Supporting Statement

**for**

**Oil Record Book for Ships**

OMB No.: 1625-0009

COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS: CG-4602A & Instruction

**A. Justification**

1) Circumstances which make the collection of information necessary.

The Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (APPS) and the International Convention for Prevention of Pollution from Ships, 1973, as modified by the 1978 Protocol relating thereto (MARPOL 73/78), requires that information about oil cargo or fuel operations be entered into an Oil Record Book (ORB). Annex I is implemented in U.S. law through the Act to Prevent Pollution from Ships (APPS) (Pub. L. 96-478, Oct. 21, 1980, 94 Stat. 2297), codified at 33 U.S.C. 1901 *et seq*. The requirement is contained in 33 CFR 151.25. Entries must be made in the ORB (form CG-4602A) for a number of operations, such as:

* Ballasting or cleaning of fuel oil tanks;
* Discharge of ballast containing an oily mixture or cleaning water from fuel oil tanks;
* Discharge overboard or disposal otherwise of bilge water that has accumulated in machinery spaces;
* Loading of oil cargo;
* Internal transfer of oil cargo during voyage;
* Any failure of, and the reasons for, of the oil filtering equipment or the oil discharge monitoring and control system;
* In the event of an emergency, accidental or other exceptional discharge of oil or oily mixture.

The statutory authority is 33 U.S. Code (U.S.C.) 1321, 1902, 1903, 1908 and 46 U.S.C. 6101. This authority is delegated by the Secretary to the Coast Guard via the Department of Homeland Security Delegation No. 0170.1, Revision No. 01.2. (II)(73),(77),(78) and (92.d) respectively.

2) Purpose of the information collection.

The Coast Guard uses the information recorded in the record book to verify compliance with APPS and MARPOL 73/78, and as a supplemental means of finding violations of APPS and MARPOL. The actual recording of information deters violations in the manner of an accounting standard, documenting the management of quantities of potential pollutants onboard the vessel in a manner which allows validation to occur through accuracy of the record and comparison to quantities of actual volumes of fluids onboard the vessel. Unless this information is recorded, the Coast Guard would have to rely on whistleblowers and/or on actual sightings of oil discharges for enforcement, making verification of compliance more difficult. Even with the ORB and the recordkeeping requirement, many violations of the law could go undetected resulting in continued pollution of the sea by oil. The written requirement acts as one more deterrent.

3) Considerations of the use of improved technology.

In October 2020, the MARPOL Convention was amended to allow electronic record books as an alternative to printed ORBs. The required entries and signatures remain the same for both printed and electronic ORBs. Because the frequency and scope of entries required has not changed, using an electronic format will not change the hour and cost burdens for this collection.[[1]](#footnote-1) We estimate that 100% of the recordkeeping requirements can be done electronically. At this time, we estimate that approximately 0% of the responses are collected electronically.

4) Efforts to identify duplication.

The Coast Guard monitors State and local regulatory activity in this field. To date, no equivalent state or local programs have been identified that require similar information, and no other Federal agencies have similar or equivalent regulatory requirements.

5) Methods used to minimize the burdens to small entities if involved.

This information collection does not have an impact on small businesses or other small entities.

6) Consequences to the Federal program or policy if collection were conducted less frequently.

Per international treaty and statute, ORB entries are to be recorded in the appropriate record books without delay, and the ORB must be readily available for inspection at all reasonable times. Because the Coast Guard uses the information in the record books to enforce APPS and MARPOL, it is imperative that the information be recorded accurately and in a timely manner. The ORB, whether in printed or electronic format, must be maintained aboard the vessel for three years and made available during Coast Guard inspections.

7) Special collection circumstances.

This information collection is conducted in manner consistent with the guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5(d)(2).

8) Consultation.

A 60-day Notice was published in the Federal Register to obtain public comment on this collection (See [USCG-2022-0098]; February 17, 2022, 87 FR 9078) and 30-Day Notice (May, 18 2022, 87 FR 30241) were published in the Federal Register to obtain public comment on this collection. The Coast Guard has not received any comments on this information collection.

9) Provide any payment or gift to respondents.

There is no offer of monetary or material value for this information collection.

10) Describe any assurances of confidentiality provided to respondents.

There are no assurances of confidentiality provided to the respondents for this information collection. This information collection request is covered by the Marine Information for Safety and Law Enforcement (MISLE) Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) and System of Records Notice (SORN). Links to the MISLE PIA and SORN are provided below:

* <https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/privacy_pia_uscg_misle.pdf>
* <https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2009-06-25/html/E9-14906.htm>

11) Additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature.

There are no questions of sensitive language.

12) Estimate of annual hour and cost burden to respondents.

* The total annual respondents are 1,029.
* The total annual responses are 377,698.
* The total annual burden hours requested is 15,741.
* The total annual cost is $807,228.

The burden to respondents is provided in Appendix A. Each time a vessel conducts a transfer of oil, an ORB entry must be completed and kept. Completing an ORB entry constitutes a response. This requirement covers certain U.S. vessels that carry oil for fuel or cargo.[[2]](#footnote-2) We estimate the annual frequency of responses varies by vessel type. We estimate that it will take vessel personnel about 2.5 minutes (0.04167 hours) to complete the entry (i.e., response). For U.S. Tank Ships and Nontank Vessels, we estimate that a Chief Engineer will complete the ORB entry. For U.S. Tank Barges, we estimate that a tankerman will complete the ORB entry. For the Chief Engineer wage rate, we used the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) wage rate for Ship Engineers (53-5031) [May 2020, mean hourly wage, loaded 50%, and rounded].[[3]](#footnote-3) For the tankerman wage rate, we used the BLS wage rate for Sailors and Marine Oilers (53-5011) [May 2020, mean hourly wage, loaded 50%, and rounded].[[4]](#footnote-4)

13) Total of annualized capital and start-up cost.

There are no capital, start-up or maintenance costs associated with this information collection.

14) Estimates of annualized cost to the Federal Government.

The annualized Federal Government cost estimate is $14,056 (see Appendix B). The cost is based on 2 elements. First, the cost is based on Coast Guard personnel review of the ORB during periodic inspections, random boardings, and post-casualty investigations. We estimate that there will be approximately 1,000 ORB reviews per year and that a review will be conducted by a CG Lieutenant (O-3) taking about 5 minutes (0.08333 hours) per review. The wage rate shown is in accordance with the current edition of COMDTINST 7310.1(series) for “In-Government” personnel. Second, the cost is based on printing/storage/distribution costs of $7,000 for the ORB.[[5]](#footnote-5)

15) Explain the reasons for change in burden.

There is no change in burden. There is no proposed change to the recordkeeping requirements of this collection. The recordkeeping requirements, and the methodology for calculating burden, remain unchanged.

16) Plans for tabulation, statistical analysis and publication.

This information collection will not be published for statistical purposes.

17) Approval for not explaining the expiration date for OMB approval.

The form (ORB) associated with this collection is prescribed by the international treaty, MARPOL, that the U.S. Government is signatory to. The addition of an expiration date to the ORB—for OMB approval—may cause significant problems. First, it could cause huge enforcement problems since there would be evidentiary problems and an inability to enforce falsified records and recordkeeping captured on expired record books. Second, it could cause enforcement problems on U.S.-flag vessel owner/operators in foreign ports as well, leading to vessel delays and enforcement by foreign Port State Control. Third, it would cause enforcement problems on U.S.-flag vessel owner/operators in the United States if they are found with forms past the expiration date. Fourth, the ORB does not require updating often because the information needed to determine compliance does not change often. Finally, completion of the ORB is an indefinite requirement since it is the only way for the international maritime community to be able to verify compliance with MARPOL and enforce violations that may have occurred outside of their territorial seas. With an expiration date, there is a risk of being unable to fully and adequately meet the international obligations that the United States agreed to when it ratified the treaty. It is for these reasons that expiration date for OMB approval is not displayed on the ORB associated with this collection. Even if the OMB approval is for a particular span of time, the form must have an ability to be acceptable past that span of time in order to meet our obligations under the treaty.

18) Exception to the certification statement.

The Coast Guard does not request an exception to the certification of this information collection.

**B. Collection of Information Employing Statistical Methods**

This information collection does not employ statistical methods.

1. In order to ensure that an electronic record book provides equivalent features to satisfy the signature and retention requirements in 33 CFR 151.25, electronic record books may only be used after the flag administration has issued a declaration to the vessel to the effect. As new vessels are built with ORB software integrated into the ship’s engineering monitoring and control systems, automated data entries may reduce the time burden associated with this collection of information. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The regulation requires “each oil tanker 150 gross tons or above, ship of 400 gross tons and above other than an oil tanker, and manned fixed or floating drilling rig or other platform shall maintain an ORB Part I (Machinery Space Operations). An oil tanker of 150 gross tons and above or a non-oil tanker that carries 200 cubic meters or more of oil in bulk, shall also maintain an ORB Part II (Cargo/Ballast Operations),” (33 CFR 151.25). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.bls.gov/oes/2020/may/oes535031.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.bls.gov/oes/2020/may/oes535011.htm> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This is based on (a) printing costs of $3,000, (b) distribution costs of $2,000 and (c) general overhead cost of $2,000 which includes warehouse storage, shipping, and handling costs ($3,000 + $2,000 + $2,000 = $7,000). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)