

**Report of the 2013 Harmonized Verification Program (HAVEP) on
Passenger Ships**



Executive Summary

The decision to carry out a Harmonised Verification Programme (HAVEP) on passenger ships was agreed at the Paris MoU Port State Control Committee Meeting in May 2012 following the tragic events of the Costa Concordia incident.

A Task Force was set up comprising all the members of the Paris MoU, EMSA and the United States Coast Guard to produce a HAVEP Questionnaire and provide guidance to PSCOs for completion of the Questionnaire.

The purpose of the HAVEP was to obtain statistics and an overall impression of emergency preparedness, according to SOLAS, for passenger ships operating in the Paris MoU region. The HAVEP ran from 1st January 2013 to 31st December 2013. It was agreed within the Task Force that only ships eligible for inspection, under the Paris MoU targeting regime (ie Priority I or Priority II), should undergo the HAVEP.

The HAVEP Questionnaire comprised 20 questions ranging from hardware information such as fire control plan, muster list, record of emergency training and drills, operation of watertight doors and emergency source of power to operational control which included a standard fire drill scenario and an abandon ship drill. The guidance for the PSCOs provided detailed information on how to answer the Questionnaire, how to carry out the standard fire and abandon ship drill scenario and how to record deficiencies according to the result of the questionnaire, which would provide some consistency in the results. A training session was also held by the Paris MoU for PSCOs.

It was agreed that the HAVEP inspections would be pre-announced to the master/operator and the Questionnaire was available prior to the HAVEP commencing.

A HAVEP Questionnaire was completed and entered into THETIS for a total of 232 passenger ships out of a total of 281 individual passenger ship calls in the Paris MoU region over the period of the HAVEP.

A total of 2 ships were detained as a direct result of the HAVEP Questionnaire. One Maltese ship was detained for an inoperative source of emergency power and a Bahamas ship with 9 detainable deficiencies. None of the detentions were recorded as R/O Responsibility.

A total of 130 inspections had deficiencies recorded that were directly related to the HAVEP. The most common deficiency recorded related to Abandon Ship Drills recorded in 20 inspections (8.62% of all inspections). The next most common was Fire Drills, 19 inspections (8.19%) followed by Closing devices/Watertight doors, 18 inspections (7.76%) and SAR Co-operation plan, 18 inspections (7.76%).

The purpose of the HAVEP was to obtain an overall view of emergency preparedness on passenger ships. The HAVEP inspections were pre-announced and ship operators were fully aware of what was expected for the HAVEP and thus should have been fully prepared.

Whilst the results of the HAVEP indicate reasonable overall compliance with SOLAS requirements for passenger ships, it is important that masters and operators pay attention to emergency preparedness and carrying out realistic emergency drills.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Table of Contents	3
1. Introduction	4
1.1 Purpose of the Report	4
1.2 Objective of the HAVEP	4
1.3 Scope of the HAVEP	4
1.4 General Remarks	4
2. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	4
2.1 Summary	4
2.2 Conclusions	5
2.3 Recommendations	5
3. HAVEP Questionnaire Results	5
3.1 Analysis	5
Table 1 Response to HAVEP Questionnaire.....	6
3.1.2 Analysis of Answers to Questionnaire in Relation to Detention	8
3.1.3 Analysis of HAVEP Topic Related Deficiencies	8
3.1.4 Number of Inspections and Number of Ships in the HAVEP – Table 2	8
3.1.5 Specification of HAVEP Topic Related Deficiencies – Table 3	9
3.1.6 Number o Ships to Number of Inspections During the HAVEP – Table 4	10
3.1.7 Number of Inspected Ships per Ship Risk Profile – Table 5	10
3.1.8 Number of Inspected Ships and Detentions – Table 6	10
3.1.9 Inspections and Detentions per Flag State	11
3.1.10 Inspections and Detentions per Recognised Organisation	11
3.1.11 Ship Age Overview – Table 7	11
3.2 Results on Former HAVEPs on Same Subject	11
3.2.1 Analysis	11
3.2.2 Comparison of HAVEPs on the Same Topic Over the Years	11
3.3 Results of Other HAVEP Participants	11
Annex 1	
Annex 1.1 HAVEP Questionnaire	12
Annex 1.2 HAVEP Guidance	13
Annex 1.3 Inspections and Detentions per Flag State	13
Annex 1.4 Inspections and Detentions per Recognised Organisations	14
Annex 1.5 Inspections and Detentions per ISM Company	15

Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this Report

This report documents the results of the Harmonised Verification Programme (HAVEP) carried out on passenger ships within the Paris MoU Region from 1st January 2013 to 31st December 2013.

1.2 Objective of the HAVEP

The objective of the HAVEP was to obtain a view of emergency preparedness on passenger ships following the Costa Concordia incident in January 2012.

1.3 Scope of the HAVEP

The HAVEP applied to passenger ships only and did not include ro/ro passenger ships or high speed craft on a regular service to which the EU Ferry Directive (1999/35/EC) applied.

The HAVEP was performed and the Questionnaire completed on every individual passenger ship eligible for inspection under the Paris MoU targeting system during the period of the HAVEP.

1.4 General Remarks

For the purpose of this report, a detention is an inspection containing at least one deficiency that is considered a ground for detention.

The tables do not take into account inspections where the HAVEP questionnaire was not recorded, with exception of table 2.

A “No” answer recorded in the questionnaire was accompanied by a relevant deficiency recorded in the Report of Inspection.

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

2.1 Summary

The HAVEP comprised a number of specific items to be inspected by PSCOs during a PSC inspection on a passenger ship in the form of a questionnaire. Whilst the HAVEP Questionnaire covered operational control and looked in detail at emergency preparedness it also included some hardware items. (See Table 1)

A total number of 251 passenger ships were inspected during the period of the HAVEP (01/01/13 – 31/12/13) out of a total number of 281 individual passenger ship calls. A HAVEP Questionnaire was completed and entered into THETIS for **a total of 232** passenger ships.

A total of 2 ships were detained as a direct result of the HAVEP Questionnaire. One Maltese ship was detained for an inoperative source of emergency power and a Bahamas ship with 9 detainable deficiencies including a serious failure of the onboard safety management system. (See Sec 3.1.2 for more detail). None of the detentions were recorded as R/O Responsibility.

A total of 130 inspections had deficiencies recorded that were related to the HAVEP. The most common deficiency recorded related to Abandon Ship Drills (Code 04110) with 20 inspections (8.62% of all inspections). The next most common was Fire Drills (Code 04109), 19 inspections (8.19%) followed by Closing

devices/Watertight doors (Code 02101) 18 inspections (7.76%) and SAR Co-operation plan (Code 01302) 18 inspections (7.76%). (See Table 3 for more detail)

Whilst a total of 169 HAVEP Questionnaires was completed on passenger ships greater than 3000 GT it should be noted that 49 questionnaires were carried out on ships less than 500 GT.

The HAVEP Questionnaire was undertaken on 30 High risk Ships, 155 Standard Risk Ships and 39 Low Risk Ships as per the Paris MoU Ship Risk Profile designation. A total of 8 ships had an unknown Ship Risk Profile at the time of inspection.

The age profile of ships inspected covered a wide range from 18 passenger ships equal to or less than 5 years of age to 35 ships over 35 years and 50 ships were in the range 11 -15 years (See Table 7 for more information)

2.2 Conclusions

The purpose of the HAVEP was to obtain an overall view of emergency preparedness on passenger ships. The HAVEP inspections were pre-announced and ship operators were fully aware of what was expected for the HAVEP and thus should have been fully prepared. Whilst the results of the HAVEP indicate reasonable overall compliance with SOLAS requirements for passenger ships, both from an operational point of view and hardware, it should be noted that in 19 out of 232 inspections (8.19%) a deficiency was recorded against a fire drill and in 20 inspections (8.62%) a deficiency was recorded against an abandon ship drill. Other deficiencies included evaluation of crew performance in fire drills, 11 inspections (4.74%); closing devices/watertight doors 18 inspections (7.76%) and SAR plans 18 inspections (7.76%).

2.2 Recommendations

The two main areas of concern on a passenger ship are fire and flooding and if the situation escalates out of control the ship must be able to be safely abandoned. Whilst a flooding scenario was not considered for the HAVEP the results indicate that masters and operators must pay attention to carrying out regular realistic fire and abandon ship drills.

The Paris MoU should continue to pay attention to operational control on passenger ships and should include a damage control drill.

HAVEP Questionnaire Results

3.1 Analysis

3.1.1 Response to HAVEP Questionnaire - Table

Table 1 Response to HAVEP Questionnaire

Nr.	HAVEP Questions	'YES'		'NO'		N/A		Blank		% 'NO' adjusted ³
		#	% ¹	#	% ¹	#	% ²	#	% ²	
Q01	Fire Control Plan satisfactory?	221	95.7%	10	4.3%			1	0.4%	
Q02	Muster list satisfactory?	223	96.1%	9	3.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Q03	Decision support system satisfactory?	222	96.1%	9	3.9%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	
Q04	Is the ship provided with an integrated system of contingency planning for shipboard emergency plans?	195	84.1%	37	15.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	
Q05	Record of emergency training and drills satisfactory?	226	98.3%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	2	0.9%	
Q06	Is the SAR Co-Operation Plan satisfactory?	211	91.3%	20	8.7%			1	0.4%	
Q07	Can master confirm when a Damage Control Exercise was carried out?	225	97.8%	5	2.2%			2	0.9%	
Q08*	Operation of Watertight Doors (WTD) satisfactory?	224	97.4%	6	2.6%			2	0.9%	2.7%
Q09*	Emergency source of power satisfactory?	226	97.4%	6	2.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.7%
Q10*	Command, Control, Communication satisfactory?	225	97.0%	7	3.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.1%
Q11	Initial response to incident satisfactory	227	98.3%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	
Q12*	Bridge team response satisfactory?	231	99.6%	1	0.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Q13*	Fire party(s) satisfactory?	227	98.7%	3	1.3%	0	0.0%	2	0.9%	0.0%
Q14	Ancillary parties (eg boundary cooling, stretcher party) Satisfactory	221	96.1%	9	3.9%	0	0.0%	2	0.9%	

Nr.	HAVEP Questions	'YES'		'NO'		N/A		Blank		% 'NO' adjusted ³
		#	% ¹	#	% ¹	#	% ²	#	% ²	
Q15	Passenger accounting satisfactory?	221	96.9%	7	3.1%	0	0.0%	4	1.7%	
Q16*	Muster personnel reacted satisfactorily?	227	98.3%	4	1.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	0.0%
Q17	Instruction at assembly/muster station satisfactory?	221	96.9%	7	3.1%	0	0.0%	4	1.7%	
Q18*	LSA preparation and manning satisfactory?	224	97.4%	6	2.6%	0	0.0%	2	0.9%	0.0%
Q19*	Lifeboats lowered and sent away?	164	96.5%	6	3.5%	60	26.1%	2	0.9%	0.0%
Q20	Was the ship detained as a result of HAVEP?	3	1.3%	228	98.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.4%	

* 'NO' means: the ship may be considered for detention. The details of any detention should be appropriately entered on the PSC report B.

(1) The percentages are calculated using the total number of inspections where the answer was "YES" or "NO" only.

(2) The percentages are calculated using the total number of inspections.

(3) "[% 'NO' adjusted]" = % "[Answer = NO, may be considered for detention]" but the ship has not been detained.

3.1.2 Analysis of Answers to Questionnaire in Relation to Detention

Whilst the results of the HAVEP Questionnaire indicate 3 ships detained analysis shows that in fact only 2 ships were detained as a direct result of the HAVEP. It is likely that Question 20 of the Questionnaire was inadvertently marked “YES” in one case.

One ship, the Saga Pearl II IMO 8000214 was detained in Italy for the emergency source of power being inoperative, the crew attempted on 4 separate occasions to operate the emergency generator without success, there was also heavy leakage of cooling water. The ship was released from detention the next day.

Another ship, Sea Spirit IMO 8802868 was detained in Dublin for multiple deficiencies including: a number of fire fighting equipment was found seized and inoperative; some statutory surveys out of window; problems with fire detection system; number of fire doors inoperative; many emergency lights inoperative; signage for ship’s operation not correct or not in language understood by crew; emergency fire pump inoperative; control and communication during fire drill unsatisfactory and LSA preparation , manning and lifeboat lowering unsatisfactory and a serious failure of the onboard safety management system. A total of 21 deficiencies were recorded of which 14 were detainable. The vessel was detained for 5 days.

3.1.3 Analysis of HAVEP Topic Related Deficiencies

The deficiencies were linked to the HAVEP Questionnaire in that a “NO” answer to any question should have had a relevant deficiency recorded on the PSC Report of Inspection and thus recorded in THETIS. The HAVEP Questionnaire Guidance provided the PSCOs with the relevant THETIS deficiency code to use in respect of each question in order to obtain some consistency in the results. There was good correlation between the number of “NO” answers in the questionnaire compared to the number and nature of deficiencies recorded. (See Table 3).

3.1.4 Number of inspections and number of ships in HAVEP

Table 2a Passenger ships

	# of individual ships inspected during HAVEP	# of inspections performed with a HAVEP questionnaire	# of inspections without a HAVEP questionnaire
Total # of inspections	251	232	19
# of inspections with detentions	2	2	0
# of detentions with HAVEP-topic related deficiencies	2	2	0

Table 2b Gross Tonnage (Passenger ships)

	# of inspections	# of inspections performed with a HAVEP-questionnaire	# of detentions with HAVEP-topic related deficiencies
<500	49	37	0
500 - 1000	7	4	0
1000-2000	15	11	0
2000-3000	16	11	0
>3000	254	169	2
Total	341	232	2

3.1.5 Specification of HAVEP Topic Related Deficiencies

Table 3 Specification of HAVEP-topic related deficiencies

HAVEP-topic related deficiencies		Inspections	Detentions HAVEP-topic related	Detentions HAVEP-topic related with RO responsibility
		(# of inspections with this deficiency) One inspection can have multiple deficiencies	(# of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention)	(# of inspections with this deficiency recorded as ground for detention and RO related)
01109	Decision-support system for masters on pass. ships	3	0	0
01302	SAR co-operation plan for pass.ships trad on fixe	18	0	0
02101	Closing devices/watertight doors	18	0	0
04108	Muster list	10	0	0
04109	Fire drills	19	1	0
04110	Abandon ship drills	20	1	0
04111	Damage control plan	3	0	0
04114	Emergency source of power - Emergency generator	9	1	0
07122	Fire control plan	12	0	0
07125	Evaluation of crew performance (fire drills)	11	0	0
11131	On board training and instructions	7	0	0

3.1.6 Number of Ships to Number of Inspections During the HAVEP Campaign

Table 4 Number of ships to number of inspections during HAVEP campaign

# of inspections performed per ship	# of ships	% of total
1	218	96.9%
2	7	3.1%
Total	225	100.0%

3.1.7 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

Table 5 Number of inspected ships per Ship Risk Profile

Ship Risk Profile	# of inspections	# of detentions	detention as % of inspections	detentions HAVEP-topic related	detentions HAVEP-topic related as % of inspections
High Risk Ship (HRS)	30	1	3.3%	1	3.3%
Standard Risk Ship (SRS)	155	1	0.6%	1	0.6%
Low Risk Ship (LRS)	39	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Unknown	8	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	232	2	0.9%	2	0.9%

3.1.8 Number of inspected ships and detentions

Table 6 Number of inspected ships and detentions per ship type

Ship type	# of inspections	# of detentions	detention as % of inspections	detentions HAVEP-topic related	detentions HAVEP-topic related as % of inspections
Passenger ships	232	2	0.9%	2	0.9%

3.1.9 Inspections and detentions per Flag State

(see Annex 1.3)

3.1.10 Inspections and detentions per Recognized Organization

(see Annex 1.4)

3.1.11 Ship age overview

Table 7 Ship age overview

Ship age*	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	Detentions HAVEP-topic related	Detentions HAVEP-topic related as a % of inspections
≤ 5 years	18	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
6-10 years	32	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
11-15 years	50	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
16-20 years	27	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
21-25 years	34	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
26-30 years	18	1	5.6%	1	5.6%
31-35 years	18	1	5.6%	1	5.6%
> 35 years	35	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Total	232	2	0.9%	2	0.9%

3.2 Results on former HAVEP's on same subject

A Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) was carried out on passenger ships in the Paris MoU Region in 2003 and whilst it was focused on emergency drills, it was in a different format to the HAVEP it would be difficult to make a comparison.

3.2.1 Analysis

See 3.2

3.2.2 Comparison of HAVEP's on the same topic over the years

3.3 Results other HAVEP participants (if applicable)

Not applicable

Annex 1

Annex 1.1 HAVEP Questionnaire

No.	QUESTION	YES	NO
GENERAL			
1	Fire Control Plan satisfactory? S74/CII-2/R15.2.4 (Code 07122)		
2	Muster list satisfactory? S74/CIII/R8 (Code 04108)		
3	Decision support system satisfactory? S74/CIII/R29 (Code 01109)		
4	Is the ship provided with an integrated system of contingency planning for shipboard emergency plans? (For information)		
5	Record of emergency training and drills satisfactory? S74/CIII/R19 (Code 11131)		
6	Is the SAR Co-Operation Plan satisfactory? S74CV/R7 (Code 01302)		
7	Can master confirm when a Damage Control Exercise was carried out? No convention reference. (Code 04111)		
8*	Operation of Watertight Doors (WTD) satisfactory? S74/CII-/R13 (See guidance for applicable dates) (Code 02101)		
9*	Emergency source of power satisfactory? S74/CII-1/R25 (See guidance for applicable dates) (Code 04114)		
10*	Command, Control, Communication satisfactory? S74/CIII/R19 (Code 04109)		
FIRE DRILL			
11	Initial response to incident satisfactory? S1999/00/R15 (Code 07125)		
12*	Bridge team response satisfactory? S1999/00/R15 (Code 07125)		
13*	Fire party(s) satisfactory? S1999/00/R15 (Code 07125)		
14	Ancillary parties (eg boundary cooling, stretcher party) Satisfactory? S1999/00/R15 (Code 07125)		
PASSENGER EVACUATION AND MUSTER			
15	Passenger accounting satisfactory? S06/III/19.3.4 (Code 04110)		
16*	Muster personnel reacted satisfactorily? S06/III/19.3.4 (Code 04110)		
17	Instruction at assembly/muster station satisfactory? S06/III/19.3.4 (Code 04110)		
ABANDON SHIP			
18*	LSA preparation and manning satisfactory S06/III/19.3.4 (Code 04110)		N/A
19*	Lifeboats lowered and sent away satisfactorily S06/III/19.3.4 (Code 04110)		
20	Was ship detained as a result of HAVEP?		

Notes:

1. Any question answered with a "NO" MUST be accompanied by a relevant deficiency on the Report of Inspection.
2. Some deficiencies are of such a serious nature that they should be considered as a "no-go" item (marked with an * and a RED BOX), warranting the detention of the ship.
3. Other items may warrant the detention by themselves or in combination with other items. Deficiency codes and convention references are given for each question.
4. If lifeboats not lowered Qu 19 can be answered N/A

Annex 1.2 HAVEP Guidance

Annex 1.3 Inspections and Detentions per Flag State

Table Annex 1.3 Inspections and detentions per Flag State

Flag	# of inspections	# of detentions	Detention as a % of inspections	# of detentions HAVEP-topic related	Detentions HAVEP-topic related as a % of inspections	WGB-list* 2012
Albania	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Black
Bahamas	67	1	1.5%	1	1.5%	White
Belgium	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Bermuda (UK)	19	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Cook Islands	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey
Croatia	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Cyprus	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Finland	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
France	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Germany	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Greece	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Italy	12	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Liberia	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Malta	40	1	2.5%	1	2.5%	White
Marshall Islands	4	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Netherlands	9	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Norway	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Panama	17	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Portugal	5	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Russian Federation	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	Grey
Sweden	2	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Turkey	24	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
United Kingdom	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
United States	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Vanuatu	1	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	White
Total	232	2	0.9%	2	0.9%	

* The official WGB-list (2012) of the Paris MoU is published in the Annual Report (2012). The scope of this table is only the HAVEP.

Annex 1.4 Inspections and Detentions per Recognized Organization

Table Annex 1.4 Inspections and Detentions per Recognized Organization

Issuing authority	Inspection*					Detentions HAVEP-topic related with RO responsibility**
	510	511	512	513	519	
	Safety Management Certificate (SMC/ISM Code)	International Ship Security	Minimum Safe Manning Document	Passenger Ship Safety	High Speed Craft Safety	
Bureau Veritas	13	11	1	29	0	
Croatian Register of Shipping	2	2	0	2	0	
Det Norske Veritas	45	46	0	42	0	
Germanischer Lloyd	19	18	0	20	0	
Lloyd's Register	36	29	0	34	0	
Other	1	7	0	1	0	
Register of Shipping (Albania)	4	4	0	4	0	
Registro Italiano Navale	30	23	0	20	0	
Rinave Portuguesa	1	1	0	1	0	
Russian Maritime Register of Shipping	2	1	0	2	0	
Turkish Lloyd	9	10	0	0	0	
Total	162	152	1	155	0	0

* Number of inspections where the certificate is recorded as issued by the RO

** Number of inspections where the RO issued the certificate and a deficiency covered by that certificate was recorded as detainable and RO related

Annex 1.5 Inspections and Detentions per ISM Company

Table Annex 1.5 Inspections and Detentions per ISM Company

IMO-number*	ISM company	# of inspections	# of inspections with HAVEP questionnaire	# of detentions HAVEP-topic related	# of HAVEP related detainable deficiencies during with HAVEP questionnaire	# of HAVEP-related defeciciencies during all inspections
1828759	V Ships Leisure SAM	29	19			4
1890038	Princess Cruise Lines Ltd	15	14			3
5577732	RCL Cruises Ltd	14	11			11
1762194	Fred Olsen Cruise Lines Ltd	13	4			5
5356321	NCL Bahamas Ltd	12	10			6
0196718	Costa Crociere SpA	12	9			2
5469579	Mediterranean Shipping Co	11	9			2
5413493	Prestige Cruise Services LLC	9	6			3
5304986	Pullmantur Cruises Ship Mgmt	9	4			2
1409053	International Shipping-Miami	9	4	1	2	5
2071600	Celebrity Cruises Inc	8	6			2
4005696	Royal Caribbean Cruises Ltd	8	4			2
1732765	Acromas Shipping Ltd	7	3	1	1	3
2057932	Carnival Cruise Lines	7	4			
0974936	Windstar Cruises Ltd	6	5			5
1996779	Aida Cruises	6	4			1
1453949	Seabourn Cruise Line Ltd	5	4			
5375992	Holland America Line NV	5	5			3
4011363	Star Clippers Monaco SAM	5	3			4
5025626	Core Marine Ltd	5	4			2
5102654	Vital Shipping Co	4	2			
5435988	Tugay Turizm Seyahat	4	4			1
0097668	Erturk Turizm Deniz Nakilyat	4	4			2
0217944	Hapag-Lloyd AG	4	2			4
0778064	Columbia Shipmanagement Ltd	4	2			
4110838	Grand Circle Dubrovnik	4	3			2
5360125	Pleasure Yachts Naftiliaki	4	4			7
1982514	Majestic International Cruises	4	1			
5087311	Meander Turizm Deniz Tas	3	2			1
5523888	Ege Birlik Tasimacilik Ltd Sti	3	2			
5512716	Adler-Schiffe GmbH &	3	3			3
0383336	Hurtigruten ASA	3				
5362170	Global Cruise Lines Ltd	3	1			2
1996500	Carnival Plc	3	3			2
5660720	Marina Maritime SA	3	2			
5224922	West Wind Ltd	3	1			3
Total		251	168	2	3	92

*Only ISM companies with 3 or more inspections