

CCS 技术通告

Technical Information

(2013 年) 技术通告第 10 号总第 44 号
2013 年 3 月 29 日 (共 1+5 页)

发：本社总部有关处室，本社验船师、审核员，船东和管理公司

巴黎备忘录发布集中大检查初步结果的通告

各有关船公司：

巴黎备忘录近期发布了通告，介绍了巴黎备忘录 2012 年 9 月 1 日至 2012 年 11 月 30 日开展集中大检查的相关情况。通告指出，103 艘船舶在 3 个月内直接因为集中大检查中有涉及消防安全方面的缺陷被滞留。同时，船舶的消防安全仍需严重关注。在此期间，我社共有 47 艘船舶被检查，没有船舶因为集中大检查滞留。

详见本通告附件。

请船公司予以关注并采取必要措施。

本通告在本社网站 (www.ccs.org.cn) 上发布，并由各分社转发所辖区域内的有关船公司。

特此通告！

中国船级社营运入级处

本通知在实施过程中如有任何疑问，请与总部：*营运入级处* 联系。

电话/Tel: (010) 58112809 传真/Fax: (010) 58112807 E-mail 地址: cd@ccs.org.cn

2013年2月26日

船舶的消防安全仍然严重关注

近期发生的多起事故表明，船舶的火灾具有潜在的破坏性并可以严重影响船舶安全。从2012年9月1日至2012年11月30日在巴黎备忘录区域开展的关于消防安全的集中大检查的初步结果显示：

103艘船舶在3个月内直接因为集中大检查中有涉及消防安全方面的缺陷被滞留。在2012年9月1日至2012年11月30日期间，所有滞留船舶中64%是因为消防安全的相关问题滞留。问题包括消防泵及其管系、消防设备及防火控制图。

在历年来的检查中，消防安全一直处在高发缺陷的前五位。这有足够的理由让巴黎备忘录通过一次集中大检查以对此类问题重点关注。“此次集中大检查的结果显示，消防安全显然不是每艘船舶严重关注的内容，这本身就需要引起重点关注了”，巴黎备忘录港口国检查秘书长Richard Schiferli说。

巴黎备忘录在通过对3985艘次船舶的4014次检查中完成了本次集中大检查的问卷调查表。共有1958项与集中大检查有关的缺陷，103艘船舶（2.6%）直接因为集中大检查的结果被滞留。在集中大检查期间，64%的滞留船舶与集中大检查有关。

在大检查期间，检查最多的船型为普通干货/多用途船，共有1347次检查（34%）；其次为散货船，有766次检查（19%）；集装箱船有422次检查（11%），化学品船有343次检查（9%），油轮有308次检查（8%）。

滞留船舶中59艘（57%）为普通干货/多用途船，14艘（14%）为散货船。其他

滞留船舶为 9 艘集装箱船，4 艘近海供应船和 4 艘滚装船。51%的滞留船舶为船龄 25 年或以上船舶。

对缺陷的分析表明大部分缺陷与消防泵及其管系（13%）、消防设备（11%）及防火控制图（9%）有关。

大部分被检查的船舶为巴拿马旗 445 艘次（11%）、利比里亚旗 308 艘次（8%）、马耳他旗 306 艘次（8%）及安提瓜和巴布达旗 282 艘次（7%）。与集中大检查有关的船旗滞留率最高的是多米尼加 28.6%（7 艘次检查中有 2 艘与集中大检查有关的滞留），塞拉利昂 21.2%（33 艘次检查中有 7 艘与集中大检查有关的滞留）及多哥 18.2%（22 艘次检查中有 4 艘与集中大检查有关的滞留）。

此次集中大检查的背景是，过去8年中，与消防安全相关的缺陷占据了巴黎和东京备忘录缺陷总数的14%。此次集中大检查是巴黎备忘录与东京备忘录联合进行的大检查。其它备忘录在大检查期间也随之跟进。

巴黎备忘录对本次大检查更详细的结果将会做进一步分析，结论将在2013年5月提交至港口国监督委员会第46次会议，并随后提交给国际海事组织。

26 February 2013

Fire safety on board ships still serious concern

Recent events have demonstrated that a fire on board a ship can be potentially devastating and can seriously affect the safety of those on board. Preliminary results from the Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on Fire Safety Systems, carried out between 1 September 2012 and 30 November 2012 in the Paris MoU region show that:

103 ships were detained over the 3 month period as a direct result of the CIC for deficiencies related to Fire Safety Systems. 64% of all ships detained in the three month period were detained for fire safety related issues. Problem areas included fire pumps and its pipes, fire fighting equipment and appliances, and the fire control plan.

Fire safety has been in the top 5 of most frequently encountered categories of deficiencies during inspections for years. Reason enough for the Paris MoU to concentrate attention to this area during a CIC. "The outcome of the CIC shows that fire safety is clearly not top priority on every ship and that is a serious concern", says Richard Schiferli, Secretary General of the Paris MoU on PSC.

The CIC questionnaire was completed during 4,014 inspections on 3,985 individual ships. A total of 1,958 CIC-related deficiencies were recorded and 103 ships (2,6%) were detained as a direct result of the CIC. 64% of the detentions during the CIC-period were CIC-topic related.

During the campaign most inspections concerned general cargo/multi-purpose ships with 1,347 (34%) inspections, followed by bulk carriers with 766 (19%) inspections, container ships with 422 (11%) inspections, chemical tankers with 343 (9%) inspections and oil tankers with 308 (8%) inspections.

59 (57%) of the detained ships were general cargo/multipurpose ships and 14 (14%) were bulk carriers. Among the other detained ships were 9 container ships, 4 offshore supply ships and 4 Ro-Ro cargo ships. 51% of the detained ships were 25 years or older.

Analysis of the recorded deficiencies shows that most deficiencies relate to fire pumps and its pipes (13%), fire fighting equipment and appliances (11%), and the fire control plan (9%).

Most inspections were carried out on ships under the flags of Panama with 445 (11%) inspections, Liberia with 308 (8%) inspections, Malta with 306 (8%) inspections and Antigua and Barbuda with 282 (7%) inspections. The flags with the highest CIC-topic related detention rate were Dominica with 28,6% (2 CIC-topic related detentions during 7 inspections), Sierra Leone with 21,2% (7 CIC-topic related detentions during 33 inspections) and Togo with 18,2% (4 CIC-topic related detentions during 22 inspections).

The background for this CIC was that, as an average for the last 8 years, deficiencies related to fire safety systems account for 14% of the total number of deficiencies within the Paris and Tokyo MoU. The CIC was a joint campaign with the Tokyo MoU. Other MOU's have followed the same routine during the campaign.

The detailed results of the campaign will be further analysed and findings will be presented to the 46th meeting of the Port State Control Committee in May 2013, after which the report will be submitted to the International Maritime Organization.

Contact

Mr. Richard W.J. Schiferli
Secretary General Paris MoU
on Port State Control
PO Box 90653
2509 LR The Hague
The Netherlands
Tel: +31 (0)70 456 1509
Fax: +31 (0)70 456 1599
E-mail: Richard.Schiferli@parismou.org
Web-site: www.parismou.org

Notes to editors:

Regional Port State Control was initiated in 1982 when fourteen European countries agreed to coordinate their port State inspection effort under a voluntary agreement known as the Paris Memorandum of Understanding on Port State Control (Paris MOU). Currently 27 countries are member of the Paris MOU. The European Commission, although not a signatory to the Paris MOU, is also a member of the Committee.

The Paris MoU is supported by a central database THETIS hosted and operated by the European Maritime Safety Agency in Lisbon. Inspection results are available for search and daily updating by MoU Members. Inspection results can be consulted on the Paris MoU public website and are published on the Equasis public website.

The Secretariat of the MoU is provided by the Netherlands Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment and located in The Hague.

Port State Control is a check on visiting foreign ships to verify their compliance with international rules on safety, pollution prevention and seafarers living and working conditions. It is a means of enforcing compliance in cases where the owner and flag State have failed in their responsibility to implement or ensure compliance. The port State can require defects to be put right, and detain the ship for this purpose if necessary. It is therefore also a port State's defence against visiting substandard shipping.