

Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control



Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control

1996 ANNUAL REPORT

Contents

- 
- 1. Introduction - page 3**
 - 2. International developments relevant to port State control
page 5**
 - 3. Performance of the Paris MOU - page 9**
 - 4. Training of Port State Control Officers - page 13**
 - 5. Co-operation with other organizations - page 15**
 - 6. Facts and figures - page 17**
 - Footnotes to the 1996 Annual Report - page 20**
 - Statistical Annexes - page 21**
 - Paris MOU fact sheet - page 55**

1. Introduction

This Annual Report on the implementation of the Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control (Paris MOU) covers the calendar year 1996.

Regular readers of the annual reports of the Paris MOU will observe that the lay-out and content of the report have changed considerably by comparison with earlier reports.

From a historical perspective, the reports were originally intended as a summary of activities recorded for the benefit of the Port State Control Committee, the executive body under the Paris MOU, with only a limited external circulation.

However, over the years, the report has received increasing external interest, although the content of the report has not changed significantly .

In order to end this ambiguity, the Port State Control Committee decided that the annual report should first and foremost serve the purpose of informing relevant maritime parties and the general public. Therefore, future annual reports will deal less with "internal affairs", such as meetings, seminars and other activities, which are of limited interest to the external reader.

There is also less need to continue to explain the aims and features of the Paris MOU in any detail in the annual report, as it is assumed that after fourteen years of operation, the Paris MOU needs little further introduction.

new lay-out of Paris MOU annual report more adapted to wishes of external readers.

Finally, it appears that readers of the Paris MOU annual reports are mainly interested in the figures and statistics. Therefore, as of this annual report, reports will be more concise, better readable, and less repetitious, in order to meet preferences expressed by readers, more emphasis will be placed on the presentation of Paris MOU port State control figures.

2. International developments relevant to port State control

2.1 EU developments

During the period under review, important developments took place in several international fora, which had or will have a bearing on the operation of the Paris MOU.

On 1 July 1996 the EU Council Directive on Port State Control¹ entered into effect and made port State control along strictly prescribed lines a mandatory effort for the EU Member States. During 1996, the Port State Control Committee completed the necessary amendments to the Paris MOU in order to bring the Paris MOU in line with the EU Directive. These amendments were adopted in May 1996 and entered into effect on the same date as the EU Directive. Significant amendments to the Paris MOU include, *inter alia*, procedures for expanded inspection, criteria for priority inspections, publication of information on detentions and refusal of access to Paris MOU ports of ships failing to rectify certain deficiencies.

Further development within the European Union is the advance application, from 1 July 1996, of the ISM Code² for passenger ships trading between ports under the jurisdiction of EU Member States. This development is based on the provisions of an EU Council Regulation.

Hence, ISM certification of passenger ships trading in Europe has been subject to port State control inspection in ports of EU Member States under the provisions of paragraph 13 of Annex II to the Port State Control Directive.

2.2 IMO developments

2.2.1 STCW amendments

Of the developments stemming from the International Maritime Organization (IMO), the adoption, in 1995, of extensive amendments to the STCW Convention³ is the most significant. These amendments were accepted on 1 August 1996 and will enter into force on 1 February 1997. They add considerably to the role of the port State. Prior to the 1995 amendments to the Convention, port State control enforcement was difficult, if not impossible. This posed a problem not only to the port State control officer, but also to the master or the ship owner who might easily see port State action as arbitrary. The amended version of the STCW

Convention contains precise control procedures, including a specification of clear grounds for believing that appropriate standards are not being maintained. This will

important international developments in the framework of the EU, ILO and IMO had their impact on the Paris MOU. Notably, the EU Directive on Port State Control, the STCW Amendments and the forthcoming entry into force of the ISM Code will lead to more stringent port State enforcement.

facilitate the task of the port State control officer, and provide for greater transparency in decision making.

2.2.2 ISM Code

In addition to regional implementation of the ISM Code for passenger ships trading between European ports, there will be staged international implementation of the Code.

On 1 July 1998, the ISM Code will enter into force for passenger ships of all sizes including high-speed passenger craft, and for oil tankers, chemical tankers, gas carriers, bulk carriers and high-speed cargo craft of 500 tons gross tonnage and over. Subsequently, on 1 July 2002, the ISM Code enters into force for other cargo ships and mobile offshore drilling units of 500 tons gross tonnage and over.

Responsible ship owners or operators have taken timely action and have made considerable efforts to complete the assessments necessary for certification under the ISM Code, well before the effective date.

However, less responsible players in the shipping industry have indicated that certification cannot be completed before 1 July 1998 and that certain transitional measures should be introduced that would effectively delay the date of implementation.

Since the ISM Code is an important additional tool in improving the safety consciousness of both shore based and ship based management, stringent port State control to verify compliance with the certification requirements under the ISM Code will be undertaken from the respective effective dates.

In view of the considerable period of notice given to the industry of the forthcoming entry into force of the provisions of the ISM Code, no further exemption from its provisions will be accepted. Ships presenting themselves in Paris MOU ports after the date of entry into force without being fully certified under the ISM Code, will be subject to rigorous port State intervention.

During the period under review, efforts were directed at putting precise guidelines for Paris MOU port State control officers in place to enable them to exercise their control

functions in a harmonized manner, from the respective effective dates of implementation of the ISM Code.

2.2.3 Implementation of Resolution A.787(19)

The previous annual report recorded the adoption of Resolution A.787(19)⁴ by the 19th Assembly of the IMO. This resolution is an amalgamation of a number of previous resolutions, all dealing with certain aspects of ship control by port States, which have now been revoked. Resolution A.787(19) contains a comprehensive set of guidelines for port State control covering ship safety, pollution prevention and manning of ships, including control on compliance with operational requirements.

During the period under review a considerable effort was made by the Working Group on Harmonization to incorporate the relevant provisions of Resolution A.787(19) in the Paris MOU, in order to provide port State control officers with one official reference document as a basis for their activities. This entailed a substantial amendment to the Paris MOU, which was still in progress at the end of the period under review.

It is envisaged that once this amendment is complete, port State control officers, in the exercise of their duties, will be able to refer to this amended version of the Paris MOU to ensure that they act fully in line both with the EU Directive on Port State Control and with the relevant provisions of IMO Resolution A.787(19).

2.3 ILO developments - 84th (Maritime) Session of the International Labour Conference

The 84th (Maritime) Session of the International Labour Conference, which was held in Geneva on 8-22 October 1996, resulted *inter alia* in the adoption of the Protocol of 1996 to the Merchant Shipping (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1976 (No. 147). This Protocol contains a supplementary appendix to the Convention which includes ILO Conventions regulating accommodation of crews, hours of work and manning, seafarers' identity documents,

workers' representatives, health protection and repatriation.

Since ILO Convention No. 147 is a relevant instrument under the Paris MOU, the decisions of the Maritime Session of the International Labour Conference must be given due consideration within the framework of the Paris MOU.

However, at the end of the period under review, the Port State Control Committee, although acknowledging the achievements made at the Conference, has not yet expressed its views on the relevance of these supplementary requirements for port State control practices under the Paris MOU.



Serious deterioration of insulation in a domestic reefer space constitutes an infringement of ILO requirements concerning food and catering

3. Performance of the Paris MOU

3.1 Management structure

The entry into effect of the EU Directive on Port State Control has prompted the Port State Control Committee to review its role. Prior to the Directive, the Committee acted on the basis of voluntary commitments of the signatories to the Paris MOU and decisions of the Committee were taken by consensus. The EU Directive has imposed upon EU Member States the obligation to comply with strict port State control procedures and practices under European law. This implies that, although the status of the Paris MOU has not changed, decisions of the Port State Control Committee must now be considered in the context of European legislation.

It is the intention of the Port State Control Committee to continue to consider the role and contributions of its EU and non-EU members of equal importance for the effective operation of the Paris MOU, and at the same time to take full account of developments within the European Union. As a result, the Committee has identified a need to change its management structure in order to facilitate the process of administering the Paris MOU. To that end, the Port State Control Committee decided to establish an MOU Advisory Board, consisting of two EU-members, two non-EU-members and the Commission of the European Communities. The main task of the MOU Advisory Board is to deal with matters at a political and strategic level in order to facilitate the work of the Port State Control Committee and to provide guidance to the

in view of the EU legislative framework for port State control, the Paris MOU changed its management structure in order to continue to accommodate full participation of non-EU member States

Paris MOU Secretariat within the framework of the Committee's decisions. The MOU Advisory Board may be seen as a standing committee which is in place during the inter-sessional periods between meetings of the Port State Control Committee. The efforts of the Advisory Board should assist the Committee in concentrating on policy matters, while technical matters will be dealt with by technical working groups.

Further refinements of the Paris MOU's management structure were in progress at the end of the period under review.

3.2 Paris MOU membership

3.2.1 Accession by the Russian Federation as a member from 01-01-96

After assessment of compliance with the qualitative criteria for new members to the Paris MOU, the Port State Control Committee accepted the maritime authorities of the Russian Federation as the 17th signatory to the Paris MOU on 10 November 1995. This decision finalised the process of adherence initiated in 1993 by the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Participation of the Russian Federation in the Paris MOU will be restricted to ports in the European region (Northern seas, Baltic Sea and Black Sea).

The effective date of membership of the maritime authorities of the Russian Federation was 1 January 1996.

3.2.2 Iceland co-operating maritime authority from 10-05-96

During the period under review, the maritime authorities of Iceland took the initiative to seek phased membership of the Paris MOU. This step was prompted mainly by the fact that Iceland is required to implement the provisions of the EU Directive on Port State Control under the aegis of the European Economic Area Agreement.

The maritime authorities of Iceland indicated that they would need time to comply with the Paris MOU's qualitative access criteria for new members and the Port State Control Committee decided on 10 May 1996 to grant the maritime authorities of Iceland the status of "co-operating maritime authority" as a transitional measure for a limited period. This status should allow Iceland to achieve access as a full member to the Paris MOU in due course.

3.2.3 Adoption of accession by Croatia as a member from 01-01-97

On 8 November 1996 the Port State Control Committee adopted the accession by the maritime authorities of the Republic of Croatia as the 18th member to the Paris MOU. The Committee's decision was based on the report of a fact finding mission that had visited the maritime authorities of Croatia in September 1996 for the purpose of assessing Croatia's compliance with the qualitative access criteria for new members to the Paris MOU.

The Port State Control Committee also decided that the membership of the maritime authorities of Croatia would take effect from 1 January 1997.

3.3 Concentrated inspection campaigns

Although concentrated inspection campaigns are not an entirely new phenomenon in the practice of port State control, the idea of concentrating on a particular aspect of control has been given new impetus during the period under review.

After their public announcement in the professional press and through other relevant channels, these campaigns concentrate for a period of usually three months on inspection of a limited number of items during all port State

control inspections at all Paris MOU ports. Concentrated inspection campaigns are additional to the normal port State control practice.

Selection of items for concentrated inspection campaigns is either based on the frequency of deficiencies noted in the subject areas, or on the recent entry into force of new international requirements.

Concentrated inspection campaigns are aimed at focusing the attention of ships' crews on the subject items, with a view to avoiding deficiencies rather than as a device for detecting more deficiencies.

During 1996, a concentrated inspection campaign was carried out on compliance with the requirements of MARPOL 73/78 to keep an accurate Oil Record Book. The evaluation of this campaign showed this to be a problem for many ships. As this phenomenon was observed over the full range of foreign ships, irrespective of flag and of their compliance or non-compliance reputation, it suggests the existence of real difficulties in maintaining an Oil Record Book in accordance with the regulations. The results of this concentrated inspection campaign will be further analysed with a view to assessing whether further international action within the IMO is necessary in order to assist ships in improving compliance in this important area.

At the end of the period under review, new items for concentrated inspection campaigns in 1997 were under consideration.

3.4 Targeting

The previous annual report mentioned that a target factor for the selection of individual ships for inspection was under development. to facilitate the selection of ships for inspection. The target factor is derived from a cumulative quantification of several elements which could affect the anticipated safety performance of a ship. It is automatically calculated for each individual ship by the SIRENAC⁵ information system and displayed by the system with the ship's details.

Further development of the target factor took place in 1996, and its application was tested to assess whether it served the intended purpose. At the end of the period

under review evaluation of these tests were still in progress and it is anticipated that further fine tuning of the target factor will continue in 1997.

3.5 Upgrading of the SIRENAC information system

For the purpose of monitoring compliance with the provisions of the EU Directive on Port State Control by EU Member States, the Commission of the European Communities has expressed the need for a monitoring instrument. The Paris MOU's computerised information system, the SIRENAC system, could serve that purpose. However in its present configuration, the system would need significant modifications before it could perform all the required monitoring functions. Moreover, the envisaged monitoring functions are more of a statistical than of an operational nature.

The present version of the SIRENAC system is also due for a redesign in line with current database technology. During the period under review, substantial efforts have been made to develop a model for the next version of the SIRENAC information system, with due regard to the issues involved. At the end of the period under review the Port State Control Committee had agreed to establish a "twin" database, one for operational purposes and the other, which will be updated regularly by the operational database, for statistical and monitoring purposes. The work to redesign the SIRENAC information system is entrusted to the Centre Administratif des Affaires Maritimes, currently responsible for managing the database, assisted by a panel of experts from Paris MOU member authorities and the Commission of the European Communities. The aim is to finalise this work in 1997.



Navigating position on a high speed ferry: a new notion of ship manoeuvring and navigation in a new concept of passenger transportation.

4. Training of Port State Control Officers

4.1 Port State Control seminars

Training of Port State Control Officers (PSCO's) has always been a priority within the Paris MOU and, in view of the introduction of new international regulations, it will remain. During Port State Control seminars, PSCO's are made aware of any new international regulations which have entered into force and attention is focused particularly on the port State control aspects of such regulations. These seminars take place twice a year and are assisted financially by the Commission of the European Communities.

When dealing with specialist issues experts, either from governmental organisations or from the industry, are invited to share their expertise with the PSCO's from all Paris MOU countries.

During 1996, Port State Control seminars dealt with port State control aspects of the HSC Code ⁶, the ISM Code ²) and the amendments to the STCW Convention ³). In view of their importance, these issues will remain on the agenda of the Port State Control seminars in 1997.

4.2 Advanced training programme for Port State Control Officers

In previous years, the Port State Control Committee had identified the need to establish a programme for advanced training of PSCO's, in order to keep them abreast of progressing technology in the maritime field and of corresponding regulatory developments. This advanced training should be additional to the regular Port State Control seminars. During the period under review, the steering group charged with the development of the modules for this advanced training programme, finalised its work.

At the end of 1996, the Commission of the European Communities, which attaches great value to this

programme and is therefore prepared to sponsor it financially, published a call for expressions of interest from professional training institutes that may wish to be involved in presenting one or more of the agreed modules.

appropriate training of port State control officers is a priority for the Paris MOU. Further efforts for enhanced training are in progress

5. Co-operation with other organizations

5.1 Relations with other port State control regions

5.1.1 Relations with the Tokyo MOU

Contacts with the regional port State control system in the Asia-Pacific region (Tokyo MOU) were further intensified during the period under review. Mutual participation in meetings was

considered very useful for the purpose of exchanging information and expertise. Several Paris MOU experts presented lectures during port State control seminars and training courses in the Asia-Pacific region.

In the light of current developments, it is anticipated that mutual co-operation between the Paris MOU and the Tokyo MOU will continue to be developed with a view to improving early identification of sub-standard ships.

5.1.2 Establishment of the Caribbean MOU

At a meeting in Barbados, Caribbean island States and Territories⁷ concluded a series of preparatory meetings on the establishment of a regional port State control system in the Caribbean region. On 9 February 1996, these States signed the Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control in the Caribbean Region (Caribbean MOU).

Arrangements have been made by Barbados to set up a regional Secretariat and it is anticipated that the Netherlands Antilles will provide the regional information system. The IMO Secretariat has been instrumental in setting up the Caribbean MOU.

The inaugural meeting of the Caribbean Port State Control Committee has been scheduled for early 1997.

5.1.3 Other regional port State control activities

The Port State Control Committee of the regional port State control system in Latin-America, the Acuerdo de Viña del Mar, met for its 3rd meeting in Rio de Janeiro, in August 1996.

co-operation with other port State control regions enhances the impact on sub-standard ships. The envisaged joint Paris MOU/Tokyo MOU Ministerial Conference is expected to boost further inter-regional co-operation.

Under the aegis of the IMO Secretariat and with technical and financial support from the Commission of the European Communities, efforts were made by South/East Mediterranean States to conclude a Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control.

At the end of the period, two preparatory meetings had been held and it is

anticipated that the MOU will be signed in Malta in July 1997. Representatives of several, mainly Mediterranean, Paris MOU countries acted as resource persons at these meetings.

5.2 Preparation of a joint Paris MOU/Tokyo MOU Ministerial Conference

In June 1996, the Minister for Transport of Canada invited Ministers responsible for port State control in Paris MOU countries and their counterparts in countries of the Tokyo MOU to participate in a joint Paris MOU/Tokyo MOU

Ministerial Conference on Port State Control This conference is scheduled to take place in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, on 24-25 March 1998. During the period under review, preparations for this conference were started by both Port State Control Committees, with a view to reaching an agreement on the agenda for the joint conference. The initiative for a joint conference, is unprecedented and preparations are complex.

In December 1996, a joint Paris MOU/Tokyo MOU preparatory meeting took place, at which views were exchanged on substantial issues to be discussed by Ministers at the conference. Further preparations by both MOU's, jointly and separately, are expected to continue throughout 1997.

6. Facts and figures

6.1 Inspections

During the period under review 16,070 inspections have been carried out on 10,256 foreign merchant ships registered in 111 different flag States. Although this number of inspections is slightly lower than the inspection figures of previous years (1993: 17,294; 1994: 16,964; 1995: 16,381), it indicates that the general inspection effort in the Paris MOU region has been fairly consistent over the past years. Considering that the numbers of ships involved show equal consistency (1993: 11,252; 1994: 10,694; 1995: 10,563), this may indicate that the regional coverage of port State control inspections in the Paris MOU region remains quite substantial. When measured in relation to the 25% inspection commitment as laid down in the Paris Memorandum, the regional inspection percentage amounted to 24.5% in 1996 (1993: 26.1%; 1994: 26.8%; 1995: 25.9%).

The slightly lower figures for 1996 may be explained by the fact that some individual Paris MOU members had difficulty in reaching the 25% inspection target during the period under review. A chart presenting the individual efforts of the Paris MOU members, has been included in the statistical annexes to this annual report.

It is anticipated, nevertheless, that the inspection percentage will increase again, after the entry into force of the EU Directive on Port State Control which makes it mandatory for the EU Member States to achieve the inspection target.

A further reason for the slight reduction may be better targeting of those ships for inspection that are most likely to be sub-standard. It is obvious that inspections of such ships will take more time and, therefore, fewer inspections may be carried out within the time available.

6.2 Detentions

The number of ships detained for deficiencies clearly hazardous to safety, health or the environment amounted to 1,719 in 1996.

After several years in which the number of ships detained had risen spectacularly (1992: 588; 1993: 926; 1994: 1,597; 1995: 1,837), the number of detentions decreased for the first time since 1988. Although it may be premature to speak of a trend, it was observed in the previous annual report that the increase in the number of detentions had moderated. It

the number of detentions decreased for the first time since 1988, although it may be premature to speak of a trend.

can only be hoped that the number of detained ships will continue to decrease, which could be taken as an indication that the overall safety standards of the world fleet are improving.

The detentions expressed as a percentage of the number of individual ships inspected amounted to 16.8%. Although half a percent lower than last year's figure, it still doubles the percentage of 1993 and it may therefore be too early to make an optimistic appraisal.

On the other hand, the currently observed decrease in the number of detentions, when considered against the background of improved methods of targeting sub-standard ships, may be seen as a sign that co-operation

between various players in the maritime field is beginning to have an effect.

However, it is noted with great concern that among the flag States whose registered ships have a higher than average three-year rolling detention rate, there seems to be a 'hard core' of States that have persistently figured in this 'list of shame' since it was introduced in this annual report in 1992, without showing any sign of improvement. In the framework of the Paris MOU, port State control authorities will continue to focus on ships flying the flags of such States and the detention record will remain an important targeting criterion in the selection of ships for port State control inspections.

There is no sign of improvement of flag States with persistent above average detention rates.

Looking at detentions by ship type over several years, it is observed that general dry cargo ships and dry bulk carriers not only constitute the majority of detentions in absolute numbers, but their detention percentages also exceed the average detention percentage of 16.8%. For general dry cargo ships this excess is quite substantial. Detention percentages of all other ship types fall well below the average detention percentage. This applies to gas carriers, passenger ships and ro-ro/container ships in particular. Statistical annexes to this report show the detention percentage for each ship type in relation to the average detention percentage.

A comparison of detention rates in 1995 and 1996 by ship type is given in the statistical annexes to this report. The detention rates of gas carriers, oil tankers and ro-ro/container ships, and to a lesser extent bulk carriers, chemical tankers and refrigerated cargo ships, have decreased, while those of passenger ships, general dry cargo ships and ships of non-specified types have increased.

6.3 Deficiencies

The number of deficiencies noted during port State control inspections in 1996 (53,967) showed a slight decrease for the first time since the Paris MOU came into operation in 1982 (1995: 54,451; 1994: 53,210; 1993: 43,071).

Nevertheless, the total number of deficiencies observed remains extremely high.

A decrease is observed, however slight in some cases, in the number of deficiencies in areas such as fire fighting equipment, crew, load lines, cargo, propulsion and machinery installations, radio equipment and safety in general. In some categories, this decrease is noted for the third consecutive year, which is another encouraging observation.

However, the number of deficiencies in navigational equipment and in the area of MARPOL Annex I rose further. The substantial increase in the number of deficiencies in the latter category reflects the result of the concentrated inspection campaign on compliance with the MARPOL provisions related to the Oil Record Book, which took place in the second part of 1996. The deficiencies in Oil Record Books more than doubled from 925 deficiencies observed in 1995 to 1865 in 1996. Considering that this campaign only covered a period of three months, these figures clearly underscore the impact of concentrated inspection campaigns.

safety consciousness and proper maintenance remain the key issues to avoid most deficiencies

Lack of proper maintenance is the main cause of the majority of deficiencies noted. This observation justifies the continued appeal to ships' personnel to be aware of the importance of proper shipboard maintenance, not only for their personal safety at sea but also for the purpose of

avoiding costly delay as a result of detention by port State authorities.

With the approaching entry into force of the ISM Code, it is anticipated that control by port State authorities of compliance with shipboard operational requirements, which includes proper maintenance, will be further intensified.

In order to consider the number of deficiencies more objectively, they may be expressed as a ratio of the number of inspections or, alternatively, as a ratio of the number of ships involved. The deficiency ratio for 1996 in relation to the number of inspections is 3.36, which implies that an average of 3.36 deficiencies were observed in each port State control inspection. This ratio is almost equal to the 1995 figure (1995: 3.32; 1994: 3.14; 1993: 2.49). The 1996 deficiency ratio in relation to the number of individual ships involved amounted to 5.26 (1995: 5.15; 1994: 4.98; 1993: 3.83).

The preliminary assumption made in the previous annual report that the increase of deficiency ratios may be levelling off remains valid in view of the most recent figures.

However, the above deficiency ratios have been expressed in relation to all ships involved in port State control inspections, irrespective of whether or not deficiencies were found. Obviously, only ships in which deficiencies were found are responsible for the total number of deficiencies. Considering that in 8666 inspections (53.92% of all inspections) deficiencies were noted, it is this number that is responsible for the total of 53,967 deficiencies. This implies that the deficiency ratio for inspections in which deficiencies were noted amounted to 6.23 (1995: 6.36; 1994: 6.10; 1993: 5.14), which is a decrease, albeit marginal, of this ratio for the first time ever.



Deteriorated skin of a (wooden!) lifeboat, which leaves no room for speculations on the availability of this vital lifesaving appliance.

Footnotes to the 1996 Annual Report

- ¹⁾ Council Directive 95/21/EC of 19 June 1995 concerning the enforcement, in respect of shipping using Community ports and sailing in the waters under the jurisdiction of the Member States, of international standards for ship safety, pollution prevention and shipboard living and working conditions (port State control). (O.J. No. L 157/1 of 7 July 1995)
- ²⁾ “International Management Code for the Safe Operation of Ships and for Pollution Prevention”, adopted by the IMO Assembly at its 18th session on 4 November 1993 by Resolution A.741(18).
- ³⁾ International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978. Amendments to Annex of the STCW Convention were adopted by the Conference of Parties to the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978, in London on 7 July 1995. In accordance with the provisions of Conference Resolution 1, the amendments were accepted on 1 August 1996 and will enter into force on 1 February 1997.
- ⁴⁾ Assembly Resolution A.787(19) “Procedures for Port State Control”, adopted on 23 November 1995.
- ⁵⁾ SIRENAC = Système d’Information RELatif aux NAVires Contrôlés; Paris MOU database on port State control inspections established in Saint-Malo, France.
- ⁶⁾ “International Code of Safety for High-Speed Craft”, adopted by the IMO Maritime Safety Committee at its 63rd session in May 1994 by Resolution MSC36(63); The 1994 SOLAS Conference (May 1994) makes this Code mandatory by the addition of a new Chapter X.
- ⁷⁾ Participating States and Territories that have signed and accepted the Caribbean MOU are: Antigua and Barbuda, Aruba, Bahama, Barbados, Cayman Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago;
Participating States and Territories that have signed but not yet accepted the Caribbean MOU are: Anguilla, Dominica, Guyana, British Virgin Islands, Montserrat, Netherlands Antilles, Surinam and Turks and Caicos Islands;
The following Caribbean States have observer status at the Caribbean Port State Control Committee:
Anguilla, Montserrat and Turks and Caicos Islands;
The following governments and organisations have observer status at the Caribbean Port State Control Committee:
Canada, the Netherlands, USA, CARICOM Secretariat, ILO, IMO, IACS and the Secretariats of Paris MOU, Tokyo MOU and Viña del Mar.