


Paris MoU



on Port State Control



Port State Control
Dealing with the pandemic

ANNUAL REPORT 2020

Port State Control
Dealing with the pandemic

ANNUAL REPORT 2020



Paris MoU



on Port State Control

Annual Report 2020


CONTENTS

Introduction Chair and Secretary-General	4
Executive summary	6
COVID-19 and the impact on the Paris MoU	8
Paris MoU developments	10
Facts & Figures 2020	16
Statistical Annexes Annual Report 2020	21
White List	29
Grey List	30
Black List	33
Explanatory note - "White", "Grey" and "Black List"	56
Secretariat Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control	57



Introduction

CHAIRMAN AND SECRETARY-GENERAL



There is no way we can begin without mentioning the COVID-19 outbreak and the impact it has had and continues to have on the global community. Both in relation to health and with regard to the restrictions imposed worldwide with the aim of limiting further spread.

This impact was, of course, also felt within the Paris MoU and the enforcement activities that the Paris MoU stands for. In 2020 inspection efforts dropped enormously from the time of the outbreak. This situation persisted for several months, but gradually the situation of COVID-19 improved and the Paris MoU efforts could be stepped up.

After efforts increased, it became clear that the restrictions posed by COVID-19 had major consequences for seafarers. Due to limitations in (the possibilities for) repatriation and shore leave, seafarers were in some cases compelled to remain on board for longer periods than was desirable and longer than the eleven months mentioned in the Maritime Labour Convention.

Considering that port State control officers (PSCOs) were confronted with these situations during their onboard visits, the Paris MoU issued guidance on how to best deal with them. The Paris MoU appreciated and uses the guidelines developed and issued by both the IMO and ILO.

The functioning of the Paris MoU as an organisation was also affected by the pandemic. The usual face-to-face Committee meeting in May was postponed, after which a written procedure was held in June to take the more urgent decisions. The Committee meeting, although in virtual form, was held at the end of September and the beginning of

October 2020. This caused the postponement of the annual meeting of the Technical Evaluation Group from December to the start of 2021. However, the Paris MoU succeeded in continuing developments based on decisions taken during PSCC53 to further improve our port State control regime.

One of the main decisions taken by the Committee was to start sharing inspection data in bulk and develop a web service for this.

The Paris MoU members and bodies have continued under these circumstances to positively contribute to the goals and results of the Organisation. The European Commission and the European Maritime Safety Agency (EMSA) are also thanked for their pro-active co-operation and strong working relationship with the Paris MoU.

The port State control officers are the ones at the heart of the Paris MoU and who continue to deliver on our common objectives. Special thanks and appreciation go to them in a very challenging year.



Brian Hogan

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Brian Hogan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Chairman of the Paris MoU Committee



Luc Smulders

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Luc Smulders". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Secretary-General of the Paris MoU

Executive SUMMARY

The impact of COVID-19 on the world has obviously impacted the work of the Paris MoU. Partly on the basis of guidelines from both IMO and ILO, guidance was developed for the member Authorities of the Paris MoU on how best to deal with this situation. This Paris MoU guidance has been revised at various times to stay in line with the changed circumstances and shared with other port State control regimes, the IMO and the ILO as well as the public.

However, the Paris MoU had to scale back efforts, resulting in decreasing numbers of inspections, bannings, detentions and deficiencies.

In 2020, 7 Refusal of Access Orders (bans) were issued. This shows a decrease compared to 2019 when 27 bans were issued. The detention percentage fell slightly to 2.81% (from 2.96% in 2019). The number of detainable deficiencies decreased to 1,942 (from 2,964 in 2019). The number of inspections carried out was 13,148. Clearly a substantial decrease to 2019: 17,913.

In the past three years 55 ships have been banned for multiple detentions, five ships were banned "failing to call at an indicated repair yard" and two ships for jumping detention. In the same period, 12 ships were banned for a second time (13 in the period 2017 to 2019).

Over a three-year period the flags of Comoros, the Republic of Moldova, the United Republic of Tanzania and Togo have recorded the highest number of bannings.

Looking at the Paris MoU "White, Grey and Black List" in this challenging year, a small shift is noticeable in the quality of shipping resulting in a larger "Grey List". The total number of 39 flags on the "White List" is slightly less

than that of 2019 (41). The "Grey List" contains 22 flags (16 in 2019); the "Black List" 9 flags (13 in 2019).

Recognized Organizations (ROs) are authorised by flag States to carry out statutory surveys on their behalf. For this reason, it is important to monitor their performance, which is why a performance list for ROs is presented in the Annual Report as well. Out of 369 detentions recorded in 2020, 37 (10%) were considered RO related (15% in 2019). Noteworthy is the fact that no RO is mentioned in the category "very low" on the RO performance list.

The number of inspections has clearly decreased significantly in 2020; 13,148. However, the detention percentage in 2020 (2.81%) has only decreased slightly from 2.96%. The number of detainable deficiencies has also decreased from 2,964 in 2019 to 1,942 this year.

Members with the largest number of inspections, namely Spain, Italy, Canada, the United Kingdom, Greece, France and the Russian Federation, jointly accounted for 51% of the total number of inspections this year.

With 545 inspections and 41 detentions the ships flying a "Black-listed flag" had a detention rate of 9.36%, which is less than the 12% in 2019. For ships flying a "Grey-listed flag" the detention rate was 4.6%, which is less than the 7% in 2019. Ships flying a "White-listed flag" had a detention rate of 2.4% which is slightly higher than in 2019 (2.2%) and 2018 (2.3%).

The five most frequently recorded deficiencies in 2020 were "ISM" (4.65%, 1,298), "fire doors/openings in fire-resisting divisions" (3.07%, 857), "seafarers' employment agreement" (1.9%, 530), "cleanliness of engine room" (1.43%, 400) and "nautical publications" (1.36%, 381).

The deficiency on the seafarers' employment agreement increased relatively from 1.2% to 1.9%. The highest increase of the most frequently recorded deficiencies.

In addition, the total number of the top five of deficiencies has relatively increased from 11.2% in 2019 to 12.4% this year. ■


Paris MoU 2020

on Port State Control

Three year trend detention %



2018: 3.18%



2019: 2.96%



2020: 2.81%

Inspection results



13,148
Inspections



6,609
Inspections
with deficiencies



369
Detentions



7
Bannings

Number of White, Grey and Black flags



39



22



9

Performance in number of ROs



High
12



Medium
16



Low
4



Very low
0

Top 5 category of deficiencies

13%

Fire Safety

11%

Safety of Navigation

10%

Labour Conditions - Health protection, medical care, welfare and social security protection

8%

Life Saving Appliances

6%

Certificate & Documentation

COVID-19 AND THE IMPACT ON THE PARIS MOU

The year 2020 will be marked in years to come as the year of the COVID-19 crisis. The impact of the pandemic on the global health, social and economic situation was enormous.

Needless to say, this also affected the Paris MoU members and the Paris MoU activities in general. Health and travel restrictions made it fairly impossible to conduct inspections and attend trainings and meetings.

After “a first wave” in March 2020 within the region, the inspection activities of the Paris MoU came to an almost complete standstill. From June onwards, efforts could be gradually resumed, resulting in a 27% decrease in the number of inspections for 2020, compared to the usual 18,000 inspections per year.

Even before inspections checking compliance with international maritime conventions could be resumed, attention was paid to the potential consequences of the crisis for industry, seafarers and the work of the Paris MoU itself and the health and safety of our PSCOs.

One of the elements in which port States play a crucial role is to ensure a correct implementation of the ILO MLC, 2006. At the start of the pandemic in March 2020, temporary guidance for the member authorities and their Port State Control Officers was developed to deal with the impact of the outbreak of COVID-19 (PSCircular 97). Recognising that exemptions, waivers and extensions to certificates had been granted by many flag States, the general principle was to adopt a pragmatic and harmonised approach. Port State Control Authorities were encouraged to accept extensions of the validity of certificates and periods of service on board for seafarers and to note delays to surveys, inspections and audits, in line with guidance issued by the IMO (Circular Letter No. 4204/Add.19 and revisions) as well as the ILO (Information Notes). The temporary guidance has been revised a number of times to stay aligned with the evolving situation of the pandemic and the aforementioned IMO and ILO guidelines. For example, in a revision on 17 December 2020, the member Authorities were urged to pay specific

attention during inspections to compliance with ILO MLC, 2006 requirements, in particular to seafarers’ employment agreements (SEAs), thereby referring to the latest ILO “Information note on maritime labour issues and coronavirus (COVID-19)”.

The Paris MoU also examined the impact of the crisis on the work of the Paris MoU itself, including whether and to what extent the harmonised and risk-based methodology was also affected. It was decided to establish a Task Force to investigate and analyse such impacts and, if necessary, to develop measures to deal with the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. Inspection results were closely monitored throughout the year to anticipate any potential negative impacts or problems. ■





Paris MoU DEVELOPMENTS

Once a year the Port State Control Committee, which is the executive body of the Paris MoU, meets in one of the member States. The Committee considers policy issues related to the regional enforcement of port State control, reviews the work of the Technical Evaluation Group and task forces and decides on administrative procedures.





The task forces are each assigned a specific work programme to investigate improvement of operational, technical and administrative port State control procedures. Reports of the task forces are submitted to the Technical Evaluation Group (TEG) in which all Paris MoU members and observers are represented. The evaluation by TEG is submitted to the Committee for final consideration and decision-making.

The MoU Advisory Board advises the Port State Control Committee on matters of a political and strategic nature, and provides direction to the task forces and Secretariat between meetings of the Committee. The Board meets several times a year and in 2020 consisted of participants from Norway, the Russian Federation, Belgium, Finland, the Netherlands and the European Commission.

PORT STATE CONTROL COMMITTEE

As a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, the PSCC meeting was postponed. Due to several urgent decisions to be taken to maintain the harmonized system and the risk-based approach, a written procedure was organized in June 2020 to approve, among other things, the performance lists of flag States and Recognized Organizations.

The Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control (Paris MoU) held its 53rd Committee meeting by virtual means from the 28th of September to the 2nd of October 2020. The Committee consists of 27 member Authorities and the European Commission.

One of the priority elements discussed was the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on port State control. Port calls and the number of inspections decreased substantially in the period from March to June as a consequence of restrictive measures resulting from COVID-19. However, as from June 2020 port State control efforts increased again.

The Committee discussed the impact of the COVID-19 situation and noted that the Paris MoU had already acted on the situation by issuing a Circular (PSCircular 97) on the resumption of inspection efforts. This Circular urges the Paris MoU member Authorities to apply an enhanced focus, during all types of inspections, on MLC requirements, in particular on Seafarers Employment Agreements, SEAs, and on the repatriation of seafarers. While the gradual resumption of port State control inspections was observable, the Committee considered that attention should be paid to possible effects on the harmonised system of inspections. That is why a task force was established to study and analyse the impact



and to determine whether actions are needed for the medium and longer term.

The Committee recalled its earlier decision, as a result of COVID-19, to postpone all concentrated inspection campaigns (CICs) by one year, and the resulting re-scheduling of the CIC on Stability to 2021. The Committee also agreed to an Inspection Campaign on the Polar Code in 2022.

Furthermore, following last year's decision, the Committee decided how to share inspection data in bulk to registered users by publishing it on the Paris MoU website.

The Committee also discussed the outcome of the joint CIC on Emergency Systems and Procedures, held from 1 September 2019 until 1 December 2019. Industry compliance was generally recorded as satisfactory.

The Committee also recalled its earlier adoption of the 2019 Annual Report, including the "White, Grey and Black List" and the performance list of Recognized Organizations. These lists were taken into account for the calculation of the Ship Risk Profile from 1 July 2020.

During the meeting the Committee re-elected Mr. Brian Hogan (Ireland) as its Chairman and Mr. Naim Nazha (Canada) as its vice-Chairman.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION GROUP

The postponement of PSC53 until the end of September 2020 gave the task forces established by the Committee little time to complete their work before the scheduled meeting of the Technical Evaluation Group in December 2020. For that reason, TEG was postponed to January 2021. The task forces, which were to deal with - amongst others - the following topics, were instructed to report to TEG and to the following Port State Control Committee:

- Information System Developments;
- Evaluation of Paris MoU Statistics;
- New inspection policy within the Paris MoU;
- CIC on Stability (in general) 2021;
- CIC on STCW 2022;
- Polar Code Inspection Campaign 2022;
- CIC on Fire Safety 2023;
- Scheme to harmonise the level of professional competence within the Paris MoU;
- Impact of COVID-19 crisis.

PORT STATE CONTROL TRAINING AND SEMINARS

Over the past years, the training programs have helped PSCOs from members Authorities, observers and other MoUs refine and enhance their skills in the application of port State control procedures. They have also increased their understanding of IMO/ILO conventions and regulations that were the subject of these training programs.

The basic aim remains to achieve a higher degree of harmonisation and to standardise inspections throughout the region.

The Secretariat normally organises five different programmes for Port State Control Officers:

- Seminars (twice a year);
- Expert Trainings (twice a year);
- Specialised Trainings (alternately about bulk carriers, passenger ships and tankers).

SEMINARS

The seminars are open to members, co-operating members and observers. The agenda is more topical than Expert and Specialised Training and deals with current issues such as inspection campaigns and new requirements.

EXPERT AND SPECIALIZED TRAINING

For the Expert Training, the central themes are “The Human Element” and “Safety and Environment”. The theme of the Specialized Training changes every year. The training programmes are intended for experienced PSCOs. Using that experience, the participants can work together to establish a higher degree of harmonisation and standardisation of their inspection practice. Lecturers for the training programmes are invited from the Paris MoU Authorities and the maritime industry.

Expert and Specialized Trainings aim to promote a higher degree of professional knowledge and harmonisation of more complex port State control issues and procedures.

The 16th Expert Training “Safety and Environment”

The sixteenth Expert Training programme was held in The Hague, the Netherlands, in February 2020. Important issues during this training were new requirements in the Annexes to the MARPOL Convention, SOLAS life-saving appliances and the use of operational drills during a PSC inspection. The International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code (IMDG Code) was also discussed. Representatives from the Black Sea MoU and EMSA took part in the training.

FACE TO FACE TRAINING AND SEMINARS CANCELLED

All other training efforts were cancelled due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Preparations have been made to explore options for an adjusted programme in the future to meet training needs.

WEBINAR

Following up on earlier experiences with webinars, a webinar for PSCOs was organised on the COVID-19 consequences and possible issues, specifically regarding MLC-related issues. The webinar was held in September and the basis of the webinar was the application of PSCircular 97 (Temporary guidance related to COVID-19 for port State control Authorities).

“Ongoing improvements and performance measurement through inspection results require strict adherence to the established procedures.”

TRAINING IN COOPERATION WITH EMSA

The Paris MoU also collaborates with EMSA in the “PSC Seminar for Port State Control Officers”. The PSC Seminars are delivered to PSCOs from all Member Authorities. In 2020 the Professional Development Scheme (PDS) for PSCOs of the Paris MoU had to be adjusted.

The Paris MoU inspection regime focuses on elimination of substandard shipping and on rewarding well-performing ships in terms of the inspection frequency. It translates to “less, but higher quality inspections”. The regime is supported by a comprehensive set of procedures, all aimed at providing more guidance for better inspections.

Ongoing improvements and performance measurement through inspection results require strict adherence to the established procedures. For the seminars organised for PSCOs in 2020, the previously adopted approach was followed in order to maximize familiarisation with port State control inspection procedures.

The overarching goal for the seminars remained the establishment of a harmonised approach towards port State control in the geographical working area of the Paris MoU. Feedback sessions with participants during the seminars indicated that indeed a broader understanding of the procedures and the available tools such as the Paris MoU manual, RuleCheck and the distance learning modules, had been achieved. The constantly evolving

methodology of delivering the lectures during the seminars is deemed effective in achieving the objectives set for the seminars.

All seminars were organised by EMSA. Lecturers were provided both by EMSA and by the Paris MoU Secretariat. In January a regular seminar was organized for 36 participants. During the rest of the year and due to the travelling restrictions imposed by the pandemic, traditional face-to-face seminars were adapted and delivered in a virtual mode. 92 new entrants participated in three virtual training sessions.

DETENTION REVIEW PANEL

Flag States or ROs that are unable to resolve a dispute regarding a detention with the port State may submit their case for review. The detention review panel consists of representatives from four different MoU member Authorities, on a rotating basis, and the Secretariat.

In 2020 seven cases were submitted to the Secretariat. In one case, the request was withdrawn during the gathering of all relevant information. The other six cases met the criteria for the Detention Review Panel and were submitted to MoU members for review. In all these six cases, the panel concluded that the port State should not be requested to reconsider the detention.

"The Paris MoU also developed a flexible information tool on inspections, detentions, deficiencies and flag States that is presented through the website."

PARIS MOU ON THE INTERNET

The Paris MoU Secretariat is constantly improving the accessibility of information on the website.

Inspection search, current detentions, current bannings and publications are in the top 5 of most popular webpages of 2020. Some popular pages (inspection search & current detentions) are embedded pages made available by courtesy of EMSA.

The Paris MoU also developed a flexible information tool on inspections, detentions, deficiencies and flag States that is presented through the website.

Flag and port States, government agencies, charterers, insurers and classification societies are continuously looking for data and information. They were able to monitor

their performance and the performance of others on a continuous basis. Validated port State control data can be accessed and offers visitors more detailed information.

Other information of interest such as monthly detention lists, annual reports, performance lists and news items can be downloaded from our website: www.parismou.org

CONCENTRATED INSPECTION CAMPAIGNS

Concentrated Inspection Campaigns (CICs) have been held annually in the Paris MoU region over the past years. These campaigns focus on a particular area of compliance with international regulations with the aim of raising awareness, gathering information and enforcing the level of compliance. Each campaign is prepared by experts and identifies a number of specific items for inspection.

The prepared CIC on Stability, as mentioned in Paris MoU developments earlier, was postponed to 2021.

CO-OPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANISATIONS

The strength of regional regimes of port State control, which are bound by geographical circumstances and interests, is widely recognised. Apart from the Paris MoU, nine other regional PSC Agreements (including the US Coast Guard) have been established.

All other PSC Agreements have observer status at the Paris MoU. This facilitates the co-operation between the Regional Agreements. Regional agreements have demonstrated that their member Authorities invest demonstrably in training of PSCOs, publish inspection data, have a code of good practice, have been granted official IGO-status at IMO and have a similar approach in terms of commitment and goals to that of the Paris MoU.

The regional agreements are: the Tokyo MoU, Caribbean MoU, Mediterranean MoU, Black Sea MoU, Riyadh MoU, Acuerdo de Viña del Mar, Abuja MoU and Indian Ocean MoU. The United States Coast Guard is also an observer at Paris MoU meetings.

The International Labour Organization and the International Maritime Organization have participated in the meetings of the Paris MoU on a regular basis since 1982.

Since 2006 the Paris MoU has had an official status at the IMO as an Inter-Governmental Organisation. The 7th session of the Sub-Committee on Implementation of IMO Instruments (III-7) in July 2020 was postponed until further notice.

The 2019 Annual Report including inspection data, a combined list of flags targeted by the Paris MoU, Tokyo MoU and USCG in 2019 and the results of the 2019 joint Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on Emergency Systems and procedures were nevertheless submitted for a future meeting.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PARIS MOU

In preparation for prospective new members of the Paris MoU, the Port State Control Committee has adopted criteria for co-operating status for non-member Authorities and observer/associate status for other PSC regions.

Specific criteria must be met, including completion of a self-evaluation questionnaire, before co-operating status can be granted.

The Paris MoU currently has 8 members with dual or even triple membership:

Canada and the Russian Federation with the Tokyo MoU, while the Russian Federation is also a member of the Black Sea MoU. With Bulgaria and Romania there are further ties with the Black Sea MoU. Malta and Cyprus are also members of the Mediterranean MoU. France and the Netherlands are members of the Caribbean MoU, whilst France is also a member of the Indian Ocean MoU. ■



Facts & Figures 2020

The facts and figures for 2020 are listed on the following pages. The COVID-19 crisis has had a clear impact on the actual number of the inspections. This affects also the usual presentation where a comparison is made with previous years. This comparison shows both the absolute and the relative differences with the results from those years.

The main impact is the decrease in the number of inspections in 2020: from a level of almost 18,000 in recent years to 13,148. A decrease of 27%. The detention percentage of 2.81% has decreased only slightly (2.96% in 2019). The number of ships that received a refusal of access (banning) order dropped from 27 in 2019 to 7 this year.

INSPECTIONS

As mentioned, the total number of inspections carried out in 2020 is 13,148. A substantial decrease compared to the numbers in 2019 (17,913).

DEFICIENCIES

The number of deficiencies in the past 3 years was 40,265 (2018), 39,755 (2019) and 27,926 (2020) respectively. The percentage of inspections carried out with one or more deficiencies recorded decreased slightly over the three-year period to 50%; against 52% in previous years.

The average number of deficiencies per inspection of 2.1 is comparable to that in 2019 (2.2).

DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES

The recorded detainable deficiencies have decreased from 2,964 in 2019 to 1,942 in 2020.

DETENTIONS

Some deficiencies are clearly dangerous to safety, health or the environment and the ship will be detained until rectified. Detention rates are expressed as a percentage of the number of inspections, rather than the number of individual ships inspected to account for the fact that some ships are detained more than once a year.

Compared to 2019, the number of detentions has decreased significantly from 531 to 369 detentions. The relative average detention rate remained at a similar level: 3.18% in 2018, 2.96% in 2019, and 2.81% this year.

"WHITE, GREY AND BLACK LIST"

The "White, Grey and Black (WGB) List" presents the full spectrum, from quality flags to flags with a poor performance that are considered high or very high risk. It is based on the total number of inspections and detentions during a 3-year rolling period for flags with at least 30 inspections in the period.

The "White List" represents quality flags with a consistently low detention record.

Flags with an average performance are shown on the "Grey List". Their appearance on this list may serve as an incentive to improve and move to the "White List". At the same time flags at the lower end of the "Grey List" should be careful not to neglect control over their ships and risk ending up on the "Black List" next year.

Regarding the "White, Grey and Black List" for 2020, a total number of 70 flags are listed: 39 on the "White List", 22 on the "Grey List" and 9 on the "Black List". In 2019 the total number of flag States on the list was also 70 of which

41 on the "White List", 16 on the "Grey List" and 13 on the "Black List".

A graph of the distribution of listed and non-listed flags indicates that only 0.9% of the ships inspected are from flags not listed on the WGB list because the number of inspections of ships under those flags is too low to be taken into account statistically.


SHIP TYPE

In 2020 the top 4 detention rates in terms of ship types were: livestock carrier 11% (up from 5.3%); MODU (Mobile Offshore Drilling Unit) & FPSO (Floating Production, Storage and Offloading) 6.3% (was 0%); Passenger ship 4.5% (up from 0.7%) and general cargo/multipurpose ships at 4.3% (down from 5.1%). The general category "other" shows a percentage of 11.1% (down from 18.2%).

PERFORMANCE OF RECOGNIZED ORGANIZATIONS

For several years the Committee has closely monitored the performance of ROs acting on behalf of flag States. To calculate the performance of ROs, the same formula to calculate the excess factor of the flags is used. A minimum number of 60 inspections per RO is needed before the performance is taken into account for the list. In 2020 32 ROs were recorded on the performance list.

Compared to last year's performance level, the RO performance level has slightly improved. It is noteworthy that, unlike in the past 3 years, no more ROs are categorised as very low performing.



"Compared to 2019, the number of inspections has decreased significantly from almost 18,000 to a little over 13,000."

Details of the responsibility of ROs for detainable deficiencies have been published since 1999. When one or more detainable deficiencies are attributed to an RO in accordance with the Paris MoU criteria, it is recorded "RO responsible" and the RO is informed. Out of 369 detentions recorded in 2020, 37 (10%) were considered RO related (15% in 2019). Both in terms of numbers and in relative terms, a significant decrease.

REFUSAL OF ACCESS OF SHIPS

A total of 7 ships were refused access (banned) from the Paris MoU region in 2020. 6 for multiple detentions and 1 for jumping detention. Over a period from 2018 to 2020, 12 ships have been banned for the second time after multiple detentions, resulting in a minimum banning period of 12 months. The total number of 7 bannings in 2020 decreased from 27 in 2019.

DEFICIENCIES PER MAIN CATEGORY

The number of deficiencies in the following six areas (out of the 16 areas defined) accounted for approximately 67% of the total number of deficiencies. The (broken) trends in these areas are described below.

Certificates & Documentation

The number of recorded deficiencies with regard to ship certificates, crew certificates and documents shows a decrease from 5,870 in 2019 to 3,969 in 2020. The relative share of the total deficiencies has only decreased from 14.7% in 2019 to 14.2% in 2020.

Safety of Navigation

In 2020, Safety of Navigation deficiencies accounted for 11% of all deficiencies recorded. A similar percentage as in 2019. The number of deficiencies decreased from 4,362 in 2019 to 3,097 in 2020.

Fire safety

In 2020 fire safety deficiencies accounted for 13.1% of all deficiencies recorded, the same as in 2019. In numbers, however, there is a decrease from 5,224 in 2019 to 3,661 in 2020.

Pollution prevention

The total number of deficiencies recorded in the different pollution prevention areas in 2020 was 1,865. This is a decrease compared to 2019; 2,676. The share of deficiencies in the different pollution prevention areas compared to the total number of deficiencies was 6.7% in both 2019 and 2020.

Working and living conditions

Most of the deficiencies in the field of working and living conditions (MLC,2006, areas as mentioned in the table on page 46 have been found in the following areas: Health and safety and accident prevention (area 11) 2,569 (44% of all MLC deficiencies); food and catering (area 10) 1,035 (17%); seafarer's employment agreements (area 4) 645 (10.7%) deficiencies; accommodation (area 8), 484 (8%); hours of work and rest (area 6) 446 (7.4%).

The percentage of deficiencies regarding working and living conditions, related to the total of deficiencies is 21.5%. An increase from 19% in 2019. The total number of MLC deficiencies in 2020 was 6,012, a small decrease from 6,253 in 2019.

Regarding specific deficiencies (as part of the distinct areas) an increase was seen in the deficiency of SEAs where other deficiencies in the top five decreased. The increase shows 484 (relative 6.4%) in 2019, 530 in 2020 (8.8%). The difference was also particularly visible in the detainable deficiencies where an increase is shown from 43 in 2019 (relative 11.8%) to 79 in 2020 (relative 26.2%).

In relation to the total recorded deficiencies regarding all relevant instruments of the Paris MoU, the SEA percentage increased from 1.2% to 1.9%.


Safety Management

The number of ISM-related deficiencies has decreased to 1,298 in 2020. In 2019, this was 1,782 deficiencies, compared to 1,906 in 2018. The percentage related to the total deficiencies has increased from 4.4% in 2019 to 4.6% in 2020. ■




BASIS PORT STATE CONTROL FIGURES 2020


NUMBER OF INDIVIDUAL SHIPS INSPECTED



NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS




NUMBER OF DETENTIONS




Note: The cut-off date for inspection data to be included in the Annual Report 2020 was 15-02-2021. Changes to inspection data after this date have as a rule not been taken into account. Due to PSCC50 decision the Annual Report data will, from now on, include the current annual year and all amended data in previous years back to 3 calendar years.


NUMBER OF DEFICIENCIES AND DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES



DETENTIONS IN % OF INSPECTIONS




NUMBER OF REFUSAL OF ACCESS




INSPECTION EFFORTS 2020

HRS, SRS AND LRS INSPECTIONS PER MEMBER STATE



COMMITMENT



Note: The number of inspections relevant for the commitment of MoU Port States may differ from the total number of inspections used in other graphs and tables. Certain inspections are not relevant for the commitment and therefore not included in the above diagram and table.






CURRENT DETENTIONS AS PER 31-12-2020 PER PORT STATE AUTHORITY SINCE 2011

Excluded detentions Annual figures 2011 - 2020 (current detentions not recorded on extraction date)

Detaining Authority	Interval	
	< 12 Months	> 12 Months
Belgium	1	1
Bulgaria	1	-
Canada	-	2
Greece	3	8
Ireland	-	1
Italy	8	5
Malta	-	1
Netherlands	-	3
Poland	-	1
Spain	2	3
United Kingdom	1	2
Norway	-	1
Russian Federation	-	1
Romania	1	-
Germany	1	-
Denmark	-	1
Grand Total	18	30

Flag	< 12 Months	> 12 Months
Bolivia	-	2
Congo, the Democratic Republic of the	-	1
Malta	4	4
Moldova, Republic of	-	1
Palau	-	1
Panama	3	6
Portugal	1	-
Russian Federation	1	2
Saint Kitts and Nevis	-	1
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	-	3
Togo	-	2
Turkey	-	1
Ukraine	-	1
Syrian Arab Republic	-	1
Cape Verde	-	1
Iceland	-	1
Belize	1	1
Marshall Islands	1	-
Germany	2	-
Cameroon	2	1
Vanuatu	1	-
Virgin Islands British, UK	1	-
Latvia	1	-
Grand Total	18	30

Full details on all currently detained ships in the Paris MoU region is available on the Paris MoU website.



WHITE LIST

RANK	FLAG	INSPECTIONS 2018-2020	DETENTIONS 2018-2020	BLACK TO GREY LIMIT	GREY TO WHITE LIMIT	EXCESS FACTOR
WHITE LIST						
1	Denmark	1,199	12	99	69	-1.80
2	Norway	1,559	18	126	92	-1.77
3	Marshall Islands	4,280	65	328	272	-1.72
4	Bermuda (UK)	169	0	18	6	-1.69
5	Netherlands	2,729	42	213	169	-1.68
6	Bahamas	1,851	27	148	111	-1.67
7	Greece	736	9	63	40	-1.63
8	Singapore	1,808	30	145	108	-1.59
9	Cayman Islands (UK)	410	4	38	20	-1.59
10	Japan	138	0	15	4	-1.54
11	Hong Kong (China)	1,741	31	140	104	-1.54
12	Liberia	4,017	89	308	254	-1.46
13	United Kingdom	922	17	78	51	-1.42
14	Malta	4,117	98	316	261	-1.40
15	Germany	570	10	50	29	-1.35
16	Turkey	732	14	63	39	-1.34
17	Italy	927	19	78	52	-1.34
18	Isle of Man (UK)	516	9	46	26	-1.32
19	Belgium	208	2	21	8	-1.30
20	Sweden	288	4	28	13	-1.26
21	Cyprus	2,018	53	161	122	-1.24
22	Barbados	399	7	37	19	-1.23
23	France	266	4	26	11	-1.16
24	Portugal	1,152	30	95	66	-1.16
25	Russian Federation	1,159	31	96	66	-1.13
26	Croatia	92	0	11	2	-1.07
27	Latvia	90	0	11	2	-1.04
28	Antigua and Barbuda	2,084	67	166	126	-1.02
29	Luxembourg	201	3	21	8	-0.99
30	Gibraltar (UK)	599	16	53	31	-0.97
31	Faroe Islands	245	5	24	10	-0.87
32	Ireland	144	2	16	5	-0.81
33	United States	194	4	20	7	-0.72
34	Lithuania	101	1	12	2	-0.66
35	Finland	404	13	37	19	-0.62
36	Spain	153	3	16	5	-0.60
37	Panama	5,754	275	435	370	-0.58
38	China	128	3	14	4	-0.26
39	Morocco	54	0	7	0	-0.22

GREY LIST

RANK	FLAG	INSPECTIONS 2018-2020	DETENTIONS 2018-2020	BLACK TO GREY LIMIT	GREY TO WHITE LIMIT	EXCESS FACTOR
GREY LIST						
40	Estonia	71	1	9	1	0.01
41	Saudi Arabia	54	1	7	0	0.11
42	Korea, Republic of	68	2	9	1	0.15
43	India	44	1	6	0	0.18
44	Philippines	133	6	15	4	0.19
45	Kazakhstan	34	1	5	0	0.27
46	Poland	68	3	9	1	0.28
47	Curacao	46	2	7	0	0.32
48	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	392	25	36	19	0.36
49	Azerbaijan	57	3	8	0	0.37
50	Iran, Islamic Republic of	87	5	11	2	0.38
51	Vanuatu	236	15	23	10	0.39
52	Saint Kitts and Nevis	121	8	14	3	0.45
53	Algeria	74	6	9	1	0.60
54	Lebanon	58	5	8	0	0.63
55	Mongolia	44	4	6	0	0.64
56	Egypt	41	4	6	0	0.68
57	Switzerland	57	6	8	0	0.77
58	Cook Islands	297	26	29	13	0.84
59	Tunisia	30	4	5	0	0.84
60	Palau	187	18	19	7	0.89
61	Ukraine	83	10	10	1	0.98






BLACK LIST

RANK	FLAG	INSPECTIONS 2018-2020	DETENTIONS 2018-2020	BLACK TO GREY LIMIT	RISK	EXCESS FACTOR
BLACK LIST						
62	Tuvalu	39	6	6	Medium	1.09
63	Sierra Leone	312	33	30		1.30
64	Tanzania, United Republic of	276	30	27		1.34
65	Belize	283	31	27		1.37
66	Moldova, Republic of	350	41	33		1.69
67	Comoros	336	45	32	Medium to High	2.17
68	Togo	430	60	39		2.44
69	Cameroon	45	10	6	High Risk	2.97
70	Albania	74	17	9		3.80

NUMBER OF INSPECTIONS PER PERFORMANCE LIST 2018-2020



FLAGS MEETING CRITERIA FOR LOW RISK SHIPS 2020

Flags meeting criteria for Low Risk Ships (as per 1 July 2021)		
Antigua and Barbuda	Bahamas	Barbados
Belgium	Bermuda (UK)	Cayman Islands (UK)
China	Croatia	Cyprus
Denmark	Faroe Islands	Finland
France	Germany	Gibraltar (UK)
Greece	Hong Kong (China)	Ireland
Isle of Man (UK)	Italy	Japan
Latvia	Liberia	Lithuania
Luxembourg	Malta	Marshall Islands
Morocco	Netherlands	Norway
Panama	Portugal	Russian Federation
Singapore	Spain	Sweden
Turkey	United Kingdom	United States

To meet the criteria for Low Risk Ships, flags should be on the Paris MoU White list and have submitted evidence of having undergone an IMO (V)IMSAS Audit.

Non-listed flags having undergone IMO (V)IMSAS Audit			
Brazil	Canada	Cape Verde	Chile
Congo, the Democratic Republic of the	Ecuador	Gabon	Israel
Kiribati	Kuwait	Malaysia	Mauritius
Monaco	Montenegro	Pakistan	Romania
Seychelles	Slovenia	South Africa	Sri Lanka
Thailand	Trinidad and Tobago	Turkmenistan	United Arab Emirates
Viet Nam			

Flags whose total number of inspections over a 3-years rolling period do not meet the minimum of 30 are not included in the Paris MoU White list. Consequently some flags cannot meet the criteria for their ships to qualify as Low Risk Ships under the Paris MoU, despite having undergone the IMO (V)IMSAS Audit.

Non-listed flags with no detentions 2018-2020*			
Canada (23)	Chile (2)	Mauritius (8)	Pakistan (2)
Kuwait (11)	Montenegro (9)	Turkmenistan (8)	Viet Nam (8)
Cape Verde (2)	Congo, the Democratic Republic of the (1)	Gabon (1)	Kiribati (1)
Monaco (1)	Trinidad and Tobago (1)	Seychelles (17)	Sri Lanka (14)
United Arab Emirates (1)	Israel (18)	Slovenia (8)	Brazil (22)
Ecuador (1)	Malaysia (21)	Romania (3)	South Africa (1)
Thailand (29)			

Flags whose total number of inspections over a 3-years rolling period do not meet the minimum of 30 are not included in the Paris MoU White, Grey and Black lists. The flags in this table had too few inspections to be included in the lists, but had no detentions in the mentioned period. * Note: The flags are listed in alphabetical order. The number of inspections over the mentioned period taken into account is shown in brackets. Flags on this list do not meet the criteria for Low-Risk Ships.

INSPECTIONS, DETENTIONS AND DEFICIENCIES 2020

Flag	Nr of Inspections	Inspections with deficiencies	Inspections with detentions	Nr of detainable deficiencies	% of Inspections with deficiencies	% of Inspections with detentions
Albania	17	16	3	30	94.1	17.6
Algeria	19	15	3	23	78.9	15.8
Antigua and Barbuda	586	332	10	47	56.7	1.7
Azerbaijan	14	12	-	-	85.7	-
Bahamas	444	206	10	31	46.4	2.3
Bangladesh	1	-	-	-	-	-
Barbados	134	70	3	26	52.2	2.2
Belgium	57	21	-	-	36.8	-
Belize	76	61	4	24	80.3	5.3
Bermuda (UK)	28	4	-	-	14.3	-
Bolivia	1	1	1	5	100.0	100.0
Brazil	6	1	-	-	16.7	-
Bulgaria	10	10	1	1	100.0	10.0
Cameroon	26	23	5	33	88.5	19.2
Canada	10	5	-	-	50.0	-
Cape Verde	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Cayman Islands (UK)	95	33	-	-	34.7	-
China	42	15	-	-	35.7	-
Comoros	79	77	4	33	97.5	5.1
Congo, the Democratic Republic of the	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Cook Islands	54	44	5	19	81.5	9.3
Croatia	19	9	-	-	47.4	-
Curacao	10	7	1	1	70.0	10.0
Cyprus	585	308	13	65	52.6	2.2
Denmark	301	108	2	8	35.9	0.7
Dominica	5	4	1	6	80.0	20.0
Egypt	8	8	1	2	100.0	12.5
Estonia	16	2	-	-	12.5	-
Falkland Islands (UK) (Malvinas)	1	-	-	-	-	-
Faroe Islands	78	47	1	4	60.3	1.3
Finland	90	43	3	7	47.8	3.3
France	57	24	1	3	42.1	1.8
Gabon	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Georgia	5	4	-	-	80.0	-
Germany	172	90	5	48	52.3	2.9
Gibraltar (UK)	158	83	4	15	52.5	2.5
Greece	213	78	-	-	36.6	-
Honduras	7	6	-	-	85.7	-
Hong Kong (CN)	464	186	11	55	40.1	2.4
Iceland	1	1	1	2	100.0	100.0

Flag	Nr of Inspections	Inspections with deficiencies	Inspections with detentions	Nr of detainable deficiencies	% of Inspections with deficiencies	% of Inspections with detentions
India	8	6	-	-	75.0	-
Indonesia	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Iran, Islamic Republic of	5	5	1	5	100.0	20.0
Ireland	40	12	1	9	30.0	2.5
Isle of Man (UK)	110	47	2	4	42.7	1.8
Israel	6	1	-	-	16.7	-
Italy	236	108	2	9	45.8	0.8
Jamaica	4	3	1	7	75.0	25.0
Japan	27	9	-	-	33.3	-
Jersey (UK)	5	1	-	-	20.0	-
Jordan	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Kazakhstan	9	6	-	-	66.7	-
Korea, Republic of	20	13	1	2	65.0	5.0
Kuwait	3	-	-	-	-	-
Latvia	26	15	-	-	57.7	-
Lebanon	14	14	1	8	100.0	7.1
Liberia	1,108	494	25	148	44.6	2.3
Libya	6	3	-	-	50.0	-
Lithuania	29	14	-	-	48.3	-
Luxembourg	61	25	1	1	41.0	1.6
Malaysia	3	1	-	-	33.3	-
Malta	1,079	472	29	147	43.7	2.7
Marshall Islands	1,211	493	25	103	40.7	2.1
Mauritius	2	1	-	-	50.0	-
Moldova, Republic of	113	109	15	119	96.5	13.3
Monaco	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Mongolia	7	7	-	-	100.0	-
Montenegro	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Morocco	14	11	-	-	78.6	-
Netherlands	768	354	16	59	46.1	2.1
NIUE	1	1	1	1	100.0	100.0
Norway	426	202	6	35	47.4	1.4
Pakistan	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Palau	46	41	2	5	89.1	4.3
Panama	1,626	950	83	420	58.4	5.1
Philippines	39	23	3	9	59.0	7.7
Poland	11	5	-	-	45.5	-
Portugal	372	161	8	36	43.3	2.2
Qatar	4	2	-	-	50.0	-
Russian Federation	284	155	3	15	54.6	1.1

Flag	Nr of Inspections	Inspections with deficiencies	Inspections with detentions	Nr of detainable deficiencies	% of Inspections with deficiencies	% of Inspections with detentions
Saint Kitts and Nevis	34	28	-	-	82.4	-
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	96	65	4	22	67.7	4.2
Saudi Arabia	15	5	-	-	33.3	-
Seychelles	5	2	-	-	40.0	-
Sierra Leone	66	62	5	35	93.9	7.6
Singapore	459	181	7	28	39.4	1.5
Slovenia	3	-	-	-	-	-
South Africa	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Spain	48	30	2	20	62.5	4.2
Sri Lanka	2	1	-	-	50.0	-
Sweden	71	25	-	-	35.2	-
Switzerland	10	5	-	-	50.0	-
Syrian Arab Republic	4	3	2	13	75.0	50.0
Taiwan, Province of China	3	2	-	-	66.7	-
Tanzania, United Republic of	60	60	4	46	100.0	6.7
Thailand	9	6	-	-	66.7	-
Togo	103	93	11	86	90.3	10.7
Trinidad and Tobago	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
Tunisia	6	6	-	-	100.0	-
Turkey	176	102	3	21	58.0	1.7
Tuvalu	5	3	-	-	60.0	-
Ukraine	21	20	1	4	95.2	4.8
United Arab Emirates	1	1	-	-	100.0	-
United Kingdom	223	107	9	32	48.0	4.0
United States	39	24	1	1	61.5	2.6
Vanuatu	56	43	1	4	76.8	1.8
Viet Nam	6	5	-	-	83.3	-
Virgin Islands British (UK)	3	2	-	-	66.7	-




2020 DETENTIONS PER FLAG, EXCEEDING AVERAGE PERCENTAGE

Flag	Nr of Inspections	Inspections with deficiencies	% of Inspections with detentions	Excess of average 2020	Detentions % 2019	Excess of average 2019
Cameroon	26	5	19.2	16.4	27.8	24.8
Moldova, Republic of	113	15	13.3	10.5	15.3	12.3
Togo	103	11	10.7	7.9	14.6	11.6
Cook Islands	54	5	9.3	6.5	7.1	4.1
Philippines	39	3	7.7	4.9	4.1	1.1
Sierra Leone	66	5	7.6	4.8	7.3	4.3
Tanzania, United Republic of	60	4	6.7	3.9	10.9	7.9
Belize	76	4	5.3	2.5	11.2	8.3
Panama	1,626	83	5.1	2.3	4.5	1.6
Comoros	79	4	5.1	2.3	16.5	13.6
Korea, Republic of	20	1	5.0	2.2	4.2	1.2
Ukraine	21	1	4.8	2.0	11.8	8.8
Palau	46	2	4.3	1.5	7.9	5.0
Spain	48	2	4.2	1.4	1.8	-1.1
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	96	4	4.2	1.4	8.5	5.5
United Kingdom	223	9	4.0	1.2	1.9	-1.0
Finland	90	3	3.3	0.5	1.9	-1.1
Germany	172	5	2.9	0.1	1.9	-1.1

Only flags with 20 and more port State control inspections and with a detention percentage exceeding the average percentage of 2.81% are recorded in this graph (last year the average was 2.96%).


2020 DETENTIONS PER FLAG, EXCEEDING AVERAGE PERCENTAGE



- Only flags with 20 and more port State control inspections in 2020 and with a detention percentage exceeding the average percentage of 2.81% are recorded in this graph. In 2019 the average detentions percentage was 2,96%.
- The light blue column represents the 2020 average detention percentage (2.81%).

INSPECTIONS AND DETENTIONS 2020 PER SHIP TYPE

Ship type	Nr of Inspections	Inspections with deficiencies	% of inspections with deficiencies	Nr of individual ships inspected	Inspections with detentions	% of detentions to inspections 2020	% of detentions to inspections 2019	% of detentions to inspections 2018	+ / - average detention % 2020
Bulk carrier	2,883	1,503	52.1	2,731	80	2.8	3.1	2.6	0.0
Chemical tanker	972	352	36.2	923	21	2.2	1.7	1.3	-0.6
Other	9	6	66.7	9	1	11.1	18.2	0.0	8.3
Commercial yacht	160	56	35.0	159	1	0.6	4.5	2.2	-2.2
Container	1,484	601	40.5	1,406	31	2.1	1.8	1.9	-0.7
Gas carrier	340	114	33.5	333	1	0.3	1.3	1.3	-2.5
General cargo/multipurpose	3,718	2,346	63.1	3,200	161	4.3	5.1	6.3	1.5
Heavy load	36	17	47.2	33	-	0.0	2.1	4.1	-2.8
High speed passenger craft	35	21	60.0	28	1	2.9	1.4	3.5	0.1
NLS tanker	9	5	55.6	7	-	0.0	5.0	0.0	-2.8
Offshore supply	263	131	49.8	260	3	1.1	1.5	0.9	-1.7
Oil tanker	965	321	33.3	929	10	1.0	1.5	1.6	-1.8
Dredger	67	32	47.8	66	2	3.0	1.1	1.2	0.2
High speed cargo	11	8	72.7	11	-	0.0	0.0	0.0	-2.8
Livestock carrier	82	78	95.1	59	9	11.0	5.3	11.9	8.2
MODU & FPSO	16	8	50.0	16	1	6.3	0.0	0.0	3.4
Oil tanker/Chemical tanker	416	175	42.1	400	4	1.0	2.0	0.0	-1.8
Other special activities	352	185	52.6	333	11	3.1	2.2	1.9	0.3
Passenger ship	112	56	50.0	106	5	4.5	0.7	1.0	1.7
Refrigerated cargo	129	78	60.5	125	1	0.8	2.0	3.4	-2.0
Ro-Ro cargo	498	217	43.6	475	14	2.8	1.6	1.4	0.0
Ro-Ro passenger ship	310	166	53.5	217	5	1.6	2.2	1.0	-1.2
Special purpose ship	85	38	44.7	82	-	0.0	1.3	1.4	-2.8
Tug	196	95	48.5	183	7	3.6	1.4	3.3	0.8



MAJOR CATEGORIES OF DEFICIENCIES 2018-2020

Deficiencies Main Group	Category of deficiencies	2018		2019		2020	
		Def	Def %	Def	Def %	Def	Def %
Certificates & Documentation	Crew Certificates	1,163	2.9	1,221	3.1	1,050	3.8
	Documents	2,884	7.2	2,528	6.4	1,704	6.1
	Ship Certificates	2,220	5.5	2,121	5.3	1,215	4.4
Structural Condition		1,839	4.6	1,910	4.8	1,379	4.9
Water/Weathertight condition		1,827	4.5	1,788	4.5	1,294	4.6
Emergency Systems		2,062	5.1	2,603	6.5	1,591	5.7
Radio Communication		924	2.3	866	2.2	556	2.0
Cargo operations including equipment		239	0.6	217	0.5	136	0.5
Fire safety		5,218	13.0	5,224	13.1	3,661	13.1
Alarms		370	0.9	381	1.0	260	0.9
Working and Living Conditions (ILO 147)*	Living Conditions	8	0.0	17	0.0	4	0.0
	Working conditions	347	0.9	413	1.0	232	0.8
Working and Living Conditions (MLC, 2006)	MLC, 2006 Title 1	76	0.2	44	0.1	19	0.1
	MLC, 2006 Title 2	359	0.9	332	0.8	275	1.0
	MLC, 2006 Title 3	2,006	5.0	2,203	5.5	1,595	5.7
	MLC, 2006 Title 4	3,218	8.0	3,246	8.2	2,770	9.9
Safety of Navigation		4,876	12.1	4,362	11.0	3,097	11.1
Life saving appliances		3,290	8.2	3,194	8.0	2,134	7.6
Dangerous goods		64	0.2	63	0.2	34	0.1
Propulsion and auxiliary machinery		1,620	4.0	1,785	4.5	1,322	4.7
Pollution prevention	Anti Fouling	3	0.0	9	0.0	1	0.0
	MARPOL Annex I	601	1.5	558	1.4	371	1.3
	MARPOL Annex II	12	0.0	16	0.0	8	0.0
	MARPOL Annex III	5	0.0	8	0.0	2	0.0
	MARPOL Annex IV	327	0.8	355	0.9	243	0.9
	MARPOL Annex V	762	1.9	586	1.5	468	1.7
	MARPOL Annex VI	693	1.7	522	1.3	299	1.1
	Ballast Water	573	1.4	622	1.6	473	1.7
ISM		1,906	4.7	1,782	4.5	1,298	4.6
ISPS		553	1.4	508	1.3	300	1.1
Other		220	0.5	271	0.7	135	0.5

* As per 1 April 2020 all member Authorities have ratified MLC,2006. Up till then records of Merchant Shipping Convention (ILO147) and the protocol of 1996 to the Merchant Shipping Convention (ILOP147) were possible.

TOP 5 CATEGORIES OF DEFICIENCIES 2020

Deficiencies	2019		2020	
	Deficiencies	% Total deficiencies	Deficiencies	% Total deficiencies
Fire safety	5,224	13.14	3,661	13.11
Safety of Navigation	4,362	10.97	3,097	11.09
Labour conditions-Health protection, medical care, social security	3,246	8.17	2,770	9.92
Life saving appliances	3,194	8.03	2,134	7.64
Emergency Systems	2,528	6.36	1,704	6.10

TOP 5 DEFICIENCIES 2020

Deficiencies	2019		2020	
	Deficiencies	% Total deficiencies	Deficiencies	% Total deficiencies
ISM	1,782	4.48	1,298	4.65
Fire doors/openings in fire-resisting divisions	1,035	2.60	857	3.07
Oil record book	484	1.22	530	1.90
Nautical publications	544	1.37	400	1.43
Cleanliness of engine room	624	1.57	381	1.36

MARITIME LABOUR CONVENTION, 2006


MLC Deficiencies per Area	Nr MLC Deficiencies	% of Total of Nr. MLC deficiencies	Nr Detainable MLC Deficiencies	% of Detainable deficiencies of MLC deficiencies
MLC,2006 Ship's certificates and documents	115	1.9	9	7.8
Area 2 Medical certification of seafarers	131	2.2	9	6.9
Area 3 Qualifications of seafarers	7	0.1	0	0.0
Area 4 Seafarers' employment agreements	645	10.7	82	12.7
Area 5 Use of any licensed or certified or regulated private recruitment and placement service for seafarers	4	0.1	0	0.0
Area 6 Hours of Works or rest	446	7.4	16	3.6
Area 7 Manning levels for the ship	45	0.7	20	44.4
Area 8 Accommodation	484	8.1	28	5.8
Area 9 On-board recreational facilities	25	0.4	1	4.0
Area 10 Food and catering	1,035	17.2	35	3.4
Area 11 Health and safety and accident prevention	2,659	44.2	56	2.1
Area 12 on-board medical care	178	3.0	3	1.7
Area 13 On-board complaint procedure	77	1.3	2	2.6
Area 14 Payment of wages	98	1.6	38	38.8
Area 15 Certificate or documentary evidence of financial security for repatriation	34	0.6	1	2.9
Area 16 Certificate or documentary evidence of financial security relating to shipowners liability	29	0.5	2	6.9
Total	6,012	100.0%	302	5.0%

MLC DEFICIENCIES TOP 5

Deficiencies	2019		2020	
	Deficiencies	% Total deficiencies	Deficiencies	% Total deficiencies
Seafarers' employment agreement (SEA)	484	6.4	530	8.8
Electrical	374	4.9	328	5.5
Access / structural features (ship)	298	3.9	259	4.3
Cleanliness of engine room	296	3.9	250	4.2
Records of seafarers' daily hours of work or rest	337	4.4	207	3.4

MLC DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES TOP 5

MLC detainable deficiencies	2019		2020	
	Detainable deficiencies	% Total detainable deficiencies	Detainable deficiencies	% Total detainable deficiencies
Seafarers' employment agreement (SEA)	43	11.8	79	26.2
Non-payment of wages	28	7.7	19	6.3
Wages	27	7.4	19	6.3
Cleanliness of engine room	27	7.4	19	6.3
Manning specified by the minimum safe manning doc	24	6.6	20	6.6



DETENTIONS OF SHIPS WITH RO RELATED DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES PER RECOGNIZED ORGANIZATION 2020 (CASES IN WHICH 10 OR MORE INSPECTIONS ARE INVOLVED)


Recognized Organization	Abbr	Total number of inspections	Number of individual ships inspected*	Total number of detentions**	Detention % of total number of Inspections	+/- Percentage of Average 2020. (0.19)	Detention % of individual ships	+/- Percentage of Average Indiv. 2020. (0.21)
American Bureau of Shipping	ABS	1,563	1,515	1	0.06	-0.13	0.07	-0.14
Bulgarian Register of Shipping	BRS	80	65	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Bureau Veritas	BV	2,902	2,668	5	0.17	-0.02	0.19	-0.02
China Classification Society	CCS	220	214	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Columbus American Register	COLAMREG	14	9	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Croatian Register of Shipping	CRS	32	28	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
DNV GL AS	DNVGL	4,902	4,565	4	0.08	-0.11	0.09	-0.12
Dromon Bureau of Shipping	DBS	169	136	4	2.37	2.17	2.94	2.73
Indian Register of Shipping	IRS	52	47	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Intermaritime Certification Services, ICS Class	ICS	51	41	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
International Naval Surveys Bureau	INSB	134	108	1	0.75	0.55	0.93	0.72
International Register of Shipping	IS	56	45	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping, S.A.	IBS	55	48	3	5.45	5.26	6.25	6.04
KOREAN REGISTER	KR	415	404	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Lloyd's Register	LR	3,054	2,879	3	0.10	-0.09	0.10	-0.10
Macosnar Corporation	MC	24	20	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Maritime Bureau of Shipping	MBS	23	16	3	13.04	12.85	18.75	18.54
Maritime Lloyd	ML	43	25	1	2.33	2.13	4.00	3.79
Mediterranean Shipping Register	MSR	37	27	2	5.41	5.21	7.41	7.20
National Shipping Adjuster Inc.	NASHA	53	44	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	NKK	2,151	2,060	1	0.05	-0.15	0.05	-0.16
Other	OTHER	73	58	1	1.37	1.18	1.72	1.52
Overseas Marine Certification Services	OMCS	39	36	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Panama Maritime Documentation Services	PMDS	39	38	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Panama Shipping Registrar Inc.	PSR	20	18	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Phoenix Register of Shipping	PHRS	176	147	1	0.57	0.38	0.68	0.47
Polski Rejestr Statkow (Polish Register of Shipping)	PRS	147	123	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Qualitas Register of Shipping S.A.	QRS	30	23	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
RINA Services S.p.A.	RINA	1,358	1,200	3	0.22	0.03	0.25	0.04
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	RMRS	573	519	2	0.35	0.16	0.39	0.18
Shipping Register of Ukraine	SRU	68	47	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21

Recognized Organization	Abbr	Total number of inspections	Number of individual ships inspected*	Total number of detentions**	Detention % of total number of inspections	+/- Percentage of Average of Average 2020. (0.19)	Detention % of individual ships	+/- Percentage of Average of Average Indiv. 2020. (0.21)
Turkish Lloyd	TL	86	79	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
United Registration and Classification of Services	URACOS	19	18	-	-	-0.19	-	-0.21
Veritas Register of Shipping Ltd	VRS	35	27	1	2.86	2.66	3.70	3.50

* As more than one Recognized Organization might have issued or endorsed statutory certificates with regard to the same ship, an inspection can be relevant for more than one RO and might appear multiple times in this column.

** Only detentions with RO related detainable deficiencies are taken into account.
(Recognized Organizations with more than 10 inspections are taken into account).

% OF DETENTIONS OF SHIPS WITH RO RELATED DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES PER RECOGNIZED ORGANIZATION 2019-2020 (CASES IN WHICH MORE THAN 10 INSPECTIONS ARE INVOLVED)



* Only ROs with 10 and more port State control inspections in 2020 and with a detention percentage exceeding the average percentage of 0.19 are recorded in this graph. In 2019 the average detention percentage was 0.32.

* The light blue column represents the 2020 average detention percentage (0.19).

RECOGNIZED ORGANIZATION PERFORMANCE TABLE 2018-2020

Recognized Organization	RO abbrev	Inspections	Detentions	Low/medium limit	Medium / high limit	Excess Factor	Performance level
American Bureau of Shipping	ABS	5,753	3	133	97	-1.92	High
DNV GL AS	DNVGL	17,859	14	388	326	-1.91	
Lloyd's Register	LR	11,313	11	251	201	-1.88	
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	NKK	7,811	13	177	135	-1.79	
Bureau Veritas	BV	10,577	22	236	187	-1.75	
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	RMRS	2,434	4	61	37	-1.72	
RINA Services S.p.A.	RINA	4,756	11	112	79	-1.68	
Korean Register	KRS	1,336	2	36	18	-1.66	
China Classification Society	CCS	815	1	23	9	-1.57	
Turkish Lloyd	TL	370	0	12	2	-1.09	
Polski Rejestr Statkow (Polish Register of Shipping)	PRS	542	1	17	5	-1.07	
Phoenix Register of Shipping	PHRS	591	5	18	6	-0.17	
Croatian Register of Shipping	CRS	142	0	6	0	0.06	
Panama Maritime Documentation Services	PMDS	130	0	6	0	0.08	
National Shipping Adjuster Inc.	NASHA	212	2	8	0	0.21	
Intermaritime Certification Services, ICS Class	ICS	177	2	7	0	0.28	
Indian Register of Shipping	IRS	197	4	8	0	0.51	
Overseas Marine Certification Services	OMCS	134	3	6	0	0.55	
Dromon Bureau of Shipping	DBS	606	13	18	6	0.57	
Panama Shipping Registrar Inc.	PSR	80	2	4	0	0.58	
Macosnar Corporation	MC	117	3	5	0	0.61	
Bulgarian Register of Shipping	BRS	240	6	9	1	0.65	
United Registration and Classification of Services	URACOS	89	3	4	0	0.73	
International Naval Surveys Bureau	INSB	544	14	17	5	0.77	
Maritime Lloyd - Georgia	ML	141	5	6	0	0.84	
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping, S.A.	IBS	138	5	6	0	0.85	
International Register of Shipping	IS	173	6	7	0	0.86	Low
Shipping Register of Ukraine	SRU	315	10	11	2	0.90	
Veritas Register of Shipping Ltd	VRS	93	5	5	0	1.30	
Maritime Bureau of Shipping	MBS	62	4	4	0	1.44	
Other	OTHER	411	17	13	3	1.70	
Mediterranean Shipping Register	MSR	151	8	6	0	1.78	

In this table only Recognized Organizations that had 60 or more inspections in a 3-year period are taken into account. The formula is identical to the one used for the White, Grey and Black list. However, the values for P and Q are adjusted to P=0.02 and Q=0.01.

Performance of Recognized Organizations is measured over a 3-year rolling period.


NUMBER OF CERTIFICATES COVERING RO RESPONSIBLE DETAINABLE DEFICIENCIES 2020

Recognized Organization	RO abbrev	Certificates	Total number of RO detainable deficiencies	% deficiencies / certificates
American Bureau of Shipping	ABS	15,062	9	0.06
Bulgarian Register of Shipping	BRS	766	0	0.00
Bureau Veritas	BV	26,319	14	0.05
China Classification Society	CCS	2,372	0	0.00
Croatian Register of Shipping	CRS	392	0	0.00
DNV GL AS	DNVGL	44,779	4	0.01
Dromon Bureau of Shipping	DBS	1,950	19	0.97
Indian Register of Shipping	IRS	367	0	0.00
Intermaritime Certification Services, ICS Class	ICS	217	0	0.00
International Naval Surveys Bureau	INSB	1,044	5	0.48
International Register of Shipping	IS	642	0	0.00
Isthmus Bureau of Shipping, S.A.	IBS	531	10	1.88
KOREAN REGISTER	KR	3,645	0	0.00
Lloyd's Register	LR	24,754	10	0.04
Maritime Lloyd	ML	415	16	3.86
Mediterranean Shipping Register	MSR	402	9	2.24
National Shipping Adjuster Inc.	NASHA	368	0	0.00
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	NKK	22,441	12	0.05
Other	OTHER	561	2	0.36
Overseas Marine Certification Services	OMCS	284	0	0.00
Panama Maritime Documentation Services	PMDS	125	0	0.00
Phoenix Register of Shipping	PHRS	1,647	1	0.06
Polski Rejestr Statkow (Polish Register of Shipping)	PRS	1,306	0	0.00
Qualitas Register of Shipping S.A.	QRS	94	0	0.00
RINA Services S.p.A.	RINA	12,067	5	0.04
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	RMRS	6,080	6	0.10
Shipping Register of Ukraine	SRU	705	0	0.00
Turkish Lloyd	TL	815	0	0.00
Veritas Register of Shipping Ltd	VRS	316	5	1.58

REFUSAL OF ACCESS (BANNING) PER FLAG 2018-2020

Flag	Failed to call at indicated repair yard	Jumped detention	Multiple detentions			Total Banned
			1 st ban	2 nd ban	3 rd ban	
Albania	-	-	2	1	-	3
Belize	-	-	1	-	-	1
Cameroon	1	-	-	-	-	1
Comoros	2	-	10	4	-	16
India	-	-	1	-	-	1
Moldova, Republic of	1	-	7	3	-	11
Palau	-	-	3	-	-	3
Panama	-	1	-	-	-	1
Saint Kitts and Nevis	-	-	2	-	-	2
Sierra Leone	-	-	2	-	-	2
Tanzania, United Republic of	1	-	4	3	-	8
Togo	-	1	6	1	-	8
Ukraine	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	5	2	39	12	-	58

REFUSAL OF ACCESS 2011-2020



MUS
STAT







Explanatory note - “WHITE”, “GREY” AND “BLACK LIST”

The normative listing of Flags provides an independent categorization that has been prepared on the basis of Paris MoU port State inspection results over a 3-year period, based on binomial calculus.

The performance of each Flag is calculated using a standard formula for statistical calculations in which certain values have been fixed in accordance with agreed Paris MoU policy. Two limits have been included in the system, the 'black to grey' and the 'grey to white' limit, each with its own specific formula:

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

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


In the formula “N” is the number of inspections, “p” is the allowable detention limit (yardstick), set to 7% by the Paris 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. 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 is positioned between the

two, the Flag 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 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 of the White, Grey or Black List. The target (yardstick) has been set on 7% and the size of the increment and decrement on 3%.

The White/Grey/Black Lists have been calculated in accordance with the principles above*.

The graphical representation of the system below is showing the direct relations between the number of inspected ships and the number of detentions. Both axes have a logarithmic character as the 'black to grey' or the 'grey to white' limit.



* Explanatory notes can be found on www.parismou.org/publications

Secretariat Paris Memorandum OF UNDERSTANDING ON PORT STATE CONTROL



STAFF

Mr. Luc Smulders
Secretary-General

Mr. Geert de Jeu
Secretary

Mr. Ivo Snijders
Secretary

Mr. Maarten Vlag
Secretary

Mr. Ronald Hulhoven
Secretary

Mr. Lourens van 't Wout
ICT Advisor

Mrs. Melany Cadogan - Eskici
Office Manager

Mrs. Ingrid de Vree
Management Assistant

COLOPHON

PHOTOGRAPHS

Paris MoU Authorities
Secretariat
Frans de Vree Fotografie

ADDRESS SECRETARIAT

Rijnstraat 8
P.O. Box 16191
2500 BD The Hague
The Netherlands
Telephone: +31 70 456 1508
www.parismou.org
E-mail: secretariat@parismou.org



Paris MoU fact sheet - ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

