

**ANNUAL REPORT  
ON  
PORT STATE CONTROL  
IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION**

**2020**



This work is protected by copyright. It may be reproduced in whole or part subject to the inclusion of an acknowledgement of the source but not for commercial use nor sale.

Further information may be obtained from:

The Tokyo MOU Secretariat

Ascend Shimbashi 8F

6-19-19 Shimbashi

Minato-ku, Tokyo

Japan 105-0004

Tel: +81-3-3433-0621

Fax: +81-3-3433-0624

This Report is also available at Tokyo MOU web-site  
(<http://www.tokyo-mou.org>) on the Internet.

## FOREWORD

We are pleased to present the **Annual Report on Port State Control in the Asia-Pacific Region 2020**.

Mentioning the year 2020, we cannot start with the outbreak of COVID-19 and subsequent spread of COVID-19, which has caused an unprecedented global crisis.

The maritime industry suffered in a number of ways, including supply chain issues, a near complete shutdown of the cruise industry and increasing seafarer welfare issues.

The activities of the Tokyo MOU were also seriously affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the impact of COVID-19, the number of inspections has reduced by approximately 40%, and the inspection rate is reduced by 20 points compared with the previous year. Furthermore, the joint concentrated inspection campaign (CIC) on Stability in General with the Paris MoU scheduled in 2020 had to be postponed by one year. In addition, almost all the planned technical co-operation activities were either postponed or cancelled.

In response to the challenges to the shipping industry by COVID-19, the Tokyo MOU developed and revised tentative guidance for dealing with situations such as extending periods of service onboard of seafarers, delaying periods for surveys, inspections and audits, etc. in a pragmatic and harmonized approach. Moreover, the Port State Control Committee established a dedicated group to evaluate impacts of COVID-19 to the activities of the Tokyo MOU and to consider and explore measures to reduce the influences as much as possible, while trying to maintain our goals and mission. The Tokyo MOU was also positively involved in the initiatives by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) for global efforts to combat the COVID-19 crisis in the maritime industry.

Following the information campaign in 2019, the Tokyo MOU continues to pay attention to the sulphur cap requirements in 2020. For ensuring compliance with the new sulphur limit requirements on marine fuel oil, the Tokyo MOU, in collaboration with the Paris MoU, took harmonized measures to prohibit the use of non-compliant fuel from 1 January 2020 and carriage of non-compliant fuel, for use onboard, from 1 March 2020, unless the ship is fitted with an Exhaust Gas Cleaning System (EGCS).

This Annual Report outlines port State control activities and developments in the Tokyo MOU in 2020. Likewise, the report also includes port State control statistics and analysis on the results of inspections carried out by member Authorities during the year.

Looking through the statistics in 2020, the notable increase trend of deficiencies relating to Working & Living Conditions or Maritime Labour Conditions can be identified, which reflects the severe impacts by COVID-19 on crew change and seafarers' repatriation. In line with previous years, ISM is the most common category where detainable deficiencies are recorded in 2020. Moreover, percentages of ISM related deficiencies and detainable deficiencies are higher than the previous year, which also reflect inefficient and inappropriate responses by ships and their companies to the COVID-19 crisis. The safety management system, which is already a vital part for ensuring ships to sail safely, securely and to minimise pollution events, is even more important during the pandemic situation.

Currently, the COVID-19 situation is still evolving and the challenges emanated could be expanded and prolonged. Recognizing the importance of port State Control activities to ensure maritime safety, marine environment protection and living and working conditions of seafarers, the Tokyo MOU has initiated some countermeasures for reducing and minimizing impacts of COVID-19 to the activities and will further explore and employ necessary pragmatic steps so as to maintain appropriate and effective maritime operations under this difficult time.



Kenny Crawford  
Chair  
Port State Control Committee



Kubota Hideo  
Secretary  
Tokyo MOU Secretariat



## CONTENTS

	page
<b>OVERVIEW</b>	
General introduction .....	1
Review of year 2020 .....	2
The Port State Control Committee .....	3
Technical Working Group (TWG) .....	4
The Asia-Pacific Computerized Information System (APCIS) .....	4
Training and seminars for port State control officers .....	4
Co-operation with other regional port State control regimes .....	5
 <b>PORT STATE CONTROL UNDER THE TOKYO MOU, 2020</b>	
Inspections .....	6
Detentions .....	6
Deficiencies .....	7
Deficiency photo of the year .....	8
Overview of port State control results 2010-2020 .....	9
 <b>ANNEX 1 -- STATUS OF THE RELEVANT INSTRUMENTS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
 <b>ANNEX 2 -- PORT STATE INSPECTION STATISTICS .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Statistics for 2020 .....	19
Summary of port State inspection data 2018-2020 .....	29
 <b>ANNEX 3 -- ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE OF THE TOKYO MOU .....</b>	<b>48</b>
 <b>Explanatory Note on the Black-Grey-White Lists .....</b>	<b>49</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

	page
Figure 1	Inspection percentage ..... 10
Figure 2	Inspection per ship risk profile ..... 10
Figure 3	Port State inspections - contribution by Authorities ..... 11
Figure 4	Type of ship inspected ..... 11
Figure 5	Detentions per flag ..... 12
Figure 6	Detention per ship type ..... 12
Figure 7	Deficiencies by main categories ..... 13
Figure 8	Most frequent detainable deficiencies ..... 13
Figure 9	No. of inspections ..... 14
Figure 10	Inspection percentage ..... 14
Figure 11	No. of inspections with deficiencies ..... 14
Figure 12	No. of deficiencies ..... 15
Figure 13	No. of detentions ..... 15
Figure 14	Detention percentage ..... 15
Figure 15	Comparison of inspections per ship type ..... 35
Figure 16	Comparison of detentions per ship type ..... 35
Figure 17	Comparison of inspections with deficiencies per ship type ..... 37
Figure 18	Comparison of number of deficiencies by main categories ..... 43
Figure 19	Comparison of most frequent detainable deficiencies ..... 45
Table 1	Status of the relevant instruments ..... 16
Table 1a	Status of MARPOL 73/78 ..... 18
Table 2	Port State inspections carried out by Authorities ..... 19
Table 2a	Port State inspections on maritime security ..... 20
Table 3	Port State inspections per ship risk profile ..... 21
Table 4	Port State inspections per flag ..... 22
Table 5	Port State inspections per ship type ..... 25
Table 6	Port State inspections per recognized organization ..... 26
Table 7	Deficiencies by categories ..... 28
Table 8	Black – Grey – White Lists ..... 29
Table 9	Inspections and detentions per flag ..... 31
Table 10	Inspections and detentions per ship type ..... 36
Table 11	Inspections with deficiencies per ship type ..... 38
Table 12	Inspections and detentions per recognized organization ..... 39
Table 13	Performance of recognized organization ..... 41
Table 14	Comparison of deficiencies by categories ..... 44
Table 15	Comparison of most frequent detainable deficiencies ..... 46
Table 16	List of under-performing ships ..... 47

## OVERVIEW

### GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The Annual Report on Port State Control in the Asia-Pacific Region is published under the auspices of the Port State Control Committee of the Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control in the Asia-Pacific Region (Tokyo MOU). This annual report is the twenty-sixth issue and covers port State control activities and developments in the 2020 calendar year.

The Memorandum was signed in Tokyo on 1 December 1993 and came into effect on 1 April 1994. In accordance with the provisions of the Memorandum, Authorities that have signed and formally accepted the Memorandum or that have been accepted by unanimous consent of the Port State Control Committee become full members. Currently, the Memorandum has 21 full members, namely: Australia, Canada, Chile, China, Fiji, Hong Kong (China), Indonesia, Japan, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Russian Federation, Singapore, Thailand, Vanuatu and Viet Nam. A maritime Authority that has declared its intention to fully adhere to the Memorandum within a three-year period may be accepted as a co-operating member by unanimous consent of the Port State Control Committee. Mexico is participating in the Tokyo MOU as a co-operating member Authority.

The main objectives of the Memorandum are to establish an effective port State control regime in the Asia-Pacific region through co-operation of its members, harmonization of the members' activities, to eliminate substandard shipping, to promote maritime safety and security, to protect the marine environment and to safeguard seafarers working and living conditions on board ships.

The Port State Control Committee established under the Memorandum monitors and controls the implementation and on-going operation of the Memorandum. The Committee consists of representatives from the member Authorities, co-operating member Authorities and observers. Observer status has been granted to the following maritime Authorities and inter-governmental organizations by the Committee: the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Macao (China), Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, United States Coast Guard, the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Abuja MOU, the Black Sea MOU, the Caribbean MOU, the Indian Ocean MOU, the Paris MoU, the Riyadh MOU and the Viña del Mar Agreement. The Secretariat of the Memorandum is located in Tokyo, Japan. The Asia-Pacific Computerized Information System is established in Russian Federation.

For the purpose of the Memorandum, the following instruments are the basis for port State control activities in the region:

- the International Convention on Load Lines, 1966, as amended;
- the Protocol of 1988 relating to the International Convention on Load Lines, 1966, as amended;
- the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974, as amended;
- the Protocol of 1978 relating to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974;
- the Protocol of 1988 relating to the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974;
- the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships 1973, as modified by the Protocol of 1978 relating thereto, as amended;
- the International Convention on Standards for Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, as amended;
- the Convention on the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972;
- the International Convention on Tonnage Measurement of Ships, 1969;
- the Merchant Shipping (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1976 (ILO Convention No. 147);
- the Maritime Labour Convention, 2006, as amended;
- the International Convention on the Control of Harmful Anti-fouling Systems on Ships, 2001;
- the Protocol of 1992 to amend the International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 1969; and
- the International Convention for the Control and Management of Ships' Ballast Water and Sediments, 2004.

### REVIEW OF YEAR 2020

The outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic caused enormous impact on the Tokyo MOU activities in various aspects in 2020. As the measure for prevention the wide spread of COVID-19, the strict restrictions of ship-shore interactions and large-scale lockdown were adopted in many places of the region, which resulted a significant decrease of number of inspections. Due to the COVID-19 crisis, the joint CIC on Stability in General scheduled for 2020, together with other planned CICs, were postponed by one year by the decision of member Authorities in coordination with the Paris MoU. Moreover, almost all the technical co-operation activities planned for 2020 were either postponed or cancelled.

Recognizing the circumstances of delaying surveys and inspections, postponement of the renewal of certificates and extended periods of service onboard of seafarers caused by the COVID-19 crisis, the Tokyo MOU, in the efficient manner, developed tentative guidance in March 2020 and revised it in April 2020, aiming to ensure PSCOs to deal with such situations in a pragmatic and



harmonized approach.

The requirements of the maximum limit for sulphur content of ship fuel oil as provided in MARPOL Annex VI (known as the global 2020 sulphur cap) became effective from 1 January 2020, which prohibited the use of non-compliant fuel from 1 January 2020 and carriage of non-compliant fuel, for use on the ship, from 1 March 2020, unless the ship is fitted with an Exhaust Gas Cleaning System (EGCS). For the purpose of effective and uniform implementation of the global 2020 sulphur cap requirements, the Tokyo MOU, in coordination with the Paris MoU, issued a joint press release on prohibition on carriage of non-compliant fuel as the message to the attention of the industry and requested member Authorities to undertake inspections to ensure compliance with the new sulphur limit requirements on marine fuel oil by ships.

As informed in the previous Annual Report, the Tokyo MOU decided to publish "Safety Bulletin" on the website for bringing the alert and attention to the interested parties of the industry in relation to the relevant safety issues/risks. Three editions of Safety Bulletin have been issued relating to lifting slings encased in plastic sheathing on freefall lifeboats, pilot transfer arrangements and casualties caused by cargoes respectively.

### **THE PORT STATE CONTROL COMMITTEE**

The thirty-first meeting of the Port State Control Committee was originally scheduled to be held from 7 to 10 December 2020 in Seoul, Republic of Korea. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Committee meeting in the normal face-to-face style was not feasible. For purpose to allow the Committee to consider and make decisions on policy

issues, further developments, the outcome and on-going work of the MOU bodies/groups so as to maintain the continuous and effective operation of the MOU, it was decided by the agreement of all Authorities that the Committee meeting would be conducted in the manner of the combination of Written Procedure (WP) and Virtual Meeting (VM).

In accordance with the agreed arrangement, the session of WP to consider and make agreement on documents of essential matters was carried out during November – December 2020. Apart from financial and administrative matters, the key issue dealt with via WP was to investigate the impact of the COVID-19 crisis and to identify relevant areas/items where actions/measures can be taken to reduce or minimize such influence. For the aforementioned purpose, the extraordinary intersessional group on impact of the COVID-19 crisis (EIG-COVID19) was established through WP to make proposals and develop appropriate countermeasures relating to COVID-19 circumstances for consideration of the Committee. As instructed, EIG-COVID19 discussed and made proposals on the following matters:

- development of interim guidance relating to COVID-19 circumstances;
- exploration of remote PSC inspections;
- treatment of PSC data during the COVID-19 pandemic in the Annual Report; and
- possibility and arrangement for implementation of technical co-operation activities in new/online style.

The session of virtual meeting of the Port

State Control Committee was scheduled to be held in January 2021.

### **TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP (TWG)**

The fourteenth meeting of the Technical Working Group (TWG) was originally planned to be held in Seoul, Republic of Korea, from 3 to 4 December 2020, prior to the thirty-first meeting of the Port State Control Committee. Same as for the Committee meeting, the TWG14 meeting was organized via a combination of written procedure in November – December 2020 and virtual meeting in January 2021.

### **ASIA-PACIFIC COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION SYSTEM (APCIS)**

For reporting and storing of port State inspection results and facilitating exchange of information in the region, a computerized database system was established. The central site of the APCIS is located in Moscow, under the auspices of the Ministry of Transport of Russian Federation.

The APCIS is connected by member Authorities on-line or by batch protocol for searching ships for inspection and for inputting and transmitting inspection reports. The APCIS also supports on-line publication of PSC data on the Tokyo MOU website (<http://www.tokyo-mou.org>) on a real time basis. Based on data stored in the database, the APCIS produces annual and detailed PSC statistics.

For inter-regional information exchange, the APCIS has established deep hyperlinks with the databases of:

- THETIS of the Paris MOU;
- BSIS of the Black Sea MOU;
- IOCIS of the Indian Ocean MOU;
- CIALA of the Viña del Mar Agreement; and
- CMIC of the Caribbean MOU.

Furthermore, the PSC data of the Tokyo MOU are also provided to GISIS and EQUASIS.

### **TRAINING AND SEMINARS FOR PORT STATE CONTROL OFFICERS**

Due to impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, all technical co-operation activities scheduled in 2020, except the PSC officer exchange from Japan to Peru in February 2020, had been either postponed or cancelled, including:

- the 28<sup>th</sup> seminar for PSC officers in Singapore in July 2020;
- the 10<sup>th</sup> general training course for PSC officers in Japan in August – September 2020;
- five expert missions in Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines and Viet Nam;
- eleven PSC officer exchanges, i.e. from Hong Kong (China) and Singapore to Australia, from Indonesia to New Zealand, from Republic of Korea and New Zealand to Indonesia, from Australia to Thailand, from Chile to Malaysia, from Malaysia to Chile, from Canada to China, from Japan to Philippines, from Republic of Korea and Singapore to Viet Nam, from Marshall Islands to Canada and from Thailand

and Vanuatu to Australia; and

- the second seminar for flag performance improvement in Viet Nam in February 2020 (the project funded by the Nippon Foundation).

### CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER REGIONAL PORT STATE CONTROL REGIMES

Establishment and effective operation of regional co-operation regimes on port State control has formed a worldwide network for elimination of substandard shipping. Currently, there are a total of nine regional port State control regimes (MOUs) covering the major part of the world, namely:

- Abuja MOU
- Black Sea MOU
- Caribbean MOU
- Indian Ocean MOU
- Mediterranean MOU
- Paris MoU
- Riyadh MOU
- Tokyo MOU
- Viña del Mar Agreement

As one of the inter-governmental organizations (IGOs) associated with IMO, the Tokyo MOU has attended meetings of the Flag State Implementation (FSI) Sub-Committee and Implementation of IMO Instruments (III) Sub-Committee since 2006. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the seventh meeting of III Sub-Committee schedule in July 2020 had been postponed. Instead of III7 meeting, the Tokyo MOU participated in three virtual meetings organized by the IMO Secretariat with regional PSC regimes on the impact of COVID-19 crisis on shipping, which were held on 8 April 2020, 17 June 2020 and 18 December 2020 respectively.

In support of inter-regional collaboration on port State control, the Tokyo MOU holds observer status within the Paris MoU, the Caribbean MOU, the Indian Ocean MOU, the Viña del Mar Agreement, and the Riyadh MOU. In a similar manner, the Tokyo MOU has granted observer status to the Paris MoU, the Indian Ocean MOU, the Viña del Mar Agreement, the Black Sea MOU, the Riyadh MOU, the Caribbean MOU and the Abuja MOU.


The Tokyo MOU has established, and maintained, effective and close co-operation with the Paris MoU at both administrative and technical levels. Representatives of the two Secretariats attend the Port State Control Committee meetings of each MOU on a regular basis. During period of 2020, the Tokyo MOU Secretariat participated in an online meeting of regional PSC regimes Secretaries hosted by the Paris MoU on 4 June 2020 for exchange of information on measures and approach taken for PSC with regard to the COVID-19. Furthermore, Tokyo MOU Secretariat also attended the virtual meeting of the 53<sup>rd</sup> session of the Paris MoU PSC Committee's from 28 September to 2 October 2020.

## PORT STATE CONTROL UNDER THE TOKYO MOU, 2020

**Note:** Due to impact of COVID-19, there was a significant decrease of PSC activities in 2020. As the consequence, PSC data for 2020 in this report (e.g. number of inspections, number of detentions, number of deficiencies and inspection rate) for certain Authorities and the region as a whole changed drastically and would not be comparable with those of other years.

### INSPECTIONS

In 2020, 19,415 inspections, involving 13,047 individual ships, were carried out on ships registered under 94 flags. Figure 3 and Table 2 show the number of inspections carried out by the member Authorities of the Tokyo MOU. Out of 19,415 inspections, there were 9,763 inspections where ships were found with deficiencies. Since the total number of individual ships operating in the region was estimated at



Winner of Deficiency Photo of the Year – 2020  
(Ship type: Oil tanker; Date: 18/02/2020; Port: Legaspi)

25,858\*, the inspection rate in the region was approximately 50%\*\* in 2020 (see Figure 1).

Information on inspections according to ships' flag is shown in Table 4.

Figure 2 and Table 3 provide information on inspections per ship risk profile.

Figures summarizing inspections according to ship type are set out in Figure 4 and Table 5.

Inspection results regarding recognized organizations are shown in Table 6.

### DETENTIONS

Ships are detained when the condition of the ship or its crew does not correspond substantially with the applicable conventions. Such strong action is to ensure that the ship cannot sail until it can proceed to sea without presenting a danger to the ship or persons on board, or without presenting an unreasonable threat of harm to the marine environment.

In 2020, 493 ships registered under 49 flags were detained due to serious deficiencies having been found onboard. The detention rate of ships inspected was 2.54%.

\* Number of individual ships which visited the ports of the region during the year (the figure was provided by LLI).

\*\* The inspection rate is calculated by: number of individual ships inspected/number of individual ships visited.



Candidate photo for Deficiency Photo of the Year  
(Ship type: General cargo/multi-purpose ship; Date: 18/09/2020; Port: Busan)

Figure 5 shows the detention rate by flag for flags where at least 20 port State control inspections had been conducted and whose detention rate was above the average regional rate. Figure 6 gives the detention rate by ship type. Figure 8 illustrates the most frequent detainable deficiencies found during inspections in 2020.


The Black-grey-white list (Table 8) indicates levels of performance of flags over a three-year rolling period. Flags, whose ships were involved in 30 or more inspections during the period, are included in the list. The black-grey-white list for 2018-2020 consists of 65 flags. The number of flags in the black list is 7, three flags less than the last year. The number of flags on the grey list is 18, one flag less than the previous year. The white list

remains 40 flags.

A list of under-performing ships (i.e. ships detained three or more times during previous twelve months) is published monthly. A total of 59 vessels, involving 13 individual ships, were identified as under-performing ships in 2020. The list of under-performing ships is provided in Table 16.

## DEFICIENCIES

Where conditions on board are found that are not in compliance with the requirements of the relevant instruments by the port State control officers, these are recorded as deficiencies and required to be rectified.



Candidate photo for Deficiency Photo of the Year  
(Ship type: Bulk carrier; Date: 08/01/2020; Port: Shanghai)



Candidate photo for Deficiency Photo of the Year  
(Ship type: Bulk carrier; Date: 16/04/2020;  
Port: Vostochny)

A total of 34,924 deficiencies were recorded in 2020. The deficiencies found are categorized and shown in Figure 7 and Table 7.

It has been noted that fire safety measures, life-saving appliances and safety of navigation continue to be the top three categories of deficiencies discovered on ships. In 2020, 5,902 deficiencies related to fire safety measures, 4,177 deficiencies related to life-saving appliances and 3,681 safety of navigation related deficiencies were recorded, represent-

ing nearly 40% of the total number of all recorded deficiencies.

Although number of deficiencies decreased more than 50% comparing with last year, proportion of deficiencies related to Working & Living Conditions or Labour Conditions increased from 10% in 2019 to 15% in 2020 as the consequence of issues on seafarers' leave and repatriation caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

### DEFICIENCY PHOTO OF THE YEAR

The function for collecting and storing deficiency photos taken during PSC inspections in the APCIS has been implemented since 2009. For encouraging and promoting PSC officers



Candidate photo for Deficiency Photo of the Year  
(Ship type: Bulk carrier; Date: 06/01/2020;  
Port: Newcastle)



Candidate photo for Deficiency Photo of the Year  
(Ship type: Bulk carrier; Date: 16/04/2020;  
Port: Vostochny)

winner for 2020. Deficiency photo of the year – 2020 and other candidate photos are provided in this section.


### OVERVIEW OF PORT STATE CONTROL RESULTS 2010 – 2020

Figures 9-14 show the comparison of port State inspection results for 2010 - 2020. These figures indicate the trends in port State activities and ship performance over the past eleven years.

to submitting deficiency photos, a prize of deficiency photo of the year has been established to award the PSC officer who took the best photo of deficiency in the year. Deficiency photo of the years are also published on the Tokyo MOU website.


In 2020, a total of 9,896 photos were submitted by PSC officers. In accordance with the procedures for selection of deficiency photo of the year, the photo taken by PSC officer of the Authority of Philippines was selected as the

**Figure 1: INSPECTION PERCENTAGE**




Total individual ship visited: 25,858

**Figure 2: INSPECTION PER SHIP RISK PROFILE**







**Figure 3: PORT STATE INSPECTIONS - CONTRIBUTION BY AUTHORITIES**



**Figure 4: TYPE OF SHIP INSPECTED**



**Figure 5: DETENTIONS PER FLAG**



Flags:


- |             |                       |                 |                         |
|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Palau    | 2. Croatia            | 3. Togo         | 4. Sierra Leone         |
| 5. Mongolia | 6. Russian Federation | 7. Belize       | 8. Denmark              |
| 9. Barbados | 10. Indonesia         | 11. Netherlands | 12. Bangladesh          |
| 13. Liberia | 14. India             | 15. Norway      | 16. Antigua and Barbuda |
| 17. Bahamas | 18. Panama            | 19. Cyprus      |                         |

Note: Flags listed above are those flags the ships of which were involved in at least 20 port State inspections and detention percentage of which are above the regional average detention percentage. The complete information on detentions by flag is given in Table 4.


**Figure 6: DETENTION PER SHIP TYPE**



**Figure 7: DEFICIENCIES BY MAIN CATEGORIES**




**Figure 8: MOST FREQUENT DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES**




**OVERVIEW OF PORT STATE CONTROL RESULTS 2010 - 2020**


**Figure 9: NO. OF INSPECTIONS**




**Figure 10: INSPECTION PERCENTAGE**




**Figure 11: NO. OF INSPECTIONS WITH DEFICIENCIES**




**Figure 12: NO. OF DEFICIENCIES**



**Figure 13: NO. OF DETENTIONS**



**Figure 14: DETENTION PERCENTAGE**



## ANNEX 1

## STATUS OF THE RELEVANT INSTRUMENTS

**Table 1: STATUS OF THE RELEVANT INSTRUMENTS**  
(Date of deposit of instruments)

(as at 31 December 2020)

Authority	LOAD LINES 66	LOAD LINES PROT 88	SOLAS 74	SOLAS PROT 78	SOLAS PROT 88	MARPOL 73/78	STCW 78
Australia	29/07/68	07/02/97	17/08/83	17/08/83	07/02/97	14/10/87	07/11/83
Canada	14/01/70	08/04/10	08/05/78	-	08/04/10	16/11/92	06/11/87
Chile	10/03/75	03/03/95	28/03/80	15/07/92	29/09/95	10/10/94	09/06/87
China	05/10/73	03/02/95	07/01/80	17/12/82	03/02/95	01/07/83	08/06/81
Fiji	29/11/72	28/07/04	04/03/83	28/07/04	28/07/04	08/03/16	27/03/91
Hong Kong, China*	16/08/72	23/10/02	25/05/80	14/11/81	23/10/02	11/04/85	03/11/84
Indonesia	17/01/77	28/11/17	17/02/81	23/08/88	28/11/17	21/10/86	27/01/87
Japan	15/05/68	24/06/97	15/05/80	15/05/80	24/06/97	09/06/83	27/05/82
Republic of Korea	10/07/69	14/11/94	31/12/80	02/12/82	14/11/94	23/07/84	04/04/85
Malaysia	12/01/71	11/11/11	19/10/83	19/10/83	11/11/11	31/01/97	31/01/92
Marshall Islands	26/04/88	29/11/94	26/04/88	26/04/88	16/10/95	26/04/88	25/04/89
New Zealand	05/02/70	03/06/01	23/02/90	23/02/90	03/06/01	25/09/98	30/07/86
Panama	13/05/66	17/09/07	09/03/78	14/07/82	17/09/07	20/02/85	29/06/92
Papua New Guinea	18/05/76	-	12/11/80	-	-	25/10/93	28/10/91
Peru	18/01/67	24/06/09	04/12/79	16/07/82	21/08/09	25/04/80	16/07/82
Philippines	04/03/69	24/04/18	15/12/81	24/04/18	06/06/18	15/06/01	22/02/84
Russian Federation	04/07/66	18/08/00	09/01/80	12/05/81	18/08/00	03/11/83	09/10/79
Singapore	21/09/71	18/08/99	16/03/81	01/06/84	10/08/99	01/11/90	01/05/88
Thailand	30/12/92	-	18/12/84	-	-	02/11/07	19/06/97
Vanuatu	28/07/82	26/11/90	28/07/82	28/07/82	14/09/92	13/04/89	22/04/91
Viet Nam	18/12/90	27/05/02	18/12/90	12/10/92	27/05/02	29/05/91	18/12/90
Mexico	25/03/70	13/05/94	28/03/77	30/06/83	13/05/94	23/04/92	02/02/82
DPR Korea	18/10/89	08/08/01	01/05/85	01/05/85	08/08/01	01/05/85	01/05/85
Macao, China*	18/07/05	11/10/10	20/12/99	20/12/99	24/06/05	20/12/99	18/07/05
Samoa	23/10/79	18/05/04	14/03/97	14/03/97	18/05/04	07/02/02	24/05/93
Solomon Islands	30/06/04	-	30/06/04	-	-	30/06/04	01/06/94
Tonga	12/04/77	15/06/00	12/04/77	18/09/03	15/06/00	01/02/96	07/02/95
Entry into force date	21/07/68	03/02/00	25/05/80	01/05/81	03/02/00	02/10/83	28/04/84

\* Effective date of extension of instruments.

(as at 31 December 2020)

Authority	COLREG 72	TONNAGE 69	ILO 147**	MLC 2006***	AFS 2001	CLC PROT 92	BWM 2004
Australia	29/02/80	21/05/82	-	21/12/11	09/01/07	09/10/95	07/06/17
Canada	07/03/75	18/07/94	D	15/06/10	08/04/10	29/05/98	08/04/10
Chile	02/08/77	22/11/82	-	22/02/18	06/10/16	29/05/02	-
China	07/01/80	08/04/80	-	12/11/15	07/03/11	05/01/99	22/10/18
Fiji	04/03/83	29/11/72	-	21/01/13	08/03/16	30/11/99	08/03/16
Hong Kong, China*	15/07/77	18/07/82	-	06/08/18	15/02/16	05/01/99	13/08/20
Indonesia	13/11/79	14/03/89	-	12/06/17	11/09/14	06/07/99	24/11/15
Japan	21/06/77	17/07/80	D	05/08/13	08/07/03	24/08/94	10/10/14
Republic of Korea	29/07/77	18/01/80	-	09/01/14	24/07/08	07/03/97	10/12/09
Malaysia	23/12/80	24/04/84	-	20/08/13	27/09/10	09/06/04	27/09/10
Marshall Islands	26/04/88	25/04/89	-	25/09/07	09/05/08	16/10/95	26/11/09
New Zealand	26/11/76	06/01/78	-	09/03/16	-	25/06/98	09/01/17
Panama	14/03/79	09/03/78	-	06/02/09	17/09/07	18/03/99	19/10/16
Papua New Guinea	18/05/76	25/10/93	-	-	-	23/01/01	-
Peru	09/01/80	16/07/82	06/07/04	-	02/07/19	01/09/05	10/06/16
Philippines	10/06/13	06/09/78	-	20/08/12	06/06/18	07/07/97	06/06/18
Russian Federation	09/11/73	20/11/69	D	20/08/12	19/10/12	20/03/00	24/05/12
Singapore	29/04/77	06/06/85	-	15/06/11	31/12/09	18/09/97	08/06/17
Thailand	06/08/79	11/06/96	-	07/06/16	-	17/07/17	-
Vanuatu	28/07/82	13/01/89	-	-	20/08/08	18/02/99	-
Viet Nam	18/12/90	18/12/90	-	08/05/13	27/11/15	17/06/03	-
Mexico	08/04/76	14/07/72	-	-	07/07/06	13/05/94	18/03/08
DPR Korea	01/05/85	18/10/89	-	-	21/08/20	-	-
Macao, China*	20/12/99	18/07/05	-	-	07/03/11	24/06/05	22/10/18
Samoa	23/10/79	18/05/04	-	21/11/13	-	01/02/02	-
Solomon Islands	12/03/82	30/06/04	-	-	-	30/06/04	-
Tonga	12/04/97	12/04/97	-	-	16/04/14	10/12/99	16/04/14
Entry into force date	15/07/77	18/07/82	28/11/81	20/08/13	17/09/08	30/05/96	08/09/17

\* Effective date of extension of instruments.

\*\* Although some Authorities have not ratified the ILO Convention No.147, parts of the ILO conventions referred to therein are implemented under their national legislation and port State control is carried out on matters covered by the national regulations.

\*\*\* MLC 2006 will supersede ILO147 if the Authority ratified both of them.

**Table 1a: STATUS OF MARPOL 73/78**

(Date of deposit of instruments)

(As at 31 December 2020)

Authority	Annexes I & II	Annex III	Annex IV	Annex V	Annex VI
Australia	14/10/87	10/10/94	27/02/04	14/08/90	07/08/07
Canada	16/11/92	08/08/02	26/03/10	26/03/10	26/03/10
Chile	10/10/94	10/10/94	10/10/94	15/08/08	16/10/06
China	01/07/83	13/09/94	02/11/06	21/11/88	23/05/06
Fiji	08/03/16	-	08/03/16	08/03/16	-
Hong Kong, China*	11/04/85	07/03/95	02/11/06	27/03/96	20/03/08
Indonesia	21/10/86	24/08/12	24/08/12	24/08/12	24/08/12
Japan	09/06/83	09/06/83	09/06/83	09/06/83	15/02/05
Republic of Korea	23/07/84	28/02/96	28/11/03	28/02/96	20/04/06
Malaysia	31/01/97	27/09/10	27/09/10	31/01/97	27/09/10
Marshall Islands	26/04/88	26/04/88	26/04/88	26/04/88	07/03/02
New Zealand	25/09/98	25/09/98	-	25/09/98	-
Panama	20/02/85	20/02/85	20/02/85	20/02/85	13/05/03
Papua New Guinea	25/10/93	25/10/93	25/10/93	25/10/93	-
Peru	25/04/80	25/04/80	25/04/80	25/04/80	04/12/14
Philippines	15/06/01	15/06/01	15/06/01	15/06/01	24/04/18
Russian Federation	03/11/83	14/08/87	14/08/87	14/08/87	08/04/11
Singapore	01/11/90	02/03/94	01/05/05	27/05/99	08/10/00
Thailand	02/11/07	-	-	-	-
Vanuatu	13/04/89	22/04/91	15/03/04	22/04/91	15/03/04
Viet Nam	29/05/91	19/12/14	19/12/14	19/12/14	19/12/14
Mexico	23/04/92	-	-	15/07/98	-
DPR Korea	01/05/01	01/05/01	01/05/01	01/05/01	-
Macao, China*	20/12/99	20/12/99	02/11/06	20/12/99	23/05/06
Samoa	07/02/02	07/02/02	07/02/02	07/02/02	18/05/04
Solomon Islands	30/06/04	30/06/04	30/06/04	30/06/04	-
Tonga	01/02/96	01/02/96	01/02/96	01/02/96	20/03/15
Entry into force date	02/10/1983	01/07/1992	27/09/2003	31/12/1988	19/05/2005

\* Effective date of extension of instruments.



## ANNEX 2

## PORT STATE INSPECTION STATISTICS

## STATISTICS FOR 2020

Table 2: PORT STATE INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT BY AUTHORITIES

Authority	No. of individual ships inspected (a)	No. of initial and follow-up inspections (b+c)	No. of initial inspections (b)	No. of follow-up inspections (c)	No. of inspections with deficiencies (d)	No. of deficiencies <sup>1)</sup> (e)	No. of detentions <sup>1)</sup> (f)	No. of individual ships visited <sup>2)</sup> (g)	Inspection rate (a/g%)	Detention percentage (f/b%)
Australia <sup>3)</sup>	2,764	4,522	3,021	1,501	1,568	6,384	178	6,137	45.04	5.89
Canada <sup>4)</sup>	577	583	583	0	389	2,483	19	2,055	28.08	3.26
Chile	516	846	533	313	246	531	8	1,862	27.71	1.50
China	770	1,113	787	326	619	2,363	56	17,415	4.42	7.12
Fiji	5	11	5	6	2	5	0	157	3.18	0
Hong Kong, China	255	321	256	65	184	629	6	4,989	5.11	2.34
Indonesia	1,574	2,145	1,949	196	625	1,923	47	8,021	19.62	2.41
Japan	1,993	2,873	2,323	550	1,238	4,401	43	7,406	26.91	1.85
Republic of Korea	1,428	2,043	1,601	442	1,123	3,879	63	10,493	13.61	3.94
Malaysia	670	892	738	154	329	963	2	8,052	8.32	0.27
Marshall Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	0	0
New Zealand	130	183	146	37	57	195	3	982	13.24	2.05
Panama <sup>4)</sup>	118	133	125	8	33	82	4	3,687	3.20	3.20
Papua New Guinea	65	99	75	24	36	135	0	456	14.25	0
Peru	181	215	189	26	47	73	0	1,663	10.88	0
Philippines	1,779	2,631	2,130	501	431	1,048	4	4,946	35.97	0.19
Russian Federation <sup>4)</sup>	996	2,674	1,410	1,264	1,198	5,631	48	2,363	42.15	3.40
Singapore	490	569	494	75	262	1,037	5	14,605	3.36	1.01
Thailand	732	1,028	935	93	218	525	1	3,640	20.11	0.11
Vanuatu	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	48	2.08	0
Viet Nam	1,739	2,399	2,113	286	1,158	2,637	6	4,974	34.96	0.28
<b>Total</b>	<b>13,047</b>	<b>25,282</b>	<b>19,415</b>	<b>5,867</b>	<b>9,763</b>	<b>34,924</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>Regional 25,858</b>	<b>Regional 50%</b>	<b>Regional 2.54%</b>

1) Numbers of deficiencies and detentions do not include those related to security.

2) LLI data for 2020.

3) Data for Australia is also provided to Indian Ocean MOU.

4) Data is only for the Pacific ports.

Table 2a: PORT STATE INSPECTIONS ON MARITIME SECURITY

Authority	No. of inspections	No. of inspections with security related deficiencies	No. of security related deficiencies	No. of security related detentions	Detention percentage (%)
Australia	3,021	3	3	0	0
Canada	583	9	9	0	0
Chile	533	6	6	0	0
China	787	27	29	1	0.13
Fiji	5	0	0	0	0
Hong Kong, China	256	11	11	0	0
Indonesia	1,949	22	24	1	0.05
Japan	2,323	69	74	0	0
Republic of Korea	1,601	140	155	0	0
Malaysia	738	24	25	1	0.14
Marshall Islands	0	0	0	0	0
New Zealand	146	3	3	0	0
Panama	125	1	1	0	0
Papua New Guinea	75	2	2	0	0
Peru	189	0	0	0	0
Philippines	2,130	59	74	0	0
Russian Federation	1,410	83	92	1	0.07
Singapore	494	21	22	0	0
Thailand	935	35	35	0	0
Vanuatu	2	0	0	0	0
Viet Nam	2,113	58	58	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,415</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Regional 0.02%</b>

Note: Security related data showing in the above table and the tables of deficiency by category are excluded from all other statistical tables and figures in this report.

Table 3: PORT STATE INSPECTIONS PER SHIP RISK PROFILE

Authority	Ship Risk Profile (SRP)				Total No. of inspections
	HRS	SRS	LRS	SRP Unknown	
Australia	499	1,412	1,105	5	3,021
Canada	128	282	172	1	583
Chile	74	293	166	0	533
China	292	300	195	0	787
Fiji	3	2	0	0	5
Hong Kong, China	121	96	39	0	256
Indonesia	607	784	554	4	1,949
Japan	796	1,054	467	6	2,323
Republic of Korea	647	629	325	0	1,601
Malaysia	269	267	182	20	738
Marshall Islands	0	0	0	0	0
New Zealand	60	58	28	0	146
Panama	25	70	30	0	125
Papua New Guinea	35	26	14	0	75
Peru	26	100	63	0	189
Philippines	739	883	507	1	2,130
Russian Federation	884	382	144	0	1,410
Singapore	159	226	109	0	494
Thailand	275	383	277	0	935
Vanuatu	0	0	2	0	2
Viet Nam	1,028	741	344	0	2,113
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,667</b>	<b>7,988</b>	<b>4,723</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>19,415</b>

Table 4: PORT STATE INSPECTIONS PER FLAG

Flag	No. of inspections	No. of inspections with deficiencies	No. of deficiencies	No. of detentions	Detention percentage %
Algeria	2	2	4	0	0
Antigua and Barbuda	143	75	218	4	2.80
Argentina	1	1	1	0	0
Australia	1	1	4	0	0
Bahamas	417	168	621	11	2.64
Bangladesh	88	73	191	3	3.41
Barbados	24	11	28	1	4.17
Belgium	25	8	18	0	0
Belize	533	495	2,009	26	4.88
Bermuda (UK)	30	8	25	0	0
Brazil	1	1	2	0	0
Brunei Darussalam	2	0	0	0	0
Cambodia	2	2	6	0	0
Cameroon	6	6	44	2	33.33
Cayman Islands (UK)	77	26	77	0	0
Chile	9	2	3	0	0
China	405	163	556	2	0.49
Comoros	3	2	11	1	33.33
Cook Islands	27	18	75	0	0
Croatia	24	12	65	2	8.33
Curacao	9	1	1	0	0
Cyprus	314	153	554	8	2.55
Denmark	83	32	77	4	4.82
Djibouti	1	1	3	0	0
Dominica	11	10	40	2	18.18
Ecuador	3	3	34	2	66.67
Egypt	2	2	19	1	50.00
Ethiopia	2	2	11	1	50.00
Fiji	1	1	2	0	0
France	19	8	16	0	0
Gabon	4	3	21	0	0
Germany	34	13	33	0	0
Gibraltar (UK)	19	9	30	0	0
Greece	169	64	195	3	1.78
Honduras	2	0	0	0	0
Hong Kong, China	1,906	664	2,261	35	1.84
India	33	20	95	1	3.03
Indonesia	151	107	442	6	3.97
Iran	6	4	11	0	0

Flag	No. of inspections	No. of inspections with deficiencies	No. of deficiencies	No. of detentions	Detention percentage %
Isle of Man (UK)	95	28	73	1	1.05
Israel	1	1	3	0	0
Italy	57	34	100	1	1.75
Jamaica	16	15	82	2	12.50
Japan	143	60	198	2	1.40
Kiribati	17	13	73	2	11.76
Korea, Democratic People's Republic	13	13	64	2	15.38
Korea, Republic of	558	311	1,017	6	1.08
Kuwait	5	3	4	0	0
Liberia	2,072	912	3,355	66	3.19
Libya	1	0	0	0	0
Luxembourg	14	8	25	0	0
Malaysia	126	62	214	2	1.59
Malta	698	301	963	15	2.15
Marshall Islands	2,015	854	3,055	49	2.43
Micronesia, Federated States of	1	0	0	0	0
Moldova	1	0	0	0	0
Mongolia	69	57	307	5	7.25
Montenegro	5	2	4	0	0
Myanmar	5	2	4	0	0
Nauru	3	2	6	0	0
Netherlands	52	30	109	2	3.85
New Zealand	2	1	1	0	0
Niue	8	6	30	0	0
Norway	167	65	240	5	2.99
Pakistan	4	3	13	1	25.00
Palau	35	34	165	4	11.43
Panama	5,373	2,923	10,257	139	2.59
Papua New Guinea	1	0	0	0	0
Peru	2	2	7	0	0
Philippines	91	48	168	2	2.20
Portugal	173	64	201	2	1.16
Qatar	10	7	21	1	10.00
Russian Federation	74	66	222	4	5.41
Saint Kitts and Nevis	2	1	4	0	0
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	28	20	60	0	0
Saudi Arabia	14	5	19	0	0
Sierra Leone	218	211	1,121	16	7.34
Singapore	1,388	518	1,535	17	1.22

<b>Flag</b>	<b>No. of inspections</b>	<b>No. of inspections with deficiencies</b>	<b>No. of deficiencies</b>	<b>No. of detentions</b>	<b>Detention percentage %</b>
South Africa	3	2	5	0	0
Spain	4	1	4	1	25.00
Sri Lanka	2	1	1	0	0
Sweden	3	3	8	0	0
Switzerland	9	4	7	0	0
Taiwan, China	94	19	56	1	1.06
Tanzania	1	1	9	0	0
Thailand	202	129	358	4	1.98
Togo	218	217	1,338	17	7.80
Turkey	25	9	24	0	0
Tuvalu	87	57	158	0	0
Ukraine	3	3	14	2	66.67
United Kingdom (UK)	78	37	139	1	1.28
United States of America	17	6	17	0	0
Vanuatu	28	16	39	0	0
Viet Nam	495	405	1,224	6	1.21
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,415</b>	<b>9,763</b>	<b>34,924</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>Regional 2.54</b>

Table 5: PORT STATE INSPECTIONS PER SHIP TYPE

Type of ship	No. of inspections	No. of inspections with deficiencies	No. of deficiencies	No. of detentions	Detention percentage %
NLS tanker	56	22	69	1	1.79
Combination carrier	14	5	16	0	0
Oil tanker	980	350	1,268	21	2.14
Gas carrier	403	134	331	4	0.99
Chemical tanker	1,641	557	1,567	25	1.52
Bulk carrier	8,249	4,167	14,944	231	2.80
Vehicle carrier	465	128	380	6	1.29
Container ship	3,097	1,298	4,079	41	1.32
Ro-Ro cargo ship	60	51	328	2	3.33
General cargo/multi-purpose ship	3,405	2,460	9,929	137	4.02
Refrigerated cargo carrier	287	155	550	8	2.79
Woodchip carrier	174	78	267	4	2.30
Livestock carrier	38	24	80	2	5.26
Ro-Ro passenger ship	37	34	104	0	0
Passenger ship	98	75	273	3	3.06
Factory ship	2	2	9	1	50.00
Heavy load carrier	63	31	82	3	4.76
Offshore service vessel	50	19	71	0	0
MODU & FPSO	2	0	0	0	0
High speed passenger craft	11	11	33	0	0
Special purpose ship	31	10	37	0	0
Tugboat	134	79	261	1	0.75
Others	118	73	246	3	2.54
<b>Total</b>	<b>19,415</b>	<b>9,763</b>	<b>34,924</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>2.54</b>

Table 6: PORT STATE INSPECTIONS PER RECOGNIZED ORGANIZATION

Recognized organization (RO)	No. of overall inspections	No. of overall detentions	No. of RO responsible detentions	Detention percentage%	RO responsible detention percentage%	Percentage of RO responsible detentions%
American Bureau of Shipping	2,441	48	0	1.97	0	0
Asia Classification Society	3	0	0	0	0	0
Asia Shipping Certification Services	14	0	0	0	0	0
Azure Naval Architects BV	3	1	0	33.33	0	0
Biro Klasifikasi Indonesia	98	4	0	4.08	0	0
Bolivian Register of Shipping	1	1	0	100.00	0	0
Bulgarski Koraben Registar	4	0	0	0	0	0
Bureau Veritas	2,604	71	2	2.73	0.08	2.82
China Classification Society	1,612	27	0	1.67	0	0
Columbus American Register	2	0	0	0	0	
Cosmos Marine Bureau	123	8	0	6.50	0	0
CR Classification Society	148	1	0	0.68	0	0
Croatian Register of Shipping	32	2	0	6.25	0	0
Cyprus Bureau of Shipping	2	0	0	0	0	0
Danforth Marinesurvey & Certification Services	2	0	0	0	0	0
Det Norske Veritas	120	2	0	1.67	0	0
DNV GL AS	4,227	93	1	2.20	0.02	1.08
Dromon Bureau of Shipping	82	4	2	4.88	2.44	50.00
Foresight Ship Classification	20	0	0	0	0	0
Germanischer Lloyd	63	1	0	1.59	0	0
Hellenic Register of Shipping	2	0	0	0	0	0
Honduras International Surveying and Inspection Bureau	1	0	0	0	0	0
Indian Register of Shipping	40	2	0	5.00	0	0
Intermaritime Certification Services, S.A.	570	24	3	4.21	0.53	12.50
International Marine Survey Association	1	1	0	100.00	0	0
International Maritime Register	8	0	0	0	0	0
International Naval Surveys Bureau	18	3	0	16.67	0	0
International Register of Shipping	88	4	0	4.55	0	0
International Ship Classification	50	2	0	4.00	0	0
Iranian Classification Society	5	1	0	20.00	0	0
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping	280	10	0	3.57	0	0
Isthmus Maritime Classification Society S.A.	2	0	0	0	0	0
Korea Classification Society (former Joson Classification Society)	36	2	0	5.56	0	0
Korea Ship Safety Technology Authority	5	0	0	0	0	0
KOREAN REGISTER	1,746	29	3	1.66	0.17	10.34



Recognized organization (RO)	No. of overall inspections	No. of overall detentions	No. of RO responsible detentions	Detention percentage%	RO responsible detention percentage%	Percentage of RO responsible detentions%
Limdal Marine Services	1	0	0	0	0	0
Lloyd's Register	2,937	75	6	2.55	0.20	8.00
Macosnar Corporation	32	0	0	0	0	0
Maritime Technical Systems and Services	7	0	0	0	0	0
National Shipping Adjusters Inc	18	0	0	0	0	0
New United International Marine Services Ltd	30	1	0	3.33	0	0
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	7,552	159	7	2.11	0.09	4.40
Novel Classification Society S.A.	3	0	0	0	0	0
Overseas Marine Certification Services	324	16	1	4.94	0.31	6.25
Panama Bureau of Shipping	4	0	0	0	0	0
Panama Maritime Documentation Services	334	16	0	4.79	0	0
Panama Shipping Registrar Inc.	37	1	0	2.70	0	0
Phoenix Register of Shipping	6	0	0	0	0	0
Polski Rejestr Statkow	35	2	0	5.71	0	0
Qualitas Register of Shipping S.A.	31	0	0	0	0	0
RINA Services S.p.A.	698	23	0	3.30	0	0
RINAVE Portuguesa	1	0	0	0	0	0
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	173	8	0	4.62	0	0
Russian River Register	2	0	0	0	0	0
Ship Classification Malaysia	2	0	0	0	0	0
Shipping Register of Ukraine	3	2	0	66.67	0	0
SingClass International Pte Ltd	38	2	0	5.26	0	0
Sing-Lloyd	30	2	0	6.67	0	0
Union Bureau of Shipping	155	20	2	12.90	1.29	10.00
Universal Maritime Bureau	121	8	0	6.61	0	0
Vega Register Inc.	2	0	0	0	0	0
Vietnam Register	514	6	0	1.17	0	0
Other	18	1	0	5.56	0	0

Note: The number of overall inspections and overall detentions is calculated corresponding to each recognized organization (RO) that issued statutory certificate(s) for a ship. In case that ship's certificates were issued by more than one ROs, the inspection and detention would be counted to each of them.

Table 7: DEFICIENCIES BY CATEGORIES

Nature of deficiencies		No. of deficiencies
Certificate & Documentation	Crew Certificates	765
	Documents	1,427
	Ship Certificates	601
Structural Conditions		1,109
Water/Weathertight conditions		2,457
Emergency Systems		2,278
Radio Communications		578
Cargo operations including equipment		403
Fire safety		5,902
Alarms		259
Safety of Navigation		3,681
Life saving appliances		4,177
Dangerous goods		36
Propulsion and auxiliary machinery		2,073
Working and Living Conditions	Living Conditions	303
	Working Conditions	1,311
Labour Conditions	Minimum requirements for seafarers	37
	Conditions of employment	523
	Accommodation, recreational facilities, food and catering	1,032
	Health protection, medical care, social security	2,090
Pollution prevention	Anti Fouling	6
	Ballast Water	384
	MARPOL Annex I	723
	MARPOL Annex II	11
	MARPOL Annex III	11
	MARPOL Annex IV	456
	MARPOL Annex V	745
	MARPOL Annex VI	372
ISM		871
Other		303
<b>Total</b>		<b>34,924</b>
ISPS		623
<b>Grand total</b>		<b>35,547</b>

## SUMMARY OF PORT STATE INSPECTION DATA 2018 – 2020

Table 8: BLACK – GREY – WHITE LISTS \*

Flag	Inspections 2018-2020	Detentions 2018-2020	Black to Grey Limit	Grey to White Limit	Excess Factor
<b>BLACK LIST</b>					
Togo	973	128	82		2.48
Sierra Leone	999	105	84		1.66
Mongolia	243	29	24		1.59
Jamaica	62	9	8		1.35
Palau	185	21	19		1.28
Kiribati	118	14	13		1.16
Korea, Democratic People's Republic	143	16	16		1.09
<b>GREY LIST</b>					
Croatia	79	9	10	1	0.91
Barbados	76	8	9	1	0.82
Niue	76	8	9	1	0.82
Comoros	31	3	5	0	0.65
Dominica	74	6	9	1	0.60
Belize	2,188	155	173	133	0.55
Qatar	44	3	6	0	0.49
Pakistan	31	2	5	0	0.47
Sri Lanka	32	2	5	0	0.46
Cook Islands	86	5	10	2	0.38
Iran	96	5	11	2	0.31
India	193	11	20	7	0.30
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	129	6	14	4	0.21
Kuwait	45	1	6	0	0.18
Luxembourg	63	1	8	1	0.05
Turkey	87	2	11	2	0.04
Vanuatu	151	5	16	5	0.01
Saudi Arabia	114	3	13	3	0
<b>WHITE LIST</b>					
Sweden	30	0		0	0
Chile	31	0		0	0
Curacao	33	0		0	0
Switzerland	53	0		0	-0.18
Indonesia	716	34		38	-0.23
United States of America	130	3		4	-0.29
Italy	282	10		12	-0.32
Bangladesh	241	8		10	-0.32

Flag	Inspections 2018-2020	Detentions 2018-2020	Black to Grey Limit	Grey to White Limit	Excess Factor
Philippines	458	18		23	-0.39
United Kingdom (UK)	419	16		20	-0.40
Antigua and Barbuda	670	25		36	-0.60
Netherlands	259	7		11	-0.62
Cyprus	1,403	54		82	-0.73
Tuvalu	359	10		17	-0.75
Russian Federation	737	25		40	-0.75
Gibraltar (UK)	80	0		1	-0.88
Viet Nam	2,146	71		130	-0.99
Portugal	796	21		43	-1.06
Greece	806	21		44	-1.08
Malta	3,055	93		190	-1.13
Cayman Islands (UK)	298	5		13	-1.14
Thailand	721	17		39	-1.15
Liberia	8,037	248		524	-1.19
Panama	21,736	682		1459	-1.22
Isle of Man (UK)	527	10		27	-1.26
Denmark	455	8		22	-1.28
Belgium	110	0		3	-1.32
Taiwan, China	307	4		14	-1.33
Norway	686	13		37	-1.33
Japan	571	10		29	-1.35
France	117	0		3	-1.39
Marshall Islands	7,930	184		517	-1.46
Malaysia	523	7		27	-1.50
Bermuda (UK)	137	0		4	-1.54
Bahamas	1,893	31		114	-1.61
Germany	226	1		9	-1.61
Singapore	5,717	59		368	-1.91
Hong Kong, China	8,205	86		536	-1.92
Korea, Republic of	3,191	25		199	-1.97
China	1,659	7		99	-2.26

- Note:** 1) Flags listed above are those of ships which were involved in 30 or more port State inspections over the 3-year period.  
2) According to the decision by the Port State Control Committee, flags involving 30-49 port State inspections with nil detentions are listed on top of the White List.

\* See explanatory note on page 49.

$p=7\%$

$z_{95\%}=1.645$

$q=3\%$

Table 9: INSPECTIONS AND DETENTIONS PER FLAG

Flag	Number of inspections				Number of detentions				3-year rolling average detention %
	2018	2019	2020	Total	2018	2019	2020	Total	
Algeria	0	3	2	5	0	2	0	2	40.00
Antigua and Barbuda	280	247	143	670	10	11	4	25	3.73
Argentina	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0
Australia	2	9	1	12	0	0	0	0	0
Bahamas	749	727	417	1,893	9	11	11	31	1.64
Bahrain	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bangladesh	62	91	88	241	2	3	3	8	3.32
Barbados	26	26	24	76	5	2	1	8	10.53
Belgium	39	46	25	110	0	0	0	0	0
Belize	823	832	533	2,188	64	65	26	155	7.08
Bermuda (UK)	48	59	30	137	0	0	0	0	0
Brazil	3	10	1	14	0	0	0	0	0
Brunei Darussalam	6	5	2	13	0	0	0	0	0
Cambodia	0	1	2	3	0	1	0	1	33.33
Cameroon	1	1	6	8	0	1	2	3	37.50
Cayman Islands (UK)	109	112	77	298	1	4	0	5	1.68
Chile	13	9	9	31	0	0	0	0	0
China	608	646	405	1,659	2	3	2	7	0.42
Colombia	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Comoros	9	19	3	31	1	1	1	3	9.68
Cook Islands	31	28	27	86	3	2	0	5	5.81
Croatia	35	20	24	79	3	4	2	9	11.39
Curacao	11	13	9	33	0	0	0	0	0
Cyprus	538	551	314	1,403	22	24	8	54	3.85
Denmark	203	169	83	455	2	2	4	8	1.76
Djibouti	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Dominica	36	27	11	74	3	1	2	6	8.11
Ecuador	1	3	3	7	1	2	2	5	71.43
Egypt	5	2	2	9	1	0	1	2	22.22
Equatorial Guinea	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Ethiopia	4	4	2	10	0	0	1	1	10.00
Falkland Islands (UK) (Malvinas)	2	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Faroe Islands (Denmark)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Fiji	2	4	1	7	0	1	0	1	14.29
Finland	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0

Flag	Number of inspections				Number of detentions				3-year rolling average detention %
	2018	2019	2020	Total	2018	2019	2020	Total	
France	45	53	19	117	0	0	0	0	0
Gabon	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0
Germany	103	89	34	226	0	1	0	1	0.44
Gibraltar (UK)	42	19	19	80	0	0	0	0	0
Greece	328	309	169	806	9	9	3	21	2.61
Honduras	2	0	2	4	1	0	0	1	25.00
Hong Kong, China	3,158	3,141	1,906	8,205	29	22	35	86	1.05
India	83	77	33	193	5	5	1	11	5.70
Indonesia	267	298	151	716	17	11	6	34	4.75
Iran	48	42	6	96	4	1	0	5	5.21
Isle of Man (UK)	221	211	95	527	3	6	1	10	1.90
Israel	11	5	1	17	0	0	0	0	0
Italy	115	110	57	282	4	5	1	10	3.55
Jamaica	22	24	16	62	4	3	2	9	14.52
Japan	216	212	143	571	4	4	2	10	1.75
Jordan	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	50.00
Kiribati	66	35	17	118	9	3	2	14	11.86
Korea, Democratic People's Republic	79	51	13	143	8	6	2	16	11.19
Korea, Republic of	1,363	1,270	558	3,191	14	5	6	25	0.78
Kuwait	24	16	5	45	0	1	0	1	2.22
Liberia	2,819	3,146	2,072	8,037	88	94	66	248	3.09
Libya	1	3	1	5	0	0	0	0	0
Lithuania	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
Luxembourg	12	37	14	63	0	1	0	1	1.59
Malaysia	192	205	126	523	1	4	2	7	1.34
Maldives	2	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
Malta	1,177	1,180	698	3,055	41	37	15	93	3.04
Marshall Islands	2,920	2,995	2,015	7,930	67	68	49	184	2.32
Mauritius	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Mexico	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Micronesia, Federated States of	3	0	1	4	1	0	0	1	25.00
Moldova	1	2	1	4	1	0	0	1	25.00
Mongolia	83	91	69	243	11	13	5	29	11.93
Montenegro	1	4	5	10	0	1	0	1	10.00
Myanmar	12	8	5	25	0	1	0	1	4.00
Nauru	0	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0

Flag	Number of inspections				Number of detentions				3-year rolling average detention %
	2018	2019	2020	Total	2018	2019	2020	Total	
Netherlands	103	104	52	259	3	2	2	7	2.70
New Zealand	4	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0
Niue	43	25	8	76	4	4	0	8	10.53
Norway	248	271	167	686	3	5	5	13	1.90
Pakistan	14	13	4	31	0	1	1	2	6.45
Palau	74	76	35	185	8	9	4	21	11.35
Panama	8151	8212	5373	21,736	248	295	139	682	3.14
Papua New Guinea	4	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0
Peru	5	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	0
Philippines	197	170	91	458	11	5	2	18	3.93
Portugal	329	294	173	796	12	7	2	21	2.64
Qatar	21	13	10	44	1	1	1	3	6.82
Russian Federation	350	313	74	737	13	8	4	25	3.39
Saint Kitts and Nevis	10	3	2	15	4	0	0	4	26.67
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	58	43	28	129	2	4	0	6	4.65
Samoa	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	50.00
Saudi Arabia	49	51	14	114	1	2	0	3	2.63
Sierra Leone	418	363	218	999	45	44	16	105	10.51
Singapore	2198	2131	1388	5,717	18	24	17	59	1.03
South Africa	2	2	3	7	0	1	0	1	14.29
Spain	9	14	4	27	0	0	1	1	3.70
Sri Lanka	18	12	2	32	1	1	0	2	6.25
Sweden	14	13	3	30	0	0	0	0	0
Switzerland	26	18	9	53	0	0	0	0	0
Taiwan, China	94	119	94	307	1	2	1	4	1.30
Tanzania	9	2	1	12	3	0	0	3	25.00
Thailand	275	244	202	721	4	9	4	17	2.36
Togo	413	342	218	973	51	60	17	128	13.16
Tonga	2	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	100.00
Turkey	25	37	25	87	0	2	0	2	2.30
Tuvalu	141	131	87	359	6	4	0	10	2.79
Ukraine	7	6	3	16	1	1	2	4	25.00
United Arab Emirates (UAE)	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
United Kingdom (UK)	191	150	78	419	7	8	1	16	3.82
United States of America	64	49	17	130	2	1	0	3	2.31
Vanuatu	68	55	28	151	4	1	0	5	3.31

Flag	Number of inspections				Number of detentions				3-year rolling average detention %
	2018	2019	2020	Total	2018	2019	2020	Total	
Viet Nam	877	774	495	2,146	26	39	6	71	3.31
Ship's registration withdrawn	1	2	0	3	1	2	0	3	100.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,589</b>	<b>31,372</b>	<b>19,415</b>	<b>82,376</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>983</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>2,410</b>	<b>2.93</b>



Figure 15: COMPARISON OF INSPECTIONS PER SHIP TYPE




Figure 16: COMPARISON OF DETENTIONS PER SHIP TYPE








Table 10: INSPECTIONS AND DETENTIONS PER SHIP TYPE

Type of ship	Number of inspections				Number of detentions				Average detention percentage %
	2018	2019	2020	Total	2018	2019	2020	Total	
NLS tanker	58	60	56	174	2	2	1	5	2.87
Combination carrier	34	37	14	85	2	1	0	3	3.53
Oil tanker	2,041	2,167	980	5,188	35	43	21	99	1.91
Gas carrier	839	818	403	2,060	12	12	4	28	1.36
Chemical tanker	2,392	2,317	1,641	6,350	40	45	25	110	1.73
Bulk carrier	11,470	12,107	8,249	31,826	339	398	231	968	3.04
Vehicle carrier	792	717	465	1,974	9	8	6	23	1.17
Container ship	5,705	5,481	3,097	14,283	114	98	41	253	1.77
Ro-Ro cargo ship	76	89	60	225	5	7	2	14	6.22
General cargo/multi-purpose ship	5,828	5,358	3,405	14,591	293	297	137	727	4.98
Refrigerated cargo carrier	690	638	287	1,615	28	27	8	63	3.90
Woodchip carrier	251	250	174	675	5	3	4	12	1.78
Livestock carrier	66	70	38	174	4	2	2	8	4.60
Ro-Ro Passenger ship	103	100	37	240	2	1	0	3	1.25
Passenger ship	311	314	98	723	7	5	3	15	2.07
Factory ship	6	5	2	13	0	0	1	1	7.69
Heavy load carrier	107	120	63	290	6	4	3	13	4.48
Offshore service vessel	125	98	50	273	2	2	0	4	1.47
MODU & FPSO	4	6	2	12	0	0	0	0	0.00
High speed passenger craft	46	49	11	106	1	0	0	1	0.94
Special purpose ship	79	78	31	188	4	2	0	6	3.19
High speed cargo craft	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0.00
Tugboat	245	204	134	583	7	6	1	14	2.40
Others	320	287	118	725	17	20	3	40	5.52
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,589</b>	<b>31,372</b>	<b>19,415</b>	<b>82,376</b>	<b>934</b>	<b>983</b>	<b>493</b>	<b>2,410</b>	<b>2.93</b>

Figure 17: COMPARISON OF INSPECTIONS WITH DEFICIENCIES PER SHIP TYPE



\* % over [+] or under [-] average

Table 11: INSPECTIONS WITH DEFICIENCIES PER SHIP TYPE

Type of ship	Number of inspections				Number of inspections with deficiencies				3-year average percentage %
	2018	2019	2020	Total	2018	2019	2020	Total	
Oil tanker/combination carrier	2,133	2,264	1,050	5,447	967	1,108	377	2,452	45.02
Gas carrier	839	818	403	2,060	348	371	134	853	41.41
Chemical tanker	2,392	2,317	1,641	6,350	1,095	1,097	557	2,749	43.29
Bulk carrier	11,470	12,107	8,249	31,826	6,508	7,101	4,167	17,776	55.85
Ro-ro/container/vehicle ship	6,573	6,287	3,622	16,482	3,275	3,240	1,477	7,992	48.49
General dry cargo ship	5,828	5,358	3,405	14,591	4,309	4,025	2,460	10,794	73.98
Refrigerated cargo carrier	690	638	287	1,615	504	461	155	1,120	69.35
Passenger ship	414	414	135	963	283	295	109	687	71.34
Other types	1,250	1,169	623	3,042	802	763	327	1,892	62.20
<b>Total</b>	<b>31,589</b>	<b>31,372</b>	<b>19,415</b>	<b>82,376</b>	<b>18,091</b>	<b>18,461</b>	<b>9,763</b>	<b>46,315</b>	<b>56.22</b>

Table 12: INSPECTIONS AND DETENTIONS PER RECOGNIZED ORGANIZATION

Recognized organization (RO)	No. of overall inspections 2018-2020	No. of overall detentions 2018-2020	No. of RO responsible detentions 2018-2020	3-year average detention percentage%	3-year average RO responsible detention percentage%	3-year average percentage of RO responsible detentions%
Aegean Register of Shipping	2	0	0	0	0	0
American Bureau of Shipping	10,425	194	3	1.86	0.03	1.55
American Register of Shipping	42	0	0	0	0	0
Asia Classification Society	40	3	2	7.50	5.00	66.67
Asia Shipping Certification Services	16	1	0	6.25	0	0
Azure Naval Architects BV	3	1	0	33.33	0	0
Biro Klasifikasi Indonesia	376	20	4	5.32	1.06	20.00
Bolivian Register of Shipping	1	1	0	100.00	0	0
Bulgarski Koraben Registar	8	0	0	0	0	0
Bureau Veritas	10,824	344	10	3.18	0.09	2.91
C.T.M. Inspection and Classification Company, S. de R.L.	1	1	0	100.00	0	0
China Classification Society	6,769	71	0	1.05	0	0
Columbus American Register	3	1	0	33.33	0	0
Cosmos Marine Bureau	338	41	7	12.13	2.07	17.07
CR Classification Society	578	7	0	1.21	0	0
Croatian Register of Shipping	116	9	1	7.76	0.86	11.11
Cyprus Bureau of Shipping	9	0	0	0	0	0
Danforth Marinesurvey & Certification Services	2	0	0	0	0	0
DNV GL AS	20,370	453	10	2.22	0.05	2.21
Dromon Bureau of Shipping	243	23	3	9.47	1.23	13.04
Ferriby Marine	1	0	0	0	0	0
Foresight Ship Classification	50	3	1	6.00	2.00	33.33
Global Marine Bureau	5	0	0	0	0	0
Global Shipping Bureau	1	0	0	0	0	0
Hellenic Register of Shipping	11	0	0	0	0	0
Honduras International Surveying and Inspection Bureau	1	0	0	0	0	0
Horizon International of Naval Surveying and Inspection Bureau, S.A.	1	0	0	0	0	0
Indian Register of Shipping	203	12	0	5.91	0	0
Intermaritime Certification Services, S.A.	2,268	126	10	5.56	0.44	7.94
International Marine Survey Association	2	1	0	50.00	0	0
International Maritime Register	25	0	0	0	0	0
International Naval Surveys Bureau	89	8	0	8.99	0	0
International Register of Shipping	356	41	3	11.52	0.84	7.32
International Ship Classification	295	27	7	9.15	2.37	25.93
Iranian Classification Society	70	7	0	10.00	0	0
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping	1,191	72	3	6.05	0.25	4.17
Isthmus Maritime Classification Society S.A.	11	0	0	0	0	0
Korea Classification Society (former Joson Classification Society)	266	17	3	6.39	1.13	17.65
Korea Ship Safety Technology Authority	47	0	0	0	0	0
KOREAN REGISTER	7,926	132	4	1.67	0.05	3.03
Libyan Surveyor Mr. Sif Ennasar Abdulhamid Giahmi	1	0	0	0	0	0
Limdal Marine Services	2	0	0	0	0	0

Recognized organization (RO)	No. of overall inspections 2018-2020	No. of overall detentions 2018-2020	No. of RO responsible detentions 2018-2020	3-year average detention percentage%	3-year average RO responsible detention percentage%	3-year average percentage of RO responsible detentions%
Lloyd's Register	12,712	314	17	2.47	0.13	5.41
M&P Surveyors, S. de R.L. de C.V.	2	0	0	0	0	0
Macosnar Corporation	144	9	0	6.25	0	0
Maritime Bureau of Africa	15	2	0	13.33	0	0
Maritime Bureau of Shipping	3	0	0	0	0	0
Maritime Technical Systems and Services	22	2	1	9.09	4.55	50.00
Mediterranean Shipping Register	1	0	0	0	0	0
National Shipping Adjusters Inc	48	5	1	10.42	2.08	20.00
New United International Marine Services Ltd	165	15	2	9.09	1.21	13.33
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	29,430	711	22	2.42	0.07	3.09
Novel Classification Society S.A.	6	0	0	0	0	0
Overseas Marine Certification Services	1,171	100	10	8.54	0.85	10.00
Panama Bureau of Shipping	34	3	0	8.82	0	0
Panama Marine Survey and Certification Services, Inc.	7	1	0	14.29	0	0
Panama Maritime Documentation Services	1,303	94	6	7.21	0.46	6.38
Panama Maritime Surveyors Bureau Inc	1	0	0	0	0	0
Panama Register Corporation	28	3	0	10.71	0	0
Panama Shipping Registrar Inc.	144	9	0	6.25	0	0
Phoenix Register of Shipping	22	1	1	4.55	4.55	100.00
Polski Rejestr Statkow	159	6	0	3.77	0	0
Qualitas Register of Shipping S.A.	34	0	0	0	0	0
Registro Brasileiro de Navios de Aeronaves	3	0	0	0	0	0
RINA Services S.p.A.	3,078	114	0	3.70	0	0
RINAVE Portuguesa	7	0	0	0	0	0
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	1,095	42	0	3.84	0	0
Russian River Register	2	0	0	0	0	0
Ship Classification Malaysia	60	2	0	3.33	0	0
Shipping Register of Ukraine	16	4	0	25.00	0	0
SingClass International Pte Ltd	137	18	4	13.14	2.92	22.22
Sing-Lloyd	194	16	1	8.25	0.52	6.25
Turkish Lloyd	1	0	0	0	0	0
Union Bureau of Shipping	872	109	18	12.50	2.06	16.51
Universal Maritime Bureau	590	60	4	10.17	0.68	6.67
Universal Shipping Bureau	3	0	0	0	0	0
Vega Register Inc.	2	0	0	0	0	0
Venezuelan Register of Shipping	4	0	0	0	0	0
Veritas Register of Shipping	2	0	0	0	0	0
Vietnam Register	2,219	72	2	3.24	0.09	2.78
Other	124	7	0	5.65	0	0

See also the note in page 27.

Table 13: PERFORMANCE OF RECOGNIZED ORGANIZATION

Recognized organization (RO)	No. of overall inspections 2018-2020	No. of RO responsible detentions 2018-2020	Low/medium Limit	Medium/high Limit	Excess factor	Performance level
SingClass International Pte Ltd	137	4	6	0	0.70	Medium
International Ship Classification	295	7	10	1	0.62	
Union Bureau of Shipping	872	18	25	10	0.54	
Cosmos Marine Bureau	338	7	11	2	0.53	
New United International Marine Services Ltd	165	2	7	0	0.31	
Croatian Register of Shipping	116	1	5	0	0.28	
Dromon Bureau of Shipping	243	3	9	1	0.27	
Korea Classification Society (former Joson Classification Society)	266	3	10	1	0.23	
Biro Klasifikasi Indonesia	376	4	12	3	0.15	
Sing-Lloyd	194	1	8	0	0.11	
International Register of Shipping	356	3	12	2	0.07	
Indian Register of Shipping	203	0	8	0	-0.26	High
Universal Maritime Bureau	590	4	18	6	-0.40	
Overseas Marine Certification Services	1,171	10	32	15	-0.53	
Panama Maritime Documentation Services	1,303	6	35	17	-1.09	
Intermaritime Certification Services, S.A.	2,268	10	57	34	-1.29	
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping	1,191	3	32	15	-1.44	
CR Classification Society	578	0	18	6	-1.73	
Vietnam Register	2,219	2	56	33	-1.83	
Lloyd's Register	12,712	17	281	228	-1.84	
Bureau Veritas	10,824	10	241	192	-1.88	
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	1,095	0	30	14	-1.91	
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	29,430	22	629	549	-1.92	
KOREAN REGISTER	7,926	4	180	138	-1.93	
DNV GL AS	20,370	10	441	374	-1.94	
American Bureau of Shipping	10,425	3	233	184	-1.96	
RINA Services S.p.A.	3,078	0	75	48	-1.98	
China Classification Society	6,769	0	155	116	-1.99	

Note: 1) In this table, only recognized organizations (RO) that had more than 60 inspections

are taken into account. The formula used is identical to the one used for the Black-Grey-White List. However, the values for P and Q are adjusted to P=2% and Q=1%.

- 2) ROs involving 60-179 inspections with zero detention are not included in this table.



**Figure 18: COMPARISON OF NUMBER OF DEFICIENCIES BY MAIN CATEGORIES**





Table 14: COMPARISON OF DEFICIENCIES BY CATEGORIES

Nature of deficiency		Number of deficiencies		
		2018	2019	2020
	Crew Certificates	1,148	1,026	765
Certificate & Documentation	Documents	3,814	2,943	1,427
	Ship Certificates	1,782	1,594	601
	Structural Conditions	2,046	2,507	1,109
Water/Weathertight conditions		5,017	5,472	2,457
Emergency Systems		4,128	5,157	2,278
Radio Communications		1,570	1,382	578
Cargo operations including		711	645	403
Fire safety		13,340	13,178	5,902
Alarms		520	537	259
Safety of Navigation		10,127	9,179	3,681
Life saving appliances		9,363	9,893	4,177
Dangerous goods		195	151	36
Propulsion and auxiliary		3,785	4,015	2,073
Working and Living Conditions	Living Conditions	410	334	303
	Working Conditions	2,126	1,913	1,311
Labour Conditions	Minimum requirements for seafarers	48	31	37
	Conditions of employment	545	444	523
	Accommodation, recreational facilities, food and catering	1,094	1,426	1,032
	Health protection, medical care, social security	2,571	3,023	2,090
Pollution prevention	Anti Fouling	16	8	6
	Ballast Water	812	1,522	384
	MARPOL Annex I	1,508	1,514	723
	MARPOL Annex II	16	25	11
	MARPOL Annex III	13	10	11
	MARPOL Annex IV	1,256	1,350	456
	MARPOL Annex V	1,673	1,181	745
	MARPOL Annex VI	1,623	954	372
ISM		1,616	1,486	871
Other		568	493	303
<b>Total</b>		<b>73,441</b>	<b>73,393</b>	<b>34,924</b>
ISPS		1,516	1,157	623
<b>Grand total</b>		<b>74,957</b>	<b>74,550</b>	<b>35,547</b>

**Figure 19: COMPARISON OF MOST FREQUENT DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES**



**Table 15: COMPARISON OF MOST FREQUENT DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES**

No.	Most frequent deficiencies	Year		
		2018	2019	2020
1	Other (ISM)	73	113	85
2	Emergency source of power - Emergency generator (Emergency systems)	63	89	54
3	Lifeboats (Life saving appliances)	81	122	50
4	Fire-dampers (Fire safety)	98	111	48
5	Maintenance of the ship and equipment (ISM)	82	88	43
6	Emergency fire pump and its pipes (Emergency systems)	53	74	37
7	Sewage treatment plant (MARPOL Annex IV)	88	103	37
8	Fire doors/openings in fire-resisting divisions (Fire safety)	64	58	33
9	Oil filtering equipment (MARPOL Annex I)	75	75	30
10	Rescue boats (Life saving appliances)	62	62	29


Table 16: LIST OF UNDER-PERFORMING SHIPS

IMO No.	Ship name (at the day of detention)	Flag	IMO company No.	No. of times on the list
8703634	QIAN JIN	Togo	6061913	10
8844218	XIN HAI 888	Belize	5940270	6
8844555	HARMONY RICH	Sierra Leone	5315345	7
9005091	YUAN XIANG	Togo	5555424	2
9124172 <sup>1</sup>	JIA XIN	Panama	6097236	1
9124172 <sup>1</sup>	ZHONG JIAN	Panama	5283251	1
9146247 <sup>2</sup>	SILVER STAR 1	Sierra Leone	6101282	12
9146247 <sup>2</sup>	GOLD STAR	Cameroon	6101282	12
9192155	MANANTIAL	Ecuador	6053873	2
9221449	DORIS	Togo	6034998	5
9342944	CAPTAIN KANG	Togo	5173250	1
9347918	SAFESEA NEHA II	Liberia	5559577	1
9387619	JET	Panama	5167945	1
9405136 <sup>3</sup>	ASIA STAR	Sierra Leone	5728980	9
9405136 <sup>3</sup>	ASIA STAR	Mongolia	5728980	9
9543835	XIN ZHONG RUI 15	Belize	5921893	2

1. The ship changed name and company.
2. The ship changed name and flag.
3. The ship changed flag.

### ANNEX 3

## ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE TOKYO MOU



## EXPLANATORY NOTE ON THE BLACK – GREY – WHITE LISTS

The Port State Control Committee adopted the same method as used by the Paris MOU for assessment of performance of flags. Compared to the calculation method of previous year, this system has the advantage of providing an excess percentage that is significant and also reviewing the number of inspections and detentions over a 3-year period at the same time, based on binomial calculus.

The performance of each flag State is calculated using a standard formula for statistical calculations in which certain values have been fixed in accordance with the agreement of the Port State Control Committee. Two limits have been included in the new system, the 'black to grey' and the 'grey to white' limit, each with its own specific formula:

$$u_{black - to - grey} = N \cdot p + 0.5 + z \cdot \sqrt{N \cdot p \cdot (1 - p)}$$


$$u_{white - to - grey} = N \cdot p - 0.5 - z \cdot \sqrt{N \cdot p \cdot (1 - p)}$$

In the formula "N" is the number of inspections, "p" is the allowable detention limit (yardstick), set to 7% by the Tokyo MOU Port State Control Committee, and "z" is the significance requested (z=1.645 for a statistically acceptable certainty level of 95%). The result "u" is the allowed number of detentions for either the black or white list. The "u" results can be found in the table as the 'black to grey' or the 'grey to white' limit. A number of detentions above this 'black to grey' limit means significantly worse than average, where a number of detentions below the

'grey to white' limit means significantly better than average. When the amount of detentions for a particular flag State is positioned between the two, the flag State will find itself on the grey list. The formula is applicable for sample sizes of 30 or more inspections over a 3-year period.

To sort results on the black or white list, simply alter the target and repeat the calculation. Flags which are still significantly above this second target are worse than the flags which are not. This process can be repeated, to create as many refinements as desired. (Of course the maximum detention rate remains 100%!) To make the flags' performance comparable, the excess factor (EF) is introduced. Each incremental or decremental step corresponds with one whole EF-point of difference. Thus the excess factor EF is an indication for the number of times the yardstick has to be altered and recalculated. Once the excess factor is determined for all flags, the flags can be ordered by EF. The excess factor can be found in the last column the black, grey or white list. The target (yardstick) has been set on 7% and the size of the increment and decrement on 3%. The Black – Grey – White lists have been calculated in accordance with the above principles.

The graphical representation of the system, below, is showing the direct relations between the number of inspected ships and the number of detentions. Both axis have a logarithmic character.



## TOKYO MOU SECRETARIAT

The Secretariat (Tokyo MOU Secretariat) of the Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control in the Asia-Pacific Region is located in Tokyo, Japan. The Secretariat may be approached for further information or inquiries on the operation of the Memorandum.

### ADDRESS OF THE SECRETARIAT

The address of the Tokyo MOU Secretariat reads:

**Tokyo MOU Secretariat**  
**Ascend Shimbashi 8F**  
**6-19-19 Shimbashi**  
**Minato-ku, Tokyo**  
**Japan 105-0004**  
**Tel: +81-3-3433-0621**  
**Fax: +81-3-3433-0624**  
**E-mail: [secretariat@tokyo-mou.org](mailto:secretariat@tokyo-mou.org)**

### STAFF OF THE SECRETARIAT

The staff of the Secretariat consist of:

Kubota Hideo  
Secretary

Ning Zheng  
Deputy Secretary

Akimoto Fumiko  
Project Officer

Ogusu Masayuki  
Technical Advisor