



Shipping Industry Flag State Performance Table

Based on data available as of end June 2005



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, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of Congo, Georgia, Honduras, Indonesia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mongolia, Sao Tome & Principe, Suriname and Syrian Arab Republic.

www.marisec.org/flag-performance

N/S No data submitted to IMO - can be regarded as a negative indicator

N/A Data not applicable
- US not eligible for Qualship 21 or USCG target listing

* UK dependent territories - entries for non-ratification of conventions, STCW 'white list' and IMO meetings attendance as UK

+ Netherlands dependent territory - entry for non-ratification of conventions, A.739, STCW 'white list' and IMO meetings attendance as Netherlands

Flag State Performance Table

(Based on the most up to date data)

Black 'blobs' • suggest **possible** negative performance indicators (although individual indicators should be considered within the context of the overall performance)

	Port State Control						Non-Ratification of Conventions					A739	Average age		Reports		IMO
	Not on Paris MOU white list	On Paris MOU black list	Not on Tokyo MOU white list	On Tokyo MOU black list	Not in USCG Qualship 21	On USCG target list (safety)	SOLAS 74 (and 88 Protocol)	MARPOL 73/78 (and annexes I-VI)	LL 66 (and 88 Protocol)	STCW 78	ILO 147	CLC/FUND 92	No. of non IACS bodies	High age (ship numbers)	High age (GT)	Not on STCW 'white list'	Not completed full ILO reports
Albania	•	•	•		•		•	•	•			N/S	•	•	•		•
Algeria	•	•	•		•		•	•		•		0					
Antigua & Barbuda					•	•	•	•		•		1					•
Argentina	•		•		•		•	•		•		N/S					
Australia	•		•		•		•	•		•		0					
Bahamas					•		•	•		•		0					
Bahrain	•		•		•		•	•	•	•		N/S				•	•
Bangladesh	•		•	•	•		•	•		•	•	0	•	•			•
Barbados			•									0					•
Belgium	•		•		•		•	•				0					
Belize	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•				9				•	•
Bermuda*												1					
Bolivia	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	1	•	•	•		•
Brazil	•	•	•		•	•	•	•			•	1					
Brunei Darussalam	•		•		•		•	•		•		N/S				•	•
Bulgaria	•		•		•		•	•			•	1					•
Cambodia	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•		N/S		•		•	•
Canada	•		•		•		•	•				0	•	•			
Cayman Islands*			•		•							0				•	
Chile	•		•		•					•	•	N/S				•	
China							•	•		•	•	0					
Colombia	•		•		•		•	•	•	•		0	•	•			•
Costa Rica	•		•		•		•	•	•	•		N/S	•	•	•		•
Cote d'Ivoire	•		•		•		•	•		•	•	N/S					•
Croatia	•		•		•	•						0	•				•
Cuba	•		•		•		•	•	•	•	•	2	•	•		•	
Cyprus	•		•		•	•						1					•
Dem. People's Rep. of Korea		•	•	•	•		•	•		•	•	1	•	•		•	•
Dem. Rep. of Congo	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	N/S		•	•	•	•
Denmark					•							0					
Dominica	•		•		•			•				N/S	•				•
Egypt	•	•	•	•	•		•	•			•	2					
Estonia	•		•		•		•	•				1					
Finland			•		•							0					
France					•	•						0					
Georgia	•	•	•		•		•	•		•		N/S	•	•		•	•
Germany					•							0					
Ghana	•		•		•		•	•				N/S	•	•			
Gibraltar*	•		•		•	•						0				•	
Greece					•							2					
Honduras	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•		•	•	8	•	•			•
Hong Kong (China)												0					
Iceland	•		•		•							N/S					•
India	•		•		•	•						0					•
Indonesia	•		•	•	•		•	•		•	•	2	•	•			•
Iran	•		•		•		•	•		•	•	2					
Ireland			•		•							0					
Isle of Man*												0					
Israel					•		•	•				0					•
Italy					•	•						0					
Jamaica	•		•		•					•		N/S				•	•
Japan					•							0					
Jordan	•		•		•						•	N/S		•		•	•

data available as of end of June 2005). To be used in conjunction with Section 2 of the Shipping Industry Guidelines on Flag State Performance. (in the context of the table as a whole). For detailed explanation of criteria for performance indicators see footnotes overleaf.

	Port State Control						Non-Ratification of Conventions				A739	Average age		Reports		IMO	
	Not on Paris MOU white list	On Paris MOU black list	Not on Tokyo MOU white list	On Tokyo MOU black list	Not in USCG Qualship 2 I	On USCG target list (safety)	SOLAS 74 (and 88 Protocol)	MARPOL 73/78 (and annexes I-VI)	LL 66 (and 88 Protocol)	STCW 78	ILO 147	CLC/FUND 92	No. of non IACS bodies	High age (ship numbers)	High age (GT)	Not on STCW 'white list'	Not completed full ILO reports
Kenya	•		•		•		•	•	•			N/S	•	•	•		•
Kuwait	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	0				•	•
Latvia	•		•		•							1					
Lebanon	•	•	•		•		•				•	N/S	•	•			•
Liberia			•		•		•	•				1				•	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	1			•		•
Lithuania	•		•		•		•	•	•			1					
Luxembourg			•								•	0				•	•
Madagascar	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	N/S	•	•		•	•
Malaysia			•		•	•	•	•	•		•	0					•
Malta	•		•		•	•		•				1					
Marshall Islands												1				•	
Mauritius	•		•		•		•	•				1					•
Mexico	•		•		•	•	•	•				0	•				
Mongolia	•		•	•	•		•	•	•		•	N/S		•	•	•	•
Morocco	•		•		•		•	•	•			0					•
Myanmar	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	N/S					•
Netherlands					•							0					
Netherlands Antilles+			•		•	•		•				0				•	
New Zealand	•		•		•		•	•			•	0					•
Nigeria	•		•		•		•	•	•			N/S	•	•			
Norway					•							0					
Pakistan	•		•		•		•	•			•	0					•
Panama	•	•			•	•	•	•				12					
Papua New Guinea	•		•	•	•		•	•	•		•	0					•
Philippines					•		•	•	•		•	1					
Poland	•		•		•		•	•				1		•			
Portugal			•		•							1					
Rep. of Korea	•				•						•	0					
Romania	•	•	•		•		•	•			•	1					•
Russian Federation	•		•		•		•	•				0					
St Vincent & Grenadines	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•			•	6					•
Sao Tome & Principe	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	N/S	•	•	•	•	•
Saudi Arabia	•		•		•		•	•			•	0				•	
Singapore					•							0					
South Africa	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	1				•	
Spain	•		•		•							N/S				•	
Sri Lanka	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	N/S					•
Suriname	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	N/S	•	•	•	•	•
Sweden					•							0	•				
Switzerland	•				•		•	•	•		•	0					•
Syrian Arab Republic	•	•	•		•		•	•	•		•	N/S	•	•		•	•
Thailand			•	•	•		•	•	•		•	0				•	•
Trinidad & Tobago	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	0	•	•		•	•
Tunisia	•		•		•		•	•	•		•	0				•	•
Turkey	•	•	•		•	•	•	•	•		•	1				•	•
Ukraine	•	•	•		•	•	•	•			•	3		•		•	
United Kingdom					•							2					
United States of America					N/A	N/A		•			•	0	•				•
Uruguay	•		•		•			•			•	N/S	•				•
Vanuatu	•				•							1				•	•
Venezuela	•		•		•	•	•	•			•	N/S					•
Viet Nam	•		•	•	•			•			•	2				•	•

Footnotes to Flag State Performance Table

1 Port State Control

Source: Paris MOU Annual Report 2004, Tokyo MOU Annual Report 2004, USCG Port State Control Annual Report 2004 and USCG Qualship 21 listings (June 2005).

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 2005), 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 annexes I to VI. LL 66 includes 1988 Protocol. STCW 78 includes 1995 amendments. ILO 147 excludes 1996 Protocol.

3 Use of Recognized Organizations complying with A.739

Source: IMO FSI/Circ. 11

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.

4 Average Age

Source: Lloyd's Register-Fairplay Ship Database, UK Chamber of Shipping customised version (June 2005).

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: 'Reports submitted on the application of the ratified ILO Maritime Conventions (1998 – 2002)', ILO and IMO MSC/Circ. 1163 (20 May 2005).

Note: Black 'blobs' indicate a failure to submit all compliance and practice reports required by ILO, and failure to achieve a place on the IMO STCW 'white list'.

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

post@marisec.org

www.marisec.org/flag-performance