



## **VOLUNTARY IMO MEMBER STATE AUDIT SCHEME**

Luxembourg Audit  
From 8 till 15 September 2008

### **FINAL REPORT**

#### **1. Executive summary**

**1.1** An audit of the maritime administration of Luxembourg was undertaken between 8 and 15 September 2008 by three auditors drawn from Canada, Belgium and France. The scope of the audit included the flag State obligations of Luxembourg in relation to the mandatory IMO instruments to which it has acceded. Visits were made by the auditors to the responsible entity within the Luxembourg administration, the Commissariat aux affaires maritimes. The audit was conducted through presentations, interviews and the examination of documents.

**1.2** The auditors concluded from the information available to them that Luxembourg substantially meets its obligations in respect of the mandatory IMO instruments to which it is a Party and also the Code for the implementation of mandatory IMO instruments. The audit identified a number of areas of good practice and also identified areas where improvement was possible. The latter however were relatively minor in relation to the overall efficiency of the administration.

**1.3** The following report provides detail of the findings and the evidence on which these are based is to be found in the appendices to the report.

#### **2. Areas of positive development**

Areas of positive development include:

- A well-run certified quality system which encompasses the entire Administration.
- The Administration has a software program to deal with international legal text, which is helpful for meeting the requirements of the various mandatory reports and will enable the State to fulfill its reporting obligations.
- The network of inspectors constitutes the first step towards achieving a ship inspection system designed to monitor recognized organizations.

#### **3. Areas for further development**

Areas for further development include:

- Training of staff responsible for surveys should be formalized.
- There is no requirement for the Administration to be informed of changes likely to occur in the network of inspectors, although the Administration is aware of inspectors' names at the outset. This leads to problems in carrying out follow-up staff training required under the Code.
- The issue still to be resolved by the Administration is whether the arrangements in place to meet the requirements of resolution A. 739(18), which stipulates that flag States must make provision for additional inspections by the Administration to monitor the activities of recognized organizations, are adequate. The Administration has the potential of carrying out inspections to monitor ships, network of inspectors and ROs. However, to ensure that the arrangement is effective, it should deploy its own staff or train a small team.