

Footnotes to Flag State Performance Table

1 Port State Control

Source: Paris MOU Annual Report 2009, Tokyo MOU Annual Report 2009, USCG Port State Control Annual Report 2009 (including 'USCG Qualship 21 Qualifying Registries for 2010').

Notes: Paris and Tokyo MOU data relate to their 'black lists', but not their 'grey lists'. The USCG methodology for evaluating PSC detention ratios (USCG target list and Qualship 21) differs from the methodology used by other PSC authorities. While Paris and Tokyo MOUs use the detention ratio formula of detentions/inspections, the USCG uses the detention ratio formula of detentions/distinct vessel arrivals.

2 Non-Ratification of Conventions

Source: IMO report 'Status of Conventions - full list' (end June 2010), IMO web site (www.imo.org); ILOLEX listings 'Ratification of Conventions', ILO web site (www.ilo.org).

Notes: SOLAS 74 includes 1988 Protocol. MARPOL 73/78 includes one entry for ratification of MARPOL and its mandatory annexes (annexes I and II), and a second entry for ratification of the remaining, voluntary annexes (annexes III to VI). LL 66 includes 1988 Protocol. STCW 78 incorporates the 1995 amendments. ILO 147 excludes 1996 Protocol, but includes ratification of MLC 2006 which will supersede ILO 147. CLC/FUND 92 includes 1992 Protocols.

3 Use of Recognized Organizations complying with A.739

Source: IMO GISIS database.

Note: Number of non-IACS bodies authorised by the flag state to carry out statutory survey work on its behalf, as reported to IMO. Some non-IACS members fully comply with A.739 and the fact that a flag recognises a non-IACS RO does not necessarily mean that it is deficient. 'N/S' indicates a failure to submit RO data to IMO in accordance with A.739, and therefore counts as a negative performance indicator.

4 Average Age

Source: IHS Fairplay Ship Database (3rd Quarter 2010).

Note: Second register fleet numbers are incorporated under main national register. Definition – trading ships, over 100 gt, excluding barge, fish processing/catching, offshore drilling/support, tug, pushboat, research and survey, dredger, naval, non ship structure and 'other' categories. Black 'blobs' denote top 25% of entries listed in this table.

5 Reports

Source: IMO MSC.1/Circ.1164/Rev.7, 1 June 2010 on reports of independent evaluation submitted by parties to STCW in line with Chapter I/8 of the STCW Code; 'Report of the Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (2010)', ILOLEX database, ILO web site (www.ilo.org).

Note: Black 'blobs' indicate a failure to achieve confirmation of the reports of independent evaluations confirming continuing compliance with STCW which are necessary to maintain a place on the IMO STCW 'white list', and a failure to submit all compliance and practice reports requested by ILO.

6 IMO Attendance

Source: IMO meeting reports.

Note: Black 'blobs' indicate a country has missed at least one meeting of the MSC, MEPC, Legal Committee or Assembly over the past two years.

Published by

Maritime International Secretariat Services Ltd

12 Carthusian Street
London EC1M 6EZ

Telephone +44 20 7417 8844

Fax +44 20 7417 8877

Email post@marisec.org

www.marisec.org/flag-performance.htm

www.shipping-facts.com



2010 Shipping Industry Flag State Performance Table

Based on data available as of end June 2010

This table summarises factual information available in the public domain that may be helpful in assessing the performance of flag states. It should be read in conjunction with Section Two of the *Shipping Industry Guidelines on Flag State Performance*, accessible at:

www.marisec.org/flag-performance

The Round Table of international shipping associations - BIMCO, INTERCARGO, INTERNATIONAL CHAMBER OF SHIPPING, INTERNATIONAL SHIPPING FEDERATION and INTERTANKO - believe it is essential that standards of safety, environmental and social performance are maintained and enforced by flag states, in full compliance with international maritime regulations. This updated flag state performance table has been produced to help the international shipping industry contribute to this objective.

Possible negative performance indicators are shown as black 'blobs'. Like all statistics the data need to be used with care and individual indicators may provide an unreliable measurement of performance.

On the basis of the data used, the following flag states have 12 or more negative performance indicators:

Albania, Bolivia, Cambodia, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Honduras, Lebanon, St Kitts and Nevis, Sao Tome, Sierra Leone.

www.marisec.org/flag-performance.htm



BIMCO



INTERCARGO



INTERTANKO

