The International Association of Marine and Shipping Professionals (IAMSP) is the professional body for Marine and Shipping professionals world-wide, formed in 2015. The association is an independent, non-political organization aims to:

Contribute to the promotion and protection of maritime activities of the shipping industry, the study of their development opportunities and more generally everything concerning these activities.

Promote the development of occupations related to maritime and shipping; serve as a point of contact and effective term for the business relationship with the shipping industry (charter brokers, traders, shipping agents, Marine surveyors, ship inspectors, ship-managers, sailors, and stevedores etc.).

Ensuring the representation of its members to the institutions, national and international organizations as well as with governments, communities and professional groups while promoting the exchange of information, skills and the exchange of experience.

Develop the partnership relations sponsorship, collaboration between IAMSP and other associations, companies, national and international organizations involved in activities related to Maritimes and shipping.

Contribute to the update and improvement of professional knowledge of its members and raise their skill levels to international standards.

Progress towards a comprehensive and integrated view of all marine areas and the activities and resources related to the sea.
By James A. Millward

In a lesser-known novel, “Claudius Bombarnac,” Jules Verne describes the adventures of the titular foreign correspondent as he rides the Grand Transasiatic Railway from the European frontier to the capital of the Celestial Empire. A cast of international characters, by turns comical, curious and shady, accompanies the French reporter by train from the Caspian Sea to Peking, narrowly escaping bandits and delivering a mysterious cargo.

When first published in 1893, the book was futuristic fiction. There was no continuous rail link across Eurasia. There still isn’t, but 125 years later China now envisions financing and building multiple such overland routes (with much faster trains). That’s for the “belt” portion of what it calls the “One Belt, One Road” initiative: It is also developing a string of new ports, from the South China Sea through the Indian Ocean to Africa and the Mediterranean.

The number and scale of the projects proposed are breathtaking, far surpassing even the imagination of a sci-fi writer. They have stimulated awe and, more often, dark suspicions among many foreign observers.

Just after Verne was writing, China’s first main railways were being built by Western companies, financed by Western loans to a nearly bankrupt Qing dynasty. Within two decades, struggles over foreign ownership of Chinese rail had touched off a revolution that brought down the dynasty in 1912. Today, the former victim of Western railway imperialism is lending billions to countries throughout Asia, Africa and Europe to construct not only railroads but also highways, ports, power plants and other infrastructure.

China’s economic progress over the past century has been phenomenal, lifting hundreds of millions of Chinese out of poverty. So when the Chinese government offers to share its experience in development — a prominent theme in its official speeches and documents — it should be taken seriously.

But the historical echoes are worrisome. Already, Sri Lanka, unable to pay back the $8 billion it owes Chinese state-owned enterprises for building major infrastructure on its territory, has agreed to lease its port in Hambantota to China for 99 years. That is precisely the term for which another strategic port, Hong Kong, was leased by the Qing to the British in circumstances that epitomize colonialism.

So one wonders: Is China presenting a new model of development to a world that could use one, or is One Belt, One Road itself the new colonialism?

Because these rail and other projects require security, they extend the Chinese government’s political reach into Central Asia, Pakistan and the Middle East. And as Beijing turns the South China Sea into a vast game of Go, its new ports in Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Pakistan and, potentially, the Maldives start to look like still more playing tokens.
China’s pretty talk of development and cooperation sounds like cover for a strategic advance, and of course it is that. But besides investing financially in infrastructure, One Belt, One Road also invests China’s prestige in a globalist message that sounds all the right notes — peace, multicultural tolerance, mutual prosperity — and that rhetoric sets standards by which to hold China accountable.

The Chinese government has rolled out the initiative with fanfare, casting it as President Xi Jinping’s signature foreign policy project, and outsiders have in turn treated it as a monolithic venture. In fact, it is made up of many elements: cultural, diplomatic, developmental, as well as commercial and strategic. You can’t give thumbs up or thumbs down to the whole package, because One Belt, One Road is nothing less than the rebranding of China’s entire foreign policy, in all its complexity.

For example, complementing the initiative’s harder edge is a cultural component that observers often overlook: numerous school programs, cultural exchanges, art shows, museum exhibitions, musical performances, dance concerts, archaeological explorations and Unesco collaborations. These extensions of Chinese soft power play on the idea of the Silk Road, that mythical ancient golden age of untrammeled trade and cross-cultural synergy. In fact, there never really was a single Silk Road (nor several roads) linking East to West that you could draw on a map; rather, trade fanned out in networks...
across the breadth of Eurasia — as it did elsewhere. And machinations of empires always played a larger role in promoting exchanges than did intrepid private traders.

But the idea of the Silk Road (unlike, say, the idea of the “Great Gamel) is nonthreatening, a sepia-tinged vision of camels and bazaars full of exotic luxuries. China has cleverly pinned its foreign policy to a pleasant historical myth that unites the peoples of Afro-Eurasia. It is a fable that can literally be told as a bedtime story about “sharing‖ and giraffes.

To the cynical, this is just so much propagandistic treacle. But China is also now loudly speaking the language of international development; it has announced that it is stepping up to be a global good citizen concerned about the economic well-being of its neighbors. Sincere or not, the message is at least supranational, in stark contrast to the protectionism and xenophobia displayed by President Trump and emerging nationalistic ideologies in Europe, India and elsewhere.

The George W. Bush administration’s 2005 call for China to become a “responsible stakeholder‖ in world affairs may have been patronizing, but it was also forward-looking. One Belt, One Road is Beijing’s full-throated answer to that challenge — even if it asserts China’s independence from an America-centered world order, rather than a convergence with it.

Is a new approach, by a new player, such a bad thing? The economic orthodoxy long imposed by the United States-dominated World Bank and International Monetary Fund on developing countries in crisis — a reform package known as the Washington Consensus — has enjoyed a mixed record at best. And in Africa, for example, Western investment remains small, given the continent’s size, population and needs.

China, for its part, has embraced Africa. Although some of its projects have coddled corrupt dictators in order to haul off African raw materials, others have delivered concrete economic benefits locally. Moreover, some Chinese government and corporate investors have proved willing to take risks that Western corporations and countries have consistently avoided.

Some of China’s Silk Road projects will be boondoggles. Some will produce economic benefits. Some may be effective at reducing poverty. Some will promote Chinese state and corporate interests. One Belt, One Road, with its many faces, is neither a nefarious plot for world domination nor the answer to all the world’s problems. We should evaluate its projects individually and hold them to the goal that the broader initiative has set for itself: to build a better future modeled on an idealized past.

[The New York Times]

Port development Vietnam: Lach Huyen International Gateway Port to be opened

05/05/2018
By Atsushi Tomiyama, Nikkei staff writer
Vietnam’s coastal city of Haiphong will open a deep-water port this month, taking a step toward becoming a key maritime link in the north and enhancing the country’s position in the global supply chain.

Haiphong is already known for its existing port. But the port is located on the River Cam, where the water runs seven meters deep at most, meaning the terminal cannot take large container ships.
The new Lach Huyen International Gateway Port, however, faces the sea, where the water is 14 meters deep. The wharf also doubles that of Haiphong Port at 750 meters long. The facility will be equipped with two container cranes.

Construction started on Lach Huyen port in 2013, with estimated costs topping $1 billion. When the first phase is completed on May 13, the port will handle around 300,000 20-foot equivalent units, or TEUs.

That number will rise to between 2 million TEUs and 3 million TEUs in 2019 as capacity develops.

Combined with the existing port's load, Haiphong will be capable of processing approximately 5 million TEUs. That would put it on a par with Ho Chi Minh City's port in the south, which handled 5.94 million TEUs last year. Haiphong's shipping capacity still pales in comparison with Singapore Port, the largest in Southeast Asia at 33.66 million TEUs. But the city will close in on the likes of Thailand's Laem Chabang port, which manages 7.78 million TEUs.

Other infrastructure projects are complementing Haiphong's port project. A new expressway connecting the port city with the capital Hanoi cuts travel time in half to roughly 90 minutes. Another highway to Quang Ninh province in northeastern Vietnam, home to factories owned by Japanese companies, will open this year.

Northern Vietnam is steadily becoming a production hub for the electronics, automotive and precision machinery sectors. South Korea's Samsung Electronics, for one, has established mobile phone plants in that region. The Deep C industrial zone near Lach Huyen has already attracted roughly 80 companies from both at home and abroad.

[Nikkei Asian Review]

05/05/2018
By Aygerim Sarymbetova

On May 2, Turkmenistan’s President Gurbanguly Berdimuhamedow inaugurated a new cargo and passenger seaport on the Caspian Sea. Officials in Ashgabat hope the port, costing $1.5 billion, will help Turkmenistan strengthen its economy by handling shipping traffic between Asia and Europe.

With the world’s sixth largest proven natural gas reserves – roughly 50 trillion cubic meters – hydrocarbon exports make up 25 percent of Turkmenistan’s gross domestic product, according to U.S. government data. The bulk of the country’s gas exports head east, to China.

Turkmenistan’s economy took a hit in 2016 and 2017, when Iran and Russia shut off their gas markets due to price disputes.

According to the Turkmenistani government, the newly launched port, located in the western city of Turkmenbashi, is capable of handling 17 million tons of goods per year with the possibility of expanding its capacity to 26 million tons.

Covering a territory of roughly 376 acres, the newly launched port also includes passenger and transport terminals, designed to serve 300,000 passengers and 75,000 vehicles per year. In addition, a plant has been launched for the construction and maintenance of ships.
The construction of the port was initiated within the government-backed plan launched in 2014 and aimed at the development of the Turkmenbashi international seaport and country's maritime merchant fleet. Meanwhile, officials in Turkmenistan announced the country’s intent to integrate the port into the East-West and North-South transportation corridors and use it to help its landlocked neighbors Uzbekistan and Afghanistan.

While the East-West trade corridors, known as TRACECA, is an international transport program involving the European Union and 14-member States of the Eastern European, Caucasian and Central Asian region, the International North–South Transport Corridor (INSTC) is a network of ships, roads and rails that will move cargo between India, Afghanistan, the Caspian and Central Asian regions as well as Europe.

While Turkmenistan’s railways are already linked with China via neighboring Kazakhstan, the newly launched port may help the country increase multimillion shipping traffic through its territory. Azerbaijan, Russia, Kazakhstan, and Iran have already launched their own seaports on what is considered the world’s largest landlocked sea.

Azerbaijan, which lies on the western shore of the Caspian Sea, earlier this year had opened the country’s first roll-on/roll-off (Ro-Ro) cargo terminal at the Baku International Sea Trade Port. Located in the Alat trade and industrial area south of Baku, the International Sea Trade Port is currently under construction as it expands. The port will be able to transport up to 25 million tons of cargo and 1 million containers.

05/05/2018
By Shihar Aneez
Sri Lanka’s state-run investment body has approved a $500 million liquefied natural gas plant by China Machinery Engineering Corp near a Chinese-controlled port and industrial zone, the development strategies minister said on Friday.

The state-run Board of Investment has approved investment projects worth $1 billion in the first quarter, Malik Samarawickrama said, the largest of which was the LNG project in Hambantota, where China Merchants Port Holdings controls a Chinese-built port on a 99-year lease.

The port, which is leased for $1.12 billion, is near the main shipping route from Asia to Europe and likely to play a major role in China’s ‘Belt and Road’ initiative. Chinese control of Hambantota, as well as a plan to acquire 15,000 acres (23 square miles) to develop an industrial zone nearby, has raised fears that it could also be used for Chinese naval vessels.

Government and diplomatic sources have told Reuters that the United States, India and Japan had raised concerns that China might use the port as a naval base. The Sri Lankan government has said the agreement bans usage of port for military purpose.

[Reuters]
Port development Ukraine: Plans for new container terminal at Chornomorsk and modernization of Yuzhny

04/05/2018
Ukraine plans to launch two major projects in Black Sea ports this year, the Ukrainian Sea Ports Authority (USPA) said Friday, citing the country's Infrastructure Minister Volodymyr Omelyan.

One of the projects envisages the construction of a container terminal in the port of Chornomorsk, while another project stipulates for the modernization of the port of Yuzhny, the USPA said in a statement.

"For us, this is a significant step forward in terms of the quality, the scope (of the works) and the new global business approaches that will be introduced in Ukraine," Omelyan was quoted as saying in the statement.

Ukraine, which set a target to become an important transit hub between Asia and Europe, last year has launched a major renewal of the country's port infrastructure, which envisages modernization of all 13 maritime ports.

The Beijing-based China Harbor Engineering Company won the tenders to carry out dredging projects at the Chornomorsk port and at the Yuzhny port. The projects are aimed at boosting the handling capacity of the maritime facilities.

[Xinhua]

Shipping emissions: Norway creates world's first maritime zero emissions zone

04/05/2018
By Jennifer Johnson
The Norwegian Parliament has ruled that all cruise ships and ferries operating in the country's world heritage fjords must be emission free as soon as possible, and no later than 2026. The decision has effectively created the world's first zero emissions zone at sea.

Last month, Norwegian ferry owner and operator The Fjords took delivery of an all-electric catamaran, The Future of the Fjords, which will transport tourists across a popular fjord route in western Norway.

The ferry is the first vessel of its kind to utilize zero-emission battery propulsion technology, though it can't claim the title of "Norway's first electric ferry". This is held by Ampere, a car carrier that operates on the Sognefjord, a major route for north-south transportation in the country.
The new ruling will mean that other operators will have to outfit their vessels with similar battery technologies, and ports will have to install charging infrastructure. Hydrogen propulsion could also be possible in the future, though the necessary technologies are still in development.

-Norway has long been a world leader in emission-free ferries based on sound political decisions on zero-emission requirements, says Marius Holm, head of the environmental foundation ZERO. -Now the country is taking a step further in the maritime green shift, with global repercussions. At the national level, this will mean a welcome development towards emission-free solutions on many tourist ships, a significant decrease in greenhouse gas emissions and a halt to harmful local air pollution.

The country’s shipping industry has also expressed enthusiasm for the zero-emissions ruling and hopes it will consolidate its position as a pioneer in green maritime technology. -The decision on zero-emission fjords can secure our industry’s position in this area, so that Norwegian business will be strengthened and we can provide good solutions also to the rest of the world, says Hege Økland, CEO of NCE Maritime CleanTech.

[The Marine Professional]
Drewry estimates that the global container shipping industry generated transport revenues of $166 billion globally in 2017, managing the flows of 207 million twenty-foot equivalent units (teu) of ocean containers, and requiring about 1.26 billion freight invoices to be issued, verified, paid and reconciled.

The impact of the costs and inefficiencies on each stakeholder diminishes as the stakeholder gets larger in size:

- Smaller stakeholders tend to be more reliant on spot markets, where more of the processes are manual, freight rates and supplier bases are most volatile, and most of the invoice errors occur.
- Larger stakeholders tend to rely more on long-term contracts, which allow for IT solutions to be developed that, after the initial setup cost, provide for nearly frictionless freight invoicing, checking and settlement processes.

Regardless of the size of the stakeholder, the prevailing inefficiencies in invoicing and reconciliation processes pose a significant market opportunity for technological disruptors, provided they address the underlying industry issues by:

- Offering simplified and/or automated invoicing and payment practices.
- Creating sufficient trust, so that market participants can drop the antiquated practice of ‘Cash Against Documents’.

With support from Mastercard, a new white paper by Drewry Supply Chain Advisers - Invoicing and payment processes in global container shipping: ready for disruption? - examines the current invoicing and payment processes and compares them with an ‘ideal state’ global container liner shipping industry - with frictionless invoice reconciliation, settlement and immediate payments. The cost of today’s process inefficiencies and lack of trust represent $34.4 billion annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDUSTRY ISSUE</th>
<th>COST DRIVER</th>
<th>ANNUAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low level of automation</td>
<td>Cost of credit</td>
<td>$1.6 bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transaction cost</td>
<td>$30.7 bn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of trust</td>
<td>‘Cash Against Documents’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of bad debt</td>
<td>$2.1 bn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Whilst the impact of these costs and inefficiencies on market stakeholders tend to diminish with increases in their size, the current inefficiencies in invoicing and reconciliation in particular pose a significant market opportunity for disruptive technology.

**Key numbers regarding payment and credit practices in global container shipping**
1. **Transaction cost for payments and reconciliation**
   - a. Number of freight-related invoices issued: 2.16 billion
   - b. Estimated cost per transaction of couriers and cheques for payment in the US (incl. labour): $51 per payment
   - c. Estimated cost per transaction of freight payment platforms (excl. labour): $2
   - d. Estimated time of checking invoices for small and large shippers:
     - Small shippers: between 2 and 15 minutes per invoice (longer in case of invoice errors)
     - Large shippers (EDI/Self Billing): between 2 and 15 minutes for 10 invoices

2. **Cost of bad debt**
   - a. Cost of bad debt for shipping lines: 0.6% of sales (equivalent to $1.0bn)
   - b. Cost of bad debt for forwarders and NVOCCs: 1.3% of sales (equivalent to $1.1bn)

3. **Cost of credit**
   - c. Average amount of receivables for a shipping line: 25 days
   - d. Average amount of receivables for a forwarder or NVOCC: 50 days
   - e. Estimated average number of credit days (if any) obtained by small and large shippers:
     - Small shippers: 10 days
     - Large shippers: 40 days


**White Paper Contents**

1. **Executive Summary**

2. **Key issues in invoicing and reconciliation**
   - 2.1 Low levels of automation
   - 2.2 Antiquated practice: ‘Cash Against Documents’ payment arrangements
   - 2.3 Managing risk for new and unknown customers

3. **Key numbers regarding payment and credit practices in global container shipping**

4. **Conclusions and Recommendations**

[Drewry Supply Chain Advisers]
Container shipping: Panama Canal Authority decides to increase containership size limits

04/05/2018
By Michele Labrut
The Panama Canal Authority (ACP) has announced that starting 1 Jun, it will allow transit of post-panamax containerships with a beam of 51.25m, up from 49.00m today, and with it the transit of 20-row wide boxships up from the current limit was of 19-rows.

According to analyst Alphaliner, the overall capacity on the route is expected to increase by 10%, until July, based on nominal vessel intakes. The capacity increase on the far East-US East Coast route, planned for this summer will be spread almost uniformly across each of the main carriers, it said.

The Ocean Alliance, from 1 May, is upsizing to 13,000—14,400 teu vessels on two of its seven existing all-water strings [AWE 1 and AWES/SAX]. The two loops will deploy 19-row-post panamaxes via the Panama Canal while The Alliance will add 9.8% to its overall all-water capacity this year, said Alphaliner.
It will deploy 20-row-wide ships that, so far, were not allowed to transit the waterway.

Average vessels sizes in the Far East-USEast trade have increased significantly since 2016 and Canal expansion inauguration, especially on the Panama route. The impact of bigger and larger new locks led average size vessel to increase from 4,600t eu in early 2016 to 8,300 teu by July 2018, commented Alphaliner.

The $5.5bn-Panama Canal expansion has allowed Panama to regain most of the all-water trade share that it lost to the Suez Canal during its construction between 2010 and 2016. Panama’s traffic share (based on head-haul passages only) currently stands at 72% compared to 48% at January 2016.

[Seatrade Maritime News]

Research & development Finland: Research consortium to boost digitalization and energy efficiency of the marine sector

03/05/2018
INTENS, a VTT-coordinated Finnish research-industry collaborative consortium, has jointly committed over €13 million in the next three years, with the ardent funding support of €5.6 million from Business Finland, to proactively advancing, promoting and digitalizing Finnish marine industries and beyond, specially focusing on energy efficiency improvement and emissions reduction of ship energy systems.

-Thanks to the great support from Business Finland Arctic Seas program and the consortium partners, we are able to form this industry-wide ambitious and committed consortium to boost the digitalization and digital transformation of the Finnish marine sector and promote our top-level marine expertise globally, states Vice President of Digital Engineering, Johannes Hyrynen, from VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland Ltd.

Finland has been one of the leading countries in the digitalization and automation of the marine industries. The INTENS project aims to further deepen and uniquely integrate digital transformation into the whole chain of the marine cluster, from R&D to innovation, design, manufacturing and operation. The generated novel solutions and innovations can largely improve energy efficiency and reduce emissions of ship
Training & education Netherlands: DP World signs MoU with Erasmus University for skills development programme

03/05/2018
DP World has signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for a strategic skills development programme which will focus on leadership and business management with the renowned Erasmus University, in Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

The joint initiative, called ‘Evolve’, will develop aspiring business unit and regional heads across DP World’s global portfolio of 78 ports in 40 countries.

The partnership is with three subsidiaries of the Erasmus University Rotterdam: the Centre for Maritime Economics and Logistics (MEL), the Erasmus Centre for Urban, Port and Transport Economics (Erasmus UPT) and the Executive Education department of the Rotterdam School of Management (RSM).

Greenpeace escort protests world’s first purpose-built floating nuclear power plant

03/05/2018
As the _Akademik Lomonosov_, a floating nuclear power plant built in St. Petersburg, today entered Danish waters on its journey to Murmansk, it was met by Greenpeace activists forming a peaceful escort and demanding stricter regulatory measures. [1]
Speaking from aboard the Beluga II, a Greenpeace ship sailing alongside the Russian nuclear plant, Jan Haverkamp, a nuclear expert for Greenpeace Central and Eastern Europe, said: “This power plant basically moves the threat of a nuclear catastrophe into fragile Arctic waters. With its flat-bottomed hull and lack of self-propulsion it’s like balancing a nuclear power plant on a wooden palette and setting it adrift in some of the world’s roughest waters.”

Russian-built nuclear icebreakers and submarines have an incident-ridden history, which, according to Jan Haverkamp, should cause alarm among nuclear regulators. “We are urging the international community to demand from Russia a full and independent assessment and oversight of the transport, testing and operation of this floating nuclear power plant, especially considering Rosatom’s ambitions of mass producing these sci-fi fantasy floating disasters,” said Haverkamp.

The reactors on the 144 metres long _Akademik Lomonosov_ are smaller than conventional land-based nuclear plants. They will need refuelling every two to three years and nuclear waste will be stored onboard until returned after 12 years of operation.

“The international community, especially Germany and the Nordic countries should recognise the threat that the _Akademik Lomonosov_ and any future floating nuclear power plants represent to the spirit and intent of the ban on dumping radioactive wastes in oceans that was agreed a quarter of a century ago,” said Jan Haverkamp, pointing to the London Convention of 1972. [2]

Due to pressure from the public in St.Petersburg and from the Nordic and Baltic countries, the Akademik Lomonosov was not loaded with uranium and tested in St. Petersburg. This will be done in Murmansk later this year. Next year it is planned to be towed 5,000 km through the Northern Sea Route and put to use near Pevek, in the Chukotka Region.

According to Russian media [3], 15 countries, including China, Algeria, Indonesia, Malaysia and Argentina, have shown an interest in hiring these plant that – among other purposes – are intended to provide power for exploration of fossil fuels.

Notes:
Greenpeace is demanding:

• A stop on the introduction of floating nuclear power plants in the Arctic and elsewhere.
• A full and unrestricted regulatory oversight by the Russian nuclear regulator Rostechnadzor with peer-review by the nuclear regulators from other Arctic countries.
• A transboundary Arctic Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) before loading and testing in Murmansk will take place.
• An assessment under the London Convention of the legality of operation of the Akademik Lomonosov as a source of (operational and potential accidental) radioactive releases into the oceans.


03/05/18
A two-year study about used electrical and electronic equipment (UEEE) that were sent to Nigeria, mostly from European ports, showed a continuing problem of non-compliance with international and national rules governing such shipments.

60,000 metric tons in both 2015 and 2016 of e-waste reached Nigeria, with 70% of the UEEE reaching Lagos each year in vehicles destined for Nigeria’s second-hand auto market, while just 30% arrived in shipping containers. This volume is prohibited under both the Basel Convention and the EU’s Waste Shipment Directive.

The study report, Assessing import of used electrical and electronic equipment into Nigeria, is co-authored by the Basel Convention Coordinating Centre for Africa (BCCC-Africa) and the Sustainable Cycles (SCYCLE) Programme of the United Nations University Vice-Rectorate in Europe, and concluded that more than 60% of the UEEE imported in containers was declared in official paperwork to be household goods or personal effects.
Key aspects:

- LCD-TVs and flat panel monitors accounted for 18% of Nigeria's imported UEEE;
- CRT-TVs and CRT-monitors (14%);
- photocopying machines (13%);
- refrigerators (12%);
- desktop CPUs (7%);
- air conditioners, speakers, and washing machines (6% each);
- and printers (5%).

Of the UEEE imported inside Ro-Ros, almost 98% came from EU member states. Specifically, the UEEE imported in containers originated from ports in the EU (29%), China (24%), and the USA (20%).

77% of Nigeria's UEEE imports were from EU ports, mainly from Germany and the UK (around 20% each), followed by Belgium, Netherlands, Spain, and Ireland. China and the USA each account for about 7% of the total imports.

Main countries in which the ports of exports of 2015/2016 UEEE imports into Nigeria are located

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Port of Export</th>
<th>RoRo-vehicles (t)</th>
<th>Containers w/o vehicles (t)</th>
<th>Containers w. vehicles (t)</th>
<th>Total annual exports to Nigeria (t)</th>
<th>Share in annual imports into Nigeria</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11,670</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12,020</td>
<td>20.03%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>10,130</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>11,710</td>
<td>19.52%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>4,860</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4,930</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>4,410</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,870</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>7.33%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,690</td>
<td>6.15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The study found, however, that none of the illegal shipments resulted in consequences for the exporters or importers.

[SAFETY4SEA]
Recently a Rotterdam court found reefer operator Seatrade and two of its directors guilty for illegal demolition of vessels. In light of this development, Nick Shaw, Partner and Global Practice Group Leader, ReedSmith and Natalia Debowska, Trainee Solicitor, ReedSmith, are attempting to explain the international law regarding the demolition of end-of-life vessels and provide their recommendations.

A Rotterdam court has found Dutch reefer operator Seatrade and two of its directors criminally liable for illegally selling vessels for demolition in South Asian yards in breach of the EU Waste Shipment Regulation.

The decision appears to be the first time an EU shipowner has been held criminally liable for the illegal export of vessels for demolition to South Asian yards. [1] The Dutch public prosecutor brought the cases against Seatrade over historic sales of vessels for demolition in India, Bangladesh and Turkey in 2012. The sales of the vessels took place via cash buyers. All vessels departed from Rotterdam and Hamburg on their last voyage to the South Asian yards.

Seatrade and its directors were fined up to 750,000 euros and the directors have been banned from working in the shipping industry for a year. The public prosecutor also sought prison sentences for the directors, but the court did not impose these.

The decision sets a precedent in the Netherlands. It makes it clear that shipowners who sell vessels for demolition in South Asian scrap yards in breach of the EU Waste Shipment Regulation risk facing criminal liability. It is the first successful prosecution of a shipowner for non-compliance with the EU Waste Shipment Regulation, which prohibits the export of hazardous waste to non-OECD countries, and bans the export of waste for disposal.


Importantly, the case reflects the political climate and the greater interest shown by European countries in environmental issues and may be followed by other European countries. Cases of illegal demolition of vessels are currently being investigated by national authorities, such as the UK and Norway. In Norway for example, the vessel the MV "Tide Carrier1 was arrested by the Norwegian environmental authorities, and these have been investigating its owners for illegally selling the vessel to a South Asian yard for demolition.

Shipowners should therefore take greater notice of the regulations when considering demolition.

International law and the demolition of end-of-life vessels

Any shipowner considering selling an end-of-life vessel for demolition should first consider whether the sale complies with the Basel Convention. An end-of-life vessel will likely be considered as "waste" under the Basel Convention, since waste is defined broadly to include "substances or objects which are disposed of or are intended to be disposed of or are required to be disposed of by the provisions of national law". Therefore, a sale of a vessel for demolition is likely to be considered a "transboundary movement of waste" under the Basel Convention.
Shipowners should be aware that if there is anything onboard the vessel that could be considered ‘hazardous’ waste under the Basel Convention or under the national laws of the destination country of the vessel being scrapped, the country of import and any countries of transit will need to be notified of the movement of waste. In addition, the countries of import and transit will need to give their consent for the movement of waste.

The Hong Kong Convention for the Safe and Environmentally Sound Recycling of Ships was adopted in 2009 but has still not been ratified by enough shipowning and scrapping countries so the Basel Convention remains the main international regulation. While an increasing number of demolition yards have been obtaining certificates and statements of compliance with the Hong Kong Convention, shipowners should be mindful that the Hong Kong Convention is not yet in force. There may be different certification providers and their standards of issuing the certification may not be entirely clear. Shipowners should therefore not decide on demolition yards solely based on a yard's statement of compliance with the Hong Kong Convention.

EU rules and the demolition of end-of-life vessels

The Dutch case brought against Seatrade concerned the illegal sale of a vessel in breach of the EU Waste Shipment Regulation (the –Regulation) that applies to ship demolition.

EU Shipowners with vessels trading in EU waters are advised to consider whether the sale of the end-of-life vessel for demolition complies with the Regulation. Importantly, the Regulation applies also to vessels of all flags that trade within EU waters – not just EU-flagged vessels.

Under the Regulation ship demolition of end-of-life vessels moving in EU waters is likely to be considered as ‘waste’, which is defined as ‘any substance or object which the holder discards or intends or is required to discard’. Shipowners should note that it is enough for an intention to discard the end-of-life vessel to arise for the vessel to be considered ‘waste’ under the Regulation.

If the intention to discard arises when the vessel is in EU waters, it is possible that the intention to scrap the vessel will make it ‘waste’ for the purposes of the Regulation. If the end-of-life vessel leaves an EU port destined for demolition in another country, the sale of the vessel is likely to be considered a shipment of waste; whether within the EU, exported from the EU to a third country, in transit through the EU to a third country, or imported into an EU state from a third country.

Shipowners should note that under the Regulation, the shipment of waste for disposal is prohibited from EU countries to non-EU, and non-OECD countries. The shipment of hazardous waste for recovery from the EU to non-EU and non-OECD countries is also prohibited.

There may be the possibility that the end-of-life vessel is a ‘green-listed’ vessel destined for recovery. If it is destined for recovery in an OECD country, it will be subject to the written notification and consent procedure under the Regulation. If the vessel is ‘green-listed’ waste destined for recovery to a non-OECD country, such as India, Pakistan or Bangladesh, it is important to check whether such countries have notified their position with the EU authorities as to the requirements of the import of such waste.

EU Shipowners with vessels trading in EU waters should therefore be aware that sales of vessels for demolition in a non-OECD country may be considered as shipment of waste for disposal, and therefore be prohibited by the Regulation. The decision of the Rotterdam court makes it clear that if a vessel is sold for demolition in a non-OECD country in breach of the Regulation criminal liability including fines and possible imprisonment for the directors making those decisions may follow.

Ship Recycling Regulation

While the Hong Kong Convention is not yet in force, the EU has adopted the –Ship Recycling
Shipping emissions: The race is on to decarbonize the 50,000-plus ships that carry our stuff around the world

03/05/2018

By Fred Pearce, environment journalist and author

International shipping produces as much CO2 as aircraft. Here’s what we can do about that.
Low-tech solutions can deliver big emission cuts: sails could once again become the norm. Credit: Elomatic Oy/NYK

Watch out for the return of the sailing ship.

Earlier this month, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) agreed to cut total greenhouse gas emissions from shipping by at least 50 percent by 2050, and to pursue efforts towards phasing them out entirely. The race is now on to find technologies that can decarbonize the 50,000-plus tankers, freighters, container vessels and ferries that make up the world’s shipping fleet. Wind power is one of the options being discussed.

International shipping counts for more than 2 percent of global carbon dioxide emissions, roughly the same as aircraft. But the 2015 Paris Agreement to fight climate change left control of the shipping industry’s emissions to the IMO. The new agreement is its response.

There is plenty more work to do at the London-based IMO, which promised a detailed strategy on how to implement the promise by 2023. While environment groups applauded the agreement, they pointed out that it falls far short of the 70 percent minimum cuts called for by the European Union and Pacific island states — and even further from what is technically achievable.

A report published just before the meeting by the International Transport Forum (ITF), a think tank run by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), found that the industry could achieve up to 95 percent decarbonization as early as 2035 using maximum deployment of currently known technologies.

**Low-tech solutions**

The good news is that easy-to-do low-tech solutions can deliver a lot. For instance, after the 2008 financial crisis resulted in a drop in world trade and too many ships, Maersk, the world’s largest container-shipping line, discovered it could cut fuel use 30 percent simply by steaming more slowly.

Because of the wide availability of cheap (and often dirty) fuel, shipping has traditionally been wasteful of fuel. Most merchant ships are made of heavy steel rather than lighter aluminum, and don’t bother with obvious energy-saving measures like low-friction hull coatings or recovering waste heat.

More slender ship designs alone could cut fuel use — and hence emissions — by 10 to 15 percent at slow speeds and up to 25 percent at high speeds, says the ITF. But replacing the existing fat fleet would take time. The average age of today’s shipping fleet is 25 years. Rules of energy efficiency for new ships introduced by the IMO in 2013 will only fully come into force from 2030, meaning that any switch to slender ships would not apply to most ships at sea until mid-century or beyond.

But much could be done more quickly by retrofitting existing ships with technology to cut their fuel use and hence emissions, according to the ITF. Here are just four:

- Fitting ships’ bows with a bulbous extension below the water line reduces drag enough to cut emissions 2 to 7 percent.
• A technique known as air lubrication, which pumps compressed air below the hull to create a carpet of bubbles, also reduces drag and can cut emissions by a further 3 percent.

• Replacing one propeller with two rotating in opposite directions recovers slipstream energy and can make efficiency gains of 8 to 15 percent.

• Even cleaning the hull and painting it with a low-friction coating can deliver gains of up to 5 percent.

Banishing conventional fuel

Such aerodynamic improvements that would be second nature to Olympic cyclists and tobogganists seeking the fastest times seem beyond the wit of the world’s shipping lines.

But some of the biggest gains will require banishing conventional petroleum-based fuel, says the Sustainable Shipping Initiative, a progressive industry ginger group whose members include cruise lines and commodities shipping lines. Innovations ranging from biofuels to liquefied natural gas (LNG), nuclear reactors to sails to catch the wind, and hydrogen to solar panels have been proposed.

Each has its benefits and drawbacks, and nobody is putting all their money on one solution. Biofuels are problematic because they take land to grow, though specially engineered crops such as algae could change that, says the ITF. While electric engines already operate on some short ferry journeys, the sheer weight and space taken up by batteries on oceangoing ships make them unviable until there are breakthroughs in lithium-ion batteries. Solar power can only augment other power sources.

One innovation already underway is converting ships to run on LNG. There are already more than a hundred LNG-fueled ships globally. A new generation of giant cruise ships powered this way and carrying up to 7,000 passengers will be launched by MSC Cruises starting in 2022. Some LNG ships claim a reduction in CO2 emissions of 15 percent, though that depends crucially on keeping leakage of the greenhouse gas methane to a minimum in ships and bunkers.

The first LNG-powered cruise ship is the Viking Grace, operating between Finland and Sweden. This vessel has another claim to fame. As of this April it also boasts the first ship-based – rotor sail! – to capture power from the wind. Rotor sails have a large spinning cylinder amidships. Wind hitting the rotor creates a vertical force that can be used to power the ship, a phenomenon known as the Magnus effect. The Viking Line says the extra power will reduce the ship’s CO2 emissions by 900 metric tons (1,000 tons) per year.

Entirely new ships

Putting together better designs and better fuel will create entirely new kinds of ships in future. And the blueprints are already being drawn up.

The Aquarius Ecoship, a cargo ship devised by a Japanese company called Eco Marine Power, is driven by a phalanx of rigid sails and solar panels. The same system could power oil tankers, cruise ships and much else. It would not, the designers admit, entirely eliminate the need for conventional fuel: Even with large batteries to store the solar and wind energy, back-up would be needed. But it could cut emissions by 40 percent.

Going one better, the Japanese shipping line NYK boasts that its design for a 350-meter- (1,100-foot-) long container ship, the Super Eco Ship 2030, would use LNG to make hydrogen to run fuel cells. Backed up by solar panels covering the entire ship and 4,000 square meters (40,000 square feet) of sails to catch the wind, the combination could cut emissions by 70 percent. Or for a completely zero-carbon option, engineers at Wallenius Wilhelmsen, a Scandinavian shipping line, offer the E/S Orcelle, a lightweight cargo ship designed to transport up to 10,000 cars (electric, we trust) on eight decks. It would be powered by electricity, half coming directly from wind, solar and wave energy, and the other half from
converting some of that energy into hydrogen to power fuel cells. The company says the ship could be afloat by 2025.

Today’s ships are in many respects almost indistinguishable from those of a century ago. But the IMO decision to finally get with the global climate agenda has fired the starting gun on what is set to be a race to create a new standard for low-carbon shipping that should be the norm just a few decades from now.

[The Guardian / Ensia]
When Michele Bachelet stepped down from her second term as president of Chile in March, it was with a flurry of ocean conservation regulations.

First, the Rapa Nui Marine Protected Area was declared, covering 740,000 square km of the Pacific Ocean – over three times the size of the UK – around the remote Easter Island, with a few allowances for small-scale traditional fishing by indigenous inhabitants. Then, she signed a decree to protect 1.4 million square km of ocean running along Chile’s mainland 6,400km (4,000-mile) coastline, expanding the proportion of sea protected by the country from a mere 4.3 per cent to a whopping 42.4 per cent.

‘The creation of huge reserves has strong, ecological, progressive arguments for it, but it could also be seen as another way of designating the sea as Chilean territory,’ explains Paul Merchant, lecturer in Latin American film and visual culture at the University of Bristol, whose latest research project examines the cultural significance of the sea in modern Chile. ‘I’ve been really astonished when I’ve spent time there,'
and from talking to Chileans, by the extent to which that territorial or even militaristic understanding of the sea as an extension of the nation is prevalent in museums and in monuments.

The annual Mes del Mar (Month of the Sea) is one regular reminder of the important role the ocean has played in the Chilean national consciousness, as school children in particular learn how the waters beyond the country's coastline have, over centuries, had significant economic, historical and cultural impacts on the modern nation. At the same time, incidents such as the February 2010 tsunami, which killed more than 500 people, are a constant reminder of the threatening presence the ocean provides.

The emphasis on environmentally-conscious policies by Bachelet at the end of her administration was part of a package of reforms that, as a whole, was seen to diverge from the consensus of the post-Pinochet years in Chile, including changes to education funding, explains Merchant. „One school of thought says this won't last,‘ he says, „that she went too far and overplayed her hand. This is beyond what the public wanted. However, support for individual measures was quite high, so I think it’s too early to say whether she’s actually shifted the terms of the debate.‘

Whether the new president, Sebastián Piñera (also in his second stint, having previously taken charge from 2010 to 2014) will keep all these policies in place remains to be seen.

[Geographical]

Terminal operators: Berth productivity trailing number of boxes exchanged per call

03/05/2018

Consolidation in container shipping is having a positive impact on liner network efficiency, but berth productivity at container terminals is not keeping pace with the growth in the number of boxes exchanged per call, according to new data.

JOC's port productivity data, gathered from the world’s largest liner shipping companies, shows that the global average number of TEU containers exchanged per call increased by 9% in 2017 compared with 2016, but berth productivity growth at the world's 30 largest ports did not keep pace with call size growth, and the limitations in terminal infrastructure were increasingly exposed.

- With ship capacity increases being driven predominantly by width and height increases, the larger ships have a significantly higher quantity of containers per bay compared with [smaller ships], I said Singapore-based container terminal operations expert Andy Lane, reported JOC.

Not enough cranes

- Whereas this can be mitigated to an extent through container distribution in the ship planning process, there are simply not enough cranes to get the optimal crane intensity on the larger ships with the larger call sizes. Contemporary crane design does not enable the simultaneous working of adjacent bays and this causes further intensity constraints, I Mr Lane added.

JOC's data shows ports in North Europe had the biggest increase in average call size in 2017 to 1,362 boxes, a 20% surge versus 2016. Southeast Asia and Latin America also had impressive average growth increases last year, to 1,220 and 890, respectively, and each was good for an 11% gain.

Lane said the gap between call size growth and productivity growth becomes increasingly dramatic when the number of containers being exchanged is larger than 4,000.
COSCO Shipping Holdings, a Chinese ocean carrier, is reportedly proposing to divest its potential interest in the Long Beach Container Terminal (LBCT) in order to obtain approval from United States authorities for the takeover of Orient Overseas International Lines (OOIL).

According to the Wall Street Journal, the option was floated to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), after CFIUS raised concerns over COSCO taking control of the Long Beach terminal. COSCO met with CFIUS in April, during which meeting when the Chinese carrier said it could either divest its interest in the terminal or carve it out in its bid to get CFIUS’ approval for the $6.3 billion acquisition.

--The transaction process is ongoing and we remain confident. We will update the market when appropriate,‖ an OOIL representative said. OOIL’s shipping arm OOCL holds a 40-year concession to operate the facility at the Port of Long Beach, which is one of the biggest gateways for imports into the US.

COSCO earlier said that the takeover is expected to be completed by June 30, 2018. If the company fails to complete the deal by that deadline, OOIL will receive a break fee of $253 million. That fee would be waived if the transaction fails to pass muster with CFIUS.

COSCO Shipping Holdings and Shanghai International Port Group (SIPG) made the offer to buy all shares of OOIL in mid-2017. If and when the transaction is completed, COSCO would hold 90.1 percent of OOIL, making it the world’s third-largest container carrier. The combined carrier would have a fleet of 400 vessels, with capacity of over 2.9 million TEUs, according to Drewry, including ships on order.

Listed Asian Terminals Incorporated (ATI), the operator of the Manila South Harbor and the Batangas Container Terminal, is planning a multibillion-peso expansion program as the government's infrastructure push is expected to bring in more shipments to the Philippines.

"Aligned with the government's Build, Build, Build program, ATI is spending a minimum of P8 billion in capital investment this year to deliver better, faster, and safer ports and logistics services to the country's supply chain," the company said in a statement on Thursday, May 3.

ATI said it will increase the annual container handling capacity of the Manila South Harbor to over 1.4
million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) by 2019 from its current yearly throughput of 1.25 million TEUs. This will be as more cargo storage spaces are coming online with the near completion of Blocks 143 and 145 adjacent to the Manila South Harbor's main container yard and the in-filling of the engineering island basin next to Pier 3.

ATI added that two brand-new ZPMC ship-to-shore (STS) cranes were delivered at Pier 3 last month, which boosted the Manila South Harbor's capability to handle more cargo and bigger ships with faster vessel turnaround times.

For the Batangas Container Terminal, ATI said civil works are ongoing to extend its quay length and expand its container yard. These will be followed by the deployment of two additional STS cranes and 4 more rubber-tired gantry (RTG) cranes within the year. The projects, said ATI, will increase the Batangas Container Terminal's STS and RTG cranes "to 4 and 8, respectively, effectively increasing its annual capacity to over 450,000 TEUs."

The port operator added that the construction of a 5-storey vehicle storage facility for completely built units (CBUs) is expected to be fully operational by the 3rd quarter of 2018. "The new car storage will push Batangas Port's storage capacity to nearly 13,000 CBUs at any given time," ATI said.

[Rappler.com]

Port development Sudan: Ethiopia to take a stake in Port Sudan

03/05/2018

By Aaron Maasho

Ethiopia and Sudan have agreed on a deal allowing the Horn of Africa nation to take a stake in Sudan’s largest sea gateway Port Sudan, officials said on Thursday.

Several countries including wealthy Gulf states have ramped up investments in seaports along the Red Sea and East Africa's coast as they vie for influence in a strategic corridor that is vital for shipping lanes and oil routes.

While the likes of Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey are using some of the ports for military purposes, Ethiopia - which lost its access to the sea following the secession of former province Eritrea in 1993 - is aiming to strike deals in a bid to diversify outlets and reduce port fees.

The deal between Addis Ababa and Sudan was reached in Khartoum on Thursday at a meeting between Ethiopia’s Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed and Sudan’s President Omar Hassan al-Bashir. -The leaders of both countries agreed to develop Port Sudan together,‖ said Meles Alem, spokesman for Ethiopia’s Foreign Ministry. -This deal entails that Ethiopia will be a shareholder of the port as well,‖ he told Reuters. No financial details of the agreement were disclosed.

The deal comes two days after Ethiopia reached a similar arrangement over the Port of Djibouti, Djibouti’s main gateway for trade. -Access to a diversified range of ports is a strategic imperative for the government of Ethiopia. That is perhaps one of its most important priorities in terms of trade and development,‖ said Ahmed Salim, vice president at the Teneo global advisory firm. Ethiopia's involvement supported the financing and development of the Sudan and Djibouti ports, he added.

Djibouti had been seeking investors for its port since it terminated the concession for Dubai’s state-owned DP World to run the port in February, citing a failure to resolve a six-year contractual dispute.
The agreement with Ethiopia gave Djibouti the option of taking stakes in state-owned Ethiopian firms. The companies that it may look to invest in include Ethiopian Electric Power and Ethio Telecom – one of Africa's last remaining telecoms monopolies. It was not clear if Sudan's agreement involved a similar arrangement with Ethiopia.

Djibouti's location is of strategic value to countries such as the United States, China, Japan and former colonial power France, all of which have military bases there. The deal with Djibouti also followed Ethiopia's agreement to acquire a 19 percent stake in the Port of Berbera in the breakaway Somali region of Somaliland. DP World retains a 51 percent stake there, while the government holds the rest.

Meanwhile, Khartoum's deal with Ethiopia came in the wake of another arrangement signed with Turkey, which wants to rebuild Suakin - a ruined Ottoman port city on Sudan's Red Sea coast - and construct a dock to maintain civilian and military vessels. Qatar has also agreed to develop the same port to the tune of $4 billion.

[Reuters]

**Port development China: Plans to build 10 fishing port clusters before 2025**

03/05/2018

China plans to build 10 major fishing port clusters before 2025 along the country's coast, according to an action plan jointly released by the National Development and Reform Commission and Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs.

Fishing vessels berth at a port in Qionghai City, South China's Hainan Province, May 1, 2018. Credit: China News Service / Luo Yunfei)
The National Fishing Port Construction Plan (2018-2025) states China will further improve disaster prevention and mitigation, promote sustainable growth in the fishing industry and accelerate the pace of developing fishing harbors.

The 10 port clusters will lie along Liaodong Peninsula, Bohai Gulf, Shandong Peninsula, Jiangsu, Shanghai-Zhejiang, Southeastern Costal Area, Guangdong, Beibu Gulf, Hainan Island and other locales on the South China Sea. The plan calls for building 64 central harbors, 85 first-class ports, 93 fishing port-based economic zones and an increase in the number of boats that can be sheltered in ports, which will rise from the current 145,300 to 214,300.

Development of the ports is expected to drive the integration of primary, secondary and tertiary industries, expanding revenues by 1 trillion yuan (about $636 million) and also promoting the social and economic development of coastal areas.

South China's Hainan Island is expected to see significant growth in years to come, with a number of new fishing ports built or upgraded. More than half of boats on the island will be able to take shelter in ports, a dramatic rise from the current level of 29.8 percent, while six economic zones centered around ports will be built, according to the action plan.

[ECNS]

Port development Kenya: Fishermen win millions for loss of rights due to construction of Lamu Port

03/05/2018

By Kevin Mwanza

Activists hailed a Kenyan court for ordering that almost 5,000 fishermen at a 14th century World Heritage Site receive millions in compensation for the loss of traditional fishing rights due to the construction of a major port.

The fishermen in Lamu, the oldest Swahili settlement in East Africa, won 1.76 billion shillings ($18 million) in compensation this week from a court in the nearby town of Malindi, which also said their rights to culture and information had been violated.

"We were happy with the judgment," Mohamed Somo, chairman of the Lamu Beach Management Unit, a fishermen’s association, and a witness in the case, told the Thomson Reuters Foundation. "Fishermen used to go fishing in the morning and come back in the evening. But now they take two to three days and are away from their family for all that time."

The $26 billion Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) plan envisages, by 2030, a port, new roads, a railway and an oil-export pipeline linking east Africa’s biggest economy with neighboring South Sudan, Uganda and Ethiopia.

Environmentalists say construction, since 2012, of the multi-billion port at Manda Bay, which juts out into the Indian Ocean towards the islands of Lamu, Manda and Pate, is destroying delicate marine life and choking coral reefs and mangroves. Somo said fishermen in the ancient Arab town had suffered because dredging had destroyed vegetation which reduced fish populations near the shore.

A lawyer with LAPSSET who declined to give his name as he is not authorized to talk to the media told the Thomson Reuters Foundation that they were studying the judgment and would give a statement after a board meeting next Wednesday.
David Obura, coordinator for a regional coastal research organization, Cordio East Africa, said the ruling was great news for United Nations heritage sites globally, which are threatened by industrial development, new infrastructure and pollution. The court also gave Kenya's environmental management agency one year to reconsider the Environmental Impact Assessment license that it had issued for the project, saying that it did not include adequate protections.

“This failure creates a verifiable and imminent risk to the violation of the right to a clean and healthy environment of the petitioners and residents,” the judgment said. The project's backers need to share more information with residents and to consult them on how to protect the cultural identity of the region, it added.

Although the court said the government violated the law by failing to compensate the fishermen, which was a requirement of the license issued in 2014, some feared it still would not pay. “(The fishermen) are very happy but they are very apprehensive that the government might not comply with the orders,” said Soyinka Lempaa, a lawyer with the Katiba Institute rights group, who represented them in court.

[Thomson Reuters Foundation]

**Container shipping: World Container Index - 03 May 2018**

03/05/2018

The World Container Index assessed by Drewry, a composite of container freight rates on 8 major routes to/from the US, Europe and Asia, is up by 22.3% to $1415.34/40ft container.

Two-year spot freight rate trend for the World Container Index:

**World Container Index: detailed assessment**

The composite index is up by 22.3% this week and down by 12.2% from the same period of 2017.

- The average composite index of the WCI, assessed by Drewry for year-to-date, is US $1,364/40ft
Oil & gas exploration: New consortium for offshore decommissioning

A new global oil and gas decommissioning consortium launched today sets out to bring a collaborative supply chain approach, offering an end-to-end solution to reduce the decommissioning burden, risk and cost for operators.

The consortium, which includes Lloyd’s Register (LR), WorleyParsons and Ardent, brings together 350 years of collective experience to reduce the interfaces, costs and risks of decommissioning for the oil and gas industry.

The consortium includes experts to cover all aspects of decommissioning, from late life management to planning, readiness for removal, execution, waste management and monitoring post removal. The consortium has the capability to take well operatorship, duty-holdership and title of offshore structures,
Oil & gas shipping U.S.: Port restrictions raise crude oil exports costs

03/05/2018

US crude oil exports averaged 1.1 million barrels per day (b/d) in 2017, an increase of 527,000 b/d from 2016. Despite this acceleration in export growth, the US Gulf Coast ports cannot fully load Very Large Crude Carriers (VLCC). Instead, export growth was achieved by using smaller and less cost-effective ships.

VLCCs need large ports with sufficient width and depth of waterways for safe navigation. All U.S. ports in the Gulf Coast that trade petroleum are located in inland harbors and connected to the open ocean via shipping channels or navigable rivers. However, these channels are not deep enough for the safe navigation of VLCCs.

Currently, most U.S. Gulf Coast petroleum ports can accept vessels with capacities of approximately 500,000 barrels of crude oil, while the number of ports that can to accept vessels with capacities of
approximately 900,000 to 1 million barrels are few. Thus, four AFRAMAX sized vessels or two SUEZMAX vessels are required to carry the same amount of crude oil as a single VLCC.

U.S. Gulf Coast petroleum ports and lightering areas

The inability to fully load larger and more cost-effective vessels has caused pricing implications for U.S. crude oil exports. Using a number of smaller ships requires a wider price spread between U.S. crude oil and international crude oil prices to balance the lower economies of scale and costs of reverse lightering and partial loadings.

The Louisiana Offshore Oil Port (LOOP), located offshore southern Louisiana in the Gulf of Mexico, is currently the only U.S. facility capable of accommodating a fully loaded VLCC. Nevertheless, trade press and company announcements have indicated that crude oil export projects with the intention to fully load VLCCs will be located near the port of Corpus Christi in southern Texas. Recently, it was announced that Corpus Christi will have a new terminal which will be able to accommodate VLCCs.

[SAFETY4SEA]

Oil & gas shipping India: First floating LNG terminal opens in Maharashtra

02/05/2018

At a time when India is sharpening its focus on expanding its LNG import terminal capacity and promoting clean energy, the Hiranandani Group-owned H-Energy Gateway opened the country's first floating liquefied natural gas terminal at JSW Jaigarh Port in Ratnagiri district of Maharashtra on Tuesday.

Floating and storage regasification units are usually docked to ports to receive, store and reheat LNG all
in the same terminal before consumption or export, thereby saving time when compared to land-based LNG terminals.

The LNG terminal, with an annual storage capacity of 4 million tonnes, is scheduled to start commercial operations by Q4 2018 and will be capable of reloading LNG into other vessels.

-In the near future, Jaigarh Port is getting ready for a giant leap to handle 80 MTPA of cargo and is aiming for direct berthing of next-generation vessels i.e. largest dry bulk carrier (Vale Max), LNG carrier (Q-Max), largest container vessels (EEE Series) and very large crude carriers,† said Capt. BVJK Sharma, Joint Managing Director & CEO, JSW Infrastructure.

H-Energy's LNG terminal would be used to cater to the growing energy demand of Indian industries. LNG from the unit will be supplied to customers through a 60-km tie-in pipeline which shall be connected to national gas grids at Dabhol, the firm said in a statement.

Earlier this year, Swan Energy had said that it was developing an FSRU terminal off the Jafrabad coast in Gujarat.

[The New Indian Express]

Oil & gas exploration: DNV GL report reveals senior oil managers’ safety concerns

02/05/2018

By Jennifer Johnson

Almost half of senior professionals in the oil and gas industry believe that there has been underinvestment in inspection and maintenance in recent years, according to a new report by DNV GL.

In a survey of 813 decision makers and technical specialists, 46 per cent expressed concerns about maintenance of key equipment and infrastructure. The findings, published in the report The State of Safety, also reveal that a significant minority of respondents have concerns about safety in the industry.

While 38 per cent felt that safety management protocols were adequate, 26 per cent disagreed. Almost twice as many engineers and technical specialists (28 per cent) as business leaders (15 per cent) believe that strict cost controls have affected safety levels in the sector. Despite these perceived risks, only 28 per cent of survey respondents plan to increase safety spending this year, with 61 per cent indicating they will maintain current budgets.

-The industry’s strong focus on cost control must continue in the long term for oil and gas to remain competitive and play an increasingly important role in the energy transition,† says Liv A. Hovem, CEO, DNV GL – Oil & Gas. -However, our research confirms the sector's clear belief that cost control must never come at the expense of safety.†

While cost efficiency has been the top, or a high priority, for more than 82 per cent of senior oil and gas professionals since 2015, 40 per cent of respondents believe digital tools and technologies have already improved safety over the past three years.

[The Marine Professional]
ADNOC Logistics and Services, the shipping and services arm of the Abu Dhabi National Oil Company (ADNOC), has signed a contract with Borouge, a leading provider of value creating plastics solutions, to handle its Ruwais container terminal operations.

The five-year contract, awarded through a competitive bidding process, is the first deal signed between Borouge and ADNOC as a new integrated entity, following the integration of IRSHAD, ESNAAD and ADNATCO into a single ADNOC operating company.

Under the terms of the contract, ADNOC will carry out all handling operations of Borouge’s packed and palletized products and bulk loaded containers. ADNOC will handle up to 800,000 TEU per annum. ADNOC is fully equipped to meet the increased production planned at Borouge’s plants in the next five years to meet the forecasted growing demand, especially in China and South East Asia, for high value polymers.

[Oil & Gas Technology]

Terminal operators: Automated container terminal market to hit $11 billion

According to a report publishing by MarketsandMarkets, the automated container terminal market is set to grow in 2023 to US$ 11 billion.
Port development Djibouti: Ethiopia to take stake in port

01/05/2018

By Aaron Maasho

Ethiopia will take a stake in the Port of Djibouti, its main gateway for trade, under a deal reached between the two countries, state media outlets said on Tuesday.

Djibouti had been seeking investors for its port since it terminated Dubai’s state-owned DP World’s concession to run the port two months ago, citing a failure to resolve a six-year contractual dispute.

The port is a key asset for Djibouti, a tiny state along the Red Sea whose location is of strategic value to countries such as the United States, China, Japan and former colonial power France, all of whom have military bases there.

The size of Addis Ababa’s stake was unclear. State-owned Ethiopian News Agency said the agreement, reached at the weekend during a visit by Ethiopia’s Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed to Djibouti, involved the joint development of facilities. In return, Djibouti would have the option of taking stakes in state-owned Ethiopian firms. “A joint committee of ministers would meet to thrash out details,” Ethiopian New Agency said.

The government had previously said that the port would remain “in the hands of our country” until it found new investors.

Djibouti handles roughly 95 percent of all inbound trade for landlocked Ethiopia, Africa’s second most-populous nation and an economic power in East Africa. The deal with Djibouti follows Ethiopia’s agreement to acquire a 19 percent stake in the Port of Berbera in the breakaway Somali region of...
Port development U.S.: Upgrades driven by megaships

01/05/2018
By Laura Close, managing editor

Favorable economic conditions and an influx of megaships has driven ports across the U.S. to invest in technology and infrastructure.

A tremendous amount of our goods in the U.S.—and 90 percent globally—are imported and exported via the oceans, a medium we’ve been relying on for hundreds of years to get our goods where we need and want them to go. The last few years, however, have been unprecedented. As of this writing, favorable economic conditions have led to an increase in demand for cargo shipping.

U.S. imports have risen almost 19 percent since 2012, and many of the top 20 ports by import volume in the country have seen close to a 30 percent increase in import traffic. In 2016, these 20 ports handled a majority of port traffic—97 percent—in regards to imports.
Experts can study and predict performance and upcoming trends of local, national, and global economies at the threshold of these ports: from a fluctuation in volume of commodities to the growing size of shipping vessels, each and every data point at the entrance of ports is providing insight into current and future trends.

Currently, this increase in activity at U.S. ports is being mirrored around the world. The Panama Canal expansion—which was started in 2007 and wrapped up in 2016 and was built to accommodate the super-sized cargo ships that are becoming the norm—was a major driver for investments in port infrastructure the world over. The market here at home responded in kind with a slew of U.S. port upgrades.

Technology at play

To understand the need for U.S. port upgrades that are planned or taking place right now, first it’s important to grasp the technology that’s at play.

Radio-frequency identification (RFID) and differential global positioning systems (DGPS) have created an environment that supports accurate, real-time information. These tech points are key for running a port efficiently, allowing precision timing of when cargo will arrive and be available for pickup.

- Of equal importance are the developments in hardware and predictive analytics technology, from data warehousing to parallel computing, new predictive models, algorithmic advances and data visualisation, Dr. ManWo Ng, assistant professor of maritime and supply chain management at Old Dominion University, told Ship Technology. -All these have contributed to making predictive analytics more practical and accessible.

As technology has provided the ability to see into every part of the supply chain, the supply chain has become more efficient. This, in turn, has driven the size of ships up exponentially. These megaships can accommodate far more cargo and are currently putting the pressure on ports‘ cargo handling capabilities.

- Another major development is the forming of alliances among container carriers, which has significantly complicated the inter-terminal logistics between the different terminals in a port complex, Ng said. -All these (and other) realities have not made cargo handling easier at today's seaports.

This cyclical turn of events now has ports looking back to technology—and improved infrastructure—to solve the problems megaships bring.

West Coast

No place else in the country is a better example of a U.S. port upgrades and the combination of technology and improved infrastructure than the largest port in the U.S., the Port of Los Angeles. This gateway was ranked number one in 2016 in terms of import volume with 3.4 million TEUs (twenty-foot equivalent units, standard measures of the industry) imported.

Continued expansion and improvement over the last few years have included the completion of the first phase of a container terminal automation program, as well as roadway enhancements in the harbor area.

What caught our attention, however, was the pilot program the Port of LA and GE Transportation implemented: Port Optimizer. The introduction of this cloud-based software solution has allowed for better planning and predictability across the entire supply chain. With the continuing inclusion of more data points at ports, Port Optimizer is able to tailor real-time information from a variety of sources depending on who is looking at the data.

- Traditionally, supply chain operations consisted of multiple systems, each designed to measure and monitor singular aspects, for example ocean transit, GE Transportation shared. -There has not been the
ability to consolidate and provide that ‘single pane of glass’ that supply chains need to see how cargo is moving—holistically.

Port Optimizer integrates data from across the port ecosystem. It combines machine learning and deep domain expertise, assisting supply chain professionals in monitoring and responding to a rash of conditions.

GE Transportation claims it increases visibility, predictability, and throughput, and ups productivity by 8 to 12 percent. The pilot program with the Port of Los Angeles was so successful that GE has now partnered with the Port of Long Beach to bring its solution to a broader audience. Another partnership in the region, the International Transportation Service (ITS) recently launched a predictive visibility solution with Advent at its port terminal in Long Beach.

And starting in the Port of Los Angeles, Amazon will launch its new delivery service for businesses called Shipping with Amazon. Currently, the largest internet retailer in the world functions as a freight forwarder and logistics provider, but the company does not own any ships. Don’t expect that to slow down Bezos and the team, though. Amazon has disrupted, revolutionized, and sometimes destroyed markets it’s moved into. What’s next for shipping with Amazon in the fray, and how will this giant retailer’s foray into shipping affect U.S. port upgrades of the future?

**East Coast**

I may be a little bias in thinking that the West Coast is the best coast, but the East Coast of the United States also has big things happening at its ports. Maryland’s Port of Baltimore has shown what happens when tech and infrastructure investment occur: success.

The fourth-fastest growing port in the U.S., the Port of Baltimore saw eight million tons of cargo handled in the first three quarters of 2017. Bigger ships are bringing more cargo, and Baltimore was ready for it.

Supersized cranes and the purchase of new land to account for the larger ships helps the Port of Baltimore future proof its gateway to the seas. The city of Baltimore is also a recent recipient of a grant from the US Department of Transportation’s program, TIGER (Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery). The $20 million will go towards building state-of-the-art cargo handling facilities called the Mid-Atlantic Multi-Modal Transportation Hub at the Sparrows Point Industrial Facility in East Baltimore.

Also jumping on the tech train, the Port of Baltimore has awarded defense and security company Saab a contract for its information management system, KleinPort. This port management information system provides many different users along the supply chain access to information and the ability to submit requests electronically, reducing the hassle and mistakes caused by paper or phone systems.

The platform also includes real time updates for pilots and linesmen, accurate billing, statistics, electronic manifests, and more. The newest iteration also includes something called a Common Operating Picture, creating a single display of relevant information, giving stakeholders an easily accessible overview of the port.

Baltimore isn’t the only port of note, however. The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey recently announced a $4.3 billion capital plan that includes adding 64 feet of air draft to one of its bridges to provide open access for megaships to the Port Newark-Elizabeth terminal.

This is big news for a port that accounted for just over 15 percent of all U.S. import TEUs, allowing the region to bring in even more cargo in the years to come.

**Port infrastructure**

We’re only scratching the surface of the monumental infrastructure and technological developments of
current U.S. port upgrades. Favorable economic conditions seem to be on the horizon for the next few years, but the increase in tariffs and the potential for a trade war with China, and potentially other countries, could add a bit of fog to the horizon.

Ports and importers alike will need to keep their fingers on the pulse of the industry and political decisions to make sure that when it comes to increased infrastructure and technology, they continue sailing in the right direction.

[BOSS Magazine]

---

**Port development Black Sea: Reforms and reinvention**

30/04/2018

By Stevie Knight

The region appears to be on an upward trajectory again for both bulk and boxes.

Black Sea economies may have turned the corner: last year the area's overall container throughput jumped by 10% to just under 2.5m teu. However, there are some intriguing stories behind the figures.

Ukraine seems to be advertising that it's a reformed character: it has overhauled its legal model, says Alistair Mackie of HFW, and now it's looking to attract foreign investment to help bring in $35bn's worth of infrastructure updates – at the same time straightening out some of its more intransigent restructuring issues.

The country's Minister of Infrastructure Volodymyr Omelyan's recent, blunt appraisal goes a long way to explaining the attraction: "By attracting foreign direct investment, we are changing the country... Global companies will not pay bribes – they are counting on a reasonable attitude... and need absolutely transparent procedures. In return, the state – and not individual people – receive jobs, budget revenues and a guarantee of development."

One of these offerings is just 30 kilometres from Odessa: Chornomorsk Port has a truly cavernous container capacity of 850,000 teu, says Alexander Khromov of Informall, able to swallow all Ukraine's boxes as the entire country's 2017 total came to just 723,000 teu. It seems a good bet and Hong Kong's Hutchison Ports has shown interest in six berths.

Still, Hutchison's entrance will mean changes, says Mr Khromov. If HPH comes in, it is expected to reduce the workforce – despite a clause to inhibit a dramatic reduction in staff – and that is going to be a worry for some.

**Eye on the competition**

There's also the local competition. On the opposite bank is Fish Port, a private terminal which has been catching a fair amount of export market share, recording 133,000 teu in 2017 - a rise of 32%. It has even taken a slice from the well-established CTO (formerly HPC Ukraine) facility at Odessa, –which is now becoming more import-oriented, says Mr Khromov. Both, of course, are a little threatened by the possible entry of Hutchison. –CTO especially is now trying to speed up development; I wouldn't say it's worried, but it understands the competition will be tough. So it's trying to grab any advantage it can, he adds.

It is worth asking why such a potentially huge container operation as Chornomorsk has entirely lost its box traffic. In fact, it's the renamed Illichivsk Port, a rising Black Sea star with the NCC-run terminal handling 300,000 teu in 2008. And then, suddenly, in 2009, despite having invested $56m, the state invoked a little-known law and NCC was peremptorily locked out of its own facility. Years of court battles were
compounded by the global slump and the Crimea conflict, leaving containers to melt away.

However, although Ukraine is signalling it has changed, the new Chornomorsk deal might still have a bumpy road: a while ago the privatisation of Odessa fell through dogged by alleged lack of transparency and unresolved issues, says Mr Mackie's HFW colleague, Alex Kyriakoulis. Mr Khromov adds that the number of existing commercial operators at Odessa meant slim pickings for the final privatisation deal itself. Chornomorsk is a different story, but Hutchison hasn't committed as yet: "It's considering all the risks", Mr Khromov says.

**Anaklia questions**

Ukraine's ports aren't the only ones with less-than-straightforward development.

"There is a lot of talk about building up a new container terminal in Anaklia, Georgia," says Mr Khromov, but Poti and Batumi already have established links. "Due to the short, 70-kilometre distance between Poti and Anaklia it doesn't look feasible to invest a whole bunch of money in that new terminal. If it goes ahead it will simply kill APM Terminals' Poti terminals," he adds. "I can't see that it makes sense."

One argument is that Anaklia would be a more efficient Silk Road port following what's been described as a 'monumental' free trade agreement with China. Cargo would come in from the east on the recently completed Baku-Tbilisi-Kars (BTK) Railway via Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan then cross the sea diagonally to Varna or Constanta.

Even so, there are inconsistencies. The narrative from the Anaklia Development Consortium (ADC) is that there are no other facilities that can handle much more than 1,500 teu feeder-sized ships but Poti has had its own expansion ideas for a while, just waiting for the right moment to execute. The existing APM Terminals' plans are for two new deep water berths able to accommodate 9,000 teu containerships and an annual throughput capacity of 1m teu. It is also hard to ignore Poti's recent stellar performance which raised throughput by 16% to 319,000 teu, pushing CTO aside for second place in the Black Sea box ranking.

Rumours about US political influence abound in the Anaklia project, but true or not, the project looks set to get going with US financial backing even if it's not, overall, in Georgia's best interests.

**Romania’s offering**

Despite Constanta remaining the largest terminal in the region by volume, operations in Romania seems to have hit a snag: overall cargo in its main port has sagged a little, total tonnes falling from 59.4m to 58.4m. HFW's Mr Mackie says the fault doesn't lie with the ports; DP World is still doing a stalwart job, adding 8% to its box throughput despite the surrounding mire. He explains the real problem still lies in the parlous state of the country's infrastructure.

"Here, it's all about interconnectivity... you need good hinterland connections to make a viable offering," he says.

So while the authorities have some ideas about using the Danube as a 'blue link' to reach Poland and Germany, Romania has achieved little in the way of solid infrastructure in the last few years. Even its big Autostrada Transilvania motorway project recently had the plug pulled after spending €1.4bn on just 52 kilometres of highway, far short of the original, planned 415 kilometres.

However, just across the border is a pair of ports that might make the most of this slip. Varna and Burgas were once eclipsed by Constanta but the authorities are seizing the moment to push Bulgarian ports into the gap.

At present, Varna's traffic is around 152,000 teu (up 8% on last year, according to Informall) but the
authorities have been allocating funds for infrastructure updates and it is also being backed by a port services framework legislation which should enable investment. However, most importantly, Bulgaria is aiming squarely at the kind of connectivity lacking from Romania's ports: for example, a rail project will link Burgas, Varna and Ruse with the ports of Kavala and Alexandroupoli, creating a freight corridor leading into the Aegean.

Could Romania turn the tables again? It's possible it might use Chinese know-how to get over its own project management shortcomings and the small nibble of a ring road built by Sinohydro may be a taster. As Mr Mackie explains: –China works like 'China Incorporated': once one business goes in, others will probably follow. The good thing is, they do exactly what they say they will.\n
Surprisingly, the NUTEP terminal (now a partnership between Delo and DP World) in Novorossiysk gained over 70,000 boxes, handling a total of 304,000 teu – a stunning rise of 30%. A relatively high US dollar helped exports out, but it's also probably gaining sanction-ridden Crimean cargo. The Crimea issue is, of course, still rumbling on, but Mr Khromov describes it as –a kind of 'frozen' conflict– adding, –while it's not stopped, people are learning to live with it! so one way or another, the containers are moving again.

**Supporting the region’s golden grain**

The Black Sea is about more than containers: Grain is the region’s new gold and ports are ramping up despite the demanding handling process and price volatility. In fact, Russian exports are reaching record levels, piling on the pressure at Novorossiysk's NKHP facility which is expecting a 16% jump to 7.1m tonnes this year.

There are plans for relief: for example, the port's PJSC terminal is expanding, further development is on the table and alternatives in, for instance, Taman are being considered. Despite this, capacity is still tight and looks like remaining so for a while.

However, the rest of the Black Sea region is willing and able to compete with Russia's rising grain output. In Ukraine, this year alone sees three new grain terminals with a combined capacity of 9.5m tonnes begin operations.

Interestingly, it's getting a hand from its eastern neighbour: Yuzhny port is using China Harbour Engineering Company (CHEC) to deepen both the approach and basin to support its Cargill-MV Cargo project. Chornomorsk too is using CHEC: a dredging contract worth $15.3m should firm up interest in its potential. Over in Bulgaria's Varna, CHEC is looking to take one step further with the establishment of a complete grain processing zone.

It seems as if the area's falling for China's charms in a big way.

[Port Strategy]
Mr Vanegas said that although CEPA is currently drafting the contract and the bidding rules, it remains open to other means of operating the port, other than as a concession. It could pass a law allowing services to be provided in other ways.

Separately, CEPA is shortly to publish master plans for the development of the ports of Acajutla and La Unión.

[Port Strategy]
Initiated by General Electric, the consortium is comprised of SinoHydro, a leading infrastructure construction services corporation; Transnet, South Africa’s state-owned rail and ports operator; and APM Terminals, a global port, terminal and intermodal inland services provider.

In the interim phase of the rail concession, remedial works will be carried out on part of the narrow-gauge rail line system to make it technically and economically operable. Additionally, a joint operation will be established between the consortium and the Nigeria Railway Corporation (NRC) with an initial supply of 10 locomotives and 200 wagons to augment the existing rolling stock in Nigeria.

This program is expected to deliver an increase in the number of available locomotives, thus increasing the frequency of passenger and freight rail services. In addition, freight haulage capacity by the end of the first 12 months of the interim phase is expected to increase roughly tenfold, from its current less than 50,000 metric ton per year to about 500,000 metric tons annually.

Following the commencement of the interim phase, the consortium will conclude negotiations with the federal government on the terms of the substantive phase of the concession agreement that will expand service to up to 200 locomotives and associated rolling stock. This will see to the comprehensive rehabilitation of Nigeria’s narrow-gauge rail infrastructure and the return of rail transport as a key element in enabling the country's socio-economic development.

[American Shipper]

**Railways South America: The Bi-Oceanic Corridor – a new railroad to rival maritime freight?**

30/04/2018
By Eva Grey

Talks regarding a possible transnational railway that would link the Pacific and Atlantic oceans across South America have been intensifying in recent months, hinting that the Central Bi-Oceanic Railway Corridor could become a reality. If greenlit, the megaproject is expected to completely overhaul South America’s trade and political landscape and put landlocked Bolivia at the heart of future negotiations.

During a 2013 meeting between Bolivia’s President Evo Morales and his Chinese counterpart Xi Jinping, the concept of a transnational megaproject was born, one that would join the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by means of a modern railway, spelling the end for the current monopoly maritime shipments have on trade.

Known as the Central Bi-Oceanic Railway, the planned 3,000km route would run from the port of Puerto Santos in Brazil to Puerto de Ilo in Peru, crossing 1,700km of Bolivian territory in between. Due to its reach and projected trade benefits, the megaproject has been dubbed ‘the Panama Canal of the 21st century’, as well as drawing comparisons with Qhapaq Ñan, a historic 35,000km network that reached Argentina, Chile,
Since its conception, several feasibility studies have already been completed and all three South American countries involved have greenlit the project, and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) gave it its full backing.

While it’s still too soon for a fixed completion date, UNASUR secretary general Ernesto Samper Pizano hinted that in 2021, the railway would transport approximately seven million people and nearly 10,000 tons of cargo, “with great possibilities of rapid increase.” Meanwhile, separate reports indicated the inauguration date could be 2025, when Bolivia celebrates the 200th anniversary of its independence.

During their meeting at this year’s Summit of the Americas in Lima, Morales and Peru’s President Martin Vizcarra discussed accelerating construction of the Bi-Oceanic train. “A commission will work so that there is a meeting of transport ministers or public works ministers to define the finances and pre-investments of the project,” Morales said.

Their eagerness comes as no surprise: once completed, the corridor will substantially alter the region’s geopolitical and trade relations and will do away with the maritime monopoly currently in place.

**Changing the face of Latin American trade**

Throughout its coast-to-coast journey, the train will traverse rough terrain, including mountain slopes in the Andes, rivers and flood-prone regions, as well as the Amazon forests.
China’s interest in the project comes as little surprise. During his 2015 tour of Latin America, Xi Jinping pledged $250bn in investment in Latin America over the next ten years as part of a drive to boost influence in a region long dominated by the United States. The project would make it far easier and cheaper to transport commodities from Latin America to China, particularly iron ore and soybeans from Brazil and minerals such as gold and copper from Peru.

At home, the railroad would be an equally big win. According to the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), South America’s countries should invest annually 6.2% of their gross domestic product (equivalent to $320bn) in order to satisfy their infrastructure demands before 2020.

“The biggest winner would no doubt be landlocked Bolivia.”

The biggest winner would no doubt be landlocked Bolivia, which is why the country is spearheading the necessary research into the commercial prospects, environmental impact and construction. Currently, the country is involved in an ongoing fight for coastal access with Chile, since its lack of easy access has left Bolivia at the mercy of neighbouring economies. The Bi-Oceanic Corridor is therefore expected to drive economic growth, improve the capacity of trade relations in the region, and allow the exploitation and industrialisation of its natural resources.

Similarly, Peru’s former President Ollanta Humala said the project would ―consolidate Peru’s political position as a natural gateway to the South American region‖ for China, a major trading partner.

For Brazil, the railway is expected to cut transportation time and reduce the cost of shipping grain to China by approximately $30 per ton. In addition, the new east-west connection will provide a welcome addition to Brazil’s current rail network, which runs mostly from north to south. Transporting goods towards the west, instead of the Atlantic, will allow from the strain to be lifted from the overloaded sea ports and adjacent infrastructure.

Interest gathering from abroad

As expected, the corridor is primed to be one of the largest infrastructure projects of the century, and as such, contract offers have already started pouring in. According to local publication Gestión, the prospect of building the corridor in the near future stirred an ―enormous interest‖ in Spanish companies, with 40 of them taking part in an information day organised by the Foreign Trade Institute of Spain and the Commercial Office in Bolivia.

In February, Bolivian public works minister Milton Claro also mentioned the involvement of a Swiss-German consortium made up of more than 30 companies as investors.

In the meantime, while the financing still remains to be revealed pending further negotiations, the project has had a number of evaluations completed already. Engineering and consultancy firm Ineco (which also lists other big projects such as HS2 in the UK and Saudi Arabia’s Haramain High Speed train project) has compiled an environmental assessment, focusing on the ecological and social impacts the route would have in Bolivia. According to Ineco’s website, the study was carried out between 2013 and 2014 and ―aims to safeguard the vast natural heritage in the region, which consists of a multitude of natural areas with high biodiversity and improve the quality of life of Bolivian people.‖
Container shipping: Lessors own growing share of container fleet

30/04/2018

By Chris Dupin

A growing share of the world's shipping container fleet is owned by container leasing companies instead of liner companies, says Drewry. It said leasing companies now own nearly 52 percent of the fleet and that share is expected to grow to 54 percent by 2020.

"Leasing companies accounted for 55 percent of container purchases in 2017, which continues a trend seen for most of this decade," the London-based consultant said. Lessors increased the size of their fleets 6.7 percent last year, while transport companies grew their fleets more slowly — 2.4 percent in 2017.

In a press release accompanying the latest issue of its Container Census & Leasing and Equipment Insight report, Drewry said container manufacturers made 55 percent more containers in 2017, with dry container manufacturing recovering from a 2016 slump.

Drewry said the world's largest shipping container manufacturer, China International Marine Containers (Group) Ltd. (CIMC) built 88 percent more boxes in 2017 than the prior year and even it was outpaced by some smaller container builders such as Dong Fang, which made 143 percent more, and Maersk Container, which made 118 percent more.

The average age of the world container fleet remained above 6.5 years for the second year in a row. Drewry said the price of new containers rose quickly as demand returned last year and has been largely stable ever since. It noted some of the price increase was attributable to rising steel prices and that an escalation in trade dispute between the United States and China could push prices for new containers higher.

CAI International, one of the leading container lessors,
said last week in an investor presentation that container prices remain stable at about $2,180 for a 20-foot, standard dry container. “Geopolitical issues notwithstanding, we do not expect any significant change in newbuild prices over the next couple of years,” said Martin Dixon, the head of research products for Drewry. He said used container prices have been rising steadily, but that their future trajectory is harder to predict.

CAI said that in the first quarter of 2018 it saw continued strength in the container leasing market: Average utilization for CAI’s owned container fleet during the first quarter of 2018 was 99.2 percent compared to 95.7 percent for the first quarter of 2017, and 99 percent for the fourth quarter of 2017.

CAI reported lease-related revenue for the first quarter of 2018 was $73.7 million, an increase of 21 percent compared to the first quarter of 2017. Profit attributable to CAI common stockholders in the first quarter of 2018 was $17.1 million compared with $5.3 million in the first quarter of 2017.

Victor Garcia, president and chief executive officer of CAI, said the company has already invested, or committed to invest, $336 million in new container-related equipment during the quarter. He said about 80 percent of the equipment on order has committed leases, most of which will go into service in the second quarter. He noted CAI raised $38.7 million through the sale of 1.6 million shares of perpetual preferred stock, which will help finance expansion of the company’s fleet.

“We expect that the utilization of our fleet will remain at a high level this year and that new investment will remain strong due to ongoing global economic growth. Lease rates have stabilized and remain at attractive return levels,” said Garcia.

[American Shipper]
30/04/2018
By Vincent Wee

Asia World Port Terminal (AWPT), one of Yangon’s main city terminals is looking to boost capacity by a third as it purchases new equipment that will enable containers to be stacked seven high from five high currently.

The terminal, which is developed, managed and operated by Asia World Port Management Company (AWPM), claimed to handle about 40% of Myanmar’s throughput last year and is optimistic that container traffic will continue to grow in the next few years. AWPM has been running the port business since 1996-1997.

The company is gearing up for this by investing in mobile container handling equipment, it said in a press release. These include nine new SANY Rubber Tyred Gantry (RTG) cranes and one Mobile Harbour Crane (MHC) from Konecranes Gottwald, as well as two Reach Stackers (RS) and two Empty Container Handlers (ECH) from SANY.

AWPT’s investments are a sign of its strong confidence in the future of Myanmar’s economy, the overall macro-economic development of the country as well as the strong policies of the government. This is the company’s single largest recent investment in technology as it strives to evolve into a technology-led port player, aiming for higher productivity levels and faster turnaround times. Investment amounts were not disclosed.

The inland terminals near the city centre are still preferred by Myanmar’s shippers as they are near to Yangon’s main industrial area. However the country’s creaking infrastructure has not been upgraded in years and city-wide congestion puts a physical limit on capacity. Myanmar is also susceptible to cyclones so there are limits to stack heights.

Hutchison Ports’ Myanmar International Terminals Thilawa has a higher capacity but is located some distance away from the city.

[Seatech Trade Maritime News]

---

Terminal operators Malaysia: Westports proposes to buy Pulau Indah land for RM116 million

30/04/2018
Westports Holdings Bhd’s wholly-owned subsidiary, Westports Malaysia Sdn Bhd (WMSB), has proposed to acquire a piece of leasehold land measuring 154.2 hectares in Pulau Indah from the Selangor State Development Corp (PKNS) for RM116 million.

In a filing to Bursa Malaysia today, Westports said it had accepted the letter of offer from PKNS today after having successfully bid for the land and will now execute the proposed acquisition. It said the purchase consideration will be satisfied entirely in cash which will be funded by internally generated funds and bank borrowings.
The proposed acquisition is for a terminal expansion as the current preliminary port design for Container Terminal 10 to Container Terminal 19 requires additional land acreage to accommodate new wharf and container yard space to facilitate the effective operations of the new container terminals, said Westports. The group said the utilisation of the proposed land for terminal expansion would be possible only after land reclamation had been carried out, adding that WMSB had implemented the land reclamation process at its existing Container Terminal 6, 7, 8 and 9.

The proposed acquisition would not have any impact on the share capital and shareholdings of the substantial shareholders of the group as well as any material effect on the net assets, gearing and earnings per share of the group for the financial year ending Dec 31, 2018, it added.

[Bernama]

**Terminal operators U.S. West Coast: PierPass members add common business rules to terminal appointment systems**

30/04/2018

The members of the West Coast MTO Agreement (WCMTOA)—the 12 marine terminal operators at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach—have agreed to add common business rules for the appointment systems that will become part of the OffPeak program later this year.

Subject to regulatory approval, the revised OffPeak program, which is administered by PierPass, is expected to begin in August. The terminals agreed to add the common business rules—operational procedures that all terminals will follow—in response to requests from trucking companies and other stakeholders.

The new common business rules include an appointment window—the time span between the earliest and latest times a truck can arrive for an appointment, including grace periods—of two hours for all appointments. In addition, all terminals agreed that their last appointment times of the day will be 3:30 p.m. on the first shift and 1:30 a.m. on the second shift. The new business rules will take effect when the new program begins and are expected to increase efficiencies for users when planning appointments at more than one terminal.

PierPass also clarified that the new system, which some have referred to as -PierPass 2.0,—won’t require appointments for individual import containers being picked up from peel-off piles. Trucking companies and cargo owners will continue to arrange for a single time window to pick up entire blocks of containers going to the same company or destination from a single container terminal.

Earlier this month, PierPass announced it will overhaul the system used by the OffPeak program for truck traffic mitigation at the two adjacent ports, replacing the current congestion pricing model with an appointment-based system that uses a single TEU-based flat fee on both daytime and nighttime container moves. The change has been welcomed by port leadership and by trucking industry associations as a way to improve flexibility and reduce the bunching up of trucks in late afternoons.

[Business Wire]
Different approaches to tackling backlogs are making headway, but there is still no perfect solution.

Amid increasing anxiety about container delivery and collection delays at US ports, proposals for imposing fees to get faster access to ports are meeting sceptical, and sometimes cynical, reactions. And in a poker-like scenario, terminal operators and port authorities are waiting to see what others do before deciding whether to play. The options on the table are the establishment of fixed appointments, and/or fees merely to get into the terminals.

Los Angeles/Long Beach still have the most comprehensive system in the form of PierPass, which charges 72.09 per teu (double for a feu) for trucks calling at the 12 terminals in the ports during the busiest times (0300 hrs to 1800 hrs weekdays).

Undoubtedly this has eased congestion on the notoriously clogged freeways of Southern California, with 58% of the 30,000 truck moves each 24 hours occurring during off-peak hours. Nine of the 12 terminals also offer appointments, which further smooths the traffic flows. PierPass says 40 million truck trips have been removed from peak hours since the system was introduced in 2005.

Return of delays

But congestion is again very much back in play, with the record volumes of containers being moved by the two ports. So much so that the terminal operators commissioned a study by two consulting groups, Tioga and World Class Logistics.

The conclusion was to introduce the option of a flat fee ($30 has been suggested) for all trucks, regardless of when they are at the port, combined with appointments for all terminals or a "peel-off" system whereby trucks become almost like taxis at an airport, picking up the next container coming off a vessel.

The response from the haulers, cargo owners and terminal operators has been heavily in favour of the appointment system/flat fee and PierPass is set to make its own recommendation in the next few weeks.

Oakland International Container Terminal (operated by SSA) is the only other terminal on the US West Coast charging a fee, $30 per container, for truck moves during the busiest hours.

Seattle and Tacoma extend port gate hours during peak season from August, with the port authority providing $2m to help offset increased costs. The port authority says gate hours increased by 70 to 90 hours per week in the 2017 season, accounting for about 8%-10% of the total gate volumes.

Dan Smith, co-author of the PierPass report and senior partner of Tioga, notes that a flat fee will mean bigger fleet operators will pay more and smaller companies less. "But it’s not a straight difference between the traffic mitigation fee and those truckers working at off-peak hours. We found that there are hidden costs when calling at the ports in the non-busy periods – for example, truck operators working the off-peak hours often have to pay parking fees at commercial premises overnight, as they can only deliver their cargo during normal office hours."
John Cushing, chief executive of PierPass, says discussions are being held with the three terminals that currently don’t require appointments (Pier A, Long Beach – SSA Marine/TIL; Pacific Container Terminal – SSA Marine; and C60 – SSA Marine/Matson) to bring them into the fold.

A spokesman for Oakland says the OICT accounts for 60% of traffic at the port, with 6,000 container vehicle moves a day, making it the busiest terminal in the country after Savannah. “There is no doubt that the night gates have worked extremely well and are welcomed by the industry.” The Trapac terminal has begun trial operations with night gates.

Weston LaBar, chief executive of the Harbour Trucking Association (the coalition representing haulers at the two Southern California ports), says the association is supportive in theory of the flat fee/appointment proposal. “The devil is in the details. We don’t know what the fee will be – the lower the better. There is still a need to control the flow between 1500 hrs and 1900 hrs. The appointment system needs to be more dynamic and make appointments before the container leaves the vessel. The Yusen terminal already does it.”

Mr LaBar says the biggest weakness affecting the terminals at the two ports is that they do not share electronic information. “Technology can solve this.”

Oakland agrees and is looking more to electronic means to improve traffic and cargo flows. The port is developing a common platform for all cargo owners and haulers to get personalised cargo status updates, check vessel schedules, pay cargo handling fees and make appointments for collecting containers.

**Concerns abound**

On the US East Coast, worsening congestion and delays over the last five years are beginning to cause problems for administrators and local politicians. Surprisingly, the only terminal that offers appointments is Global Container Terminals Bayonne (GCT Bayonne) at New York/New Jersey.

GCT Bayonne reports that the newly implemented system has improved truck turn times by more than 40% down to under an hour, allowing about 300 transactions per hour. Today, more than 50% of all daily gate visits are executed at the terminal under the new reservation system.

The port authority said GCT Bayonne now handles 1,700 appointments a day, and the terminal said that turn times through the new system are 45% faster than those outside the reservation window.

“Reservation windows run for a full hour with a half hour grace period on either end,” says the port authority. “Since truck traffic will be metered into the terminal, the system is expected to accommodate single moves in 45 minutes and a double move within one hour. Reservations can be cancelled at any time, and modifications can only be made during the reservations window, which is currently Monday through Friday 0600 hrs - 1800 hrs. Trucks without appointments can now enter between 1200 hrs and 1600 hrs.

Ports America and its partner TIL (the terminal arm of MSC) have taken a different tack with their Flex Services fee at Port Newark Container Terminal (PNCT). Fifty slots a day at $95.50 per container are open to those who want to be the first to pick up their cargo when the terminal opens at 0600 hrs. The terminal says the system will be expanded for reefers to be collected after the 1630 hrs cut-off, for $80.
Industry executives have for some time been making their anxieties known privately about the congestion problems on the US East Coast where they claim that the West Coast’s successful PierPass system cannot be copied because the East Coast trucking industry, local politics and the dockworker union all differ vastly from those in California. It seems there is no one-size-fits-all solution in sight for clogged up US terminals.

**Lagging behind traffic volumes**

Jonathan Gold, vice-president of the National Retail Federation, the voice of the largest retailers and chain stores in the US, claims that the US West Coast’s PierPass and the US East Coast have not kept pace with growing volumes of traffic. ‘An improvement in the system is to be welcomed, but it must include all stakeholders throughout the industry and supply chain – there are concerns that only some of them will be involved.’

These concerns centre mostly on the smaller hauling companies and one-person operations. This is especially acute when appointments are being made – big operations can delegate staff to jump in and hammer away at computer keyboards the moment appointment slots become available. Smaller outfits are occupied in collecting loads and driving and do not have the luxury of taking time to make favourable appointments.

Adding to the mix and worries over congestion is the Federal Maritime Commission, which is probing demurrage and detention charges at US terminals. Trucking companies and cargo owners have been complaining that terminals are tightening the penalties and cut-off times for cargo to be collected.

Some analysts are unsurprised by the terminals’ attitudes. ‘They are needing to get more money, what with the massive costs of cranes and loaders today,’ said one, speaking privately. ‘They can’t get the money from the ocean carriers, because they are strapped, and so are looking at the landside operators.’

---

**Terminal operators Australia: The empty box debate**

30/04/2018
By Peter van Duyn, director of ICHCA Australia Ltd.
A recent Customer Advisory note issued by Maersk Line Australia to return import containers has upset terminal operators.

The note announced that it would be introducing a ‘Return of import containers to Australian shipping terminals’ policy. This practice – common at overseas container terminals, much to the chagrin of the container terminal operators – has up to now only been used sporadically in Australian container terminals.

Empty repositioning of containers is a non-revenue-earning part of the container logistics chain caused by the large imbalance between import and export containers.

The motive for the ‘direct return’ is to save the extra move to and from the empty container park (ECP) with its associated transport and handling costs. A number of stakeholders in the logistics chain have complained about the potential increased costs in implementing this ‘direct return’.
There are also implications for transport operators. Instead of returning the empty containers to the ECP, with a quick turnaround for the trucks, the transport operator must co-ordinate the timing of the container unpack at the importer (usually during _banking hours_), lodge an electronic Pre-Receive Advice, book a Vehicle Booking System time slot (required for being serviced at the container terminal) and hope for a quick turnaround.

There are a number of reasons why the _direct return_ practice has increased recently in Australian container terminals, including the continuous drive by shipping lines to reduce costs and increased competition between stevedores with pressure by shipping lines to offer _direct return_. Also, stevedores currently have sufficient yard space to accommodate the empty containers and can now ascertain the condition of the container (i.e. record any damage) when it arrives at the terminal receive gate using Optical Character Recognition and CCTV technology, enabling the shipping line to check if the container was damaged before it arrived at the container terminal.

If this practice becomes widespread and, when container volumes increase, yard space at the terminals will come at a premium and storing empty containers will not be the main priority. Terminal operators might rue the day when they reluctantly agreed to accommodate the shipping lines.

[Port Strategy]

---

**Terminal operators UAE: DP World and Branson launch hyperloop cargo joint venture**

30/04/2018
By Marcus Hand

DP World's vision of a cargo carrying hyperloop has moved a step closer from pipe dream to reality with the launch DP World Cargospeed.

The new company is a partnership between DP World and Virgin Hyperloop One and is to develop hyperloop-enabled cargo systems to support the fast, sustainable and efficient delivery of palletised cargo. DP World Cargospeed systems, enabled by Virgin Hyperloop One technology, aims to transport high-priority, time-sensitive goods such as fresh food, medical supplies, and electronics, linking existing modes of transport.

Dubai is at the forefront in the development of hyperloop technology which aims to transport both cargo and passengers through low-pressure tubes on levitating pods at speeds of up to 1,200 kmh. DP World became a significant investor in Virgin Hyperloop One in 2016 and Bin Sulayem sits on its board.

The DP World Cargospeed system is designed to be mixed use for both cargo and passengers. Rob Lloyd, ceo of Virgin Hyperloop One, said: “Based on McKinsey’s assessment of our technology, Virgin Hyperloop One-enabled supply chains can dramatically impact business bottom lines by reducing both finished goods inventory and required warehouse space by 25%.”

In August 2016 DP World signed an agreement with Virgin Hyperloop One to explore shipping cargo via hyperloop from its flagship Jebel Ali Port to an inland container depot (ICD) 29km away near Dubai’s new Al Maktoum International Airport.
30/04/2018

By Vincent Wee

COSCO Shipping Ports (CSP) was helped by support from the alliances as well as parent China COSCO Shipping Corporation to a 38% rise in first quarter throughput to 27.2m teu from 19.8m teu in the previous corresponding quarter.

The Greater China area still accounted for the bulk (79%) of the group’s volumes, and during the first quarter this rose 38% to 21.3m teu.

Among the individual regions within the sector, throughput of the Bohai Rim region recovered strongly and dominated this year, accounting for 33% of the group’s total from just 18% in the previous corresponding quarter. In absolute numbers, this more than doubled to 8.9m teu from 3.6m teu previously.

The Yangtze River Delta made up 17% of total throughput and amounted to 4.6m teu in the first quarter,
sliding slightly due to the Lunar New Year break and prolonged foggy days at Shanghai Mingdong Container Terminals, CSP said.

The Southeast Coast saw the group’s second highest growth in the first quarter, rising 27% to 1.4m teu, although it only accounted for 5% of total revenue. In particular, the throughput of Xiamen Ocean Gate Container Terminal saw a 92% spike on increased calls from the OCEAN Alliance.

The Pearl River Delta region saw small but consistent gains, rising 6% in the first three months of the year to 6.2m teu. The throughput of Yantian International Container Terminals especially benefited from the growth in US and European exports, rising 9% to 2.9m teu.

The overseas terminals continued to do well, with total throughput rising by 36.0% to 5.9m teu. Among these Piraeus Container Terminal was boosted by increased calls by the OCEAN Alliance and THE Alliance and saw volumes rise 20% to break the 1m teu mark.

Meanwhile, increased calls from the OCEAN Alliance, of which both CSP parent China COSCO Shipping and Singapore-based APL’s parent CMA CGM are members, helped boost throughput of COSCO-PSA Terminal 67% to 788,240 teu).

[Seatrade Maritime News]

Bunkering: Outlook for LNG demand in the marine transportation sector

30/04/2018
By Akos Losz
There is a lot of excitement these days about the marine transportation sector as a potential driver of global liquefied natural gas (LNG) demand in the decades ahead.

With the International Maritime Organization (IMO) set to impose new sulfur emission standards on the international shipping sector in 2020, demand could skyrocket as fleet operators must switch to cleaner bunker fuels, namely low sulfur marine gasoil or LNG, or remove sulfur from high sulfur fuel oil (HSFO) by installing scrubbers. Accordingly, most forecasters predict LNG bunker demand in the shipping sector to reach between 20 and 30 million tons per annum (mtpa) by 2030 from less than 1 mtpa today. This would be a significant increase: for comparison, India’s entire LNG demand was 20 mtpa last year and China’s LNG imports averaged less than 30 mtpa only two years ago.

While this could be great for LNG exporters, there are a few caveats to this broadly optimistic outlook. First, the LNG demand potential from the shipping sector is only material in the longer term (i.e. post-2025), as converting existing vessels to LNG propulsion is prohibitively expensive, and the turnover rate of the global shipping fleet is fairly slow, with large oceangoing vessels often operating for 25 years or more. The widespread adoption of LNG will also require a dedicated bunkering infrastructure in ports around the world. With a few exceptions across Europe, Asia and North America, this infrastructure is largely missing at the moment, and it could take several years and substantial government support to develop even in the best of circumstances.

Second, the IMO rules can not only help, but also hurt LNG demand, especially indirectly, in the power generation sector. The majority of fleet operators are widely expected to switch to low sulfur marine gasoil as the default compliance option after 2020, and refineries around the world could struggle to shift their
product yield immediately to minimize heavy fuel oil and maximize cleaner distillate fuel production. In fact, some simple refineries could even increase their fuel oil output temporarily, as they ramp up utilization to boost distillate yields. In this scenario, the IMO standards could leave millions of barrels of dirt-cheap high sulfur fuel oil on the market, no longer needed in shipping and few places to go other than the power generation sector. If fuel oil prices fall far enough, then countries that are now planning to replace oil with imported LNG for power generation—particularly in the Middle East, Central America and the Caribbean—could very well decide to burn cheap fuel oil in their power plants instead, at least until refineries can adapt to the new market requirements after 2020.

Third, not all future LNG bunker demand will be met with traded LNG. In fact, much of the LNG that is used today as a bunker fuel across Europe and North America is liquefied pipeline gas, sourced from the domestic gas transmission grid. To the extent this type of use remains prevalent, we could see a substantial increase in LNG consumption in the shipping sector without much growth in actual LNG trade. In this scenario, LNG bunkering might not help the bottom line of LNG suppliers—or bankroll the next wave of liquefaction projects—quite as much as many hope in the LNG industry.

And finally, even if the IMO’s 2020 sulfur cap is a long term positive for LNG in the marine transportation sector, the IMO’s newly-adopted greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction target, which is calling for a 50% emission cut by 2050, will further complicate the viability of LNG as a marine fuel in the longer term.

While LNG emits about 25% less CO2 than oil-based bunker fuels (and eliminates nearly all air pollution associated with the burning of HSFO), its lifecycle GHG footprint depends greatly on the extent of fugitive methane emissions along the entire LNG supply chain, including during combustion in LNG-powered engines called methane slip. Methane is a much more potent greenhouse gas than CO2, and depending on how much of it escapes unburned, LNG could either meaningfully reduce, or—under some circumstances—actually increase overall GHG emissions relative to traditional bunker fuels.

Unlike most other low carbon bunker fuels that are being proposed to meet the new GHG target (such as hydrogen, ammonia, methanol, advanced biofuels or electric batteries), LNG is both practical and proven on a large scale. But whether it offers a step forward or a step backward towards achieving the IMO’s new ambitious GHG targets will largely depend on the industry’s ability to mitigate methane emissions throughout the entire LNG chain.

If lifecycle emissions are properly managed, then LNG can play a substantial role in the marine transportation sector, and LNG demand from bunkering operations could indeed be very substantial over the longer term. But this outcome is nowhere near as assured as some recent analyses suggest—and as some participants might hope in the LNG industry.

Akos Losz is a senior research associate for the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University. Prior to joining Columbia, Losz was senior analyst at Douglas-Westwood. Previously, he worked on the strategy-development team of MOL Group, a Hungary-based international energy company.

The statements, opinions and data contained in the content published in Global Gas Perspectives are solely those of the individual authors and contributors and not of the publisher and the editor(s) of Natural Gas World.

[Natural Gas World]
HFW’s Matthew Gore examines the implications of new virtual security regulations

The importance of cyber security to the maritime transport sector was brought into sharp focus in June 2017 when the _NotPetya_ malware attack struck organisations in more than 60 countries worldwide, including many prominent organisations within the maritime transport sector.

Incidents such as this demonstrate the need to improve the security of network and information systems across the maritime transport sector. The Directive on Security of Network and Information Systems (EU 2016/1148) (the Cyber Directive), which was transposed into UK law on May 9, 2018, brings cyber security onto a legislative footing. It applies to organisations termed as _ Operators of Essential Services_ (OES) and requires such organisations to demonstrate that they have implemented _appropriate and proportionate_ cyber security measures to prevent, or at least alleviate, the potential harm of cyber security incidents.

The latest UK Government publication on the application of the Cyber Directive indicates that OES within the maritime transport sector will apply to harbour authorities, ports or port operators that either have annual passenger numbers greater than 10m or that account for more than 15% of the UK’s ro-ro traffic, 15% of the UK’s lo-lo traffic, 10% of UK total liquid bulk; or 20% of UK total bio-mass fuel.

The Cyber Directive will also impact sea freight carriers that handle more than 30% of freight at any UK port that falls within the parameters above, and 5m tonnes of total annual freight in UK ports as a whole.

While those identified as OES pursuant to these thresholds will need to comply with the requirements of the Cyber Directive summarised below, it is important to note that businesses that supply or contract with OES are also likely to be affected due to the highly interconnected nature of the sector.

**Compliance requirements**

OES within the maritime transport sector will be required to comply with a set of fourteen security requirements based on the following four objectives as defined by the National Cyber Security Centre:

Managing security risk – OES will need to ensure that appropriate organisational structures, policies, and processes are in place to understand, assess and systematically manage security risks to the network and information systems supporting essential services across their assets and supply chains.

Protecting against cyber attack – This objective necessitates the implementation of proportionate security measures to protect essential services and systems from cyber attack. Examples include managing access to relevant systems, the protection of data and providing staff with appropriate training.

Detecting cyber security events – OES must demonstrate they have the capability to ensure security defences remain effective and to detect cyber security events affecting, or with the potential to affect, essential services.

Minimising the impact of cyber security incidents – This objective centres on an organisation's ability to minimise the impact of a cyber security incident on the delivery of essential services. It calls for OES to have a robust incident response plan to cover all relevant potential incidents. In addition, any incident having a _significant_ impact on the continuity of essential services must be formally reported.

**Oversight and enforcement**
Once the Cyber Directive is effective, each ‚Competent Authority‘ will have responsibility for the oversight of its sector. The Competent Authority for the maritime transport sector will be the Secretary of State for Transport, and by extension the Department for Transport. Responsibilities of the Competent Authority will include the designation of OES; monitoring the application of the Cyber Directive; the publication of guidance (including incident reporting thresholds); and enforcement and the imposition of penalties.

The Competent Authority will have the right to impose financial penalties (up to a maximum of £17m) on OES which contravene the Cyber Directive. However, the UK Government is keen to stress that the maximum penalty should be regarded as a last resort - indeed, the latest guidance dictates that the Competent Authority will take a reasonable and proportionate approach to enforcement.

[Port Strategy]

Dry bulk shipping: Winners and losers of soybean war

30/04/2018
By Michael King
As the US ramps up agricultural tariffs, south American exporters are poised to fill a China-sized gap.

Grain port development and bulk handling companies with a strong presence in South America are likely to be among the _winners_ from the US‘ budding trade war with China. In response to the billions in tariffs placed on Chinese imports announced by the Trump regime, as Port Strategy went to press China had retaliated with its own range of swingeing, punitive tariffs on US products. Chief among its targets were US agricultural exports.

China is now the world’s leading importer of a range of grains and soybeans, while the US is one of the world’s leading exporters of agricultural produce, much of it barged down the Mississippi River to the US Gulf, but with sizeable volumes also exported out of the Great Lakes, Atlantic ports and the Pacific North West. Both countries have much to lose should a full-blown trade war break out.

According to Emily French, managing director of grains consultancy ConsiliAgra, in 2016, China, whose ballooning middle class is increasingly turning to grain-based foods, was the largest buyer of several US commodities including 62% of its soybean exports, 79% of its sorghum, 49% of its hides and skins, 23% of its distillers‘ grains, 25% of its peanuts and 30% of its whey. Indeed, soybean exports from the US to China alone are worth more than $12bn annually, making the crop the second most valuable US export to China after aircraft parts.

If both countries follow through on their tariff threats, much of this trade will stop, or be vastly reduced. For the dry bulk trades, if the US is forced to seek alternative buyers to China for its agri-exports, for example in Europe, then US Gulf ports would likely benefit, possibly at the expense of Pacific North West alternatives.

Non-US winners
As China seeks out non-US sources of agricultural imports, likely impacts of relevance to port strategists will be more Chinese demand for Brazilian and Argentinian soybeans and soymeal.

Certainly, the soybean trade is set to be a key battleground in the putative trade war. In the 2016-17 (October 1-September 30) season China imported 96.7m tonnes of soybeans, a figure forecast to surpass 100m tonnes this season. While Brazil was the main supplier, the US was a close second – the two countries account for 83%-84% of global exports.

There is mounting evidence to suggest that China has for some years been taking steps to ensure it is not reliant on US farm imports, not least by building infrastructure and using state trading companies to ensure it is the lead buyer of Brazilian soybeans. Such is China’s gargantuan appetite for soybean imports, it is unlikely to be able to entirely pull away from buying from US farmers, this year at least. But in the first months of 2018 a procurement swing of soybeans from the US to Brazil by China was already apparent, even before the tit-for-tat tariffs were announced by the respective countries.

Brazil’s soybean exports are forecast to reach 75m tonnes this year, up from 67.5m tonnes in 2017, 51.1m tonnes in 2016 and just 23.7m tonnes in 2007. With ample land available for legal development and China seeking to source more soybeans from there in the future, Brazil’s soybean production is scheduled to continue its astonishing increases, but only if its export infrastructure can keep up.

Last year, port congestion at key load ports was evident through most of the peak soybean export season which typically runs through most of the second quarter of each year. If soybeans are still waiting to be loaded, congestion can also be a problem later in the summer when the corn export crop enters the system.

Vessel-waiting times in Brazil depend on a number of factors and as long as the transport routes leading to the northern ports, namely the BR163 highway, remain in a poor condition, this will continue to put big pressure on the ports in the south and drive up logistics costs for soybeans, says David Ross, national manager of Alphamar Agencia Maritima, a Brazilian bulk cargo port and agency specialist.

He adds that all well-established trading houses as well as new players are currently seeking concessions in both the north and south of Brazil, as well as seeking to extend existing facilities to meet surging demand.

**Investments justified**

The value of the soybean crop certainly justifies port investments. Indeed, soybeans are now of vital importance to the Brazilian economy. Last year, for example, Brazil exported 379.7m tonnes of iron ore worth $19.2bn. Soybean exports of 67.5m tonnes delivered income of $25.7bn.

At present, most of Brazil’s grain exports are shipped via the Atlantic Ocean, passing by the Cape of Good Hope, to reach Asia. But Brazil’s northern ports increased shipments of grain volumes by 80% in 2017, or about 40% of total exports, according to government data, and that is where more facilities are most needed.

Mr Ross said the lack of space available for expansion in southern ports had, however, made it difficult to build new terminals, confining developments to the ports of Santos and Paranagua. As with elsewhere in Brazil, the grain sector’s ‘ABCD’ players – Archer Daniels Midland Co (ADM), Bunge Ltd, Cargill Inc and Louis Dreyfus Corp – are to the fore.
ADM completed investments last year of $86m in the port of Santos, expanding its terminal capacity by 33%. A terminal at Santos’ Wharf 38 operated by LDC and Cargill is also due to have its existing shiploader replaced. At Wharf 37 developers are awaiting federal authorisation to install two to three new silos.

At Paranagua, Cargill is seeking permission to build a new terminal, although Mr Ross said securing a green light would likely take a number of years as any construction project would negatively impact on operations at the already congested port.

**Northern stars**

In northern Brazil, in a bid to reduce shipping costs from the producing state of Mato Grosso, ADM last year quadrupled capacity at its terminal, a joint venture with Glencore, in the northern port Barcarena. Mr Ross said further investments on the export route were also in the pipeline.

Capacities in the north have increased heavily and are still expected to grow further with four more terminals either approved or under construction with a further two concessions for terminals due to be awarded, he said. The majority of this growth is expected in Barcarena where two terminals are planned – to be operated by LDC and Cargill – and a concession called VDC 29 is in the pipeline and is expected to handle cargoes received by barges loaded with grains transhipped at the port of Miritiuba when it opens for business.

New ports in the north are helping to reduce the pressure in the ports in the south, but ports are still seeing some bottlenecks, said Mr Ross.

The industry is certainly setting up to export more out of the country’s northern ports. Brazilian farmers in top soya state Mato Grosso recently signed a memorandum of understanding with the Panama Canal Authority to evaluate ways to cut transport costs. However, a spokesperson for the Authority said a shift in shipping patterns would take some time.

The main route for grain shipments through the Canal has traditionally been from the US Gulf to Asia destinations, considering the United States is a producer of soybeans, wheat and sorghum, which are typically loaded at Gulf Ports before shipping, she tells Port Strategy. –As Brazil is working to improve its internal transportation infrastructure, most grain shipments from Brazil are loaded in the South and therefore ship via the Cape of Good Hope route. As Brazil’s internal transportation improves and makes northern-port loading more of an option for grains, shippers will likely have more flexibility to choose other routes, such as those through the Panama Canal.

**Equipment needed**

Irrespective of the shipping route, port equipment companies are hopeful of winning more orders in Latin America. Indeed, some already are. Bedeschi, for example, was set to commission a new pipe conveyor during April for KRK Latinoamerica at a new terminal in Rosario, Argentina. It also reports that it has received multiple requests about the purchase of new equipment from South America.

A number of other handling companies also told Port Strategy they were receiving multiple enquiries from the region and had noted that Brazil was ramping up its soybean exports.
However, in terms of Brazilian grain and soybean logistics, Mr Ross says that although port investment to boost capacity and handling speeds is needed, kinks in the supply chain that cause shipping delays are just as frequently caused by problems outside the terminal.

--In almost all our export terminals the limitations around cargo reception means that loading rates are superior to reception rates, I he said. --This means that down time experienced due to bad weather, terminal maintenance and the time between vessels is vital for receiving cargo to prevent forced idle time of facilities due to a lack of cargo.

--With more reliable cargo flow, there would be fewer delays, less demurrage and lower prices.‖

[Port Strategy]

Ro-ro shipping: Grimaldi confirms order for six hybrid ro-ro vessels

30/04/2018
By James Baker

Italian shipowner Grimaldi doubles efficiency with environmentally-friendly vessels after confirming an order for six new ferries designed to reduce emissions in port and fuel consumption.

Grimaldi Group has signed an agreement with Chinese shipyard Jinling for the construction of six ro-ro vessels as it sets about modernising its fleet. The Italian group announced last year that it would be spending $2bn on a newbuilding and fleet upgrade programme that would include ro-ro ships of revolutionary design, with zero emissions in port.

The new vessels, whose delivery is expected from 2020, will be 64,000 gt and more than 7,800 linear metres, equivalent to about 500 trailers, Grimaldi said. This will make them nearly twice the capacity of the largest ships in Grimaldi’s current fleet but have been designed to run on the same amount of fuel as existing vessels. The ships will use conventional fuel while at sea but are designed to use electric power when in port, guaranteeing zero-emissions.

Rather than cold ironing from shore supplies, the vessels will be equipped with lithium batteries that will provide energy requirements while at berth. The batteries will be recharged during navigation, through shaft generators and with the aid of 600 m of solar panels installed on board.

Fuel consumption is being reduced by an air lubrication system under the keel, which creates bubble layers that reduce friction and hydrodynamic resistance. The vessels‘ hull will also be covered with non-toxic silicon paints with by low surface roughness, which will reduce friction with the sea and not release any substances into the water. To meet sulphur emission requirements, the vessels will be built with scrubber devices.
Oil & gas shipping: Malaysia’s MISC to invest $4 billion as potential seen in FPSOs and shuttle tankers

30/04/2018
By Vincent Wee

Despite dim prospects in the LNG and petroleum tanker segments for this year, Malaysia’s MISC is pushing forward with expansion plans, planning $4bn in capex over the next five years, local media reported.

The expenditure, of which 30% will be raised by equity and the remainder from bank borrowings, will be spread across its four core business segments of liquefied natural gas (LNG) shipping; petroleum and product shipping; offshore business; and marine and heavy engineering.

The floating production storage and offloading (FPSO) and shuttle tanker businesses are slated to be allocated $500m for potential new projects and tenders, president and group ceo Yee Yang Chien was quoted as saying on the sidelines of a shareholders’ meeting.

Yee noted that the oversupply situation for both LNG and petroleum tankers caused by overcapacity and Organisation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) production cuts will continue to affect growth this year. –We do not see it to be any better this year. We are prepared for another difficult year but we look forward for future growth in 2019 and beyond,l he concluded.

Oceans: Australia’s $400-million plan to save the Great Barrier Reef is too little, too late

30/04/2018

For the past few years, the news about corals has been depressing—and it will likely continue to be. These fragile ecosystems are being killed en masse, as human-induced climate change causes increased ocean temperatures and acidity. As one scientist put it: –It’s the confirmation of our worst fears.

Though coral reefs cover less than 0.1% of the oceans, they are home to 25% of all marine life. Even if you don’t care about the reefs’ beauty, you should care about their economic value. A 2014 estimate found that corals add about $9.9 trillion to the global economy.

Australia knows this better than most countries. The Great Barrier Reef is the Kohinoor of corals,
supporting 64,000 jobs and adding A$6.5 billion ($5 billion) to the country’s economy through tourism, fishing, and related activities.

But it’s disappearing fast. In a budget announcement on April 28, the Australian government said it set aside A$500 million to help protect corals. The money will be spent on reducing water pollution from agriculture, fighting coral-killing crown-of-thorns starfish, community engagement, reef monitoring, and research on climate adaptation.

It’s too little, too late. As leading coral-scientist Terry Hughes of James Cook University put it:

Though the Australian investment is welcome, it will at best only delay coral deaths. The only way to save corals over the long term, be it in Australia or elsewhere, is to slow down climate change. That process will require all countries to work together to find the most economically efficient way of cutting emissions of greenhouse gases.

The most recent emissions figures, however, show that the world is failing at that task. After plateauing for three years, 2017 saw an uptick in global emissions. This week in Bonn, Germany, countries are meeting to discuss how to work on their commitments in the Paris climate agreement. Let’s hope they hear about the silent death of the world’s corals.

[Quartz]
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The pressure is mounting on Chilean President Sebastián Piñera’s administration to protect one of the most beautiful and biodiverse regions of the world, the Patagonian Sea.

Late last week, Chile's Kawésquar Indigenous community won a long-fought legal battle against the salmon farming industry, which has already spread pollution in other regions of Chile and plans to expand in Patagonia. The decision came on the heels of Greenpeace Chile actions calling out the industry’s damage to marine ecosystems.

Estefanía González, oceans campaign coordinator for Greenpeace Chile, said: –The Patagonian Sea is one of the most breathtakingly beautiful places on the planet, attracting thousands of visitors each year. None of them come here to see an ocean marred by industrial salmon farming cages and their associated pollution. The Kawésquar’s _David and Goliath_ victory this week is a major step forward, and should be a sign to Chile’s leaders that it is time to permanently stop the advance of the salmon industry in Chilean Patagonia.

Last week, activists on board the Greenpeace Arctic Sunrise ship deployed a four-metre-tall inflatable resembling a map location pin with the message –Mar en peligro! (–Sea in danger!) in the Skyring Sound — an area home to numerous threatened species — and generated light-painted images of some of Patagonia’s most iconic wildlife.

The Patagonian Sea is home to whales, dolphins, otters, seals and other rare animals, all of which are threatened by pollution stemming from industrial salmon farming.

Chile is the world’s second-largest producer of salmon, more than 80% of which is for export. But as the country’s salmon farming industry has grown, so has the damage to the pristine Patagonian Sea. Protecting this region would help avoid a repeat of disasters like the 2016 red tide crisis in Chiloé, in which industrial salmon farmers dumped more than 9,000 tonnes of rotting salmon into the ocean, contributing to the death
Oceans: New technology doubles scientists’ view of ocean-air interactions

30/04/2018
By Kate Squires, NASA’s Armstrong Flight Research Center

NASA scientists are hard at work trying to unlock mysteries of our planet’s ocean surface currents and winds using a new Earth science radar instrument called DopplerScatt.

Ocean currents and winds form a never-ending feedback loop: winds blow over the ocean's surface, creating currents. At the same time, the hot or cold water in these currents influences the wind's speed. Understanding the relationship between the two phenomena is crucial to understanding Earth's changing climate. Gathering data on this interaction can also help people track oil spills, plan shipping routes and understand ocean productivity in relation to fisheries.

NASA has been studying winds for decades using NASA’s NSCAT, QuickScat and RapidScat instruments. However, DopplerScatt, developed by NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California, provides a new capability to measure both winds and currents simultaneously.

Flying aboard a B200 King Air aircraft, DopplerScatt is a spinning radar that "pings" the ocean's surface, allowing it to take measurements from multiple directions at once. It's a step up from previous technology, which could simultaneously measure currents from one or two directions at the most and couldn't measure properties of the sea surface as completely as this new instrument.

Like a highway patrol person's speed gun, the DopplerScatt instrument calculates the Doppler effect of a radar signal bouncing off an object. As that object moves closer or farther away, it detects these changes and figures out its speed and trajectory. Those measurements are combined with data from a scatterometer, which detects the reflection of the radar signal from the ocean's surface. The more "scattering" the radar observes, the rougher the waves. From the roughness and orientation of the waves, wind speed and direction can be calculated.

DopplerScatt is funded and managed by the Earth Science Technology Office at NASA Headquarters in Washington D.C. The B200 King Air research aircraft used to fly the instrument is managed and operated from NASA's Armstrong Flight Research Center located in Edwards, California.

[NASA]
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