy load	17	17	14 (3)	2 (0) - 14.29%	2 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Special purpose ship	16	16	7 (9)	1 (0) - 14.29%	4 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Ro-Ro passenger ship	16	22	14 (8)	6 (1) - 42.86%	8 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Gas Carrier/NLS tanker (GASNLS)	11	11	10 (1)	3 (0) - 30.00%	4 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Livestock carrier	8	9	0 (9)	0 (1) - 0.00%	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%

ShipType	Individual Ships With PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²
Fish factory	6	6	2 (4)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Combination carrier	5	5	3 (2)	2 (0) - 66.67%	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Oil tanker/Gas carrier (OILGAS)	5	5	4 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
High speed passenger craft	4	4	2 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
NLS tanker	4	4	2 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
MODU and FPSO	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Commercial yacht	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Total	8517	9244	6930 (2314)	1239 (85) - 17.88%	1577 (104)	30 (4) - 0.43%

For each Ship Type, the table shows:

CIC Unsatisfactory Response – inspections where at least one CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded with an assessment. The percentage represents the rate based on inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire for that Ship Type.

CIC Related Deficiencies¹ – total number of CIC topic-related deficiency records (row-based count; no percentage calculated).

CIC Related Detentions² – inspections where a CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded as grounds for detention. The percentage reflects the detention rate relative to inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire for that Ship Type.

Figures in parentheses for Unsatisfactory Responses and Detentions indicate cases identified outside CIC questionnaire inspections and are excluded from percentage calculations.

3.1.6 Ship age overview

Table 6: Ship age overview

This table summarises the results of the CIC on Ballast Water Management by Ship Age. Age is calculated as the difference between the inspection date (DateOfInspect) and the keel laid date (DateKeelLaid), and grouped into the following bands: 0–6, 7–12, 13–18, 19–24, 25–30, 31–35, and Over 35 years.

For each age group, the table presents the number of individual ships inspected, total PSC inspections, and inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire. Figures in parentheses refer to inspections where the CIC questionnaire was not conducted.

Age Group	Individual Ships With PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²
0-6	1379	1437	1132 (305)	179 (6) - 15.81%	209 (6)	1 (0) - 0.09%
7-12	1793	1874	1366 (508)	226 (10) - 16.54%	307 (15)	1 (0) - 0.07%
13-18	2947	3250	2414 (836)	384 (32) - 15.91%	483 (38)	6 (2) - 0.25%
19-24	1584	1755	1353 (402)	291 (20) - 21.51%	377 (24)	10 (1) - 0.74%
25-30	634	707	530 (177)	128 (13) - 24.15%	159 (15)	7 (0) - 1.32%
31-35	125	147	87 (60)	26 (4) - 29.89%	37 (6)	5 (1) - 5.75%
Over 35	69	74	48 (26)	5 (0) - 10.42%	5 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%
Total	8517	9244	6930 (2314)	1239 (85) - 17.88%	1577 (104)	30 (4) - 0.43%

For inspections with a CIC questionnaire, the table shows:

CIC Unsatisfactory Response – inspections where at least one CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded with an assessment. The percentage is calculated based on inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire within the respective age group.

CIC Related Deficiencies¹ – total number of CIC topic-related deficiency records (row-based count; no percentage calculated).

CIC Related Detentions² – inspections where a CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded as grounds for detention. The percentage reflects the detention rate relative to inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire within the respective age group.

Figures in parentheses for Unsatisfactory Responses and Detentions indicate cases identified outside CIC questionnaire inspections and are excluded from percentage calculations.

3.1.7 Inspections and detentions per Flag State

Table 7: Inspections and detentions per Flag State

This table summarises CIC outcomes on Ballast Water Management by ship flag. It presents the number of individual ships inspected (distinct IMO), total PSC inspections (distinct InspID), and inspections conducted with and without a CIC questionnaire. Figures in parentheses refer to inspections where no CIC questionnaire was conducted. Flag performance categories are also indicated.

Ship Flag	Individual Ships with PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²	Flag Performance
Panama	2340	2593	1983 (610)	372 (25) - 18.76%	475 (33)	13 (0) - 0.66%	High
Liberia	1209	1279	958 (321)	184 (12) - 19.21%	234 (13)	0 (2) - 0.00%	High
Marshall Islands	867	923	683 (240)	122 (8) - 17.86%	168 (11)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Singapore	672	705	536 (169)	91 (3) - 16.98%	106 (3)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Hong Kong, China	633	670	535 (135)	83 (4) - 15.51%	96 (5)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
China	305	314	269 (45)	15 (1) - 5.58%	20 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Korea, Republic of	277	291	235 (56)	30 (1) - 12.77%	36 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Malta	262	271	198 (73)	31 (2) - 15.66%	32 (3)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Vietnam	170	183	147 (36)	24 (1) - 16.33%	37 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Bahamas	158	166	106 (60)	16 (3) - 15.09%	17 (4)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Belize	125	163	118 (45)	22 (5) - 18.64%	28 (5)	2 (1) - 1.69%	Low
Portugal	119	131	86 (45)	14 (1) - 16.28%	16 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Cyprus	115	124	95 (29)	15 (1) - 15.79%	18 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Japan	87	93	68 (25)	22 (0) - 32.35%	26 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Norway	71	76	46 (30)	6 (0) - 13.04%	7 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Antigua and Barbuda	68	73	51 (22)	8 (0) - 15.69%	13 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Sierra Leone	65	83	58 (25)	20 (4) - 34.48%	23 (4)	1 (0) - 1.72%	Low
Denmark	61	66	53 (13)	9 (0) - 16.98%	13 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Greece	55	56	37 (19)	6 (1) - 16.22%	7 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High

Ship Flag	Individual Ships with PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²	Flag Performance
Thailand	51	56	43 (13)	5 (0) - 11.63%	9 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Indonesia	49	51	35 (16)	6 (0) - 17.14%	9 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Palau	46	59	43 (16)	16 (1) - 37.21%	24 (1)	1 (0) - 2.33%	Low
Malaysia	41	42	26 (16)	4 (0) - 15.38%	8 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Isle of Man (GB)	40	46	24 (22)	4 (0) - 16.67%	7 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Philippines	34	34	26 (8)	1 (0) - 3.85%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Russian Federation	32	33	31 (2)	9 (0) - 29.03%	12 (0)	1 (0) - 3.23%	Medium
Tanzania, United Republic of	31	44	20 (24)	3 (1) - 15.00%	5 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Low
United Kingdom	31	37	24 (13)	3 (0) - 12.50%	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Bangladesh	30	31	27 (4)	3 (0) - 11.11%	4 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Sao Tome and Principe	29	49	26 (23)	9 (0) - 34.62%	9 (0)	2 (0) - 7.69%	Low
Barbados	27	27	22 (5)	5 (0) - 22.73%	7 (0)	2 (0) - 9.09%	Medium
France	26	27	19 (8)	5 (1) - 26.32%	6 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Netherlands	26	28	15 (13)	3 (0) - 20.00%	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Cameroon	22	28	17 (11)	7 (0) - 41.18%	8 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Low
Togo	22	34	21 (13)	8 (2) - 38.10%	13 (3)	2 (0) - 9.52%	Low
India	19	20	15 (5)	5 (0) - 33.33%	6 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Tuvalu	19	21	15 (6)	1 (0) - 6.67%	4 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Gambia	18	22	16 (6)	5 (1) - 31.25%	5 (1)	1 (0) - 6.25%	Unknown
Mongolia	18	18	12 (6)	2 (0) - 16.67%	2 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Low
Comoros	17	20	13 (7)	5 (1) - 38.46%	7 (1)	2 (0) - 15.38%	Low
United States	16	16	13 (3)	1 (0) - 7.69%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Taiwan, Province of China	14	15	11 (4)	1 (0) - 9.09%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High

Ship Flag	Individual Ships with PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²	Flag Performance
Germany	13	14	11 (3)	2 (0) - 18.18%	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Saint Kitts and Nevis	13	16	10 (6)	4 (1) - 40.00%	7 (1)	1 (0) - 10.00%	Low
Italy	12	13	10 (3)	3 (0) - 30.00%	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Bermuda (GB)	11	11	7 (4)	2 (0) - 28.57%	2 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Vanuatu	11	11	7 (4)	3 (1) - 42.86%	5 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Jamaica	10	11	9 (2)	3 (0) - 33.33%	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Belgium	9	9	4 (5)	1 (0) - 25.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Guinea-Bissau	9	10	8 (2)	3 (0) - 37.50%	4 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Cayman Islands (GB)	8	8	8 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Niue	7	8	4 (4)	1 (0) - 25.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Saudi Arabia	6	6	6 (0)	1 (0) - 16.67%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Switzerland	6	7	5 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Cook Islands	5	5	4 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Low
Gibraltar (GB)	5	5	4 (1)	1 (0) - 25.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Luxembourg	5	5	2 (3)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Mozambique	5	5	4 (1)	1 (1) - 25.00%	1 (3)	0 (1) - 0.00%	Unknown
Sweden	5	5	2 (3)	0 (1) - 0.00%	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Gabon	4	4	3 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Iran, Islamic Republic of	4	4	3 (1)	1 (0) - 33.33%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Low
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	4	4	3 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Ukraine	4	4	0 (4)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Aruba (NL)	3	3	3 (0)	1 (0) - 33.33%	1 (0)	1 (0) - 33.33%	Unknown
Croatia	3	3	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Djibouti	3	3	3 (0)	1 (0) - 33.33%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Low

Ship Flag	Individual Ships with PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²	Flag Performance
Ecuador	3	3	1 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Oman	3	3	2 (1)	1 (0) - 50.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Qatar	3	4	3 (1)	1 (0) - 33.33%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
San Marino	3	3	2 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Sint Maarten	3	4	3 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Spain	3	3	1 (2)	1 (0) - 100.00%	3 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Egypt	2	2	1 (1)	1 (0) - 100.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Fiji	2	2	0 (2)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Guinea	2	3	1 (2)	1 (1) - 100.00%	2 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Guyana	2	2	2 (0)	2 (0) - 100.00%	5 (0)	1 (0) - 50.00%	Unknown
Kuwait	2	2	1 (1)	0 (1) - 0.00%	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Latvia	2	2	2 (0)	1 (0) - 50.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Montenegro	2	2	2 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Tonga	2	2	2 (0)	1 (0) - 50.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Turkey	2	2	2 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	High
Australia	1	1	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Benin	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Bolivia	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Brazil	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Brunei Darussalam	1	1	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Chile	1	1	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Curacao	1	1	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Kiribati	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Medium
Lithuania	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown

Ship Flag	Individual Ships with PSC Inspection	PSC Inspections	Inspections With CIC	CIC Unsatisfactory Response	CIC Related Deficiencies ¹	CIC Related Detentions ²	Flag Performance
Nauru	1	1	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Pakistan	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Poland	1	1	0 (1)	0 (0) - 0.00%	0 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Seychelles	1	1	1 (0)	1 (0) - 100.00%	1 (0)	0 (0) - 0.00%	Unknown
Total	8517	9244	6930 (2314)	1239 (85) - 17.88%	1577 (104)	30 (4) - 0.43%	

For inspections conducted with a CIC questionnaire, the table shows:

CIC Unsatisfactory Response – inspections where at least one CIC topic-related deficiency was recorded with an associated action code. The percentage is calculated using CIC inspections for that flag as the denominator.

CIC Related Deficiencies¹ – total number of CIC topic-related deficiency records (row-based count), split between inspections with and without a CIC questionnaire. No percentage is calculated.

CIC Related Detentions² – inspections where detention was imposed and at least one CIC topic-related deficiency was indicated as grounds for detention. The percentage is calculated using CIC inspections for that flag as the denominator.

Percentages therefore reflect rates within CIC inspections only and exclude inspections where no CIC questionnaire was conducted.

Annex Inspection form for the CIC

Questionnaire format for a Concentrated Inspection Campaign

CIC on Ballast Water Management			
Inspection Authority			
Ship Name		IMO Number	
Date of Inspection		Inspection Port	

No.	Item	Yes	No	N/A	Detention
1*	Is a valid International Ballast Water Management Certificate (IBWMC) on board? (01136 - BWM 2004 / Reg. E-2)				
2*	Is the approved Ballast Water Management Plan (BWMP) on board? (14801- BWM 2004 / Reg. B-1)				
3*	Is the BWMP up to date to reflect the applicable requirements to manage Ballast Water as required by the Convention? (14801- BWM 2004 / Reg. B-1)				
4*	Are officers and crew familiar with their duties in the implementation of the BWMP? (14806 - BWM 2004 / Reg.B-6)				
5*	Is the Ballast Water Management System (BWMS) approved by the Administration/Organization, as appropriate? (14812 - BWM 2004 / Reg. D-3 or BWMS Code Section 4)				
6*	Is the BWMS operational? (14811 – BWM 2004 / Reg. D-2 or BWMS Code Section 4)				
7	Was the Ballast Water managed according to the BWMP? (14813 - BWM 2004 / Reg. B-1)				
8	Is the Ballast Water Record Book (BWRB) properly filled including exemptions if granted? (14802- BWM 2004 / Reg. B-2 & Reg. A-4.4)				
9*	Is the crew managing Ballast Water sediments in accordance with the BWMP? (14805 - BWM 2004 / Reg. B-5)				
10*	If an exemption has been granted, are the conditions of exemption implemented? (14809 – BWM 2004 / Reg. A-4)				

If "No" is ticked for questions marked with an asterisk "*", the ship may be considered for detention