

Port State Control in Japan

Mr. Yoshiro ICHIKAWA
Director
Port State Control Affairs
Ministry of Transport, Japan

The System and Activity of Port State Control in Japan
**(International Symposium on Maritime Management System for
Safer and Cleaner Seas in Millennium,
on 26 May 2000, at Pusan, Republic of Korea)**

Yoshiro ICHIKAWA
Director for Port State Control
Maritime Technology and Safety Bureau
Ministry of Transport, Japan

Executive Summary

The author of this document is generally in charge of Port State Control affairs at the headquarters of Ministry of Transport, Japan. In this document, the necessity of Port State Control, the brief history of Japanese Port State Control and the present system of Port State Control in Japan are introduced. Also, the newest output of Japanese Port State Control which is an annual statistic of 1999 is explained, subsequently the policy and strategy on Port State Control in Japan is introduced.

1. INTRODUCTION

Japan is surrounded by the sea and it highly depends on the maritime transport to import and export energy resources, materials, goods and so on. Furthermore, Japan heavily depends on marine living resources as foods. Therefore, the safer sea and cleaner sea is very important for this country.

Japan has a long history as a Flag State. Its survey system for Japanese vessels was established more than a hundred years ago. Also, Japan has well implemented responsibilities in accordance with relevant International Conventions. But it is not enough to ensure the maritime safety and to prevent the marine pollution.

Japan experienced a casualty with a serious marine pollution, recently. A Russian oil tanker navigated to Vladivostok from China carrying approximately 18,000 tons of heavy oil and it was broken into two parts at offshore of Oki Islands in January 1997. Subsequently, approximately 6,000 tons of heavy oil were spilled out and Japanese coastlines were seriously contaminated in a long range. On the other hand, a several foreign ships have been abandoned on coastlines and in marine routes after casualties. The almost of those abandoned ships have been removed by local governments because shipowners of those ships could not be identified or they did not take any necessary action even the shipowner could be identified.

At present, Japanese people well understand that the control for Japanese ship is very important but it is not enough to ensure the maritime safety and to prevent marine pollution around Japan. The control for foreign ships is also important and necessary.

2. The Necessity of Port State Control

It is needless to say that Flag State implementation is the most fundamental and important for the maritime safety and marine environment. Flag State implementation is the first defense line. However, the fact is that there are a lot of Flag States in the world and some Flag States have not implemented their responsibilities adequately. Japan has no intention to say that all open registry countries have not been implemented their responsibilities but it is certain that some open registry countries do not have appropriate administrative resources or technical abilities to control their ship properly.

That is the most substantial background why sub-standard ships are operated. Furthermore, there are some ship operators who use sub-standard ships enjoying lower chartering fee. The cost of sub-standard ships may be much lower than the cost of ships complying with all applicable and relevant requirements. Therefore, sub-standard ships unfairly compete with ships complying with those requirements. If sub-standard ships are retained, ships complying with requirements will be eliminated by sub-standard ships due to less competition.

Sub-standard ships are essentially danger to the maritime safety and marine environment. These are main reasons why sub-standard ships shall be eliminated and the Port State Control is necessary. But it should be recalled that the Port State Control is the second defense line and responsibilities concerning compliance with applicable and relevant requirements should be owned by Flag States, first.

3. The Brief History of Japanese Port State Control

Originally, Japanese relevant laws had provisions for PSC in accordance with International Conventions. e.g. SOLAS. However, up to 1980's, few port inspections of foreign ships were only carried out in Japan. Reasons why Japan did not carried out port inspections was supposed that, up to early 1980's, a lot of ships were registered at Japan and sub-standard foreign ships were rarely found.

In 1982, the memorandum of understandings on Port State Control in European region, called as "Paris MOU", was established. On the other hand, SOLAS Protocol 78 was entered into force in 1981, MARPOL73/78 was entered into force in 1983 and STCW78 was entered into force in 1984. Those three instruments were mainly developed according to casualties of oil tankers causing serious marine pollution, e.g. "TORRY CANION", "AMOCO CADIZ", etc. Taking into account of such situations, Japanese Government, Ministry of Transport recognized the importance and necessity of port inspections of foreign and it instructed their officers to carry out port inspections vigorously, in early 1980's.

At the starting time, our officers were not so familiar with port inspections, therefore, inspections were mainly carried out for ships' and ship officers' Certificates, and inspections of equipment and hull structure were not carried out so strictly. But it was enough in 1980's because sub-standard foreign ships did not call Japanese ports so much.

Up to present, SOLAS74 including Protocol 1978 and 1988, MARPOL73/78 and STCW78 have been principal instruments still. However, despite of the development of those Conventions, casualties particularly casualties with serious marine pollution or huge loss of lives, have continuously occurred, therefore requirements of those Conventions have been improved and enhanced. Japan has endeavoured to catch up such improvement and enhancement as not only the Flag State but only Port State.

In 1980's to 1990's, while such improvement and enhancement were implemented, the globalization of the world economy were promoted. For example, the economy of Asian countries significantly grew in those decade and such promotion brought a great change into the world shipping industry. From late 1980's, a lot of ships have been flagged out and some countries have started the business of "Flag State". Before the change, open registry country e.g. Liberia and Panama were not many, but a lot of countries have newly joined to this business. It should be recalled that performances of all open registry countries are not bad. But it is certain that some open registry countries do not have adequate ability to control ships registered at themselves. Subsequently, from early 1990's, visits to Japanese ports by sub-standard foreign ships have increased. Accordingly, Japanese port inspections have been enhanced.

In January 1997, a Russian oil tanker named "Nakhodka" broke into two parts at the offshore of Oki Islands during the voyage to Vladivostok. A huge amount of heavy oil spilled out. The fore part drifted and was grounded at the coast of Fukui prefecture. Consequently, it was supposed that approximately 6,000 tons of heavy oil spilled out and Japanese coasts, particularly coasts of Fukui prefecture, were seriously contaminated by oil. Furthermore, the aft part was sunk into the seabed of the depth of approximately 2,000 meters with approximately 10,000 tons of heavy oil and such heavy oil still spill off from the sunken aft part little by little even the present. Persons concerned with are monitoring the sunken part, continuously. The total lost was more than 300 million dollars and this amount easily exceeded the limitation of the recovery made by IOPC fund.

According to the investigation of this casualty carried out by the Japanese Investigation Committee, causes of the casualty were estimated as follows:

- .1 The M/V Nakhodka should have sufficient strength against wave force at the accident, if her condition had been kept with proper maintenance. However, because of extreme wastage of structural members, the ultimate hull strength had been considerably reduced. Consequently, the load acting on the hull should exceeded the ultimate hull strength, and as a result the ship broke up.; and
- .2 It should be added that one of the severest sea condition in the sea of Japan and non-standard loading condition were the additional factors which had contributed to the increase of the load acting on the hull.

Nakhodka had not visited any Japanese ports never, but Japanese people were aware that a lot of sub-standard ships had been operated with serious dangerous around Japan. Japanese people, particularly politicians, strongly stressed that;

1. the requirements for oil tankers should be enhanced;
2. the procedure of port inspections should be improved further;
3. Japanese port inspection activities should be significantly improved; and
4. the international cooperation on Port State Control should be enhanced within Asia-Pacific region.

The matters of No.1 and No.2 has been dealt within IMO mainly and certain outputs have been already made. With regard to the matters of No.3, the system of Port State Control Officers, who carry out port inspections exclusively, was established, in April 1997. The matter of No.4 has been also implemented by several measures, such as the enhancement of relationships within and activities of Tokyo MOU, the cooperation with Paris and other MOUs through Tokyo MOU and so on.

Up to April 1997, port inspections were carried out by Ship Inspectors and Ship Labour Inspectors. However, both Ship Inspectors and Ship Labour Inspectors are originally officers for Flag State Control affairs. Ship Inspectors survey Japanese ships and equipment provided on board of Japanese ships, and Ship Labour Inspectors monitor labour standards, working condition etc. of Japanese ships. Therefore, they shall give the first priority to inspections or monitoring of Japanese ships. Port inspections are the second task for them and they have sometimes failed to carry out port inspections of ships to be inspected, particularly sub-standard ships, due to their original tasks. This is a main reason of the establishment of new exclusive system of Port State Control Officers. There was one more reason of the establishment of such new system that the implementation of the 1994 amendments to SOLAS. The amendments including the new regulation for port inspections of operational requirements.

Originally, the system of exclusive Port State Control Officers started with 46 PSCOs located at 13 stations. Ministry of Transport has continuously enhanced this new system, subsequently there are 64 exclusive PSCOs at 23 stations, at present. This means that nearly a half of Japanese major ports are covered by those exclusive PSCOs.

By the way, there are about 40 stations without exclusive PSCOs. At those stations, port inspections are still carried out by Ship Inspectors and Ship Labour Inspectors as well as before the establishment of exclusive PSCOs.

4. The system of PSC in Japan

4.1 Headquarters of Ministry of Transport

Maritime Technology and Safety Bureau is in charge of all Port State Control matters and several Divisions concern with matters as follows:

1. Director for Port State Control Affairs

This Director belongs to General Affairs Division and an exclusive Director for port inspections. This Director is in charge of:

- a) communication with other Governmental bodies in Japan;
- b) communication with foreign Governments;
- c) communication with International Organizations; and
- d) coordination of port inspections carried out in Japan.

2. Safety Standard Division

This Division is in charge of the development international and domestic

regulations mainly, and also in charge of planning and investigation of port inspections relating to ships' structure and equipment.

3. Inspection and Measurement Division

This Division is in charge of the type approval, control of recognized organizations, carriage of dangerous goods and measurement of gross tonnage, mainly, and also in charge of the management of Port State Control system relating to ships' structure and equipment.

4. Ship Inspectors

There are five Ship Inspectors at the Headquarters including one Ship Inspector-General and they are in charge of implementation of surveys for Japanese ships mainly, but they are in charge of the development of standard procedures for port inspections relating to ships' structure and equipment.

5. Labour Standard Division

This Division belongs to Department of Seafarers of the Bureau and this Division is in charge of labour standards in Japanese ships. Also this Division is in charge of port inspections relating to watchkeeping and operational requirements.

6. Ship Officers Division

This Division also belongs to Department of Seafarers and this Division is in charge of ship officers' certification mainly and in charge of port inspections relating to STCW Convention.

It should be noted that there are only two exclusive officers for Port State Control affairs in the Headquarters. Other officers are not exclusive and they originally have their tasks and duties heavily.

4.2 District Transport Bureau

There are ten District Transport Bureau through out Japan and all port inspections are carried out by those local offices actually. Every District Bureaus have two or more Maritime Branch Offices in their control area.

Every District Bureau have three to six exclusive PSCOs of which one or two PSCOs are appointed as Senior Port State Control Officer. Senior PSC Officers manage port inspections carried out by not only District Transport Bureaus themselves but also Maritime Branch Offices which belong the Bureau. In general, exclusive PSCOs belong to Director-General of Bureaus directly. Names and locations of District Transport Bureaus are shown in below:

Hokkaido (Otaru), Touhoku (Sendai), Niigata, Kanto (Yokohama), Chubu (Nagoya), Kinki (Osaka), Kobe*, Chugoku (Hiroshima), Shikoku (Takamatsu), Kyushu (Moji)

*: Kobe is "Kobe District Maritime Bureau"

4.3 Maritime Branch Offices

Total number of Maritime Branch Offices is 53 and they belong to District Transport

Bureaus individually. At present, 13 Maritime Branch Offices have two exclusive PSCOs. Port inspections are carried out exclusive PSCOs or the unit made by Ship Inspector and Ship Labour Inspector in the case that the Maritime Branch Office has no exclusive PSCO. Names of Maritime Branch Offices which have exclusive PSCOs are show in below. Names of controlling District Transport Bureaus are also shown in brackets.

Wakkanai, Tomakomai and Kushiro (Hokkaido), Kashima, Chiba and Tokyo (Kanto), Shimizu and Fushiki (Chubu), Wakayama (Kinki), Mizushima and Tokuyama (Chugoku), Fukuoka and Oita (Kyushu)

4.4 Note

Japanese Government is going to reconstruct its whole governmental bodies in January 2001. Ministry of Transport will be also combined with Ministry of Construction, Agency of Land and Agency of Hokkaido Development into Ministry of Land and Transport. In this context, some changes will be occurred on the present system, but no dramatic change may be occurred.

5. Annual Report of Port State Control of Japan in 1999

Following tables show some statistic of Port State Control carried out in Japan during 1999. It should be noted that those statistic are made by us individually from Tokyo MOU, therefore some figures do not harmonize with Tokyo MOU's ones. For example, inspection data of fishing vessels are not incorporated into Tokyo MOU's statistic but they are incorporated into Japanese statistic shown in below.

5.1 Flag State

Flag State	Number of inspections	Number of ships with deficiencies	Ratio (%)	Number of detentions	Ratio (%)
Antigua and Barbuda	16	3	18.8	2	12.5
Bahamas	69	41	59.4	2	2.9
Belize	122	116	95.1	60	49.2
Cambodia	117	107	91.4	60	51.3
China	156	125	80.1	17	10.9
Cyprus	96	65	67.7	4	4.2
Denmark	16	4	25.0	0	0.0
Germany	10	6	60.0	1	10.0
Greece	22	6	27.3	1	4.5
Honduras	44	42	95.4	17	38.6
Hong Kong, China	42	18	42.9	0	0.0
India	14	6	43.0	1	7.1
Indonesia	21	19	90.5	2	9.5
Korea, Republic of	164	115	70.1	15	9.1
Liberia	145	66	45.5	0	0.0
Malaysia	32	22	68.8	1	3.1
Malta	35	22	62.9	5	14.3
Myanmar (Burma)	18	7	38.9	1	5.6

Netherlands	14	7	50.0	1	7.1
North Korea	18	18	100.0	10	55.6
Norway	51	25	49.0	0	0.0
Panama	1,598	930	58.2	74	4.6
Philippine	169	88	52.1	6	3.6
Russia	337	295	87.5	78	23.1
St. Vincent & Granada	60	51	85.0	17	28.3
Singapore	121	70	57.9	5	4.1
Taiwan, China	35	19	54.2	3	8.6
Flags States of which inspection numbers are 10 or less	77	56	72.7	5	6.5
Total / Average	3,663	2,349	64.1	388	10.6

5.2 Ship type

Ship Type	Number of inspections	Share (%)	Number of detentions	Ratio (%)
Passenger ships	2	0.1	1	50.0
Oil tankers	58	1.6	0	0.0
Chemical tankers	61	1.7	3	4.9
Gas carriers	32	0.9	1	3.1
Bulk carriers	824	22.5	18	2.2
Cement carriers	12	0.3	0	0.0
Container ships	401	10.9	15	3.7
General cargo ships	1,685	46.0	281	16.7
Refrigerated carriers	225	6.1	29	12.9
RO-RO cargo ships	80	2.2	3	3.8
Vehicle carriers (PCC)	177	4.8	5	2.8
Dredger, Cable layer, etc.	13	0.4	1	7.7
Research ships, etc.	25	0.7	0	0.0
Fishing vessels *	68	1.9	31	45.6
Total / Average	3,663	100.0	388	10.6

*: "Fishing vessels" mean ships registered as fishing vessels in relevant Certificates.

5.3 Ship size

Ship size	Number of inspections	Share (%)	Number of detentions	Ratio (%)
less than 1,000 GT	371	10.1	153	41.2
1,000 GT and more but less than 5,000 GT	1,065	29.1	168	15.8
5,000 GT and more but less than 10,000 GT	680	18.6	34	5.0
10,000 GT and more but less than 20,000 GT	705	19.2	25	3.5
20,000 GT and more	839	22.9	8	1.0
unknown	3	0.1	0	0.0
Total / Average	3,663	100.0	388	10.6

5.4 Ships' age

Ships' age*	Number of inspections	Share (%)	Number of detentions	Ratio (%)
less than 10 years	1,569	42.8	45	2.9
10 years and more but less than 15 years	793	21.6	71	9.0
15 years and more but less than 20 years	677	18.5	123	18.1
20 years and more but less than 25 years	391	10.7	94	24.0
25 years and more	229	6.3	55	24.0
unknown	4	0.1	0	0.0
Total / Average	3,663	100.0	388	10.6

*: Ships' ages are generally calculated by IMO Number, therefore little incorrectness may be possibly included.

5.5 Duration of detentions

Duration of detentions	Number of Detentions	Share (%)
less than one day*	240	61.9
2 days and more but less than 8 days	121	31.2
8 days and more	24	6.2
other**	3	0.8
Total	388	100.0

*: "less than one day" means that the ship was released from the detention on the date of the detention or the one day after.

** : Ships categorized as others have escaped from the detention illegally.

References:

1. The average of the duration of detentions in 1999 was approximately 2.7 days.
2. The longest detention in 1999 was 43 days.

5.6 Detainable deficiencies

In 1999, 388 detained ships totally had 1,469 deficiencies, which were grounds of detentions.

Category of deficiency	Number of detainable deficiencies	Share (%)
Ships' Certificates	42	2.9
Crews' Certificates	4	0.3
Accommodations	1	0.1
Working conditions	1	0.1
Life-saving appliances	349	23.8
Fire fighting equipment	120	8.2
Safety general	149	10.1
Alarm system	2	0.1
Stowage of cargoes	32	2.2
Load Lines	159	10.8
Mooring arrangements	28	1.9
Machinery	27	1.8
Navigational equipment	344	23.4
Radio installations	98	6.3
Marine pollution prevention equipment	93	5.4
Operational requirements	5	0.3
ISM Code	15	1.0
Total	1,469	100.0

Note: Deficiencies on hull structure were generally categorized in "Safety General". Deficiencies on charts and nautical publications were categorized in "Navigational Equipment".

6. The Policy and Strategy on Port State Control of Japan

6.1 The purpose of Port State Control

It is unnecessary to say that the purpose of Port State Control is to eliminate sub-standard ships. It is also very clear that a sub-standard ship means a ship which does not comply with relevant and applicable international requirements.

However, we consider that ships not complying with those requirements are not necessarily sub-standard ships. We consider that actual sub-standard ships are both or either:

1. ships having serious deficiencies which give unreasonable threats to maritime safety, particularly the safety of other ships, ports and marine routes, and marine environment; or
2. ships' equipment required by relevant and applicable requirements of Conventions unable to perform necessary functions required by those requirements at all.

Ships having a deficiency mentioned in above may be detained. The detention criteria prescribed in IMO Resolution A.787(19) as amended is also referred.

6.2 Ships to be inspected

Now, a computerized inspection data exchanging system on port inspections is completely operated within Asia-Pacific region. Japanese PSCOs collect information about ships in the port from Port Authorities, Customs, etc. and they always select ships to be inspected using both those information and the inspection data exchanging system, before they visit at ships.

In the selection of ships to be inspected, taking into account of the statistic on port inspections carried out in Japan, PSCOs usually give higher priorities to the ship:

1. of which Flag State shows a high detention ratio extremely;
2. of which last inspection record includes any detainable deficiency or, 10 or more minor deficiencies;
3. of which classification society is not major one, e.g. IACS member societies;
4. of the passenger ship, oil tanker, chemical tanker, gas carrier or bulk carrier;
5. of which gross tons are less than 2,000 tons, particularly general cargo ships and refrigerated carriers; and
6. of age of 20 years and more.

We have paid a particular attention to small general cargo ships and small refrigerated carriers because their results are extremely bad and activities of ports and/or marine routes are seriously damaged if such ship causes a casualty. Furthermore, although those ships are small, a certain marine pollution may be occurred subsequently in the case of the casualty.

PSCOs have sometimes received notifications on sub-standard ships from Maritime Safety Agency, pilots, Port Authorities and so on. PSCOs may give the highest priority to the ship notified.

PSCOs generally avoid to inspect the ship which has been already inspected by member Authorities of Tokyo MOU within the proper period if the ship is seemed in a good condition having regard to the last inspection data provided by the data exchanging system.

6.3 Detention and release

Ships having a deficiency mentioned in paragraph 6.1.1 and/or 6.1.2, may be detained. In the case of the deficiency having the nature mentioned in paragraph 6.1.1, the ship may be strictly detained unless the deficiency will be rectified or an appropriate temporary measure with which PSCOs may be satisfied, will be taken in order to remove an unreasonable threat to the maritime safety and marine environment.

With regard to the deficiency mentioned in paragraph 6.1.2, it is also principle that all detainable deficiencies shall be rectified before departure. However, it is sometimes unrealistic or impracticable for some ships to rectify detainable deficiencies in Japan. There are some reasons and the first reason is the cost of repair. There is a vast deference on the cost of repair between in Japan and in neighbour countries, e.g. Republic of Korea and China. The cost of repair in Japan may be very expensive in comparison with those countries. Furthermore, distances between Japanese ports and ports of neighbour countries are not so long, sometimes shorter than the distance between the port of inspection and repair yard in Japan. We can point out other reasons that it may be sometimes impossible to get a equipment duly approved by the Administration and so on.

Therefore, Japanese PSCOs may allow a detained ship to proceed to the port of repair yard provided that the shipowner or ship operator submits a clear evidence which is enough to certify that all remained detainable deficiencies will be surely rectified at next calling port. The PSCOs will also require to submit a full report with a certain evidence, e.g. a survey report of the classification society, photographs, etc. by the date appointed by the PSCOs. The headquarters will discuss about the proceeding with the Flag State Administration if necessary.

The detained ship, which has been allowed to proceed to the port of repair yard, has been continuously monitored until the shipowner or ship operator submits a rectification report and it is confirmed by the PSCOs that necessary actions have been adequately taken. If such ship enters into any Japanese ports again, the ship will be necessarily inspected and it will be strictly detained if proper rectification is not implemented. In this case, the ship will be only allowed to proceed to Japanese repair yard.

6.4 Qualification and trainings of PSCOs

Japanese PSCOs can be generally divided into two categories. One is the PSCO having deep experience of Ship Inspector. The other is the PSCO having deep experience of Ship Labour Inspectors. Ship Inspectors well understand requirements for hull structure, machinery, equipment and installations as Flag State surveyors and their knowledge is very useful for port inspections, particularly inspections relating to

SOLAS, MARPOL, LL Convention and so on. Ship Labour Inspectors are very familiar with requirements for the working condition, certification of ship officers, watchkeeping and safe practice, and their knowledge is also very effective for port inspections, particularly inspections relating to operational requirements and STCW Convention.

However, it is desirable that the PSCO can inspect all aspects. In this context, we have implemented some training courses in order to improve abilities of PSCOs as follows:

1. Any exclusive PSCO should attend to a week training course in the class room atleast one time. This course have been held once in a year;
 - .2 A several trainings are held at District Transport Bureau gathering PSCOs who belong to the Bureau. On the job trainings, which mean simulations of on board actual inspections and subsequent discussions, are mainly carried out in this training. Five or six trainings are held in a year at different District Bureau; and
 - .3 A several exclusive PSCOs attend the two weeks training course for Ship Inspectors to get the qualification of auditors of ISM Code.

Furthermore, in order to improve English ability, all PSCOs learn at English language school by the national budget.

6.5 The enhancement of Port State Control system

At present, 64 exclusive PSCOs are located at 23 local offices and nearly a half of major ports in Japan are already covered by them. Ministry of Transport is still planning to increase the number of exclusive PSCOs and the number of ports covered by them. At this stage, we do not have so fixed target, but we consider that at least all major ports are covered by exclusive PSCOs. Also we must consider the location of PSCOs taking into account of the number of visits of foreign ships of each port, the character of each port, and so on.

The eighth session of the PSC Committee of Tokyo MOU adopted an amendment to MOU that a regional annual inspection target rate should be increased to 75% from 50%. This target should be achieved in not so far future. Now, we are examining how much annual inspection rate is desirable and necessary in Japan in order to achieve the regional target for whole member Authorities. Our intermediate strategy on Port State Control will be developed based on such examination and so on.

6.6 International cooperation

Since ships are operated internationally, it is not effective for Port States to carry out port inspections individually. The international cooperation on Port State Control is an important key point, in particular:

- .1 exchanging inspection data each other;
- .2 harmonization on procedures for inspections; and
- .3 training of PSCOs.

In Asian-Pacific region, Memorandum of Understandings for Port State Control in Asia-Pacific region, called as "Tokyo MOU", was developed in 1993 and Tokyo MOU Secretariat was established in 1994 in accordance with the MOU.

Taking into account of the necessity and importance of the international regional cooperation, Japan has vigorously contributed to activities of Tokyo MOU. Especially, Japan has provided a huge assists for technical cooperation programme, such as:

- .1 Basic Training Courses (BTCs) were held from 1995 and approximately 220 PSCOs from many members and observers were participated. This course was a training course for PSCOs not having deep experiences of port inspections and up to present, nine courses were held; and
- .2 Expert missions were implemented from 1997. Australia, Canada and Japan have sent nine expert missions to China, Fiji, Indonesia, Republic of Korea, Thailand and Vietnam.

With regard to BTCs, the original target established by the PSC Committee that 220 PSCOs should be participated to courses has been achieved in last year. The PSC Committee settled the new intermediate target that:

- .1 the present BTC should be continuously held to give lectures to PSCOs newly appointed, but the scale of BTC could be reduced, such as for 10 PSCOs in a year; and
- .2 the fellowship training course, which is a course for PSCOs having a little experience on port inspections and is mainly conducted by on board inspection trainings, should be established and started from 2000.

We consider that the improvement of abilities of PSCOs is a key element to promote the harmonization on port inspections within this region. Therefore, Japan will continuously and positively contributed to training programmes.

Furthermore, we of course believe that other activities of Tokyo MOU are also very important. For example, in last year, the concentrated inspection campaign on GMDSS requirements was conducted by Tokyo MOU member Authorities and Japan was appointed as a coordinator of this campaign. Such campaign is very useful and effective because all members use a same inspection guidelines and check list, subsequently, the statistic and analysis can be made very easily and correctly.

In this context, Japan vigorously participates to activities, discussions etc. within Tokyo MOU to enhance port inspections carried out in this region in order to eliminate sub-standard ships. Japan also provide necessary assistance for the Secretariat continuously to enhance its functions further.

7. Conclusion

It should be recalled that Port State Control is the second defense line to ensure the maritime safety and to prevent marine pollution. If all Flag States implement their responsibilities well, any port inspection may be unnecessary. Also, if all ship operators and/or shippers avoid to use sub-standard ships by themselves, sub-standard ships may be naturally eliminated. Both regulatory of the Administration and self-regulatory of industries are substantial to eliminate sub-standard ships.

In this context, it is expected that:

- .1 the performance of Flag States would be improved by appropriate measures which would be discussed and taken by IMO mainly; and
- .2 shipping industry would pay a particular attention to outputs of port inspections, particularly the monthly detention list, and would avoid to use or select sub-standard ships anymore.

The further enhancement of port inspections is also required, until the above action will be implemented adequately.

Finally, I would like to express my deep appreciation for Dr. Jung-Joy JOH, ex-Minister of Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, and other persons involving this important symposium, such as authorities of Korean Society of Marine Environment and Safety, and Korea Maritime University.