



Company Findings Report

All finalized findings across two completed demonstration inspections for the same fictional company.

Filter	Pelagic Demo Fleet
Generated	30/Sep/2027
Inspections	2
Vessels	2
Findings	24

MV DEMO KESTREL FEN | SF-DEMO-103

Pelagic Demo Fleet | Demo Port South | 15/Sep/2027 | Sample Inspector C

Rule / full inspected question	Result	Finding description
2.5 Do all personnel maintain rest period/work hours and are the rest hours in compliance with STCW or MLC requirements? (V)	No	Fire and safety rounds were carried out by the off-duty officer after each watch for approximately 18-23 minutes. However, this scheduled duty was not reflected in the Table of Shipboard Working Arrangements, while the time spent conducting the rounds was recorded in the associated Work and Rest Hours records.
4.5 Is the vessel provided with an enclosed space entry procedure, and is there documented evidence that it was followed, and is there evidence that the crew assigned to responsibilities requiring entry into enclosed spaces has attended a dedicated enclosed space entry course? (V)	No	No objective evidence was provided at the time of inspection that a ship-specific Enclosed Space Register, covering all enclosed and connected spaces, had been prepared and maintained on board, addressing the following: • Layout and access arrangements • Physical hazards • Connected and adjacent spaces • Special hazards (e.g. ballast water treatment effects) • Ventilation arrangements • Gas-testing methods • Locking and signage arrangements • Rescue equipment A list of enclosed spaces was available on board; however, it provided information only on compartments identified as enclosed spaces.
4.7 Are procedures in place for the control of hot work, are they incorporated in the safety management system and is there documented evidence of compliance? (M)	No	The vessel's managers had established a Hot Work Permit procedure; however, the procedure did not include a requirement to prepare a written Hot Work Plan and submit it to the vessel's managers for verification and approval prior to commencing hot work outside the designated hot work area. For non-tanker vessels, office authorization was required only for hot work involving fuel oil/oil storage tanks and pipelines, areas where fuel oil/oil or associated vapours could accumulate, or where the Master considered that the work presented a risk of fire or explosion.



Rule / full inspected question	Result	Finding description
4.16 Are portable gas detectors suitable for atmosphere testing of enclosed spaces provided; in good condition; calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, and are officers trained and competent with their operation? (V)	No	The required gas detection equipment capable of measuring CO concentrations in oxygen-deficient atmospheres was not available on board at the time of the inspection, despite the vessel being engaged in loading grain cargo in bulk. Ship's personnel presented confirmation from the manufacturer that appropriate gas detectors had been ordered as part of a fleet-wide order. However, due to high demand, the expected delivery period was advised as approximately 6–7 months from the order date of 23/Jun/2027.
4.17 Is the welding and gas-burning equipment, as well as the electric arc welding equipment, properly stored and maintained in good working order? (M&V)	No	There was no evidence provided that an annual check of the oxygen and acetylene installation on board had been undertaken by a competent person/engineer from the manufacturer.
8B.13 Have hatch covers been ultrasonically tested for weather tightness before loading? (M&V)	No	A hose test had been carried out prior to loading operations on 3-12/Aug/2027. However, no objective evidence was provided to demonstrate that ultrasonic testing had been conducted to verify the weathertight integrity of the hatch covers prior to loading the grain cargo.
9A.8 If the hatch covers are supported by bearing pads, are they free from wear or damage? (V)	No	During the operational test of cargo hold hatch cover No. 4, it was observed that, when fully closed, the forward and aft ends of the hatch cover were not resting on their designated bearing pads, with a measured clearance of approximately 4–10 mm between the support legs and the bearing pads.
9A.15 If hatch covers are hydraulically operated, has the hydraulic oil been tested regularly for contamination and deterioration? (M&V)	No	No objective evidence was provided during the inspection to demonstrate that the hydraulic oil used in the hatch cover operating system had been renewed within the previous five years. Furthermore, no documentary evidence or confirmation from the oil manufacturer was available to support its continued use beyond five years.
10.14 Are appropriate stoppers in use and are the mooring ropes turned up to bitts correctly? (V)	No	The vessel was using loose mooring ropes at both the forward and aft mooring stations, secured on the mooring bitts. However, no certificates for the rope stoppers used in conjunction with the loose mooring ropes were available on board during the inspection.
13.2 Are the responsibilities of watch standing engineers and engine ratings well-defined and clearly posted in the Engine Control Room? Is there a manning matrix for engineers that takes into account both planned and unplanned changes? (V)	No	The vessel's managers had established an Engine Room Manning Matrix defining the required manning levels for various operational conditions. However, the available Engine Room records did not provide objective evidence of the actual Engine Room manning composition during departure from the previous port or arrival at the port of inspection.



Rule / full inspected question	Result	Finding description
13.6 Have the entry requirements to the engine room when operating in UMS mode been documented, posted at the entrance to the engine room and understood by all crew? (V)	No	The vessel was classed for periodically unattended machinery space (UMS) operation, and the vessel's managers had established a procedure requiring completion of a vessel-specific checklist prior to placing the Engine Room into UMS mode. The relevant checklists dated 12/Aug/2027 and 17/Aug/2027 were completed at 22:17 LT. According to Engine Room personnel, the Engine Room had been placed into UMS mode at approximately 17:17 LT on these occasions; however, no corresponding entries were available in the Engine Room Log Book to verify the actual time when UMS operation commenced.
13.9 Is the engine room logbook, as well as other required records being properly maintained? (V)	No	The vessel was fitted with an Engine Room alarm and monitoring system connected to a printer for alarm recording. However, it was observed that the date and time settings of the alarm and monitoring system were not synchronized with the vessel's actual date and time. Consequently, the alarm records generated by the system reflected incorrect dates and times.
14.8 Are the hatch numbers clearly indicated and correctly placed? (V)	No	Hatch cover identification numbers were not marked in locations where they could be readily seen by the crane operator. Upgrading of the hatch cover condition was in progress at the time of the inspection; the hatch covers had been painted, while the required identification markings were still outstanding
14.9 Are the mast heads and their fittings, including but not limited to wire stays, as well as the flood lights, deck lights, emergency lights, and hold lights (if installed), in good working order? (V)	No	Four wire stays of the mast at the forward mooring station were sheathed in plastic; however, no procedure was provided during the inspection to demonstrate how the condition of the wire stays beneath the plastic sheathing was to be verified. In addition, the ends of the wire stays on the forward mast were secured with incorrectly fitted wire rope clips (bulldog clips).



MV DEMO VESPER CAIRN | SF-DEMO-105

Pelagic Demo Fleet | Demo Port Polar | 22/Sep/2027 | Sample Inspector E

Rule / full inspected question	Result	Finding description
2.5 Do all personnel maintain rest period/work hours and are the rest hours in compliance with STCW or MLC requirements? (V)	No	Fire and safety rounds were carried out by the off-duty officer after each watch for approximately 13-18 minutes. However, this scheduled duty was not reflected in the Table of Shipboard Working Arrangements, while the time spent conducting the rounds was recorded in the associated Work and Rest Hours records. The table was amended accordingly, after pointing out the issue.
3.6 Has the Master/Pilot information exchange been taking place effectively and is the standard pilot card being completed as required? (V)	No	The vessel's managers had established a procedure and provided a dedicated checklist for the Master/Pilot Information Exchange (MPX). However, during the vessel's arrival and berthing at Demo Port Polar, Demo State West on 25/Aug/2027, two groups of pilots were involved: two river pilots for the river transit and two docking pilots for the final berthing operation. The MPX checklist was completed with the first group of pilots and the information exchange was recorded in the Deck Log Book. However, no separate MPX checklist/form was completed with the docking pilots, and no corresponding record of an information exchange with them was entered in the Bell Book or Deck Log Book prior to commencement of the berthing operation.
3.16 Is a chart and publication management system being implemented to ensure that all charts, nautical publications, and other publications on board are current, maintained and up to date? (M&V)	No	The ENC maintenance record book was not available on board during the inspection. Furthermore, no objective evidence was provided to demonstrate that any equivalent software or electronic system was in use on board for maintaining the required ENC maintenance records.
4.6 Is entry into and rescue from enclosed space training undertaken and are regular drills conducted? (V)	No	A review of the Enclosed Space Entry Permits identified that only one person entered the enclosed space during the inspection of the Dirty Water Tank on 29/May/2027 and Void V41S on 05/Jun/2027. Furthermore, during cleaning of the FW Tank on 30/Jun/2027, three persons were recorded as being inside the tank simultaneously, while the vessel was equipped with only two personal gas detectors.
4.15 Has a smoking policy been implemented; is it being followed and are designated smoking areas adequately identified? (V)	No	The vessel's managers had established a procedure for the nomination of designated smoking areas by the Master. However, the procedure provided guidance to nominate several multi-purpose spaces (e.g. Ship's office, Bridge, Engine Control Room and Crew Recreation Room) as designated smoking areas, despite requiring that any room allocated for smoking should be utilised exclusively for that purpose. The Master had nominated the designated smoking areas in accordance with the company's procedure.



Rule / full inspected question	Result	Finding description
4.16 Are portable gas detectors suitable for atmosphere testing of enclosed spaces provided; in good condition; calibrated in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions, and are officers trained and competent with their operation? (V)	No	The required gas detection equipment capable of measuring CO concentrations in oxygen-deficient atmospheres was not available on board at the time of the inspection.
7A.7 Are bunkering and oil fuel transfer procedures carefully planned and executed in accordance with industry standards, are the details of the last operation in accordance with industry standards, is the vessel equipped with a procedure for sampling the oil fuel used on board, and are bunker samples stored in a sheltered location? (V)	No	1. The vessel's managers had established a procedure for the retention of bunker fuel samples, requiring samples to be retained for a minimum period of 15 months. However, the procedure did not reflect the requirement for samples to be retained until the corresponding fuel oil had been substantially consumed, nor did it define when retained samples were no longer required or establish clear arrangements for their safe disposal. As a result, a considerable number of historical bunker samples remained stored on board, including samples dated 07/Dec/2025, 22/Dec/2025, 12/Jan/2026, 28/Jan/2026, 06/Mar/2026, 20/May/2026, 09/Jul/2026 and 15/Aug/2026, without documented criteria linking their retention to the consumption status of the corresponding fuel oil or a defined disposal schedule. 2. The vessel's managers had established a bunkering procedure and provided an Oil Transfer Planning Checklist requiring spot measurement of benzene concentration during oil transfer operations. However, in the checklist completed for the bunkering operation on 11/Jul/2027, the benzene spot measurement was recorded as "Not Available". According to the vessel's personnel, no suitable detector tubes for benzene measurement were available on board.
12.1 Is access to the ship being controlled by an adequate deck watch? (V)	No	At the time of boarding, the deck watch rating did not make the inspector aware of any specific hazards associated with the cargo or ongoing operations onboard and did not point out the instructions to be followed in the event of an emergency
13.6 Have the entry requirements to the engine room when operating in UMS mode been documented, posted at the entrance to the engine room and understood by all crew? (V)	No	The vessel was classed for periodically unattended machinery space (UMS) operation, and the vessel's managers had established a procedure requiring completion of a vessel-specific checklist prior to placing the Engine Room into UMS mode. However, according to entries in the Engine Log Book, the Engine Room was placed into UMS mode during several occasions enroute from Demo Port Horizon to Demo Port Polar at 17:17 LT, while the prescribed UMS checklist was completed at 21:17 LT during the duty engineer's safety round in the Engine Room, approximately four hours after the Engine Room had been placed into UMS mode.
13.40 Is an emergency steering gear drill being carried out every three months? (V)	No	During the Engine Room tour, an operational test of the steering gear using the steering gear pump supplied from the Emergency Diesel Generator was carried out. The test was unsuccessful, as Steering Gear Pump No. 3 could not be started either from the local control position or remotely from the bridge. According to the records provided, the last successful test of the emergency steering arrangement using Steering Gear Pump No. 3 had been conducted on 22/Aug/2027 as part of the recorded emergency steering training.