INTERNATIONAL
OIL POLLUTION
COMPENSATION
FUND 1992

THIRD INTERSESSIONAL
WORKING GROUP
Agenda item 2

92FUND/WGR.3/25/3
4 February 2005
Original: ENGLISH

REVIEW OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMPENSATION REGIME

PROPOSALS MADE IN RELATION TO SUBSTANDARD SHIPPING BY THE INTERNATIONAL GROUP OF P&I CLUBS

Submitted by the International Group of P&I Clubs

Summary:	In this paper it is suggested that the political imperative which has underscored the review undertaken by the Third Intersessional Working Group is best addressed by dealing directly with the issue of substandard transportation. The Report on Ship Safety contained in the Annex describes how proposals for steps to be taken by the P&I Clubs can contribute to this, in conjunction with possible actions by other parties in the chain of responsibility. The paper further suggests that an informal Working Group of interested States be established to consider any additional measures which can be taken.
Action to be taken:	The Working Group is invited to consider the matters set out in this paper and, if thought appropriate, establish an informal Working Group.

1 Introduction

1.1 Document 92FUND/WGR.3/25/2 deals with the International Group's proposals on sharing the burden of compensation. This submission addresses the problem of substandard shipping, which has been a powerful motivating force for many of the proposals that have been made to revise the Conventions. We believe that these proposals are misplaced in the context of the Conventions for two broad reasons.

1.2 In the first place, there is no evidence that the imposition of additional liability will improve the behaviour of the substandard operator – if he is already prepared to risk bearing a substantial liability under CLC of, say, SDR30 million or SDR40 million, he is unlikely to change his conduct if that liability is increased or even doubled, particularly with the knowledge that such liability is insured (as required under CLC).

1.3 Second, the punitive intent of the proposals will not be fulfilled since the burden of liability is necessarily shared by the insurance mechanism. In practice a single large claim will have only a marginal affect on the owner's overall insurance cost, part of which is a fixed reinsurance

contribution. The effect is that the burden of increased liability will fall upon the shipping industry generally and not upon the individual substandard operator. Special liability provisions for substandard operators will therefore neither have a deterrent effect, nor a punitive effect.

1.4 We therefore remain firmly of the view that it will not be effective to make special provision on liability for substandard operators, no matter how defined. However, Clubs are equally firmly of the view that the issue of substandard shipping is of crucial importance and has to be addressed seriously. To this end we suggest that the primary aim should be to create the conditions that would deter or prevent the substandard operator from trading altogether, rather than imposing greater liability for any damage he does and supporting him with insurance that spreads the liability burden. In the following Report on Ship Safety we set out in greater detail proposals for addressing this issue.

1.5 The valuable work that has been undertaken by the Working Group in response to the *Erika* and *Prestige* disasters has been impelled by two separate but related themes. First, the realisation that the compensation system was inadequate to meet the scale of modern oil spill disasters, especially those involving the more polluting cargoes, and, second, the need to respond to the political imperative to deal with substandard shipping. The first has been dealt with by the substantial increases already agreed in 2003. The second deserves further analysis.

1.6 Several incidents in recent years, including the *Erika* and *Prestige*, have caused outrage that vessels thought to be of dubious quality were allowed to trade and to carry particularly polluting cargoes. The EU and IMO have therefore responded accordingly and, through revision of MARPOL and EU Directives, have introduced dramatically accelerated programmes for the withdrawal of single hull tankers, an expanded Condition Assessment Scheme for tankers 15 years and older, and a requirement for the carriage of the more polluting cargoes (ie heavy oils) in double hulls only – all of which will be in effect in 2005. The political pressure that found expression in these initiatives also played its part in bringing within the review process the proposal that special liability provision be made in CLC in respect of substandard ships.

1.7 For the reasons indicated in paragraphs1.2 and 1.3 above, we believe that the proposals made to date in this connection cannot achieve their intended purpose, and do not meet the aim of ensuring that substandard operators are deterred or prevented from trading altogether. The political imperative will therefore not be met by such measures. Moreover, practical problems will remain if special provision is made in respect of substandard vessels, but without having any impact on the likelihood of accidents involving such ships. States may then be asked why the political initiative was not seized to make a co-ordinated attempt for improved practical measures to discourage substandard shipping.

1.8 The Group has prepared, in the attached Report, certain concrete proposals in this regard. We hope that these proposals can be considered further by an informal working group which could meet initially during the forthcoming IOPC Fund meetings. We would hope that membership of such a working group could be open to all, but that it would be of particular interest to those States which have made proposals in relation to substandard shipping. We respectfully submit that this would be a more effective means of responding to the political issue of substandard shipping than the introduction of special liability provisions, which, for the reasons indicated above, are most unlikely to meet their intended aim.

2 Action to be taken by the Working Group

The Working Group is invited to consider the matters set out in this paper and, if thought appropriate, establish an informal Working Group.

* * *

APPENDIX

Report on Ship Safety.

Submitted by the International Group of P&I Clubs.

Executive Summary.

The thirteen Clubs in the International Group provide third party liability insurance for an estimated 98% of the world's ocean-going tanker fleet. The Group is an integral part of the shipping industry that has a strong self-interest in addressing sub-standard shipping since liabilities in excess of $6 million per incident are shared amongst the Clubs on a mutual basis.

Part 1 of the report sets out the measures already taken by Clubs in relation to sub-standard shipping.

Part 2 sets out proposals made by the International Group, partly as a consequence of the OECD report. These can be summarised as follows:

1) a checklist of information that should be obtained by Club underwriters to identify and assess risk;

2) a minimum scope to be covered by Clubs' condition surveys;

3) harmonised criteria for targeting ships to be surveyed;

4) the establishment of a Group database recording condition surveys;

5) double retention on the Group Pool for a Club where a ship has been taken on which another Club has declined to insure on the grounds of the unfit condition of the ship, and

6) management audits and the use of vetting schemes.

Part 3 details proposals for possible steps to be taken by other industry interests.

Part 4 sets out certain proposals for State action

In conclusion it is suggested that an informal Working Group be set up to consider this initiative further both during the IOPC Fund meetings (if possible without impinging on the normal working hours) and, possibly, intersessionally. It is suggested that this Working Group should include representatives of all States that have displayed an interest in this topic during the review of the Conventions. It is further suggested that the Working Group should report both to the IOPC Fund Assembly and IMO

The Working Group is invited to establish an informal Working Group in order to consider the issues in this paper further.

Introduction

The International Group shares the desire of States to eradicate sub-standard shipping. Recent years have seen a considerable improvement in ship safety, partly as a consequence of measures taken by States to improve Flag State implementation, enhanced classification society surveys, as well as through the introduction of initiatives like Port State Control and the ISM Code. The improvement has also been partly due to measures taken by each sector of the maritime industry. Nonetheless, industry is not complacent and further steps should be adopted, both by States and industry, with the aim of preventing sub-standard shipping from trading.

This issue has arisen in the context of the work of the Third Intersessional Working Group of the IOPC Fund because it has there been suggested that the issue of sub-standard shipping should be addressed in part in the liability and compensation system. The Group does not share this view and believes it would be counter-productive to impose additional liabilities on sub-standard operators/ships (however defined) for three reasons:

First, the recovery for the victim will be hampered while difficult legal issues are resolved;
Second, the additional liability will be covered by insurance (as required by CLC) with the result that the sub-standard operator will in practice carry no extra financial burden;
Third, the imposition of additional liability is therefore most unlikely to modify the behaviour of the sub-standard operator.

However, regardless of the decisions reached by the Working Group on revision of the Conventions, we believe that the maritime industry as a whole should continue to address the issue of sub-standard shipping. This paper is therefore intended only to be part of a wider initiative to tackle this issue. For this reason in this submission it is proposed that an informal Working Group be established composed principally, but not exclusively, of those States which have already communicated a particular interest in the issue of sub-standard shipping.

While the International Group recognises that existing insurance practices might be altered to do more to discourage substandard shipping, there are externally imposed limits to the measures that can be taken by the Group. For example, the Group is currently taking legal advice as to whether Clubs may share information regarding each other's condition survey reports without infringing competition or other laws. Clubs were advised some ten years ago about potential risks under laws of confidentiality with regard to exchanging information about the condition of ships in circumstances where such information was provided by applicants for insurance pursuant to a good faith obligation. Recent English advice has taken a more robust view, but two of the Clubs are subject to laws which criminalise the exchange of information received from an assured in relation to the condition of ships, unless express consent is given. Clubs have also received advice that if exchanges of information are used to bring about the result that no Club will provide cover, thus jeopardising the owner's trading prospects, Clubs could risk being accused of a breach of competition law, based on 'abuse of dominant position'. It may therefore still be necessary to ask States to require competition authorities to put appropriate exceptions in place, so long as they are justified by public policy.

There are also practical limits on what the Clubs can do: for example, the International Group should not seek to replicate the survey and inspection work already undertaken by Classification Societies or Port State Control Inspections, or to take on the responsibility of Flag States to enforce safety rules. Nonetheless, the International Group is willing to play its part in the drive to eliminate sub-standard shipping, and the recommendations put forward in this paper are intended to make a significant contribution to that campaign.

The contribution of the P&I Clubs is set out below in two parts, with the first part providing an overview of the existing measures taken by the Clubs in relation to sub-standard shipping and the second part containing tentative conclusions on further measures that may be taken in response to the OECD report (Report commissioned by the Maritime Transport Committee of OECD, dated June 2004, published at http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/58/15/32144381.pdf, on "The Removal of Insurance from Substandard Shipping"). Two further sections deal with the possible measures to be taken by other industries and proposals for action by States.

Part 1: Measures taken by P&I Clubs in relation to sub-standard shipping

Each P&I Club is a mutual insurance organization where each member is both insurer and assured. They therefore have a close interest in maintaining the quality of their membership. Moreover, since the Clubs pool risks in excess of $6 million per incident they all have an interest in maintaining the quality of each other's tonnage. Each Club is committed to safety and loss prevention in order to maintain quality amongst their Members.

In addition to the reliance placed on Flag States and Classification Societies, each Club has a Risk Management or Loss Prevention Department which focuses on surveying for quality, setting out procedures for claims prevention, assisting and educating Members on claims prevention and circulating the lessons learnt from claims. This includes the supervision and administration of the survey programmes run by all Clubs to assess whether ships are maintained and operated to an acceptable standard. Clubs commission condition surveys on some ships prior to acceptance, normally on ships over a certain age. They may also do the same for ships already within the Club where:

(a) a ship changes classification societies, usually from an IACS to a non-IACS society;
(b) information from Port State Control (PSC) indicates that the ship is below the acceptable standards of the Club;
(c) the ship has a deteriorating claims record or a if a claim demonstrates a lapse in shipboard maintenance, or
(d) a ship inspection visit indicates that the ship is not maintaining the standards acceptable to the Club.

In addition some Clubs also undertake an annual programme of ship visits and inspections, with the aim of raising awareness to practices onboard that could lead to claims or affect safety. Although they have some elements in common, these are not identical to class surveys or port state control inspections but they will involve the assessment of safety standards, service and maintenance, cargo-worthiness, operational performance, manning, pollution control and management systems.

The survey programmes form only a part of the loss prevention and risk management initiatives undertaken by the Clubs in their drive to address safety and maintain quality. Some Clubs have also established safety and loss committees comprising industry experts to review major claims and to provide expert advice and guidance to Members. Clubs also publish a wide range of materials each year for Members and other third parties on topical and informative issues concerning safety. These include multimedia and interactive guides (including videos and DVDs), safety and loss prevention posters, manuals, guides, checklists, bulletins, magazines and newsletters. The subjects covered are wide, ranging from loss prevention on specific trades to raising awareness among crews of personal injury incidents that may occur. Workshops, seminars, and training programmes are also regularly held by Clubs for their Members, on maritime safety and risk management issues.

Some Clubs will also undertake periodical "awareness drives" in order to address a rise in a particular type of claim, and will analyse major claims in order to identify trends. For example, the OECD report makes reference to the UK P&I Club's Analysis of Major Claims, first published in 1991. This examines the overall trends of major claims over a ten year period and provides a basis of information from which Members themselves may apply risk management principles to reduce their exposure to claims. Publications of this type are not only for consideration by the Club and its Members. The IMO, maritime and safety agencies and the press have drawn statistics from the UK Club's analysis.

Although the Clubs compete with each other for business, they pool their larger risks under the auspices of the International Group according to the Pooling Agreement. Therefore all Clubs in the International Group have a strong self-interest in ensuring that ships in other Clubs in the Group are of an acceptable standard, and have adopted common measures as part of their rules to achieve this aim. These include:

1. all Group Clubs' Rules deny rights of recovery for claims arising from failure of vessels to comply with statutory requirements of Flag States, or for claims arising on vessels that are not classed by an approved Classification Society;

2. all Group Clubs' Rules make it a condition of insurance that the insured must:

   (a) promptly report to Class any matters in respect of which Class might make recommendations;

   (b) comply in timely fashion with Class rules and requirements

   (c) authorize Class to disclose information about the ship requested by the Club, and

   (d) advise the Club if the Class Society is changed, identifying any recommendations or requirements that are outstanding at the date of the change.

3. Clubs also have an agreed policy not to insure, either newly or by way of renewal, any ship that does not hold a valid Safety Management Certificate required under the ISM Code.

International Group Clubs are able to apply these common standards by virtue of the homogeneity that the Pooling Agreement provides.

Despite the stringent measures that form part of each Club's policy conditions, accidents continue to occur. Statistics demonstrate that human error is the principal cause of claims and that such errors cause expensive losses in well-managed fleets as well as in fleets of a lesser quality. However, it is apparent that a small but persistent percentage of claims covered by the International Group arises in respect of ships whose condition or operation can be characterized as 'sub-standard'.

Part 2. Conclusions Reached by the International Group in response to the OECD report

The report prepared for the Maritime Transport Committee of the OECD was anticipated with interest since it focused specifically on the possible role of insurance in relation to sub-standard shipping. A number of the issues brought out in the report were already under consideration by the Clubs in the International Group, as the report itself acknowledges. Others have required fresh consideration.

1. Underwriting information and proposal form.

Much substandard tonnage is rejected for entry in the Clubs on the basis of information provided to underwriters. However, the OECD report suggests that P&I underwriters would be "well advised to rely less on the general duty of disclosure and instead make more use of 'proposal' or 'application' forms in which they could set out each category of information which they require to receive before agreeing to give insurance."

This suggestion has an attractive simplicity since all the information necessary to form an underwriting opinion could be set out systematically. However, some Clubs who have experience of using proposal forms have reported only mixed success. While there might be benefit in employing a proposal form in relation to new business, there would be much less benefit in relation to existing members. Further, commercial pressures would make it difficult for Clubs to withhold cover merely because a proposal form had not been returned, particularly if relevant underwriting information could be obtained in other ways. A leading shipowner may have been entered in a leading Club for over twenty years and their offices would be in daily contact on a variety of matters. In this context it would be unduly pedantic to insist on a proposal form, since the requisite information would be available in any event.

It is therefore intended that rather than insisting on the use of proposal forms, a check-list prepared with input from all Clubs underwriters be employed with immediate effect. This check-list includes all the information which is customarily required from prospective members before agreeing to give insurance. In addition to the information that is already required by underwriters before reaching a judgement on whether to accept a ship, prospective members are asked:

- whether P&I cover for that operator had ever been declined or terminated by an insurer or whether special terms of warranties imposed, and the reasons why;
- whether the vessel had undergone a previous P&I condition survey
- permission for the Club to divulge the findings of any such condition survey.

A copy of the checklist is contained in Annex I to this document. The checklist differentiates between the type of information requested for new members and existing members with new acquisitions, simply because particular information requested from new members may not be available, or relevant, to existing members with new acquisitions.

2. Club Surveys – scope.

All Clubs make use of condition surveys to assess the quality of certain ships entered or to be entered. While there has been a degree of convergence in recent years, with each Club having a different membership profile there has been no uniform practice in relation to the scope of such surveys, or their triggers.

A minimum scope of information to be included in any condition survey undertaken by an International Group Club has been drawn up with input from all Clubs. These requirements are contained in Annex II to this document. A 'sample' condition survey report form has also been drawn up that includes all of the requirements of the scope. A copy is contained in Annex III to this document. It is expected that some Clubs will adopt this as a common form, while others may prefer to continue using their own form, but that all Clubs would ensure that the scope of their condition surveys is at least as extensive as that in the scope document.

A further change to current practice is recommended, namely that the survey department of each Club should report any vessel which causes concern not merely to the underwriting department but also to the central management of that Club. It is necessary to introduce this measure generally because, as indicated in the OECD report, there is, surprisingly, no precise correlation between claims and condition. The issue of vessel quality is therefore given the importance it deserves by being reported as a matter of routine to the Club's central management.

3. Club Surveys – Triggers.

Since Clubs undertake condition surveys on a regular and systematic basis, there is a broadly similar approach to the factors that should lead to a particular ship or fleet being targeted for a condition survey or ship inspection, for example, if the vessel is out of Class, or has a high PSC detention rate, or if beyond a certain age on entry. However, differing standards are inevitably employed; for instance, some Clubs may survey 10 year old ships on entry whereas others may only survey 15 year old ships. In addition to the existing triggers the OECD report suggests that consideration should be given to targeting the carriage of heavy fuel oil in older ships.

It has therefore been agreed that all Club Boards be recommended to agree as a minimum requirement that condition surveys be undertaken upon the application for entry of any sea-going ship aged 12 years or more.

With regard to ships already entered, the Group will also recommend to Club Boards that Clubs should implement as soon as possible in 2005 a common approach whereby all vessels that appear on the EC blacklist should be automatically surveyed. The question whether vessels already entered should automatically be surveyed because of their age is more controversial, given that it is generally recognized that a few fleets made up of older vessels are rigorously maintained to a very high standard and bear favourable comparison with much younger fleets. A better approach therefore may be to make age a criterion in combination with another risk factor, for example, a history of carrying heated Heavy Fuel Oil.

In order to implement this proposal, owners of sea-going vessels over ten years old will be required to declare annually whether that vessel has carried Heavy Fuel Oil during the previous year. That vessel will then be subject to survey.

Consideration has yet to be given to the difficult issue of the consequences of not carrying out a survey when required to do so under agreed guidelines. Should pooling be withdrawn in whole or in part or would some lesser penalty be more appropriate? These issues will be considered by Club Boards with a view to implementing a common approach for the 2006 policy year.

4. Condition Surveys – Exchange of Information.

The OECD report notes that a great deal of information is collected about the condition of ships but surmises that the main barriers to transparency are legal. The report suggests that it would be a significant step if the Clubs were to set up a database where each Club would be obliged to lodge survey and inspection reports.

Legal opinions have been obtained on whether Clubs are entitled, or obliged, to pass on information about action taken by Clubs on the basis of condition surveys or inspections to other members of the Pool. The opinions vary under different legal systems, but it is considered possible without legal obstacle merely to record on a central database the identities of ships on which a condition survey has been carried out, so that underwriters will be aware if a prospective entry has been surveyed by another Club. Taken together with the additional requirement that shipowners permit access to survey reports (see under Underwriting information above), this will entitle the new Club to gain access to relevant reports.

The Group therefore proposes to establish a central database as described, and will require that underwriters consult the database before quoting and obtain from the prospective member and Club concerned a copy of any relevant report. On the basis of legal advice that is currently available this is unobjectionable from a legal point of view but, as indicated below in Part 4, considerable legal obstacles remain to the sharing of information generally and the Group will look to governments to help remove such obstructions.

Again, consideration will have to be given to the issue of penalties when the agreed procedures are not followed and a Pool claim results.

5. Penalties if Sub-Standard Vessels knowingly underwritten.

Consideration is also being given to making provision in the Pooling Agreement so that if a Club takes on a vessel which another Club has declined to insure on grounds of the unfit condition of the ship, claims arising from the operation of that vessel by the same operator would be subject to a double retention on the Pool i.e. the Club in which the vessel was entered would be responsible for the first $12 million instead of the first $6 million of every claim. The force of this proposal may be gauged by comparing its effect with the present procedure whereby a Club may withdraw cover on the basis of an adverse survey report only to find that the vessel has been accepted by another Club and furthermore face the possibility of having to share in a claim brought to the Pool from that vessel. However, the further development of this proposal is subject to the Group receiving satisfactory legal advice since in certain circumstances the consequence may be that the vessel may no longer be able to trade, which would open the issue whether the Clubs had been guilty of an 'abuse of dominant position' within the meaning of the competition law provisions of the Treaty of Rome. In any event the serious consequence of this proposal has prompted the necessity to consider carefully how to determine whether a vessel is of unfit condition within the context of the attached survey report form. For this purpose further work is being undertaken in order to determine whether a scoring system can be developed which would permit an objective judgment to be reached on the basis of the factors outlined in the survey report.

6. Management Audits.

Since the Clubs are just as affected by sub-standard operations as they are by the sub-standard physical condition of a ship, it has been suggested that formal management audits should be carried out on the membership of each Club. Clubs already take great care to review management and procedures before tonnage is taken on, and this existing practice fits in well with the ethos of Clubs where the working relationship between the Club and its member is generally a close and continuing one. This relationship allows Clubs to form a realistic assessment of operating procedures, which might not be possible if a more formal system were put in place. However, it is recognized that there are situations where a more formal approach is appropriate and in this connection Clubs have exchanged information and are working to identify best practice for conducting this type of audit. One way forward might be for all Clubs to use a list of management related questions as part of the mechanism for forming a view on how the management operates in relation to new members. The more formal assessment might then be reserved for the case where a Club may seek to establish a case for a withdrawal of cover. Clubs are also presently investigating if the recently

introduced Tanker Management Self Assessment scheme offers additional information which may be useful in this process.

7. Vetting.

The OECD report did not deal in any detail with the issue of vetting since the commercial availability of vetting services is largely a new phenomenon. The measures already undertaken by Clubs as outlined above already constitute a form of vetting, but these procedures could possibly benefit from the independent judgment of a third party. However, further enquiry may be necessary to assess their reliability and appropriateness in the context of P&I.

Several oil and chemical companies have run vetting programmes for many years that have proved successful in identifying ships which are suitable for charter to that company. The survey information used in the chemical companies' programmes is available to be shared with the Clubs, with the shipowners' consent. That used by the oil companies is not available to be shared, for reasons attributed to competition law. The information does, in any event, require interpretation and some of the vetting criteria would be inappropriate if they were used in the different context of justifying a withdrawal of cover. Nevertheless the Clubs recognize the value of such programmes and have sought to understand better what is done by that side of the industry. In addition, recent years have seen the emergence of organizations offering publicly available vetting services that profess to be able to tabulate all the information relating to a particular vessel and produce an accurate risk profile which is kept constantly up-to-date. These developments will be followed closely, in consultation with other industry bodies, since it is plain that such vetting procedures could be of considerable assistance in supplementing the measures outlined above, including the more traditional methods of assessing risk recorded in the Annexes to this paper. Further reports will be made as these initiatives develop.

Part 3. Possible Steps to be taken with, and by, other industry partners.

It was recognized by the OECD in their report that much information is gathered and held about ships by different organizations for different purposes. This information, properly collated and shared (if this were possible) would make easier the identification and elimination of the sub-standard ship and ship operator. Collaboration by inspecting parties has the potential not only to improve efficiency and save costs for the shipping industry but also to enhance for each of the respective organizations the quality of information available to them.

1. Measures to consolidate surveys and share survey information.

The International Group would accordingly support the IMO in reviving the efforts at co-ordination which were made some years ago. As a precursor to this process, it would be appropriate for each industry organization to seek to identify the extent to which joint surveys using common survey forms might be possible. Whenever this proposal has been raised in the past it has been objected that each organization is pursuing different goals and there is obvious merit in this point of view. Nonetheless, if the specific requirements of Class are put on one side, it could be argued that, for example, the P&I survey report and the OCIMF SIRE (Ship Inspection Report Programme) survey report have much in common.

The co-ordination of survey forms would provide a helpful background to the possible sharing of information since this would then be available on a common basis. As a matter of public policy it would plainly be of benefit if all parties, shipowners, charterers and insurers were able to access data from which judgements can be made regarding ship quality on a transparent basis. Such factual information should logically also be available to Equasis (the database of information (www.equasis.org) relating to the quality of ships and their operators) and Port State Control. The preparation of a common form of survey report together with broad access to the information gained thereby would be an enormous undertaking, but provided there is a legal framework so that organizations can properly collaborate in sharing such information, the task should not be beyond contemplation.

It may be suggested that Classification Societies should perhaps be excluded from the efforts to produce a joint survey report because of the specific tasks they are required to perform. Nonetheless, given their established lead in independent ship surveys from the perspective of hull and machinery conditions and physical seaworthiness, the more that Classification Societies can (in addition to their statutory functions) act as a party to gather and distribute information and data from which judgements as to quality can be made, the greater the likelihood of progress towards the ultimate goal. It is recognized, however, that the Societies are independent and not currently equipped to carry out surveys beyond their traditional role, and that substantial additional training, agreement on common standards, and sufficient control to produce a consistent and acceptable quality of work amongst class surveyors worldwide would be necessary.

2. Measures which could be taken by cargo interests

Many cargo interests, such as the oil company members of OCIMF, have a clear commitment to ensuring that their cargoes are not carried in sub-standard ships. A number of vetting systems, based variously on survey information and other collated data, are used to select ships of appropriate quality in both the dry and wet bulk trades. However, there is also much cargo owned by interests who do not necessarily share the same commitment to avoid the substandard vessel.

The question should therefore be considered as to whether pressure can be brought to bear on such interests, perhaps by responsible receivers using conditions of sale that require cargoes to be carried in vessels of appropriate quality, which could in turn link to insurability of cargoes.

Part 4. Possible Steps to be taken by States.

1. Competition Law.

As indicated above the broad aim of the Clubs in relation to sub-standard shipping is not to charge more premium but to withdraw cover. This accords with the policy objectives of States and it would be appropriate therefore to request States to amend competition law to allow this objective to be achieved. The problem arises because the Clubs in the Group are estimated to be nearly the sole providers of the Certificate of Financial Responsibility which is required under the Convention in respect of Civil Liability for Oil Pollution 1992. Therefore, if a tanker's cover is terminated by one Club and that vessel is refused cover by all other Clubs in the Group (which is a likely consequence of the proposal made above regarding double retention Part 2.5.) then it will probably be unable to trade. As matters stand, unless great care is taken with regard to the procedures to be followed, that vessel owner would probably be able to claim that the action of the Club(s) constituted an abuse of dominant position under European competition law. For this reason, as suggested above in relation to management audits, it may be necessary to develop detailed guidelines and, for example, provide an appeal procedure in an appropriate case. Nonetheless the threat of inappropriate resort to competition law will remain. As a matter of public policy it is suggested that this result was never intended; it would be helpful therefore if States would assist in having the point clarified.

2. Flag State Implementation.

The recent efforts of IMO are to be applauded and it is very much hoped that Governments will volunteer to be audited in accordance with the Voluntary IMO Member State Audit Scheme (IMO Assembly Resolution A.946(23)). The Group recognizes this as a key tool in the drive against sub-standard shipping. However, as pointed out in the OECD report, this initiative is much more likely to gain success if it can be demonstrated that failure to comply has a practical consequence. This will inevitably follow if Port State Control targets those vessels which fly the flag of a country which has not chosen to accept a voluntary audit.

3. Port State Control.

Port State Control can also assist by making the provision of adequate insurance cover one of the criteria it adopts. For this purpose, it is proposed that the informal Working Group may wish to consider whether Port State Control regimes should employ the language used in the IMO Guidelines on Shipowners' Responsibilities in respect of Maritime Claims (Assembly Resolution A.898 (21)) and identify insurers of an equivalent standard to the members of the International Group of P&I Clubs. As suggested in the OECD report this would be a useful next step in building on the IMO Guidelines. In this way it may be possible to

construct a list of acceptable insurers as has been done in Japan in relation to domestic legislation and as is proposed in India.

4. IMO.

It is suggested that IMO should consider making the Guidelines on Shipowners Responsibilities in Respect of Maritime Claims (Assembly Resolution A.898 (21)) mandatory with the same policy objectives as outlined above.

Conclusion

It is hoped that the measures outlined above will assist in meeting the goals set by States. However, it will not have escaped the attention of delegates that many of the initiatives described above have as one of their principal objectives the refusal to trade with or offer cover in relation to certain vessels. These measures will not, however, have the consequence that these vessels will cease to trade to the extent that they are able to contract with other charterers or insurers who may be less scrupulous. The obligation to deal with sub-standard shipping will therefore end where it began – with Flag States and Port States as well as with Classification Societies. For this reason it is proposed that an informal Working Group be established which can meet during the IOPC Fund meetings, and perhaps intersessionally, in order to formulate proposals to be made to the IOPC Fund Assembly and to IMO. The proposed Working Group may wish to consider, in addition to the suggestions made above in relation to P&I insurance, the following proposals:

1. to request IMO to revive discussion with regard to surveys with a view to
    i. consolidating surveys, perhaps reducing their number;
    ii. ensuring transparency by providing a central data-base for survey information from multiple sources
    iii. ensuring consistency in the performance of Classification Societies.
2. ensure that Flag State Implementation momentum is maintained
3. ensure that Port State Control
    a. targets vessels from Flag States that have not accepted voluntary audit, and
    b. targets vessels not covered by a list of acceptable insurers.
4. requests IMO to make mandatory the Guidelines provided by Assembly Resolution A.898(21)).

The International Group stands ready to assist as necessary.

Annex I

Guidelines for Underwriters - Indicators of Quality

a) Indicators of Quality - New members:

- general details of the vessel such as age, type, Flag, any major conversion work etc;
- date and place of build;
- identity of current Classification Society, and date of any changes in Class in the last three years and identity of previous Class, and whether a change of Class is planned;
- details of ISPS and ISM Certification;
- identity of current managers and length of involvement, and details of any changes in management in the last three years;
- area and type of trade of the vessel;
- source of officers and crew, and their nationalities;
- whether the vessel has undergone previous P&I condition surveys (and permission for the Club to divulge the findings of any P&I condition survey);
- details of whether P&I cover has ever been declined or terminated by an insurer or special terms or warranties imposed, and the reasons why;
- claims, and PSC, record, including details of any fines, prosecutions, banning orders or blacklisting and
- opinions of third party agencies and other existing members

b) Indicators of Quality - Existing members with new acquisitions:

- general details of the vessel such as age, type, Flag, any major conversion work etc;
- date and place of build.
- identity of current Classification Society, and date of any changes in Class in the last three years and identity of previous Class, and whether a change of Class is planned;
- details of ISPS and ISM Certification;
- identity of current managers and length of involvement, and details of any changes in management in the last three years;
- area and type of trade of the vessel in relation to the profile of the member's fleet;
- source of officers and crew, and their nationalities;
- whether the vessel has undergone previous P&I condition surveys (and permission for the Club to divulge the findings of any P&I condition survey);
- details of whether P&I cover has ever been declined or terminated by an insurer, or special terms or warranties imposed, and the reasons why.

Annex II

International Group Condition Survey

Introduction

In accordance with the requirements of the International Group of P & I Clubs vessels may need to be surveyed as a condition of acceptance, renewal of entry, or within a policy year at the discretion of the Club Managers. The purpose of the survey is to check the sea and cargo worthiness of the vessel in order the standard of maintenance and operation can be assessed. Vessels need to comply with all applicable International, National and Classification requirements but particular attention needs to be given to safety practices and operational procedures. It is important that surveyors use their initiative, professional judgement and expertise to identify areas which could lead to P & I claims. The survey findings will be taken into account by the Club when decisions affecting entry or cover are taken. Therefore it is important nothing significant is overlooked, and deficiencies are neither understated nor exaggerated.

Scope of Survey

These surveys will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the individual Club but should include the following:

1. VESSEL PARTICULARS

The vessel's particulars are to be set out in the report. Any recent flag or classification society changes should be reported.

Details of any expired certificates, overdue surveys, special conditions, exceptions, notations and endorsements should be reported.

2. CREW

The crew complement should be checked as fully certificated [with necessary endorsements] and in compliance with the Safe Manning Certificate; with a copy of the crew list appended to the report. Information on communication difficulties and training should be included in the report.

3. SHIPBOARD MANAGEMENT

The vessel's Management system should be checked as being in place and evidenced as functioning correctly.

4. BRIDGE AND RADIO

Bridge and radio equipment should be checked as operational and any deficiencies reported.
Procedures, publications, documentation and logs should be checked as complete and up to date.

5. HULL – EXTERNAL

An inspection of the hull, decks, deck structures, deck fittings and markings is to be carried out and evidence of damage, significant wastage, pitting, scaling or repairs including doublers should be reported. Labelling and marking on external coatings is also to be reported.

6. MOORING EQUIPMENT

Mooring equipment should be checked to ensure its satisfactory condition. Including brake linings, safety guards, roller fairleads, mooring ropes and anchor cable where visible.

7. MEANS OF ACCESS

Means of access should be checked and any concerns regarding structural integrity and suitability for its intended use, including steps, stairways, catwalks, walkways, gangways, accommodation / pilot and other ladders should be reported.

8. LIFTING APPLIANCES

Lifting appliances and cargo gear should be checked to ensure they are satisfactory, clearly marked [SWL etc.], with inspection certificates and records up to date and any concerns reported.

9. CLOSING APPLIANCES

Weather tight doors and hatches are to be inspected to ensure they are fully operational and provide an effective seal

10. BALLAST TANKS & VOID SPACES

Selected ballast tanks and void spaces should be internally inspected and any concerns regarding the structural condition and integrity, significant wastage, scaling, pitting, buckling, fractures, doublers and temporary repairs should be reported. The condition of the tank coating, access ladders, manhole covers and pipework should also be checked.

11. GALLEY, STOREROOMS AND ACCOMMODATION

These areas should be inspected to ensure they are hygienic, clean, tidy, well lit, with gear correctly secured. The temperature of fridges and lock-in alarms should be checked. Fire hazards non-approved electrical wiring and dangerous appliances should be reported.

12. MACHINERY & MACHINERY SPACES

Machinery spaces should be inspected and any concerns regarding safety, cleanliness, electrical fittings, illumination, fire hazards and correct stowage of equipment should be reported. Machinery should be verified in working order and free from significant oil or water leakages. The engine room log books should be checked to assess the operational status of the machinery.

13. SAFETY EQUIPMENT

Safety equipment should be checked to ensure that it is in operational condition, correctly stowed and fulfils SOLAS requirements.

14. SAFETY TESTS (as carried out during survey)

Random safety checks should be performed on emergency equipment power sources / steering / lighting / fire pump / remote stops / shut-downs and quick closing valves, fire fighting equipment, fire and vent flaps, breathing apparatus, lifeboats, life rafts, lifebuoys, lifejackets, pyrotechnics, medicines and oxygen/gas detection meters, smoke detectors, bilge alarms, lifeboat drill, lifeboat engines(s) and any concerns with regard thereto reported.

15. SAFE WORKING

If the opportunity presents itself activities such as entry into enclosed spaces, hot work, working aloft, working over the side, should be observed to check safe working procedures are being followed. The availability and use of personal protective clothing and safety equipment should be reported.

16. POLLUTION CONTROL

Anti-pollution measures should be checked including the oily water separator / piping, 15ppm monitor, deck containment save-alls, oil spill clean-up packs, oil record book entries, bunkering procedures, garbage procedures and records and any concerns reported.

17. SURVEYOR'S CONCLUSION AND COMMENTS

The surveyor's conclusions and comments should contain their professional assessment as to whether there are points of concern regarding the vessel's structural condition, technical integrity, safety, pollution prevention and cargo worthiness. A list of all deficiencies noted, areas not inspected, together with areas that may warrant further investigation should be included.

SPECIFIC SHIP TYPES

1. DRY CARGO / BULK CARGO

A general inspection of the steel structure in the cargo spaces is to be carried out. Evidence of damage, significant wastage, pitting, scaling or repairs, including doublers, is to be reported. Hull thickness records can be used to assist in assessing steel wastage. The inspection should include checks on hold bilges, non-return valves, high level alarms, ladders and safety rails, hold lighting, pipework and its protection, manhole covers, and coatings.

The condition of the vessel's hold hatch covers needs to be examined, close attention being given to the operation, alignment and condition of the hatch cover panels, compression bars, landing pads, quick acting cleats, cross joint wedges, drain channels, non-return valves, coamings, rubber seals and seal retaining channels. The hatch opening and closing arrangements need to be checked and hydraulic systems inspected

for leakages. The inside of hatch coamings should be inspected for signs of leakages and hatches test for watertightness, if considered necessary.

Pontoon and tarpaulin hatch covers need to be inspected and any concerns noted regarding the structure, and the condition and number of tarpaulins, securing battens, straps,wedges and cleats.

2. REEFER VESSELS

The general condition of the installation should be checked and recent problems with the plant or cargoes reported. All relevant documentation for the reefer installation operation should be checked.

The hold atmosphere and temperature monitoring equipment / procedures should be checked.

The reefer machinery should be checked and any concerns regarding significant oil, gas or water leakages, safety guards being in place, the condition of piping and insulation and sufficiency of spares on board being reported.

The reefer holds and hold hatch covers should be inspected, including the condition of the insulation, gratings, air ducting, cooling batteries, temperature probes, bilges and cleanliness.

On vessels equipped to carry reefer containers the condition and integrity of the sockets and power supply should be checked, together with spares kits and any concerns reported.

3. CONTAINER VESSELS

Inspection of the steel structure in the cargo spaces is to be carried out, reporting damage, significant wastage, pitting, scaling and repairs or doublers. Hull thickness records can be used to assist in assessing steel wastage.

The inspection should include checks on lashing gear, twist locks, securing points and cell guides. Documentation and procedures should be checked, including the securing manual, stability monitoring / recording and procedures for carrying IMDG cargoes and any concerns reported.

On vessels equipped to carry reefer containers the condition and integrity of the sockets and power supply should be checked, together with spares kits.

4 TANKERS/OBO/CHEMICAL & GAS TANKERS

The inspection should include assessment of whether the inert gas, crude oil washing, cargo handling, cargo venting and cargo heating systems are satisfactory, including pumps, pipes, couplings, isolation valves, securing arrangements and earth straps.

The inspector should also check whether electrical equipment used in hazardous areas is intrinsically safe.

The general condition of the pump room safety, lighting, ventilation and cleanliness should be checked, including the functionality of the cargo pump emergency stops.

If the cargo tanks are gas free and entry into the tanks is possible the condition of access ladders, primary structures, shell and bottom plating, plating under suction bell mouths, web fames, brackets, in-tank piping, spindles, valves and tank coatings should be checked and any concerns reported.

The condition of tank openings, sealing arrangements, vents and flame arrestors are to be checked.

The condition of instrumentation and alarms should be checked and cargo sampling and storage procedures checked.

Special safety systems and equipment for the type of vessel should be checked.

5. PASSENGER / RO-RO VESSELS

The emergency command structure should be checked for adequacy, including muster lists, damage control plan, fire control plan, evacuation plan, life saving plan, bilge pumping plan.

The watertight integrity of the vessel should be checked including bow / stern doors and ramps, side shell doors, scuppers, down flooding openings, cross flooding arrangements, operation of watertight doors and watertight door indicator panels and any concerns reported.

The fire protection, detection and extinction arrangements and equipment should be checked including draught stops, fire doors, ventilation systems, galley smothering systems, fire detection systems, sprinkler systems, engine compartment fixed fire protection system, car deck drencher system, paint locker fixed fire extinguishing system and fire patrols and any concerns reported.

The life saving appliances, safety equipment, safety notices and arrangements should be checked.

The clarity and audibility of communication systems should be checked including the public-address system, fire/general alarm and internal emergency communication systems.

Annex III

CONDITION SURVEY REPORT

<SHIP NAME>

IMO no:

Survey date:

Survey port:

Surveyors:

STC – Condition Survey Report

Version 1.01

Date 15-11-2004

INSTRUCTIONS TO SURVEYORS FOR COMPLETING THE SURVEY FORM

A. Report sections
The full report consists of three sections:-

- **Part 1 – Master's information (which applies to all ship types).**
  The Master's Information form is designed for the Master to complete concurrently with the survey being carried out and applies to all ship types. It is designed to help reduce the overall survey time. The surveyor should therefore hand the form to the Master on boarding or consideration given to forwarding a copy by fax or email prior to the survey date.

  Upon concluding the survey, the surveyor should review the completed form to ensure it has been correctly compiled. If the surveyor has any doubt regarding the information provided, the entry should be verified.

  If it has not been possible to complete the form prior to completion of the survey, the Master should be requested to forward the completed form by fax or email at a later date.

- **Part 2 – General (which applies to all ship types).**
  This section is designed for all ship types and is to be completed by the surveyor.

- **Part 3- 9 – Ship type specific.**
  This section, to be completed by the surveyor, is ship type specific and only the sub-section appertaining to the type of ship being surveyed should be completed and included with the full report.

B. Filling out the form
For Parts 2 & 3, the surveyor is required to tick one of the four boxes:-

Y Yes = Entirely satisfactory in both condition and compliance with regulations etc.

N No = Not satisfactory due to poor condition or non compliance with regulations etc.

NA Not Applicable = Does not apply to this ship.

NI Not Inspected = Item not assessed.

For any items answered "**No**" it is required that the surveyor provides additional information and clarification in the remarks column provided. Further, a "**No**" shall normally generate a recommendation. However, certain topics have been highlighted and if such an item generates a "**No**" a recommendation is not necessarily to be automatically generated as such questions are designed to give the Club an indication of the management of the ship.

If an item is relevant to the ship being inspected but the Surveyor was unable to inspect it, then "**NI"** will be applicable and a comment made as to why it was not possible to form an opinion.

C. Comments

Surveyors are encouraged to complete the "Comments" column after each item and below each section as these help assist with the overall assessment of the ship and her management.

Whenever possible, surveyors should sight documents and records.

D. Distribution

The completed report should be e-mailed to the Club as soon as possible after the survey. This should be in either Word or PDF format and accompanying digital photographs shall be in a resolution of no less than 300 dpi or 800 x 600 pixels. Where a hard copy is forwarded this should be sent with enclosures and photographs within 14 days of completing the survey unless other arrangements have been agreed.

PART 1
MASTER'S INFORMATION

1 MASTER'S INFORMATION

1.1 General information

1.1.1 Ship's name & IMO no: .....

1.1.2 Owners: .....

1.1.3 Managers: .....

1.1.4 Office contact / Designated person: .....

1.1.5 Expected trading area: .....

1.1.6 Period under present management (in years): .....

1.1.7 Type of cargo normally carried: .....

1.1.8 Has the vessel been laid up during the last five years? State period: .....

1.2 Ship condition

1.2.1 Have you inspected the ship in order to ascertain Sea- and cargo-worthiness? Yes / No

1.2.2 If yes, when and where: .....

1.2.3 Have you or the owners made a planned maintenance schedule for the ship? Yes / No

1.2.4 If Yes, state areas included in the schedule (decks, tanks, cargo hold, etc.): .....

.....

1.3 Records

Are the following records available onboard?

1.3.1 History of significant damage? Yes / No

1.3.2 Maintenance routines? Yes / No

1.3.3 Latest hull thickness measurement report? Yes / No

1.3.4 Near misses reports Yes / No

1.4 Instructions and routines

Are the following instructions/routines implemented and in use on board?

1.4.1 Routines concerning visitors? Yes / No

1.4.2 Stowaway prevention policy? Yes / No

1.4.3 Pre-departure instruction? Yes / No

1.4.4 Drug and alcohol policy? Yes / No

1.4.5 Smoking regulations? Yes / No

1.4.6 Permit for enclosed space entry, hot work, works aloft & over the side? Yes / No

1.4.7 Medical log? Yes/No

1.4.8 Risk assessment - operational? Yes/No

1.4.9 Risk assessment - safe working? Yes/No

1.5 Cargo care

Are the following instructions/routines implemented and in use on board?

1.5.1 Cargo sampling routines? Yes/No

1.5.2 Dangerous cargo endorsement? Yes/No

1.5.3 Cargo securing instructions? Yes/No

1.5.4 Cargo monitoring/sampling routines? Yes/No

1.5.5 Pre-shipment damage inspection? Yes/No

1.5.6 When was the last hose/ultrasonic test of the hatch covers carried out? What was the result?

……
……

1.5.7 When was the last pressure test of cargo heating coils carried out? What was the result?

……
……

1.5.8 When was the last cargo lines pressure tested carried out? What was the result?

……
……

1.6 Pollution

Are the following instructions/routines implemented and in use on board?

1.6.1 SOPEP? Yes/No

1.6.2 Vessel Response Plan (VRP)? Yes/No

1.6.3 Bunkering instructions? Yes/No

1.6.4 Garbage management plan? Yes/No

1.6.5 When was the last oil pollution drill carried out?.....

1.7 Safety Management System – SMS (ISM)

1.7.1 Have you received training on SMS? Yes/No

1.7.2 Name of governing body:.....

1.7.3 Date for implementation: .....

1.7.4 Date for last external audit: .....

1.7.5 Date for last internal audit: .....

1.7.6 Date for last master's review: .....

1.7.7 Number of deviation reports/non conformities logged during last 12 months: .....

1.8 Crew

1.8.1 Number and nationality of crew: .....

1.8.2 Minimum safe manning requirements: .....

1.8.3 Common working language: .....

1.8.4 Language in manuals, instructions and signs: .....

1.8.5 Do you have procedures for crew shipboard familiarization? Yes/No

1.8.6 Are the officers' licenses available onboard? Yes/No

1.8.7 Do you have procedures for competence evaluation of your crew? Yes/No

1.8.8 Is there a training programe for all crew? Yes/No

1.8.9 Are ship's officers employees of the shipping company? Yes/No

1.8.10 Are ships crew employees of the shipping company? Yes/No

1.8.11 If "No" on .9 and .10, state name of crewing agency? .....

1.8.12 Are records for working/rest periods kept in accordance with STCW? Yes/No

1.8.13 Are Crew's medical certificates available onboard? Yes/No

1.8.14 Are Crew's on board training records available on board? Yes/No

1.9 Safety drills and inspections

When were the items below last checked for functionality or carried out as appropriate?

1.9.1 Portable fire extinguishers: .....

1.9.2 Fixed fire fighting system: .....

1.9.3 Fire and vent flaps: .....

1.9.4 Emergency fire pump: .....

1.9.5 Fireman's outfit: .....

1.9.6 Emergency generator: .....

1.9.7 Emergency batteries: .....

1.9.8 Emergency steering: .....

1.9.9 Life boat engines: .....

1.9.10 Remote stops and shutdowns:.....

1.9.11 Quick closing valves:.....

1.9.12 Bilge alarm and pumping system: .....

1.9.13 Last fire drill:.....

1.9.14 Last lifeboat drill: .....

1.9.15 Last lowering of life boat:.....

1.9.16 Last foam analysis: .....

1.9.17 Last service of breathing apparatus:.....

1.9.18 Last security drill: .....

1.9.19 Last passenger mustering drill:.....

1.9.20 Last SOPEP drill:.....

1.9.21 Last damage control drill: .....

1.10 Navigation / communication

1.10.1	Is all navigational equipment in good working order?	Yes / No
1.10.2	Is all communication equipment in good working order?	Yes / No
1.10.3	Are all voyage charts corrected to latest available Notice to Mariners?	Yes / No
1.10.4	Are nautical publications corrected?	Yes / No
1.10.5	Are Master's standing orders available?	Yes / No

1.11 Additional comments & clarifications to the above questions

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

To my best knowledge, the information given herein is true and correct

Date	Master's name	Signature

PART 2
SURVEY REPORT – ALL SHIP TYPES

2 CONDITION SURVEY REPORT

2.1 PARTICULARS

2.1.1 Ship's name:

2.1.2 Ex. names:

2.1.3 IMO No:

2.1.4 Flag state:

2.1.5 Year built:

2.1.6 Builder:

2.1.7 Class Society:

2.1.8 Class notations:

2.1.9 Ship type:

2.1.10 GT:

2.1.11 Summer DWT:

2.1.12 Last docking:

2.1.13 Last SS:

2.1.14 Ship's trading pattern:

2.1.15 Name of owner's representative attending survey:

2.1.16 Operational status of ship during survey:

2.2 Class and Statutory Certificates	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.2.1 Are vessel's Class Certificates valid?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.2.2 Are vessel's Statutory Certificates valid?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.3 Shipboard Management	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.3.1 Are internal audits carried out at regular intervals and satisfactorily recorded?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.3.2 Are safety meetings carried out at a regular interval?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.3.3 Are Non Conformity / Accident / Near Accident reports raised and handled in a satisfactory manner?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.3.4 Is a master's review carried out and satisfactorily recorded?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.3.5 Is efficient access control in place? Was surveyor's identification checked and verified upon boarding?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.3.6 Is the ship's IMO number displayed as per ISPS requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……

2.4 Crew	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.4.1 Proficiency in English – sufficient to communicate effectively?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.4.2 If crew is multinational is there a common language understood by all?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.4.3 Does Company have a briefing/de-briefing policy for Masters/Chief Engineers prior to	☐	☐	☐	☐	

joining/leaving?

2.4.4	Are crew pre employment-medical checks carried out?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.4.5	Are random or specific drug and alcohol test carried out? How often?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.4.6	Have Master/Deck Officers attended Bridge Team Management Courses (in addition to standard education)?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.5 Safe Working		**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
2.5.1	As observed, are safe working procedures adhered to (i.e. entry into confined spaces, hot work, work aloft, work overboard, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.5.2	Are portable oxygen and gas detection meters provided and regularly calibrated?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.5.3	Are personal protective items (helmets, shoes, safety goggles, boiler suites, ear protectors, high visibility clothing, etc.) in use?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.5.4	Is deck lighting in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.5.5	Are alarms from cold stores and freezers in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.5.6	Is gangway/accommodation ladder in satisfactory condition and utilized with safety nets?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.5.7	Are walkways/stairways/catwalks/ladders/ platforms/handrails in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.5.8	Are mobile safety guard rails/lines/wires/etc. provided and in use?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……

……
……

2.6	Hygienic Standard and House Keeping	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.6.1	Is galley / pantry clean and tidy? Is fitted equipment in apparent good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.6.2	Are provision / cold stores clean, tidy and maintained to correct temperature?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.6.3	Are accommodation spaces clean, tidy and in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.6.4	Is the general housekeeping standard onboard satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……

2.7	Fire Safety	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.7.1	Are main and emergency fire pumps in good operational condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.2	Are fire stations in tidy condition and sufficiently equipped?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.3	Is BA in good condition, sufficiently charged and cylinders within test date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.4	Are fire extinguishers and fire hose lockers in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.5	Is fixed fire fighting extinguishing system (CO_2, foam, etc.) in apparent satisfactory condition and release instruction posted?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.6	Are all combustible liquids (paint, chemicals, etc.) stored in designated spaces?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.7	Are acetylene and oxygen bottles stored in a designated place?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.8	Are main and emergency exits unobstructed?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.7.9	Is the fire integrity of the ER casing satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.8	Safety Equipment	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.8.1	Are emergency power sources in apparent satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.8.2	Are life boats and davits in apparent satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.8.3	Is the crew familiar with the risks of lifeboat on-load release systems?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.8.4	Are life rafts properly secured and in apparent satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.8.5	Are life buoys and life jackets in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.8.6	Is the medicine locker sufficiently stocked, tidy and in date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.8.7	Are all signs/instructions for safety equipment in place and written in the official language of the vessel?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.9	Safety Test (if carried out during survey)	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.9.1	Fire and vent flaps.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.9.2	Emergency fire pump.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.9.3	Emergency power source .	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.9.4	Emergency lightning.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.9.5	Emergency steering.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.9.6	Remote stops and shutdowns.	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.9.7	Quick closing valves.	☐	☐	☐	☐	

2.9.8	Fire detectors.	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.9.9	Engine room bilge alarm.	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.10 Pollution Control		**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
2.10.1	Are deck save-alls in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.10.2	Is oil spill clean-up equipment available?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.10.3	Is the Oil Record Book up to date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.10.4	If observed, were bunkering procedures adhered to?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.10.5	Is the Garbage Record Book up to date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.10.6	Is the overboard valve from the 15ppm separator identified, secured in closed position and are warning signs posted?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.10.7	Oily water separator tested and found OK?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional Information:

….....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.11 Bridge and Navigation		**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
2.11.1	Is the bridge equipment in apparent good working order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.11.2	Are nautical charts and publications corrected and up to date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.11.3	Are bridge procedures and company standing orders in place?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.11.4	Are navigational lights in a satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.11.5	Is passage planning carried out in accordance with STCW (berth to berth)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

2.11.6 Is weather routing in use for ocean voyages? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.12 Hull and Deck	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.12.1 Is the visible condition of shell plating satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.12.2 Is the visible condition of deck plating satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.12.3 Are draft and Plimsoll marks clearly marked?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.12.4 Are ventilators and air/sounding pipes on deck in satisfactory condition and with efficient closing devices clearly labeled?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.12.5 Are weather tight doors/stores hatches fully operational and providing effective sealing?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.12.6 Is windlasses/winches/rollers/fair leads/capstans/etc. in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.12.7 Are visible sections of anchor cables in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.12.8 Are mooring ropes/wires in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.13 Lifting Appliances	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.13.1 Is the Cargo Gear Book up to date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.13.2 Are lifting appliances in apparent good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.13.3 Are SWL's clearly marked?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

2.13.4 Are hydraulic systems free from leakages? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.14 Ballast Tanks & Void Spaces		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.14.1	Are tanks free of significant wastage, pitting and scale?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.14.2	Is the corrosion protection (coating/anodes) in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.14.3	Is the steel structure free from buckling/fractures/doublers/ temporary repairs/poor alignment/etc.?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.14.4	Are access ladders and manhole covers in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.14.5	Are tanks free of any sign of oil contamination?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.14.6	Is pipe work passing through tanks/void spaces in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

2.15 Machinery Spaces		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
2.15.1	Are engine compartments, including bilges, clean, tidy and free of combustible materials?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.15.2	Is machinery in apparent good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.15.3	Is an external fuel testing program in use?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.15.4	Is main and auxiliary machinery free of significant fuel, oil, water leakages and temporary drains?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.15.5	Are FO and LO pipes adequately shielded?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2.15.6	Are FO/LO purifiers and FO heaters in	☐	☐	☐	☐	

apparent good condition?

2.15.7	Are self closing devices of sight glasses on all oil tanks fully operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.8	Are self closing devices on short DB sounding pipes fully operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.9	Are exhaust manifolds on machinery free of leaks and shielded with intact insulation?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.10	Has a thermo graphical examination of electrical installations and hot surfaces been carried out?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.11	Is adequate lighting provided in machinery spaces?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.12	Is the engine control room in apparent satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.13	Are engine spares properly stored and well secured?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.14	Are ER pipe system, overboard valves in good condition (free from leaks, temporary repairs and cement boxes)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.15	Are ER floor plates in place?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.15.16	Is the steering gear free of hydraulic leaks and in satisfactory condition? Are equipment and instructions for emergency use provided?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

2.16 Ship specific page…..goes in here…

2.17 Survey summary

Following the completion of the survey, and based on the surveyor's overall impression of the vessel, please rate the following areas (1=worse 5=best):

Structural integrity

Maintenance level

Cargo worthiness

Safe workplace

Shipboard management

Specify areas of most concern:

……
……
……
……
……
……

2.18 Enclosures

Master's Information	☐
List of Recommendations	☐
Class Listing of Surveys	☐
Hatch Cover Tightness Report	☐
Photos	☐
Etc….	☐

<place> 8 February 2005
the club

/<name of surveyor>/

Disclaimer

a) This survey report, which is and shall remain the property of the Club, is solely intended for the exclusive use of the Club to assess the general condition of the ship at the time of the entry or during the currency of the insurance period. The report is not intended to be a definite review of the ship's condition, and nothing herein shall prejudice the Club's right under the insurance policy should a dispute arise between the Club and the member relating to the condition of the ship. Any and all parties interested in or affected by this report accept to be bound by these terms.

PART 3 - 9
SURVEY REPORT – SPECIFIC SHIP TYPES

b)

3 DRY CARGO – GENERAL CARGO / BULK CARGO

3.1	Cargo spaces	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
3.1.1	Are access ladders in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.2	Are cargo spaces suitable for the carriage of the nominated cargo?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.3	Are bilges clean, non return valves working and pumps in good working order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.4	Is bilge sounding system in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.5	Have bilge high level alarms been tested?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.6	Is cargo space lighting satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.7	Are cargo spaces free of significant corrosion, pitting and scaling?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.8	Is coating of cargo spaces in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.9	Is the overall steel structure free from significant buckling / dents / fractures / wastage / doublers / temporary repairs / etc.?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.10	Are manhole covers in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.11	Is the condition of pipe work (air / sounding / bunker / ballast / etc.) passing through the cargo spaces satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.12	Is cargo spaces fixed fire fighting system in apparent satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.13	Is cargo spaces ventilation in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.14	Is lashing gear in good order and in accordance with the Cargo Securing Manual?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.1.15	Are deck stanchions and fixed lashing points in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

3.2	Hatch Covers	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
3.2.1	Has a satisfactory tightness test been carried out (enclose a copy of the report)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.2	Are hatch coamings structurally in good condition and free of signs of water leakage?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.3	Are hatch covers panels structurally in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.4	Are hatch cover panels correctly aligned?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.5	Are compression bars, landing pads, cleats and cross/joint wedges in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.6	Are rubber gaskets in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.7	Are side and cross joint drain channels and non return devices in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.8	Are hatch cover panels opening/closing arrangements in good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.9	Is hydraulic system in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.10	Are hatch cover panel hinges in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.11	Are means to secure hatch covers when open in a satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
3.2.12	Is there any evidence of temporary means to provide water tightness (e.g. expanding foam/tarpaulins/Ramnek/etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

4 DRY CARGO - REEFER VESSELS

4.1 General

4.1.1 Type of installation (direct expansion or indirect brine):
4.1.2 Rated air changes (circulation and ventilation) per hour:
4.1.3 Reefer capacity (kJ per hour):
4.1.4 State ships last three cargoes:

4.2 Cargo spaces		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
4.2.1	Are ladders in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.2	Are cargo spaces suitable for the carriage of the nominated cargo?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.3	Are cargo space separations (tween deck hatches/doors/etc.) gas tight and in general satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.4	Are ventilation ducts/gratings in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.5	Are bilges clean, non return valves working and pumps in good working order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.6	Is bilge sounding system in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.7	Have bilge high level alarms been tested?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.8	Is cargo space lighting satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.9	Is cargo space insulation (bulkhead-deck) in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.10	Are cargo spaces clean and tidy?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.11	Is the condition of pipe work (air/sounding/bunker/ballast/etc.) passing through cargo spaces satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.2.12	Is cargo spaces fixed fire fighting system in apparent satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……....

4.3 Hatch Covers and Side Loading Doors		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
4.3.1	Has a satisfactory tightness test been carried	☐	☐	☐	☐	

out (enclose a copy of the report)?

4.3.2	Are hatch coamings structurally in good condition and free of signs of water leakage?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.3	Are hatch covers panels/doors structurally in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.4	Are hatch cover/door insulation in a satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.5	Are compression bars, landing pads, cleats and cross/joint wedges in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.6	Are rubber gaskets in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.7	Are side and cross joint drain channels and non return devices in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.8	Are the closing arrangements for hatch cover panels/door openings in good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.9	Is hydraulic system in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.10	Are hatch cover panels/door hinges in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.11	Are means to secure the hatch covers/doors open in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.3.12	Is there any evidence of temporary means to provide water tightness (e.g. expanding foam/tarpaulins/Ramnek/etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

4.4	**Documentation**	**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
4.4.1	Is the reefer log free from incidents / unusual occurrence records over the last 40 days?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.4.2	Is the vessel's reefer class certificate valid and free of outstanding recommendations?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.4.3	Are manufacturers' reefer machinery manuals available onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.4.4	Are fault finding references available	☐	☐	☐	☐	

onboard?

4.4.5	Are reefer cargo manuals available onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.4.6	Is a planned maintenance scheme for the reefer installation available onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.4.7	Does crew responsible for the reefer installation have appropriate certification and experience?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

4.5 Atmosphere monitoring		**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
4.5.1	Is the automatic data logger in good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.5.2	Is the alarm recorder in good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.5.3	Is the CO2 recorder in good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.5.4	Is the relative humidity indicator/recorder in good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.5.5	Are fixed/portable cargo temperature meters/recorders in good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.5.6	Are all atmosphere monitoring instruments calibrated?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

4.6 Reefer machinery		**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
4.6.1	Are <u>all</u> auxiliary engines and generators in good condition and rated at full power?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.2	If applicable, has class approved installation of additional power packs onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

4.6.3	Are condensers in apparent good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.4	Are economizers in apparent good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.5	Are air circulating fans in apparent good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.6	Are expansion valves in apparent good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.7	Are brine pumps in apparent good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.8	Are sea water pumps in apparent good working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.9	Is insulation of machinery and piping in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.10	Is there sufficient refrigerant onboard for one full charge?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.11	Does the system run without exceptionally high refrigerant consumption?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.12	Is the Freon leakage detection system operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.6.13	Is the pH and brine density regularly tested?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

4.7	**Reefer containers**	**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
4.7.1	Are reefer containers electrical sockets and supply cables in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4.7.2	Are there suitable manuals and spare kits onboard for repair of reefer containers?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

5 DRY CARGO - CONTAINER VESSELS

5.1	Hatch Covers	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
5.1.1	Has a satisfactory tightness test been carried out (enclose a copy of the report)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1.2	Are hatch coamings in structural good condition and free of signs of water leakage?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1.3	Are hatch covers panels structurally in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1.4	Are compression bars, cleats and cross/joint wedges in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1.5	Are landing pads without excessive wear and in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1.6	Are rubber gaskets in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1.7	Are side and cross joint drain channels and non return devices in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.1.8	Is there any evidence of temporary means to provide water tightness (e.g. expanding foam/tarpaulins/Ramnek/etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

5.2 Cargo Securing and Stability		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
5.2.1	Is an approved Cargo Securing Manual onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.2	Does the container lashing system used comply with the Cargo Securing Manual?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.3	Is condition of lashing gear in satisfactory condition and are sufficient numbers onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.4	Are lashing maintenance records kept?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.5	Are twist lock sockets, elephant feet, D-rings, etc. in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.6	If utilized, are twist locks identified left and right?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.7	Are cell guides in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.8	Is cell guide/tank top connection in good condition and free of wastage/fracture?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.9	Is the ship stability computer in good working order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.10	Does voyage planning include the use of weather routing?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5.2.11	Does the ship have additional voyage guidance systems installed (ECDIS, AOG, etc.)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

6 OIL TANKERS / OBO

6.1 Cargo Tanks		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
6.1.1	Are tank lids, hatches, ullage and butterworth openings packings and securing devices in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.2	Is the closed gauge system for measuring contents of tanks in good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.3	Are access ladders / platforms / safety railings in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.4	Is tank overall structure in satisfactory condition and free of significant corrosion?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.5	Is shell and bottom plating free of significant pitting?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.6	Is plating under suction bell mouths in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.7	Are heating coils in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.8	Is piping (cargo / ballast / hydraulic) in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.1.9	Are spindles and valve connections in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

6.2 Inert Gas System		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
6.2.1	Is the IGS in good working order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.2.2	Is Oxygen Analyzer calibrated up to date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.2.3	Are scrubber, deck seals and non return valves in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……

……
……

6.3 Crude Oil Washing System	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
6.3.1 Is COW system in satisfactory condition and fully operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.3.2 Is an approved operating manual provided?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.3.3 Are COW plans prepared and adhered to?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

6.4 Deck Cargo Piping	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
6.4.1 Is deck cargo piping in satisfactory condition (state date and pressure for last test)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.4.2 Are PV valves in satisfactory condition (state date and pressure for last test)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.4.3 Is deck piping free of any signs of leakage from flanges/joints/etc.?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.4.4 Are piping earth connections in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.4.5 Are cargo hoses in satisfactory condition (state date for last pressure & megger test)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.4.6 Are savealls in satisfactory condition and free from oil?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

6.5 Pump Room	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks

6.5.1	Is the pump room clean and tidy and are bilges free from oil?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5.2	Are pumps and shaft bearings in apparent good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5.3	Are pump room fans operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5.4	Is lighting satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5.5	Is floor plating satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5.6	Are cargo valves reported as being in working condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5.7	Are cargo pump emergency stops and means of communication reported functional?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.5.8	Are sufficient Emergency escape sets provided?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

6.6	**Cargo Control Room**	**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
6.6.1	Is cargo monitoring indicators and panels in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.6.2	Is ODME equipment operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.6.3	Are remote sensing / measuring / level alarms and systems operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.6.4	Are loading / discharge and tank cleaning plans drawn up?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6.6.5	Is gas monitoring equipment operational and calibrated?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

6.7 OBO	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
6.7.1 Is gas monitoring system in ballast tanks and void spaces reportedly in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

For OBO vessels – please also complete form XX for DRY CARGO – GENERAL CARGO vessels

7 PRODUCT/CHEMICAL TANKERS

7.1 General

7.1.1 Number of cargo tanks:
7.1.2 Describe tank/pumping arrangement and construction materials/coatings:
7.1.3 State vessels IMO type (I, II or III):
7.1.4 Certificate of fitness issued by and expiry date:

7.2 Cargo tanks & piping		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
7.2.1	Are tank lids, hatches, packings and securing devices in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.2	Is the closed gauge system for measuring contents of tanks in good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.3	Are access ladders/platforms/safety railings in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.4	Is tank overall structure in satisfactory condition and free of significant corrosion?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.5	Is shell and bottom plating free of significant pitting?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.6	Is plating under suction bell mouths in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.7	Is tank coating in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.8	Are heating coils in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.9	Is piping in cargo tanks (cargo/ballast/hydraulic) in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.10	Is an industry standard tank cleaning guide carried onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.11	Is the ship provided with cargo and coating compatibility guides?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.12	Are cargo hoses and removable pipe lengths in good condition and regularly tested?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.13	Are deck cargo valves/pipelines and manifolds in good condition and suitably marked?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.14	Is the tank vent system in good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.2.15	Is the cargo heating/cooling system fully	☐	☐	☐	☐	

operational and well maintained?

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

7.3	Cargo Control	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
7.3.1	Are cargo monitoring indicators and panels in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.3.2	Are remote sensing / measuring / level alarms and systems operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.3.3	Are cargo samplings routines implemented and are samples stored in a suitable manner?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.3.4	Is there a satisfactory system for temperature measurement of the cargo?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.3.5	Has the ship been inspected by the Chemical Distribution Institute (CDI) recently?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

7.4	Safety	Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
7.4.1	Does all crew have regular medical checks and blood test?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.4.2	Is all protective clothing and breathing gear, including personal escape sets in good order, sufficient in number and cylinders within test date?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.4.3	Are decontamination showers and eye baths on deck in working order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7.4.4	Is suitable medical advice and medicines carried (e.g. Ship Captains Medical Guide including Chemical Supplement)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

7.4.5	Is the ship provided with portable gas/chemical testing equipment? Is the equipment calibrated?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.4.6	Is the latest edition of the ICS Tanker Safety Guide (Chemical) onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.4.7	Are there contingency plans onboard to deal with chemical spills and other emergencies?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.4.8	Are wheel house doors, windows, air inlets, etc. to the accommodation and deck house ends facing the cargo in good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.4.9	Are fixed and portable electrical equipment used in fire zones intrinsically safe?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

8 LPG/LNG TANKERS

8.1 General

8.1.1 Number and type of cargo tanks:
8.1.2 Certificate of fitness issued by and expiration date:
8.1.3 Minimum cargo temperatures:
8.1.4 Maximum tank working pressure:
8.1.5 Is ship fitted with deck tanks (how many?):
8.1.6 Will the ship carry non LPG/LNG cargoes (state type)?:

8.2 Cargo tanks, pipes and void spaces		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
8.2.1	Is the tank ventilation system in good order?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.2.2	Are tank domes, hatches, packings and securing devices in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.2.3	Are deck cargo piping, deck manifolds, cargo hoses and removable pipeline bends in satisfactory condition and regularly pressure tested?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.2.4	Are cargo pumps reportedly in good condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.2.5	Is cargo reliquifaction equipment, including coolers and heat exchangers, reportedly in good operational condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.2.6	Are void spaces in structural sound condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.2.7	Is the tank insulation (as viewed from void spaces) in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

8.3 Cargo control		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
8.3.1	Are inert gas and air drier systems reportedly in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.3.2	Are cargo monitoring indicators and panels in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

8.3.3	Are remote sensing / measuring / level alarms and systems operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

8.4	**Safety**	**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
8.4.1	Is a class approved cargo operation manual onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.4.2	Is the ship provided with portable atmosphere testing equipment? Is the equipment calibrated?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.4.3	Is the deck spraying system fully operational?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8.4.4	Is the emergency shut down system operational and regularly tested?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

9 PASSENGER- RORO/PAX

9.1 General

9.1.1 What is the passenger carrying capacity?

9.1.2 What is the number of crew?

9.1.3 Is the ship compliant with the Stockholm Convention?

9.2 Safety routines		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
9.2.1	Is a muster list available and properly maintained?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.2.2	Is an adequate emergency command structure in place?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.2.3	Is a damage control plan available and properly maintained?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.2.4	Is a fire control plan available and properly maintained?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.2.5	Is an evacuation plan available and properly maintained?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.2.6	Is a life saving plan available and properly maintained?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.2.7	Is a bilge pumping plan available and properly maintained?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.2.8	Are all above plans available on the bridge?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……

9.3 Watertight integrity		Y	N	NA	NI	Remarks
9.3.1	Are bow/stern doors and ramps fully operational and provide effective sealing?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.3.2	Are side shell doors fully operational and provide effective sealing?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.3.3	Are the scuppers working effectively (ro/ro	☐	☐	☐	☐	

deck and upper deck)?

9.3.4	Are down flooding openings (drains) working satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.3.5	Are visible areas of watertight bulkheads without unauthorized penetrations?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.3.6	Is the condition and operation of watertight doors satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.3.7	Does the status of watertight doors during passage comply with SOLAS regulations?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.3.8	Is the watertight door indicator panel in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

9.4	**Fire Safety**	**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
9.4.1	Are draft stops in place and in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.2	Is the fire door status indicator in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.3	Is the condition and operation of the fire screen doors satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.4	Are ventilation fire shutters and flaps operational and in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.5	Are the galley exhaust fire dampers in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.6	Is the galley hood smothering system in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.7	Is the fire detection panel in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.8	Is the accommodation sprinkler system in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.9	Is the engine compartment fixed fire protection system in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.4.10	Is the car deck drencher system in	☐	☐	☐	☐	

satisfactory condition?

9.4.11	Is the paint locker fixed fire extinguishing system in satisfactory condition?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.4.12	Are professional fire men employed onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.4.13	Is fire man's outfit and equipment of an upgraded standard (above minimum IMO standard)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.4.14	Are fire patrols in operation?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.4.15	If fire drill held, was the result satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.4.16	Is dangerous cargo allowed onboard?	☐	☐	☐	☐
		☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

9.5	**Passenger safety**	**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
9.5.1	Is the passenger list properly maintained with details about sex, age and disabled persons?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.5.2	Are designated officers trained for crowd control?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.5.3	Can ship's officers and crew communicate in a language understood by the passengers?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.5.4	Are adequate hazard warning notices for passengers posted?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.5.5	Are non slip material applied on exposed areas of public decks?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.5.6	Are emergency escapes from accommodation marked and accessible?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.5.7	Has the swimming pool a protection net?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.5.8	Is all sport and recreation equipment apparently safe to use?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

9.5.9	Is a medical doctor employed onboard? Is he/she satisfied with the equipment available? Can a heart attack be handled?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.5.10	Are procedures for bacterial control established (food and water)?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.5.11	Are health conditions onboard regularly inspected by an authority?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.5.12	Are chemicals for use onboard stored in designated areas?	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……

9.6 Shipboard Communications		**Y**	**N**	**NA**	**NI**	**Remarks**
9.6.1	Is the public address system in satisfactory condition (tested on emergency power)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.6.2	Is fire/general alarm in satisfactory condition (tested on emergency power)?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.6.3	Is emergency communication between bridge-engine room and bridge-steering gear room satisfactory?	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9.6.4	Are handheld communication devices satisfactory and in adequate supply?	☐	☐	☐	☐	

Additional information:

……
……
……
……
……
……