

## **FICHES RELATING TO COUNTRY-SPECIFIC ISSUES<sup>1</sup>**

### **List of Countries Concerned**

<b>Belgium</b>	<b>2 fiches</b>
<b>Finland</b>	<b>1 fiche</b>
<b>Spain</b>	<b>1 fiche</b>
<b>Greece</b>	<b>1 fiche</b>
<b>Italy</b>	<b>3 fiches</b>
<b>The Netherlands</b>	<b>1 fiche</b>
<b>Norway</b>	<b>1 fiche</b>
<b>Poland</b>	<b>2 fiches</b>
<b>Sweden</b>	<b>1 fiche</b>
<b>Russia</b>	<b>1 fiche</b>

**Last update July 2006**

---

<sup>1</sup> The contents of these fiches do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the individuals or entities submitting them, nor do they prejudge their position in any way.

**Bottlenecks specific to Member States, Norway and Russia**

**BELGIUM**

**2 fiches**

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SsS) AND A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration through ECSA on 28 April 2000.**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

- There exists an extensive transfer of containers by waterway barge between Rotterdam and Antwerp and v.v.
- For each container a T1 customs document has to be issued at Rotterdam.
- The T1 documents have to be delivered to Belgium customs.
- Belgium customs are not open 24 hours and are far away from discharging berth of container barge.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

- The barge captain very often cannot deliver the document due to long walking distances.
- Delivery by courier is not allowed.
- When documents are delivered to customs offices, they do not control and confirm its completeness.
- Weeks later Belgium customs claim incompleteness withholding on-carriage of containers and provoking a customs fine by Rotterdam customs.
- These fines can be reduced by extensive documentation by ship agents in Rotterdam, proving that a T1 has been issued.

**Measures towards a solution:**

- Establishment of a direct IT link between Rotterdam and Antwerp customs, communicating every T1 issued in Rotterdam directly to Antwerp customs.
- Induce Rotterdam and Antwerp customs authorities to establish directly IT connection.

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution**

- Rotterdam and Antwerp customs authorities.

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

Currently a pilot project is underway towards 'paperless' sailing' for barges between Rotterdam and Antwerp.

\* \* \* \* \*

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND  
A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by DG Transport (Maritime) on 14/12/1999.**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

In certain cases, the ship is required to stop and report to the authorities in sea-river transport even when it is only in transit along a river.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

This practice results in increased transit time and additional costs to the ship (e.g. port fees) each time the ship is required to stop and report.

**Measures towards a solution (if available):**

In COM(1999) 317 final the Commission invites the Member States concerned to promote river-sea transport by reconsidering this transit reporting procedure which takes place on arrival and departure. Consequently, recommendation 17 in Annex I to COM(1999) 317 final invites the Member States concerned to simplify or eliminate the obligation for a short sea ship to report when only in transit along a river.

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

The Member States who carry out such reporting procedures (to simplify, facilitate or eliminate such procedures).

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

Sea-river vessels en route to or from German Rhine ports have to stop at Dutch ports to complete certain customs formalities even when they are only transiting the Dutch territory. The Dutch authorities have informed the Commission that they are introducing a simplified procedure to facilitate this reporting. This involves electronic reporting without a call at Dutch ports, unless the ship needs to be checked. It is based on licences.

In Belgium there has been a trial allowing 24h opening of the Albert Canal. The Flemish Government plans to introduce 24h service on locks and bridges.

**FINLAND**

**1 fiche**

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND  
A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by the Danish Shipbrokers' Association on 17 April 2000.**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

Infrastructure costs/dues, e.g. Swedish Light-dues and **Finnish Fairway-dues**, are calculated on basis of a maximum number of calls per individual vessels and cannot be paid by an equivalent lump sum for liner service, e.g. for the operating fleet of each liner company.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

Each liner service is unable to adjust their tonnage to "supply and demand" without having to pay any additional dues.

This will, however, have a negative effect on regular short sea shipping, thus resulting in a reduced competitiveness.

**Measures towards a solution:**

Tariff adjustments with the purpose of promoting regular short sea shipping.

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

EU and governmental level.

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

None.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Translation of message from Finnish FoP, Ms Lolan Eriksson sent 12 October 2004**

**Fairway dues:** Only the procedure is known at the moment. A working group on fairway dues is considering the principles of collecting these dues. It will continue its work until May 2005. We can come back to the issue at a later stage. This group is also studying the issue of ice class.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Bottlenecks specific to Member States, Norway and Russia**

**SPAIN**

**1 fiche**

## **A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration through ECSA on 28 April 2000.**

### **Description of the bottleneck:**

- Monopolistic structures for national hinterland transport. No free negotiation of haulage prices possible.
- Trucking costs per Km are more than twice as high as international trucking Km-tariffs.

### **Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

Extremely high haulage costs to the disadvantage of SSS and adding high costs to the door/door offer. Inland transport is a main cost component in the SSS chain (according to some estimates between 1/3 and 2/3 of the total cost). SSS loses its competitive position, if practises in inland transport are restrictive or inefficient or if the price of land legs is set artificially higher than land transport price in general.

### **Measures towards a solution:**

Cracking of the structures distorting free competition between hauliers. Increased cargo flows in ports can be profitable to all parties concerned, including land transporters. As such, co-operation should work both ways. The aim would be to have a free market benefiting all, including the end consumer. Roundtables for ports and SSS involving all the parties concerned could be used to consider these issues.

### **Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

Land transporters (to operate within a free market, to consider whether increased traffic flows - resulting from lower total cost of SSS - could lead to larger profit margins). Also ports, shipowners and shippers/forwarders (to try to solve any such problems through an open dialogue and co-operation) and Member States (to consider the framework conditions).

The Commission together with the Spanish government.

### **Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

Hinterland trucking is freely negotiable in Valencia, an open market situation without restrictions.

\* \* \* \* \*

**Bottlenecks specific to Member States, Norway and Russia**

**GREECE**

**1 fiche**

## **A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by** Mediterranean Cargo Vessels Shipowners Union of Greece (<http://shipping.gr/mcvsu>, e-mail: [eemfp@ath.forthnet.gr](mailto:eemfp@ath.forthnet.gr)) **on** 24 April 2000 and updated on 18 January 2005 **and by** DG TREN (Maritime) **on** 14/12/1999.

### **Description of the bottleneck:**

The ports of Piraeus and Thessaloniki:

- Apply monopolistic policies in the provision of services.
- Apply cross subsidization methods among different sectors of services.
- Apply compulsory use of Pilot services for short-sea ships, visiting the above ports almost every day.

In the Port of Piraeus:

- The share of the main user of the port, who enjoys the privileges of the contract with PPA, now accounts to over 70% of the port traffic, having reduced the share of all the other users.
- Since 2000 (when the original fiche was drafted) the container terminal at some stages has developed yard congestion which resulted in the application of a congestion surcharge by the trucking companies. The surcharge was € 96 per truckload to/from the Venizelos container terminal, and later reduced to € 60 still in force.
- There is discrimination against short-sea ships, violating the first come first served principle. (N.B. the “first come, first serve” principle is in force in Thessaloniki.)
- Ships not allowed to begin unloading until the authorities have attended to the ship and reporting procedures have been completed.

### **Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

- Violation of Community legislation.
- Distortion of Competition between ports.
- Expensive handling tariffs.
- Low productivity.
- Delays in the overall service of ships.

### **Measures towards a solution:**

- More than two (2) subsidiaries for each category of services.

- Not extremely high prices against the principle of remuneration.
- Port Authorities not to interfere in the pricing procedure but to facilitate competition.
- Abolition of compulsory pilot services for ships calling very often at the ports of Piraeus and Thessaloniki (pilot services are not compulsory for large Passenger vessels).
- Recommendation 14 in Annex I to COM(1999) 317 final invites the States concerned to aim at allowing a ship to commence discharging immediately after arrival without a requirement to complete the reporting procedures first.

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

- Ministry of Mercantile Marine.
- Port Authorities of Piraeus.
- Port Authorities of Thessaloniki.

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

- As indicated above “Measures towards a solution”
- Monitoring by the Mercantile Marine Ministry, the Ministry of Finance and the Commission.
- In some States unloading can start immediately when the ship arrives and the administrative procedures are carried out alongside of discharging. Sometimes the master or agent is required to report the ship within a number of hours of arrival, and discharge is allowed to commence before then.

\* \* \* \* \*

## Comments from Greek SPC 18 January 2005

1. Indeed all points contained in the fiche, continue to apply for the Port of Piraeus.

Two container terminal users, have lodged complaint to the Greek Competition Authority, against Piraeus Port Authority for abuse of dominant position, due to non-compliance with the “first come, first served” principle and distortion of competition.

The Ministry of Mercantile Marine is examining the Port Package and is consulting the representative bodies of all concerned with the port (users, pilots, stevedore union, port workers union, etc).

The Government, has declared the intention to liberalise portual services.

Since the fiche was drafted, the container terminal at some stages has developed yard congestion which resulted in the application of a congestion surcharge by the trucking companies. The surcharge was € 96 per truckload to/from the Venizelos container terminal, and later reduced to € 60 still inforce.

The share of the main user of the port, who enjoys the privileges of the contract with PPA, now accounts to over 70% of the port traffic, having reduced the share of all the other users.

2. All points also apply for the Port of Thessaloniki, except the “first come first served” principle which is in force.

Moreover, users are obliged to store containers outside the Port and not in the Port area. This is causing delays and extra cost.

## Comments from Greek SPC February 2006

**A.** Fiche 1 – GREECE is still valid, except the following:

**(a)** Measures towards a solution: it is referred that two (2) subsidiaries should operate for each category of services.

This is not correct. It should be at least two (2) operators, means that not only operators subsidiaries of the Port authority should be licensed, but also independent private operators.

**(b)** The congestion surcharge applied by the trucking companies in summer 2004 for transports to/from the Piraeus container terminal, has been lifted but simultaneously an increase, equal to the congestion surcharge, has been applied on the trucking rates.

Furthermore quite recently (Jan. 06) PPA has increased, amongst other items (berthing dues etc), the loading/discharge/storage dues, by approx. 8%.

**B.** Between Greece and Europe about 450.000 trucks and lorries (full and empty) are moving annually through the ports of Patras-Igoumenitsa and Corinth. The equivalent in

TEU, is about 1.400.000. Although this transport mode, includes a sea voyage, road transportation is by far the prevailing part of the total voyage.

In the same market, but on the multimodal container mode sector (maximization of sea voyage) viz Europe/Greece and v.v., the volume through the port of Piraeus and Thessaloniki is about 240.000 TEU (full and empty)

More over, this ratio is always increasing to the detriment of short sea shipping.

The policy and practices applied so far (excessive pricing of local cargo, non equal treatment of users, cross subsidization, dues for non requested services etc), is to the detriment of short sea shipping as well as of the local cargo (it is less than 35% of the total cargo transshipped by the Port of Piraeus). This policy does not give incentives to the operators to choose shipping for their transport and they prefer lorries and trucks, affecting also European short sea trade. The number of containers handled during 2005, was decreased by 4,5% compared with the number of 2004.

The above mentioned number of 1.400.000 TEUs should be the target for the Port of Piraeus and Thessalonikik in respect of the development of SSS.

**Bottlenecks specific to Member States, Norway and Russia**

**ITALY**

**3 fiches**

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND  
A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by Swedish Focal Point on 15 May 2000.**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

In Italy you are not allowed to choose your own agents and in these two countries special customs agents in addition to the regular agent were described as the norm.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

**Measures towards a solution (if available):**

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

France has already abolished the above-mentioned system.

\* \* \* \* \*

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND  
A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by Swedish Focal Point on 15 May 2000.**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

Still impossible in Italy, according to one owner, to start discharging until all the paperwork has been completed.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

**Measures towards a solution (if available):**

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

\* \* \* \* \*

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS)  
AND  
A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by** Italian National Round Table on Short Sea Shipping and Ministero dei Trasporti e della Navigazione **on** 20 April 2000.

**Description of the bottleneck:**

Inflexibility of the rail carrier (FS) and lack of rail cars.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

**Measures towards a solution:**

Liberalisation of rail transport (multiple operators).

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

State railways, foreign rail operators (future candidates).

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

N/A.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ministry of Infrastructure and Transport

Directorate-General for Shipping, Maritime  
Transport and Inland Waterway Transport  
National Focal Point Office  
Short Sea Shipping  
Reference 293

Mr Wolfgang Elsner  
European Commission  
DG TREN: Energy and Transport  
Directorate G  
Short Sea Shipping and Ports  
Brussels

Rome, 30 April 2003

**Subject: Short Sea Shipping -Request for information on Italian bottlenecks**

Regarding the request for information concerning possible developments concerning a solution to the problem of Italian bottlenecks, reported in sheets Nos 1, 2 and 3, we communicate the following:

Sheet No 1

At the request of the Focal Point, the Italian customs authorities have started a survey of all the national ports but have reported that they have aligned themselves to the relevant Community rules and therefore there would not seem to be any obstacle for a shipowner to select his own customs agent. We reserve the right to provide further information at the end of the customs' survey, probably on the occasion of the next meeting in June.

Sheet No 2

From a survey carried out nationally, this kind of bottleneck does not appear to exist, nor are the times needed to complete the documents as long as stated. This is probably a matter of an isolated incident, in which case we invite the Swedish Focal Point to inform us in which Italian port these unfortunate events occurred.

We suggest that this bottleneck is cancelled.

Sheet No 3

Some time ago the Italian Government launched a programme to liberalise rail transport, the results of which are tangible, and the upgrading of rail connections from and for ports has also begun.

Enrico-Maria Pujia  
Contact Point

**Bottlenecks specific to Member States, Norway and Russia**

**THE NETHERLANDS**

**1 fiche**

## **Fiche No. 1 THE NETHERLANDS**

### **A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

Fiche submitted for consideration through ECSA on 28 April 2000.

#### **Description of the bottleneck and hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

- Customs documents have to be issued 24 hrs before shipment due to difficult customs' clearance procedure. With IT this could be done in minutes. SSS cannot compete with road transport with such expensive and excessive administrative burdens.
- Transit of containers by barge between the sea ports of Rotterdam and Antwerp is heavily distorted by the lack of IT between Dutch and Belgian customs. Special couriers have to be copied to physically transport documents, which could be done by IT within seconds. If documents do not reach the destination customs officer fines and duties are collected.

#### **Measures towards a solution:**

Round table with customs, shipping agents and terminals to establish procedures providing at the Rotterdam short-sea terminal a prompt movement of the container without delay by customs.

As prompt as possible introduction of an integrated IT system for customs' clearance with the port of Rotterdam and within the port of Antwerp and an integrated clearance possibility between both ports.

Establishment of a further scanner at the Rotterdam short-sea terminal.

Operating of customs offices 24 hrs with full staff.

#### **Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

Custom authorities Rotterdam with Shipping Agents' Association and Terminal Operator Association plus individual agents and terminals

Rotterdam/Antwerp barging: Customs authorities at Rotterdam and Antwerp, Shipping Agents Associations Rotterdam and Antwerp, terminal operators Rotterdam and Antwerp.

#### **Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

Currently a pilot project is underway towards 'paperless sailing' for barges between Antwerp and Rotterdam.

\* \* \* \* \*

<b>Comments on Fiche 1 from Dutch Ministry (January 30 2004)</b>
--

**I hereby respond to the Member State specific fiche for the Netherlands of the revised short sea bottlenecks list (your e-mail of June 5, 2003), as requested in the last short sea focal point meeting of December 2003.**

Fiche nr 1

**Electronic reporting:**

From Spring 2004 systems for electronic cargo declaration of agricultural products to the Plant Protection and Veterinary Inspection Services ("PD-CLIENTsystem" for phytosanitary goods and "VGC" for veterinary goods) will be operational in the Dutch Seaports. An electronic system for the customs declaration (Sagitta Binnenbrengen) is expected to be operational mid 2004. These systems will form the first part of the electronic one-stop-shop for reporting to the government and port authorities in the Netherlands. The aim is to have the electronic one-stop-shop fully operational in 2006.

**Pilot paperless sailing:**

The pilot paperless sailing for containers on barges between the ports of Rotterdam and Antwerp v.v. is currently in its test phase and it is expected to become operational in the first quarter of 2004.

**Inspections:**

The situation of cargo being delayed by physical checks up to 14 days was according to customs an incident. In general this is not the case. There is consultation between customs and the business community in the port of Rotterdam on a regular basis. The customs authorities provide companies the opportunity to schedule physical inspections into the logistical process. At the moment of unloading the vessel information of containers that have to be physically checked is submitted by the customs to the company.

In the port of Rotterdam all governmental inspection authorities have joined forces to minimise the influence of inspections on the logistical process by improving efficiency and communication. This initiative is called "Platform Overheidsinspecties Zeehavens". Currently the Platform is under evaluation, including investigation into the need for a further intensifying of the cooperation of the different inspectorates and the necessity for starting similar initiatives in other Dutch Seaports.

In the Eem/Waalhaven area in Rotterdam a mobile type of container scanner is operational since November 2002. For containers handled in this area, this saves a 50 km trip to the scanner on the Maasvlakte. According to the customs authorities in the port of Rotterdam there is a 24 hour availability of customs officials. Finally the situation at the Rotterdam Short Sea Terminal seems to have come to a satisfactory solution.

HEAD MARITIME TRANSPORT DIVISION  
H. Merkus

Relevant extract from submission by Mr van Holk, Dutch FoP following meeting on Bottlenecks, 6 March 2003.

- Considering fiche nr. 1 for the Netherlands:

- In the Netherlands we are currently developing a single electronic window for delivering the required information to all authorities for ships entering a seaport. This electronic window will be operational at latest on 1/1/2004, probably sooner (starting with customs and veterinairy checks).
- In the focal point meeting my Belgian colleague gave an update on the current pilot for "paperless sailing"for barges between Rotterdam and Antwerp.

**A BOTTLENECK IN SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND  
A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by Norwegian Shipowners' Association  
on 28 September 2005**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

WASTE MANAGEMENT IN PORTS

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

Costly

**Measures towards a solution (if available):**

Smoothing the waste routines, including reporting systems

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

National authorities, ports, operators

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

**POLAND**

**2 fiches**

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING AND A  
POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by the Short Sea Shipping Round Table Poland on 13 September 2000**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

Exorbitant costs of harbour pilotage resulting from the monopolistic standing of the Polish pilotage firms and the existing harbour safety regulations.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

Extra costs of operation for ship-owners thus discouraging docking at the Polish ports. This in turn leads to the loss of potential cargo.

**Measures towards a solution:**

Creating new laws on the part of the Maritime Administration Authorities aimed at harbour pilotage exemption on certain vessels. Setting maximum price levels on sea/harbour pilotage tariffs.

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution:**

The Ministry of Transport and Maritime Economy, Maritime Administration Authorities, sea ports, short sea shipping operators, harbour pilots.

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

\* \* \* \* \*

**1. FICHE NO. 1 "EXORBITANT COSTS OF HARBOUR PILOTAGE"**

On 1 January 2003 a new regulation on pilotage was implemented. Its most important aim is to improve the quality and eligibility of Polish seaports. We are also waiting for the new EU directive on access to port services market. Since the date of Poland's accession to the EC we will be entirely committed to this regulation.

## **A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by the Short Sea Shipping Round Table- Poland on 13 September 2000**

### **Description of the bottleneck:**

Ineffective and insufficient **land** links/routes (i.e. by road, rail, or river) from/to sea ports.

### **Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

The existing network of road, rail, and river links with Polish sea ports doesn't guarantee the provision of services high enough in quality to successfully compete with independent lorry operators. This ineffective and insufficient land route infrastructure thus hampers the integration of short sea shipping into sea-land intermodal chain links.

The lack of logistic centres and intermodal terminals in Poland often forces operators to transport their cargo in lorries or on trains in non-containerised/non-unitised form to the sea ports where the consolidation process finally takes place. Poor road networks and an insufficient rail infrastructure often have an adverse effect on the forwarders and operators, who in turn are discouraged from sending their cargo to Polish ports. What then occurs is a situation where cargo consolidated in land terminals is sent by road or rail to European ports, rather than Polish ones, which are much closer.

### **Measures towards a solution:**

Speeding up the modernisation and expansion of road, rail, and river links thus guaranteeing effective land networks to/ and from sea ports.

The construction of motorways and a thorough modernisation of the rail network meridionally [South- North ] .

The creation, in sea ports, of logistic centres equipped with modern intermodal terminals linked via the Internet with land terminals.

The above mentioned measures would increase the competitiveness of Polish sea ports in the area of cargo consolidation and distribution, and they would also create favourable market conditions for a successful integration of short sea shipping into the sea-land intermodal transport links.

The promotion and development of intermodal projects aimed at the creation of logistic centres, especially in sea ports, in order to improve the competitiveness of Polish sea ports in the area of cargo consolidation and distribution.

### **Parties needed to be involved in the solution:**

The Government of the Republic of Poland, the Ministry of Transport and Maritime Economy, local authorities, port authorities, forwarders, short sea shipping operators, logistic operators.

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

The construction of motorways and the modernisation of rail infrastructure financed through the governmental budgets in Germany.

Financial assistance from national and regional budgets in the construction of intermodal terminal networks and logistic centres in countries like: Germany, France, and Italy.

\* \* \* \* \*

<b>Comments received from Polish FoP on fiches (27.2.03)</b>
--

**2. FICHE NO. 2 "INSUFFICIENT LAND ROUTES TO SEAPORTS"**

In the frame of "National Development Plan for the years 2004-2006", which is a legal base for implementation of the EU structural funds, the access to Polish seaports is one of the main priorities of the Polish Transport Policy. Implementation of the project includes improvement of existing railway connections to port terminals and facilities as well as a construction of new roads and motorways enabling direct access of the TEN into the ports. There are also some projects aimed at improving inland waterways near Port of Szczecin.

**Bottlenecks specific to Member States, Norway and Russia**

**SWEDEN**

**1 fiche**

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOORSHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND A POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by EFIP on 15 April 2000, and the Danish Shipbrokers' Association on 17 April 2000.**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

- Very high fairway and pilotage fees on Lake Vänern and Mälaren in Sweden, since they are considered by the Swedish Maritime Administration as sea bays instead of inland waterways.
- Infrastructure costs/dues, e.g. Swedish Light-dues and Finnish Fairway-dues, are calculated on basis of a maximum number of calls per individual vessels and cannot be paid by an equivalent lump sum for liner service, e.g. for the operating fleet of each liner company.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

- Additional costs for sea-river shipping
- Each liner service is unable to adjust their tonnage to "supply and demand" without having to pay any additional dues. This will, however, have a negative effect on regular short sea shipping, thus resulting in a reduced competitiveness.

**Measures towards a solution (if available):**

- Swedish Maritime Administration should apply a pragmatic approach, which safeguards safety, but does not discriminate against sea-river ports and the development of sea-river shipping.
- Tariff adjustments with the purpose of promoting regular short sea shipping.

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

- Swedish Maritime Administration and ports.
- EU and governmental level.

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck: N/A.**

By e-mail to FoPs and Commission 7 October 2004

[New Swedish Fairway Dues](#)

Dear Short Sea Shipping Focal Point Colleagues,

Referring to the bottleneck exercise at the meeting of the Focal Points on October 5th and the discussion about the Swedish bottleneck fiche I hereby send you information in English concerning [the new fairway dues](#) in Sweden that will be in force from January 1st 2005.

With best regards,

Magnus Sundström  
Short Sea Shipping Focal Point for Sweden

15 March 2003

*Comments from Mr Vieweg, Swedish FoP, on Fiche 1 following Bottleneck meeting held on 6 March 2003*

**The Bottleneck exercise. In the minutes from the last meeting it is said that Swedish FoP is intended to update fiche no 1 for Sweden.**

As discussed during the meeting there are some misunderstandings expressed in the fiche.

Although we understand that operators find most tariffs high it must be noted that pilotage dues in Sweden, accounted for according to the ship's GT and the time a pilot is used, only cover about half of the total pilotage costs. So, we claim, on the contrary, that pilotage in Sweden is cheap compared to many other countries. The reason for this is that half of the pilotage costs is covered by the fairway dues in a way that takes the form of cross-subsidisation.

Then, of course, you can argue that the fairway dues are a rare fee in European countries. Finland has also fairway dues, but in other countries this costs are covered by either port dues, lighthouse dues and/or public funds.

When it comes to Lake Vänern and Lake Mälaren there are furthermore special rebates for pilotage to compensate for the time used in the locks.

It is also wrong that you need to speak Swedish to have a pilot exemption Sweden is the first country to accept English as the language if you fulfil the stipulated other requirements to be granted a PEC.

W. N.  
18.10.04 IK

# High Level RoRo Carriers Action Group

15 October 2004

L. 855/D4  
SF 1.271

Dear Mr Gunnar Eriksson,

## Results of the Consultation paper – Nya Farledsavgifter – Fairway Dues and the Tariff structure.

As you know the High Level RoRo Carriers' Action Group has been following this consultation exercise very closely. Indeed the Group has, in addition to our joint meeting in February 2003 to discuss alternative Fairway Dues tariff structures, wrote to Mr. Bengt Owe Birgersson as part of the Consultation Paper's request for reactions from the various players within the Maritime Industry.

As you are aware one of the main thrusts of our arguments was over the use of Gross Tonnage as the basic structure for calculating Fairway Dues. We have always viewed this, as both discriminatory and also creating an unfair playing field for high-sided vessels over vessels of more conventional designs that are able to carry in the region of two-thirds of their entire cargo complement on deck and therefore outside the GT based calculations.

The Group was therefore initially pleased when the results of the Freight Transport Delegation's investigations and consultations concluded, amongst other points, the fact that Net Tonnage (NT) should replace Gross Tonnage (GT) as the basic structure for calculating Fairway Dues.

We have, however, now reviewed the publication from the Swedish Maritime Administration on the new vessel Fairway Dues structure / tariff that will be in effect as from January 01<sup>st</sup> 2005.

We were extremely disappointed to note that although many of the recommendations from the Freight Transport Delegation had been taken on board the biggest omission of all was that GT remained within the calculation structure.

We fail to understand why, after more than three years of review and consultation by the Freight Transport delegation that an arbitrary decision that does not align itself with the conclusions of the delegation has been made to ignore the main fundamental recommendation or introducing NT as the governing factor in calculating Fairway Dues.

This decision allows the continuation of penalising high-sided vessels against other vessel types (purely due to design) and therefore de-facto subsidising those types with a lower GT value whilst having similar or the same dynamic characteristics – LOA, draft etc.

Rue Ducale, 45 – B- 1000 Bruxelles  
Tel. 32 2/511 39 40 - Fax. 32 2/511 80 92

High Level RoRo Carriers' Action Group

It is noted that when referring to the basic Fairway Dues levy the true short sea vessels will be paying exactly the same as before.

This problem is even further compounded for those Short-Sea RoRo vessels trading N. Europe – Mediterranean which, having lost all rebates find that they are having to pay something like 3.0 or more times as much in Fairway Dues as their competitors vying for the same cargoes.

The Mediterranean service operators will have to pay 52 times a year at 2.05 SEK / GT. The Deep-sea operators (transiting the Mediterranean area) will only have to pay 1,200,000 SEK / year per line. This can be translated into a weekly service having to pay something close to 23,077 SEK per weekly call. The larger RoRo vessels (51,714 GT) will always have to pay the (ceiling) rate of 50,000 SEK per weekly call. On top of this amount has to be added the Sulphur surcharge (of some 31,028 SEK making an all inclusive cost per call of 81,028 SEK), which is not applicable to Deep-sea operators as their annual charge is "all-inclusive".

If we now consider that the new tariff structure is going to be introduced in order to favour those operators that are burning fuels deemed environmentally friendly then how does an "all-inclusive" charge match this strategy.

The question now being asked is how does the new structure and tariff assist and promote short sea shipping in general and Short Sea liner RoRo services in particular. On the surface it appears to be doing the reverse and actually penalising Short Sea services, especially RoRo services in general and in particular those on long-haul pan-European services.

It certainly does not seem to fit in with the philosophy of the European Commission, the European Parliament and the apparent wish of Member States to support and encourage Short Sea Shipping to become a viable alternative to road and rail in order to combat road congestion and its associated pollutions.

**Summary statement:**

**If the Swedish Government is going to implement most of the recommendations of the Freight Transport Delegation then we strongly urge the Swedish Government to implement all the recommendations of the Delegation to ensure a balanced outcome that would be fair to all stakeholders. Also all port users should be levied in the same manner to avoid discrimination i.e. based on individual port calls and not all-inclusive special deals for "preferred customers".**

We look forward to a favourable reply.

Yours sincerely,



James Dempster  
Executive Director – High Level RoRo Carriers' Action Group ECSA

High Level RoRo Carriers' Action Group

**Mr G. ERIKSSON**  
Ministry of Industry, Employment and Communications  
103 33 STOCKHOLM  
SWEDEN

cc:

**Mr. Dirk J. Van Vreckem – Head of Unit**  
European Commission – DG TREN  
Rue de Genève 1  
1049 Brussels  
Belgium

**Mr. Lars Vieweg (National Short Sea Focal Point)**  
Swedish Maritime Administration  
Slottsgatan 82  
SE-601 78 Norrköping  
SWEDEN

3

**Bottlenecks specific to Member States, Norway and Russia**

**RUSSIA**

**1 fiche**

**A BOTTLENECK IN DOOR-TO-DOOR SHORT SEA SHIPPING (SSS) AND A  
POTENTIAL SOLUTION**

**Fiche submitted for consideration by EFIP on 15 April 2000**

**Description of the bottleneck:**

The Russian inland waterway network is closed to sea-river vessels flying EU flag, while Russian vessels have free access to the EU waterway network, which they use very frequently. There is no reciprocity in relations.

**Hampering effects of the bottleneck:**

The EU sea-river fleet has no access to the world's biggest inland waterway network which gives access to major Russian industrial centres.

EU sea-river vessels have to tranship all cargo on Russian vessels in Russian seaports or charter Russian vessels (with a lot of bureaucratic problems).

**Measures towards a solution (if available):**

Insist on a rapid opening of the Russian waterway network in the framework of the negotiations on the Partnership and Co-operation Agreement (IX, art. 39) and eventually block EU investments in transport/maritime related areas in Russia.

**Parties needed to be involved in the solution (and their roles):**

European Commission and Member States.

**Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:**

N/A.

\* \* \* \* \*