REPORT OF
CIC on SHIP STABILITY

September 1, 2025 – November 30, 2025

Section 1
Introduction

1.1 Executive Summary

From September 1, 2025 to November 30, 2025, the Caribbean MOU carried out a Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on **Ship Stability** throughout the region. This campaign involved 12 Member States of the Caribbean MOU.

This report documents the results of the campaign and was prepared by the CMOU Secretariat in conjunction with the Technical Standing Working Group of the CMOU.

During the course of the campaign, 111 port State control inspections on individual vessels were carried out. Of these PSC inspections, 62 vessels were inspected for the CIC. There were no detentions reported as a direct result of this campaign. This CIC inspection was conducted only once on board each individual vessel during the campaign period.

1.2 Purpose of the report

The report documents the results of the CIC on Ship Stability and outlines an analysis of the results of this CIC.

1.3 Objective of the CIC

The CIC was designed get a detailed insight of the compliance with the requirements of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), 1974, as amended with specific emphasis on SOLAS Chapter II-1 – Construction: Structure, Subdivision and Stability, Machinery and Electrical Installations by:

- confirming that the ship staff are assessing the actual stability condition on completion of cargo operations before departure of the ship and on all stages of the voyage;
- creating awareness among ship staff and ship owners about the importance of calculating the actual stability condition of the ship on completion of cargo operations and before departure of the ship;
- verifying that the ship complies with intact stability requirements (and damage stability requirements, if applicable) under the relevant IMO instruments.

1.4 Scope of the CIC

The Concentrated Inspection Campaign (CIC) on Ship Stability focused on verifying compliance with the stability-related requirements of SOLAS Chapter II-1 and the International Code on Intact Stability, 2008 (IS Code), ensuring that ships are designed, equipped, and operated in a manner

that maintains adequate stability at all times. The scope included verification that approved stability information and booklets are onboard, ship-specific, up to date, and endorsed by the flag Administration; confirmation that the ship's loading conditions, draughts, and tank soundings are consistent with approved stability criteria; and checks that stability instruments or software, where required, are approved, operational, and correctly used by the crew. Inspections would assess operational practices affecting stability, such as cargo loading and securing, ballast and bilge arrangements, watertight integrity (doors, hatches, air pipes, and closing appliances), and compliance with damage stability and subdivision requirements where applicable. The CIC also examined crew knowledge and training, including the ability of officers to demonstrate use of stability information and respond to abnormal or emergency conditions, while paying particular attention to recurring deficiencies such as missing or outdated stability data, inoperative watertight closures, or poor cargo and ballast management that could compromise the ship's stability. The campaign was designed to examine a specific area and not intended to detract from the normal coverage of port State control inspections. As such, the CIC was conducted in conjunction with the regular port State control targeting and inspection activities as outlined by the Caribbean MOU.

1.5 Applicability of CIC

The 2025 CIC applied to all SOLAS-certified ships engaged on international voyages, including cargo ships of 500 GT and above and passenger ships of any size, where stability documentation and operational controls are mandatory.

1.6 General remarks

For the purpose of this report:

.1 a detention is an inspection containing one or more detainable deficiencies;

.2 a CIC-related detention is an inspection containing one or more detainable deficiencies related to the CIC;

.3 the tables do not take into account inspections where the CIC questionnaire was not recorded; and

.4 only one CIC inspection was conducted on board each individual vessel during the campaign period.

Section 2
Summary analysis, conclusions and recommendations

2.1 Summary analysis

During the period from September 1, 2025 to November 30, 2025, a total of 111 Inspections were carried out within the CMOU. Of this 62 underwent the CIC on **Ship Stability** was positive to see that there were a limited number of deficiencies identified during this CIC.

2.2 Conclusions

During the CIC period, a total of 111 individual ships were inspected, of which 62 inspections (56%) were conducted using the CIC questionnaire, while 49 inspections (44%) were carried out without it. Only one detention was recorded overall, and this occurred during an inspection without a CIC questionnaire. Importantly, no detentions were related to CIC-topic deficiencies, resulting in a 0% CIC-related detention rate. This indicates that deficiencies identified under the CIC scope did not reach a severity warranting detention and suggests an overall acceptable level of compliance with the campaign's focus area.

Analysis of the questionnaire responses (Table 2) shows a generally high compliance rate, with the majority of responses recorded as "Yes" across all six questions. The percentage of unsatisfactory outcomes per question ranged from 9.68% to 12.90%, with an overall average unsatisfactory rate of 10.48%. The highest level of unsatisfactory responses was observed for Q2 (12.90%), followed by Q6 (11.29%), indicating that these areas may present recurring weaknesses, potentially linked to operational practices, documentation, or crew familiarity rather

than structural or design-related shortcomings.

The consistent presence of blank responses (5–6 per question) suggests that, in some cases, certain items were not applicable to the ship inspected or could not be fully verified during the inspection, which is typical in CIC exercises covering a wide range of ship types and operational profiles. Overall, the results demonstrate that while minor or procedural deficiencies were identified with some regularity, ships generally met the essential requirements under the CIC scope, and the campaign functioned primarily as an awareness-raising and compliance-monitoring exercise, rather than revealing systemic or critical non-compliance.

2.3 Recommendations

Member States are encouraged to continue to be vigilant on the inspection of Ship Stability especially with respect to ship types with higher stability risk profiles, such as ro-ro passenger ships, ro-ro cargo ships, container ships, bulk carriers, and tankers, as well as special-purpose and offshore vessels where stability is closely linked to operational condition.

Section 3
CIC Questionnaire Results

3.1 Summary of results

The total number of ships inspected and the total number of inspections performed during the CIC are presented in Table 1 below. The number or ships and the number of inspections are different because some ships have occasion to be inspected more than once during a CIC.

Table 1

	# of ships inspected during CIC*	# of inspections performed with a CIC questionnaire**	# of inspections performed without a CIC questionnaire
Total	111	62	49
Total number of detentions	1	0	1
Detentions with CIC-topic deficiencies	0	0	

* Number of individual IMO numbers

Looking at the number of inspections performed with a CIC questionnaire (**Column 2 of Table 1), the percentage of detentions that were CIC-topic related amounts to:

0%

The responses to the CIC questionnaire are summarized in Table 2

Table 2

	Yes	No	N/A	Blank	Total inspections	% unsatisfactory of total inspections
Q1	56	0	0	6	62	9,68%
Q2	54	2	0	6	62	12,90%
Q3	56	0	0	6	62	9,68%

Q4	56	0	0	6	62	9,68%
Q5	50	1	6	5	62	9,68%
Q6	55	1	0	6	62	11,29%
					Average	**10,48%**

3.2 CIC Questions

Questions comprised in the CIC Questionnaire:

N°	Questions	Yes	No	N/A	Detention
1	Has the ship been provided with approved stability information which can be understood and easily used by the Master and the responsible officer?				
2	Is the data used in the stability check for departure, complete and correct?				
3	Does the ship comply with the stability criteria as applicable to the ship type?				
4	Is there evidence to show that the Master or responsible officer can determine the stability of the ship under varying conditions of service using the approved stability information provided on board?				
5	If the ship is provided with a Stability Instrument, is it approved by the Flag or RO?				
6	Does the ship have a stability booklet stamped and approved by Flag or RO?				

3.3 Inspections by Member States

The following outlines the CIC inspections carried out by the Member and Associate Member States of the CMOU.

Member State	Number of CIC Inspection
Antigua and Barbuda	1
Belize	1
Bermuda	4
Cayman Islands	5
Curaçao	11
France	9
Jamaica	12
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2

Suriname	1
The Netherlands	12
Trinidad and Tobago	4
Total	**62**

3.4 Inspections by Ship Type

Of the 62 CIC inspections that took place, Passenger ship had the highest number of inspections which was followed by Containership and Oil tanker. These three vessel types usually are the most prevalent vessel type trading within in the CMOU region.

Ship Type	Number of CIC Inspections
Bulk carrier	2
Chemical tanker	5
Containership	11
Gas carrier	1
General cargo/multi-purpose ship	5
Heavy load carrier	1
MODU & FPSO	1
Oil tanker	10
Other types of ship	3
Passenger ship	15
Refrigerated cargo carrier	1
Ro-ro cargo ship	4
Vehicle Carrier	3
Total	**62**

3.5 Inspections by RO

DNV AS and Lloyd's Register recorded the greater number of CIC inspections, followed by American Bureau of Shipping.

Recognised Organizations	Number of CIC Inspections
American Bureau of Shipping	8
Bureau Veritas	7
Det Norske Veritas	3
DNV AS	13
KOREAN REGISTER	4
Lloyd's Register	13
Nippon Kaiji Kyokai	5
No class	4
Overseas Marine Certification Service, Inc.	1
RINA Services S.p.A.	2
Unknown	2
Total	**62**

3.6 Number of Deficiencies per Category

Ship's Certificates and Documents recorded the greatest number of deficiencies from all the inspections during the CIC period

Category of Deficiency		Number of Deficiencies	Percent of Total Deficiencies
Ship's Certificates and Documents		31	16,23%
SOLAS	Stability, structure and related equipment	19	9,95%
	Propulsion and auxiliary machinery	13	6,81%
	Alarm signals	3	1,57%
	Fire safety measures	24	12,57%
	Lifesaving appliances	28	14,66%
	Radiocommunications	6	3,14%
	Safety of navigation	16	8,38%
	Operational deficiencies	3	1,57%
	ISM related deficiencies	1	0,52%
	ISPS related deficiencies	3	1,57%
	Other	2	1,05%
MARPOL	Annex I	5	0,00%
	Annex II	0	0,00%
	Annex III	0	0,00%
	Annex IV	1	0,00%
	Annex V	1	0,00%

	Annex VI	0	0,00%
	Operational deficiencies	0	0,00%
STCW	Certification and Watch keeping for seafarers	2	1,05%
Load Lines		13	6,81%
AFS Convention		0	0,00%
ILO		6	3,14%
Other		14	10,99%
TOTAL		**191**	

3.7 Number of Deficiencies per Sub-Category (only deficiencies occurred 3 times or more)

Electrical installations in general and Propulsion main engine recorded the greatest number deficiencies from all the inspections during the CIC period.

Code	Deficiency	Number
02108	Electrical installations in general	5
13101	Propulsion main engine	5
11117	Lifebuoys incl. provision and disposition	4
11118	Lifejackets incl.provision and disposition	4
11108	Inflatable liferafts	4
04103	Emergency lighting, batteries and switches	4
07105	Fire doors/openings in fire-resisting divisions	4
07108	Ready availability of fire fighting equipment	3
07103	Division - decks, bulkheads and penetrations	3
02199	Other (structural condition)	3
03106	Windows, sidescuttles and deadlights	3
11104	Rescue boats	3
11101	Lifeboats	3
10109	Lights, shapes, sound-signals	3
10127	Voyage or passage plan	3
13104	Bilge pumping arrangements	3

16105	Access control to ship	3
99102	Other (SOLAS operational)	3