

PORTS FICHES¹

Port Services – HANDLING	fiches 1 – 3
Port Services – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	fiche 4
Port Services – DIVERSE	fiches 5 – 6
Port Charges/Costs – COST LEVEL	fiches 7 – 8
Port Charges/Costs – TONNAGE MEASUREMENT	fiche 9
Port Infrastructure/Equipment	fiches 10 – 11
Port Hinterland Connections	fiches 12

Last update July 2006

¹ 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.

PORTS

Port Services – HANDLING

fiches 1 – 3

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:

Availability of, and competition in, the port services market is not as good as it should be. Protective practices deny free access to other operators for port services. This in effect creates (by default) monopolies that result in excessive and non-market level pricing coupled with, sometimes, poor service and inefficiencies.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

Excessive rates create artificially high (sometimes exorbitant) overall port costs in turn creating commercially-effective cost barriers for Short Sea shipping to compete with the other transport modes of road and rail, for example:

- Cargo handling practices are often costly and unnecessary and preserve the image of shipping as old fashioned.
- Too many man-hours are spent on handling cargoes due to old agreements with dockers.
- Excessive docking time at loading/unloading terminals
- Automatic mooring not allowed or subject to conditions.

Measures towards a solution:

Industry representative organisations working with the European Commission and member state focal points to impress upon and persuade the relevant parties to review/abandon the restrictive practices to allow open and fair competition in the provision of port services. In doing so they should take into account the nature of the business, volume and frequency, increasing use of modern vessel designs and associated modern technological enhancements when determining the minimum requirements for imposition of any particular port service.

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

Industry representative organisations working with the European commission and member state focal points to impress upon and persuade where appropriate National governments/focal points, local Port Authorities to review any restrictive Legislation to allow more open and fair competition. In view of the complexity this is to be dealt with case by case.

Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

Main (leading) Seaports of Germany and the Netherlands and equally all ports that are not restrained by restrictive legislation.

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

Fiche submitted for consideration - under the auspices of the Danish SSS Focal Point -
by the Danish Shipbrokers' Association **on** 17 April 2000.

Description of the bottleneck:

Non-flexible working conditions in the ports, both as regards calculation of waiting time, idle time, over-time, etc. Non-flexible collective wage agreements, e.g. number of dockworkers in each gang. This issue is actual in BE, DE, DK, SW, FIN, FR, IRL, ES, IT, PT, NL and S. It is a general problem that depends also on the port system in the country.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

Poor utilisation of vessels and shore-equipment, as many ports are charging unreasonably high rates for working hours during nights and weekends.

Measures towards a solution:

Commencement of operation upon arrival with the resources required without additional expenses.

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

Port authorities, stevedores/terminal operators, and shipping lines.

Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

None.

* * * * *

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

**Fiche submitted for consideration by DG TREN (Maritime) on 14/12/1999 and the
Port Autonome de Dunkerque on 30/04/2000.**

Description of the bottleneck:

In some ports, SSS has to compete for port facilities with priority given to ocean shipping, having negative time and financial implications for SSS and Inland Waterway vessels.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

Uncertainties can be detrimental to the overall quality of just-in-time transport services and can create an obstacle to the development of door-to-door SSS.

Measures towards a solution (if available):

Ports should provide a corresponding level of service on commercial basis to all users without discrimination. In some ports systems have been developed to accommodate better the needs of short sea services, for example the crucial need for shorter turn-around times. These systems include, in particular, separate terminals for SSS but also other dedicated services based on commercial considerations in ports.

To set up or actively continue the regular work of round-tables or corresponding arrangements on SSS and ports in order to have a forum where problems affecting SSS and ports can be discussed and solved.

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

Ports concerned (to give non-discriminatory treatment to SSS in comparison with deep-sea traffic and to consider how the specific characteristics of SSS could be better taken into consideration, to set up fora for all the parties to solve problems in co-operation).

Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

N/A.

* * * * *

PORTS

Port Services – INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY fiche 4

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 and the SSS Focal Point in Portugal **on** 12 June 2000 and updated November 2003.

Description of the bottleneck:

Information technology systems

- Use of Electronic Data Interchange for transmitting data between ports is still not generalised.
- Lack of automated goods management systems

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

The lack of quality information management systems may delay the relevant information flow, endangering quick cargo dispatch. The aforementioned deficiency obstructs SSS integration in the supply chain, not allowing an efficient process of modal shift.

Measures towards a solution:

- Development and use of information and management systems, namely EDISEA and optimisation of Vessels Quick Dispatch Centres.
- Use of electronic equipment e.g. scanner for security cargo checking and control.
- Extension to the main Italian ports of the INTERMED system already operating between Genoa, Marseille and Barcelona.
- Use of a telematic management system for shipments into and out of ports.

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

Port Authorities, Ports Administrations, Ports Institutes, Navy Harbour Master, health Department, Immigration, Customs, Customs Guard. Ports – to offer infra-structures and services in order to implement the necessary activities to SSS.

Government – to give political support to new lines, with promotion actions, supports of a tax nature, and other foreseen on the European Commission's Guidelines, to support projects of new port infrastructures dedicated to SSS, namely dedicated terminals.

European Commission – to intensify the supporting mechanisms.

.Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

INTERMED (between ports of Genoa, Marseilles and Barcelona)

Port Net-system Finland (see below).

1. FINNISH MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Telematics Unit

12.10.2004

Subject: The Port Net-system; a major step towards a "paperless port" in Finland

Finnish Maritime Administration has been operating The PortNet-system as a host organisation since the beginning of 2000. PortNet is an Information system on vessel traffic in Finland. Each and every ship calling a Finnish port has to provide information to the PortNet-system regarding information on its timetable, route, cargo, dangerous cargo and maritime fees. The user interface for The PortNet-system is based on Internet. Corporate users may utilise the system simply by using Edifact or the XML-format to enable systems to speak directly, without human interaction. PortNet is a telematic system, where telecommunications and an Information system are combined together. The Finnish PortNet system comprises also the information referred to in the IMO/FAL Convention and the International ISPS International Ship and Port Security Code.

The main user groups for the system are:

- The Customs
- Port Authorities
- Ship Agents
- Stevedoring Companies
- Maritime Administration
- Vessel traffic operators
- Frontier Guard

The main tasks of the system are:

- Timetable information on port traffic
- Information on vessels visiting Finnish Ports
- Information on Dangerous cargo
- Information for Harbour Invoicing
- Information for National Maritime Statistics and Port Statistics

In the future there are plans to enlarge PortNet by adding new functions to the system:

- Pilot service
- Vessel positioning by linking Port Net-system to the National AIS-Network
- Vessel Traffic System by linking Port Net-system to the National VTS-system
- Link to the Terminal notifications regarding containers is under construction

The PortNet system has presently over 1500 users all over Finland representing about 200 different agencies, forwarding companies and port or governmental authorities like the customs and the frontier guard. The users are divided into different user groups depending on their role in the system. Some organisations, like agencies or forwarding companies, feed in the basic information in the form of vessel visit information, cargo (manifest) and dangerous cargo (IMO transports) notifications and others utilise the information these have fed in. The most important user groups that retrieve information from the system are the Customs in Finland, the Finnish ports (both municipal and factory ports) and the Finnish Maritime Administration. The Frontier guard, Vessel Traffic Operators, Pilots etc. are becoming more and more important users to the system as well.

All Vessels that call Finnish ports are obliged to provide the following information regarding their voyage to the Port Net System 24 hours in advance:

- Vessel identification (Name, Call sign, IMO-number, MMSI-number)
- Vessel information (dimensions, draught, ice class, etc.)
- Route information (Port of destination, previous and next port of calling)
- Estimated and actual time of arrival and departure (ETA, ATA, ETD, ATD)
- Information on cargo (unloaded, loaded) and passengers (disembarked, embarked), including dangerous cargo in particular
- The Security level at which the ship is currently operating
- The Security level at which the ship operated in the last 10 ports of call where it has conducted a ship/port interface
- Information regarding the IMO/FAL forms as stated in the IMO/FAL Convention
- Information on Port services, including pilotage, needed during the harbour visit
- Information on paid ship specific maritime and harbour dues
- Information on the agency company that handles all declarations for the vessel during this harbour visit
- Information on dangerous waste disposal requirements
- Some other information as information on the ship manager, captain, number of passengers etc.

* * * * *

PORTS

Port Services – DIVERSE

fiches 5 – 6

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

Fiche submitted for consideration by the SSS Focal Point in Portugal **on 12 June 2000** and updated November 2003.

Description of the bottleneck:

- Rigid administrative proceedings.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

- The heavy rigid and complex administrative proceedings may delay the process of cargo transfer, dispatch and circulation.

Measures towards a solution:

Use of electronic equipment – scanner – for security cargo checking and control.

Issue of Pilot Exemption Certificates (PEC) to SSS vessels.

Exemption from using tugs for vessels having auxiliary means of manoeuvre with proven efficiency.

Control proceedings simplification for vessels with repeated port calls, taking the best advantage of Port State Control.

Proper working schedules in port for all entities involved – twenty four hours a day – either public or private, in a way to allow a better optimisation of vessels turn around, which is essential to SSS efficiency avoiding, this way, the increase of extra costs.

Creation of ‘One-Stop-Shops’ as a way to sell door-to-door services to the customer (shippers).

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

Port terminals/carriers.

Government – support of a tax nature and other support as foreseen in the European Commission Guidelines; support to projects creating port infrastructure dedicated to SSS.

Port Authorities – Ports Administrations, Ports Institutes, Navy Harbour Master, Health, Immigration, Customs, Customs Guard.

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

* * * * *

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:

Imposition of the use the national language for port services in particular for Pilotage services and other burdensome requirements hampering seriously the possibility to obtain Pilotage Exemption Certificates or corresponding arrangements.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

Language Requirements

- It creates evident problems for masters serving the same port on a regular basis to obtain a Pilot exemption certificate (PEC) thereby increasing the cost picture for the Short Sea Service.
- It is a protective measure in favour of local pilotage operators and can act in a discriminatory way in favour of national flag owners.
- This protective effect supports the monopoly position of Pilotage services often resulting in high and even excessive costs distorting seriously the competitive position of Short Sea Shipping versus other modes.
- **Impedes enhanced safety when all players could be communicating at one level.**

Other Hindrances

- Other cumbersome and often unworkable procedures for obtaining and/or maintaining a PEC such as the number of port calls required and rigid prescriptions on the type of vessels act as a deterrent to obtain PEC's and consequently increase costs.

Measures towards a solution:

- Acceptance of English as the standard language for Pilotage services (and safety-related services).
- The number of port calls required to obtain a PEC should be reasonable and should not contain an element of protectionism.
- A change to a similar type of ship should not require the master to retake all aspects of qualification and examination for a PEC. Such problems should be looked into and solved.

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

National governments, focal points, port authorities and industry representative organisations.

Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

Sweden issues PECs to non-Swedish speakers who speak English, as long as all other criteria for PECs are fulfilled. **Denmark** does not apply PECs but if the captain has sailed the same route 4 times in previous year then a pilot is not necessary. **Norway, the Netherlands** and **Poland** also issue PECs to English speakers (some knowledge of the local language might be required).

REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTING PILOT EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES IN THE EU MEMBER STATES
 (Submitted by ECSA in April 2005. The table originates from 2003.)

COUNTRY	LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT FOR EXAMINATION	COMMENTS
GERMANY	Good command of German - in case of "regular exemption" and "exemption on request" only - in case of general exemption no language requirements at all.	PECs are not generally granted to tankers. PEC's are granted according to the number of calls on the basis of vessel's Length , width and depth. Dependant on L/W/D there are different possibilities for sailing without a pilot: General exemption - up to 90m / 13m L/W Regular exemption - i) up to 120m / 19m / 8m L/W/D ii) after 6 voyages under pilot supervision Exemption on request - after 12 - 48 voyages per year with pilot supervision plus examination (for vessels beyond a.m. dimensions)
DENMARK	English or other Scandinavian Languages is acceptable.	PECs are not granted to loaded tankers > 1500 dwt. There is no real general rule regarding the requirements for obtaining PECs. Each port has its specific requirements and in some ports PECs cannot be obtained.
FINLAND	Only Finnish and Swedish languages at least for the time being. Expecting introduction of use of English Language in 2006 latest.	PECs are not granted to loaded tankers
FRANCE	Only French language accepted	12 to 20 operations per year for renewal
NETHERLANDS	Practical knowledge of the Dutch or English language	PECs are not available for sea-going vessels with a cargo of dangerous goods in Bulk and, in general, sea transports being towed. The applicant should demonstrate that the candidate would sail the relevant route/fairway at least 18 times a year in both directions after the PEC has been established. A PEC can be invalidated if the PEC holder does not complete 18 trips within the relevant year. Since August 2002 specific exemptions can be obtained for smaller vessels (mainly between 70 - 90 metres). These exemptions can be obtained if candidates show knowledge of the region, the applicable regulations and the Dutch or English language. Furthermore technical information on the ship should be provided and at least 12 ports of call in the last 2 years should be made.
IRELAND	English only.	In one port - the req is for 6 in / out - for ferries - where the berth is on the seaward side of the port and the PEC is for that berth only.
NORWAY	A Scandinavian language or English	PECs are not available for sea-going vessels with a cargo of dangerous goods in Bulk. PECs are valid for 2 years and are then renewable upon application for 2 years at a time. A PEC holder on a fixed schedule can apply for renewal on a 4 yearly basis provided proof can be shown for at least 12 passages per year in both directions on the route to which the PEC applies. A PEC can be invalidated if the holder has performed fewer than 8 passages (in both directions) between issue and application for renewal.

REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTING PILOT EXEMPTION CERTIFICATES IN THE EU MEMBER STATES
 (Submitted by ECSA in April 2005. The table originates from 2003.)

COUNTRY	LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT FOR EXAMINATION	COMMENTS
SWEDEN	English or Scandinavian language accepted	It has to be noted that local regulations and requirements would always take precedent over National rules and regulations as they represent more localised specifications.
UNITED KINGDOM	Basic English	
SPAIN	Only Spanish language accepted	For ships calling the port twice or more per day, the applicant must be in command of the ship at least during the 2 months previous to the application. For ships calling the port twice or more per week, the applicant must be in command of the ship at least 4 months during the 12 months previous to the application. For other ships, the applicant must be in command of the ship at least 8 months during the 12 months previous to the application. The 30 calls must be done during such periods of time. In relation to towage, the master can obtain a PEC if he has carried out 10 tug-assisted manoeuvres (only one tug) in the last 12 months and passes a practical test with a tug. PECs are not granted to sea-going vessels carrying usually more than 200 mt of dangerous goods. The PEC is valid for 12 months. One month before the expiration, an extension of 12 months can be asked for if the applicant has done at least 12 calls during the exemption period.
PORTUGAL	Only Portuguese language accepted.	There is an annual validity for PECs. No PECs are granted to ships which carry cargoes of classes 1 and 7 and tankers which carry cargoes 2, 3 and 8 (SOLAS IMDG) or tankers in ballast and not gas freed.
GREECE	PECs are not granted to sea-going vessels. All cargo vessels approaching a Greek port have to use a pilot except for passenger vessels employed in regular domestic lines.	
ITALY	PECs are not granted to any sea-going vessels. Some vessels (ro-pax) can use pilot via VHF but varies from port to port and is according to type, tonnage, LOA. In every case knowledge of the Italian language is required.	
BELGIUM		

* * * * *

PORTS

Port Charges/Costs – COST LEVEL

fiches 7 - 8

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

Fiche submitted for consideration - under the auspices of the Danish SSS Focal Point - by the Danish Shipbrokers' Association on 17 April 2000 and Norwegian Shipowners' Association on 28 September 2005

Description of the bottleneck:

Cost for services not always considered as being necessary, are often inflicted upon Short Sea Shipping - e.g. compulsory pilotage and towage in situations, where the captain already have sufficient knowledge of nautical conditions.

Infrastructural costs/dues including pilot costs are often increased for fiscal rather than commercial reasons.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

Unnecessary increase in the costs for Short Sea Shipping.

Fluctuating freight rates or costs influence the competitiveness of short sea shipping.

Measures towards a solution:

- Adjustment of local pilotage and towage regulations.
- Commission proposal for a Directive on Market Access to Port Services.
- Acceptance of the fact that the *infrastructure* also contains elements of basic economics.

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

Local nautical authorities.

EU level.

Norwegian Coastal Administration currently (2006) evaluating the fees and taxes on maritime transportation in Norway.

Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

Sweden issues PECs to non-Swedish speakers who speak English, as long as all other criteria for PECs are fulfilled. **Denmark** does not apply PECs but if the captain has sailed the same route 4 times in previous year then a pilot is not necessary. **Norway, the Netherlands** and **Poland** also issue PECs to English speakers (some knowledge of the local language might be required).

* * * * *

**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:

Although SSS produces high frequency calls in EU ports, these tariffs to date are not negotiable in some Member States. They are fixed in a monopolistic manner. There exists no competition. The structure is protected by law. Since years the MIF asks for liberalisation and free competition. This is a serious problem.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

SSS has to pay a relatively high part of the low short-sea freight to the a.m. port services, making it difficult to compete with road transport. Special reduced short-sea tariffs and doing away with monopolistic structures in all ports would make SSS more competitive.

Measures towards a solution:

Negotiation between Commission and Ministry of Transport Council with the aim to abolish monopolies and to introduce special reduced short-sea tariffs for a.m. services.

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

The Commission and Transport Ministry Council plus national Focal Point.

Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

Ports of Felixstowe and Southampton, where mooring/unmooring and port dues can be freely negotiated.

* * * * *

Bottlenecks in Door-to-Door Short Sea Shipping

PORTS

Port Charges/Costs – TONNAGE MEASUREMENT

fiche 9

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:

Port service tariffs (towage, pilotage, mooring and port dues) when structured on Tonnage measurement (in accordance with the London Convention of 1969) do not fairly or accurately price the amount to pay for port service workloads rendered. When reference is made to payment for services rendered, GT (or NT) based tariff costs only reflect the volumes of the vessel and not to the actual workload received from the port service in terms of working hours and/or required maritime, navigational or vessel handling skills in relation to other vessels of similar dynamic characteristics such as length overall or operating draft. This then creates "artificially" high tariff related port costs to vessels of high sided designs such as Ro-Ro vessels again in relation to other vessel types with designs allowing sometimes 2/3 of their cargo carrying capabilities to be on deck and therefore outside the scope of the 1969 tonnage re-measurement convention. A corresponding situation applies to open-top container ships and car-carrier vessels.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

This is a total anomaly as there is no level playing field. The tariff either has to be based on an equal measurement system in that for all vessels all cargo-carrying capabilities are included in the evaluation of port services rendered or another form of tariff structure needs to be found/introduced. Excessive rates create artificially high (sometimes exorbitant) overall port costs in turn creating commercially-effective cost barriers for Short Sea shipping to compete with the other transport modes of road and rail.

Measures towards a solution:

Industry representative organisations working with the European commission and member state focal points to impress upon and persuade National governments and local Port Authorities to review any restrictive Legislation with the aim to move towards a fairer system of setting and evaluating port service costs.

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

Industry representative organisations working with the European commission and member state focal points to impress upon and persuade National governments/focal points, local Port Authorities accordingly.

Any available best practices related to this bottleneck:

Maintain the GT (NT) basis but introduce a co-efficient factor to bring High sided vessels in line with other port users - e.g. Zeebrugge has a dividing coefficient of 2.5 on the GT of a RoRo / Car carrier type vessel.

Maintain the GT (NT) basis but decrease the percentage dependency on GT and proportion a certain percentage against cargo tonnes handled. Due to the inherent nature of cargo weight tonnage for high sided vessels this will allow a fairer equilibrium of level of costs e.g. this is under consideration by some ports / countries.

Adopt a fairer measure of the work performed in relation to the vessels' dynamic characteristics - e.g. Antwerp tariffs are based on Length overall and distance of pilotage.

Adapt the tariff structure to create entries pertaining strictly to Short sea operators and RoRo / Car carriers - Bremerhaven port tariffs are geared towards a Short Sea friendly set of tariff items specifically to encourage and enhance the Short Sea trade.

See attached submission from ECSA (submitted in April 2005, originates from 2003).

PILOTAGE TARIFFS IN OTHER EUROPEAN PORTS (SUBMITTED BY ECSA)

German ports (Bremerhaven / Emden):

The tariffs are based on GT. The burden of GT based tariffs is well recognised within the German maritime cluster as evidenced in the Structure of the Port Dues tariffs. To compensate for this anomaly there is a 15% reduction on GT values for RoRo and Car Carriers prior to calculation of pilotage costs.

Livorno:

As for German ports the port of Livorno makes a distinctive allowance for ferries and RoRo vessels.

- For Passenger RoRo cargo ferries – 75% of GT certificate value
- For all other RoRo types – 90% of GT certificate value

Reduction factor implemented prior to calculation of Pilotage costs.

Le Havre:

The tariffs are based on volume to create a fairer level playing field for high-sided vessels with rebates for frequency.

The tariff is structured around a vessel's volume and is calculated on $V = L \times B \times Dt$

The frequency rebate applies to pure car carriers of $V > 13000$ cubic metres operating in Liner service.

NOTE: the discount is against the operating company and not individual ships (therefore vessel substitution has no effect on outcome) and is based on number of calls per calendar year.

There is also available a discounted rebate on annual turnover for RoRos > 13000 cubic metres.

Rotterdam:

The tariff is based on the dynamic characteristics of the vessels being operating draft and pilotage distance that gives for a more level playing field.

There is also a tabulated frequency discount based on number of calls on vessels' length overall.

The offer is available either on a per-individual vessel basis but also accepted clusters of sister vessels / company fleet accumulatively.

Antwerp:

The tariff is based on the dynamic operational characteristics of the vessel in relation to the service provided in that consideration is only given to the **operating draft** for pilotage on the river and **Length overall** for pilotage in the inner harbour.

Sheerness:

The tariff is also only concerned with the dynamic operational characteristics of the function being performed in that the tariff is a lump-sum payment per handling based solely on the operating draft.

2. FAIRWAY / TONNAGE / PORT DUES TARIFFS IN OTHER EUROPEAN PORTS

Spain:

The tariffs are based on GT but offer direct rebates and frequency rebates. In recognition of the negative impact that GT based tariffs have on RoRos and car carriers an immediate 15% rebate is offered with a further 15% for a regular liner service.

In addition frequency rebates for liner services are offered.

Flushing:

The tariffs are based on GT and are structured around vessel type and frequency. (Note that the same applies for Terneuzen.)

The tariff differentiates between liner and non-liner services. It starts with a general tariff for all vessel types except for RoRos and Lash and then again with RoRos when the DWT is < 65% of the GT of the vessel in question (which in reality would only ever apply to Car carriers).

The available frequency rebates also identify between non-liner and liner.

Zeebrugge:

There are basic rates for the inner as well as the outer ports and are based on GT. However in recognition of the burden that GT based tariffs place on RoRos there is a reducing factor within the tariff that is only applicable to RoRo vessels:

- GRT is accepted
- GT reduced by 2.5 prior to calculating costs.

There is also a frequency rebate for all liner services as long as certain minimum requirements are met:

Dublin:

Structured tariff plus rebates for cargo tonnes handled in ratio to vessel's NT.

These dues are based on either ½ GT or NT depending on whichever is greater.

The actual tariff is structured two-fold i.e. for EU destined ports (Short-sea) and non-EU destined ports (Deep-sea) and on vessel type. The different types of vessels so identified are:

LO/LO – Bulk liquid – break solid – breakbulk – RoRo freight – car carriers

Cork:

Structured tariff, based on GT, differentiating between EU destined and non-EU destined ports (Short-sea and deep-sea).

As for Dublin the tariff allows for various vessel types.

LO/LO – Bulk liquid – bulk solid – breakbulk – RoRo freight – car carriers

Le Havre:

Structured tariff, based on volume, with rebates for frequency or ratio between cargo handled and vessel volume.

The tariff is structured around a vessel's volume and is calculated on $V = L \times B \times T_e$

The tariff is two-fold and is divided between Short Sea and Deep Sea trade and also for loading and unloading operations (that are considered individually) for different vessel types.

Reductions, which are available to all qualified port users, can be granted on the basis of either frequency or as a ratio of cargo handled to vessel's volume. Only one can be applied at any one time and the carrier can always opt for the more beneficial reduction.

The frequency reduction applies to ships on regular lines and making round trips scheduled in advance.

Bremerhaven (and Bremen):

Structured tariff, based on GT, differentiating between EU destined and non-EU destined ports (Short-sea and deep-sea).

The trade routes are categorised as:

Short sea routes are designated as those on short distance European routes engaged in traffic with the North Sea-Baltic section including Norway, UK, the Faeroe Islands, Ireland and the French coast up to the border of Spain on the Bay of Biscay.

Deep-sea routes concerns traffic with non-European routes, which are not covered by the definition of "long distance European routes as described below.

Long distance European routes is traffic with the European ports not included in the definition for Short sea routes and includes the ports of Iceland and the and the non-European ports of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea.

The tariff items are based on these trade routes however the tariff joins the Deep-sea routes and the Long distance European routes together as one entry.

However there is an additional entry for car carriers and RoRos only but also split into Short Sea and Deep Sea (plus long distance European).

PORTS

Port Infrastructure / Equipment

fiches 10 - 11

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

Fiche submitted for consideration by the SSS Focal Point Portugal **on** 12 June 2000.

Description of the bottleneck:

Lack of ports infrastructures and proper equipment, namely terminals suitable to SSS.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

The defective availability of proper infrastructures leads to an increase of the vessels' stay in ports and, therefore to an increase of the merchandises "transit time", contradicting the necessary SSS competitiveness.

Measures towards a solution:

Improvement of maritime accesses to ports terminals.

The rearrangement and increasing capacity of ports infrastructures and construction of supporting intermodal platforms to ports.

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

Lines operators/Shipowners – to take the initiative to begin with the new services, to increase the existing frequencies.

Ports authorities, Ports administrations, Ports – to offer abilities and services to implement the necessary activities to SSS.

Government – to support projects on creation of port infrastructures dedicated to SSS.

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

* * * * *

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

Fiches submitted for consideration by the SSS Focal Point of Portugal **on** 12 June 2000 and The Norwegian Coastal Administration **on** 6 October 2005.

Description of the bottleneck:

Defective access conditions to terminals

Some ports (in Norway) are choosing to close down railway tracks in ports as a result of the high cost of track maintenance due to strict regulation.

Obstruction in coastal fairways and harbours due to narrow waters, dangerous underwater rocks, urban development projects competing for harbour area etc.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

The start of SSS services on a port becomes difficult.

Reduced ability for efficient and safe sea transport.

Measures towards a solution:

Improvement of maritime and land accesses to port terminals.

The rearrangement and increasing capacity of port infrastructures and construction of supporting intermodal and Logistics platforms on port hinterlands.

Creation of the Civil Harbour Master.

Proper working schedules on port of all entities involved – twenty four hours a day – either public or private, in a way to allow a better optimisation of vessels turn around, which is essential to SSS efficiency avoiding, this way, the increase of extra costs.

Establish practical regulations that are adjusted to the situation in the port area.

Increased effort on dredging and removing underwater rocks in fairways as well as carrying out arrangements helping harbours to improve efficiency.

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

Port Authorities – Port Administrations – Port Institutes – to offer abilities and services to implement the necessary to SSS activities.

Governments – to support projects creating ports infrastructures dedicated to SSS.

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

Norwegian Coastal Administration is developing a standardised specification for fairways in order to improve safety and efficiency for sea transport of all kinds.

* * * * *

PORTS

Port Hinterland Connections

fiche 12

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

Fiches submitted for consideration by the SSS Focal Point of Portugal and the Italian National Round Table on Short Sea Shipping and Ministero dei Trasporti e della Navigazione in June 2000 and The Port of Oslo on 7 October 2005.

Description of the bottleneck:

Defective highway and railway connections to hinterland linking ports to the Trans-European Network of Transport.

Low Standard of Hinterland railway and road connections for otherwise competitive ports because of different administrative levels for ports (local) and railway/road (governmental). No direct governmental responsibility for connecting the Ports to the National Trunk Roads.

Hampering effects of the bottleneck:

The aforementioned deficiency obstructs the SSS integration on the Supply Chain philosophy, not allowing an efficient process of modal shift.

Reduced competitiveness for Intermodal transport rail/road-sea-rail/road, especially for door-to-door SSS.

Measures towards a solution:

A bigger apprehension on an infrastructure policy for the road-rail and maritime accessibility to ports, in order to begin the promotion of SSS as part off a door-to-door intermodal chain.

The rearrangement and increasing capacity of ports infrastructures and construction of supporting intermodal and logistic platforms on ports hinterlands.

A direct governmental responsibility to upgrade and keep the standard of Hinterland connections. National Budget priority of connections.

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

Government - to support projects on land accessibility to ports.
European Commission – to intensify the supporting mechanisms.

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

* * * * *