



International
Chamber of Shipping

Shaping the Future of Shipping

Shipping Industry Flag State Performance Table

2017/2018



Shipping Industry Flag State Performance Table

The following Table is published annually

www.ics-shipping.org

There is nothing inherently unusual in an international ship registry system in which the owner of a ship may be located in a country other than the state whose flag the ship flies. However, a balance has to be struck between the commercial advantages of selecting a particular flag and the need to discourage the use of flags that do not meet their international obligations.

The purpose of this Flag State Performance Table is two-fold:

To encourage shipowners and operators to examine whether a flag state has sufficient substance before using it.

To encourage shipowners and operators to put pressure on their flag administrations to effect any improvements that might be necessary, especially in relation to safety of life at sea, the protection of the marine environment, and the provision of decent working and living conditions for seafarers.

How to use the Table

This Table summarises factual information in the public domain that might be helpful in assessing the performance of flag states. Sources are shown in the footnotes overleaf.


Positive performance indicators are shown as green squares on the Table.

Like all statistics, the Table needs to be used with care. Where a flag state is missing a single positive indicator in itself this does not provide a reliable measurement of performance. For example, a flag state might be unable to ratify a Convention due to conflict with domestic law but might nevertheless implement its main requirements. Equally, a flag state may not be listed on a Port State Control 'white list' because it does not make any port calls in that PSC region.

However, if a large number of positive indicators are shown as being absent, this might suggest that performance is unsatisfactory and that shipping companies should ask further questions of the flag state concerned.

 GREEN squares suggest positive performance indicators

 GREEN-BLACK squares indicate satisfactory performance.

 RED squares highlight potentially negative performance (although individual indicators should be considered within the context of the Table as a whole).

Shipping Industry Flag State Performance Table

Based on the most up to date data available as of January 2018

Port State Control

A simple means of assessing the effective enforcement of international rules is to examine the collective Port State Control record of ships flying a particular flag.

The three principal Port State Control (PSC) authorities are the countries of the Paris Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the Tokyo MOU and the United States Coast Guard (USCG). All three authorities target particular flags on the basis of deficiencies and detentions recorded for ships flying that flag. The Table identifies flag states that feature on the Paris and Tokyo MOUs' white lists and that have fully qualified for the USCG's Qualship 21 program, and those which do not appear on their respective black lists/target lists. Ships whose flag states do not appear on PSC 'white lists' tend to be subject to a greater likelihood of inspections.

The Table now also identifies those flags whose ships suffered no detentions within a particular PSC region over the previous three years, but did not meet the relevant minimum requirement of inspections or arrivals to be included in the MOU white lists/ Qualship 21 program. In order to be identified in this way with respect to the Paris and Tokyo MOU white lists, a flag must have undergone at least one inspection in the previous three years. With respect to the Qualship 21 program, a flag must have made at least three distinct arrivals in each of the previous three years. This is in alignment with the way in which the three PSC authorities present this information.

NB: Flags which do not qualify for Qualship 21 have not been given red squares, as the list of flag states which qualify varies considerably from year to year and non-inclusion is currently not regarded by ICS as an indicator of potentially negative performance.

The full criteria for PSC are explained in the footnotes to the Table.

Ratification of major international maritime treaties

Ratification of international maritime Conventions does not necessarily confirm whether the provisions of these global instruments are being properly enforced. However, a flag state should be able to provide good reason for not having ratified any of the instruments referred to in the Table.

The Table refers to those 'core' Conventions, relevant to flag state responsibilities, which already enjoy widespread ratification and enforcement. The full criteria for the Conventions listed are shown in the footnotes to the Table.

Use of Recognized Organizations complying with A.739

IMO Resolution A.739 requires flag states to establish controls over Recognized Organizations (ROs) conducting survey work on their behalf, and which determine that these bodies have adequate resources for the tasks assigned. The Resolution also requires flag states to submit data to IMO on the ROs authorised to act on their behalf.

The Paris and Tokyo MOUs on Port State Control now submit an annual assessment to IMO entitled 'Performance of Flag Administrations and Recognized Organizations', which includes a list of flag states deemed by these PSC regimes to delegate survey work to underperforming ROs. The Table therefore positively indicates flag states which do not appear on this list and which have also submitted their RO related data to IMO in line with Resolution A.739.

Age of fleet

A high concentration of older tonnage under a particular flag does not necessarily mean that this tonnage is in any way substandard. However, a flag which has a concentration of younger ships may be more likely to attract quality tonnage than a flag state with a high concentration of older vessels. As a positive indicator, the Table therefore shows the 90% of flags (among those listed) that have the lowest average fleet age (the bottom 10% of those listed having the highest average age). **Nevertheless, it is strongly emphasised that the position of ICS is that the age of an individual ship is not an indicator of quality, and that the condition of an individual ship is ultimately determined by the standard of its maintenance.**

Reporting requirements

There are various reporting requirements concerning the submission of information by flag states to IMO and ILO. Information covering the extent to which flag states actually comply with these reporting requirements is not always available in the public domain.

However, as an indicator, the Table positively identifies flags that are in compliance with ILO reporting obligations, as well as flags confirmed by IMO to have communicated information demonstrating that full and complete effect is given to the relevant provisions of the STCW Convention (as amended in 2010) and included within the latest STCW 'white list', as approved by the IMO Maritime Safety Committee.

Attendance at IMO meetings

Although in itself not an indicator of their safety and environmental record, flag states that attend the major IMO meetings (Maritime Safety Committee, Marine Environment Protection Committee and Legal Committee) are thought more likely to be seriously committed to the implementation and enforcement of IMO rules.

Attendance at these meetings is also important to keep abreast of regulatory developments. The Table identifies flag states that have been represented at all meetings of these three major IMO committees, plus the biennial meeting of the IMO Assembly, during the two years previous to 1 January 2018.

IMO Member State Audit

When governments accept to be bound by an IMO Convention they tacitly agree to incorporate it into their national law, implement it and enforce its provisions. The IMO Audit Scheme determines how effectively audited states adhere to all applicable mandatory IMO instruments covered by the Scheme. These audits became mandatory in 2016 and the Table positively indicates flag states reported to have already been audited.

■ squares suggest positive performance indicators

	Port State Control					Ratification of Conventions							A.739	Age	Reports		IMO		
	Paris MOU White List	Not on Paris MOU Black List	Tokyo MOU White List	Not on Tokyo MOU Black List	USCG Qualship 21	USCG Target List (safety)	SOLAS 74 (and 88 Protocol)	MARPOL including Annexes I - II	MARPOL Annexes III - VI	LL 66 (and 88 Protocol)	STOW 78	ILO MLC	GLC/FUND 92	Recognized Organizations	Low Average Age (Ship Numbers)	On latest STCW 95 'white list'	Completed full ILO Reports	IMO Meetings Attendance	IMO Audit Scheme
Albania	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	N/S	■	■	■	■	■
Algeria	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Antigua & Barbuda	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Argentina	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Australia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Bahamas	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Bahrain	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Bangladesh	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Barbados	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Belgium	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Belize	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Bolivia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Brazil	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Bulgaria	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Canada	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Chile	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
China	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Colombia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Comoros	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Cook Islands	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Costa Rica	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Cote d'Ivoire	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	N/S	■	■	■	■	■
Croatia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Cuba	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Cyprus	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Dem. People's Rep. Korea	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Dem. Rep. of the Congo	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	N/S	■	■	■	■	■
Denmark	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Dominica	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Egypt	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Estonia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Faroe Islands	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Finland	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
France	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Georgia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Germany	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Ghana	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	N/S	■	■	■	■	■
Greece	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Honduras	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Hong Kong (China)	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Iceland	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
India	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Indonesia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Iran	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Ireland	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Israel	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Italy	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Jamaica	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Japan	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Jordan	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Kenya	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Kiribati	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Kuwait	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Latvia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Lebanon	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Liberia	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Libya	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Lithuania	■	■	■	■		■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Luxembourg	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■

■ - Indicates where a flag administration suffered no detentions within the particular PSC region, but did not meet the relevant minimum requirement of inspections/arrivals, as set by the PSC authorities, to be included in an MOU white list or the Qualship 21 program. In order to be identified in this way with respect to the Paris and Tokyo MOU white lists, a flag must have undergone at least one inspection in the previous three years. With the respect to the Qualship 21 program, a flag must have made at least three distinct arrivals in each of the previous three years. This is in alignment with the way in which the PSC authorities present this information.

■ squares suggest positive performance indicators

	Port State Control						Ratification of Conventions						A.739	Age	Reports		IMO		
	Paris MOU White List	Not on Paris MOU Black List	Tokyo MOU White List	Not on Tokyo MOU Black List	USCG Qualship 21	USCG Target List (safety)	SOLAS 74 (and 88 Protocol)	MARPOL including Annexes I - II	MARPOL Annexes III - VI	LL 66 (and 88 Protocol)	STOW 78	ILO MLC	CLO/FUND 92	Recognized Organizations	Low Average Age (Ship Numbers)	On latest STOW 95 'white list'	Completed full ILO Reports	IMO Meetings Attendance	IMO Audit Scheme
Malaysia	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Malta	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Marshall Islands	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Mauritius	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Mexico	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Mongolia	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Morocco	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Myanmar	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Netherlands	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
- Curacao	■	■	■	■	■	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	NL	■	■	NL	NL	■	■	■
New Zealand	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Nigeria	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Norway	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Pakistan	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Palau	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Panama	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Papua New Guinea	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Philippines	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Poland	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Portugal	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Qatar	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Republic of Korea	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Republic of Moldova	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Romania	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Russian Federation	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
St. Kitts & Nevis	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
St. Vincent & Grenadines	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Sao Tome & Principe	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	N/S	■	■	■	■	■
Saudi Arabia	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Sierra Leone	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Singapore	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
South Africa	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Spain	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Sri Lanka	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Sweden	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Switzerland	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Syrian Arab Republic	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Tanzania	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Thailand	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Togo	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Tonga	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Trinidad & Tobago	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Tunisia	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Turkey	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Tuvalu	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Ukraine	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
United Arab Emirates	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
United Kingdom	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
- Bermuda *	■	■	■	■	■	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	■	■	UK	UK	■	■	■
- British Virgin Islands*	■	■	■	■	■	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	■	■	UK	UK	■	■	■
- Cayman Islands *	■	■	■	■	■	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	■	■	UK	UK	■	■	■
- Gibraltar *	■	■	■	■	■	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	■	■	UK	UK	■	■	■
- Isle of Man *	■	■	■	■	■	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	UK	■	■	UK	UK	■	■	■
United States of America	■	■	■	■	N/A	N/A	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Uruguay	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Vanuatu	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Venezuela	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Viet Nam	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■

UK - Indicates where a dependent territory's entry is based on the ratification, reporting or IMO meeting attendance of the UK 'mainland' flag.
 NL - Indicates where a dependent territory's entry is based on the ratification, reporting or IMO meeting attendance of the Netherlands 'mainland' flag.
 N/S - No data submitted to IMO - can be regarded as negative indicator.
 N/A - Data not applicable - US not eligible for Qualship 21 or USCG target listing.

Footnotes

Port State Control

Sources: Paris MOU Annual Report 2016 (published in July 2017); Tokyo MOU Annual Report 2016 (published in May 2017); USCG Qualship 21 Qualified Flag Administrations 2017 and USCG List of Targeted Flag Administrations 2017 (Safety), as recorded in USCG Port State Control Annual Report 2016.

Paris and Tokyo MOU data relate to their 'white lists' and 'black lists' but not their 'grey lists'. Many flag states which are on neither the MOU 'white list' or 'black list' are included in the 'grey list'.

However, flag states whose ships have been inspected less than 30 times in the last 3 years do not appear in any of the MOU lists. This principle applies in both the Paris MOU and Tokyo MOU regions.

The USCG methodology for evaluating PSC detention ratios (USCG target list and Qualship 21) uses the formula of detentions/distinct vessel arrivals, rather than detentions/inspections as used by the Paris and Tokyo MOUs. In order to be considered for Qualship 21 status, a flag state's ships must have made at least 10 distinct arrivals per calendar year for the previous three years.

The Table also identifies those flags whose ships suffered no detentions within a particular PSC region over the previous three years, but did not meet the relevant minimum requirement of inspections or arrivals to be included in the MOU white lists/Qualship 21 program.

In order to be identified in this way with respect to the Paris and Tokyo MOU white lists, a flag must have undergone at least one inspection in the previous three years. With the respect to the Qualship 21 program, a flag must have made at least three distinct arrivals in each of the previous three years. This is in alignment with the way in which the PSC authorities present this information. Some flag states may therefore not receive a positive indicator despite having experienced zero detentions.

There are various other regional and national PSC regimes worldwide, but in the interests of simplicity this Table only uses data from the three principal regional PSC authorities.

Ratification of Conventions

Source: IMO report 'Status of Conventions', IMO website (www.imo.org), ILO website (www.ilo.org) (all as at 31 January 2018).

The criteria for the Conventions listed in the Table are:

International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1974 as amended (SOLAS 74) - includes the 1988 Protocol.

International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification and Watchkeeping for Seafarers, 1978 as amended (STCW 78) including the 2010 amendments.

International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973 as modified by the Protocol of 1978 (MARPOL 73/78) - the Table includes one column for the ratification of MARPOL and its mandatory Annexes I (oil) and II (bulk chemicals); and a second column for the remaining Annexes III (dangerous packaged goods), IV (sewage), V (garbage) and VI (atmospheric pollution).

International Convention on Load Lines, 1966 (LL 66) - includes the 1988 Protocol.

ILO Maritime Labour Convention, 2006 (ILO MLC).

International Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage, 1992, and the **International Convention on the Establishment of an International Fund for Compensation for Oil Pollution Damage, 1992** (CLC/Fund 92) - includes the 1992 Protocols.

Average Age

Source: IHS Maritime & Trade Sea-web Database.

Second register ships are incorporated under main national register. Includes trading ships over 100 gross tonnage.

Reports

Sources: Report of the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations 2017;

MSC.1-Circ.1163-Rev.10.

IMO Attendance

Source: IMODOCS 'List of Participants' for the following meetings: MEPC 69, 70 and 71; MSC 96, 97 and 98; LEG 103 and 104; Assembly 30.

IMO Audit Scheme

Source: IMO GISIS 'Member States Audit' module.



ICS is the international trade association representing all sectors and trades of the shipping industry. Together with representatives of its member national shipowners' associations, ICS participates actively at the committee meetings of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), and contributes significantly to the development of IMO regulations which impact on international shipping. ICS also represents maritime employers as an official 'social partner' at the International Labour Organization.

Published in February 2018 by

International Chamber of Shipping
38 St Mary Axe London EC3A 8BH

Telephone + 44 20 7090 1460
info@ics-shipping.org
www.ics-shipping.org