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Circulation of IAPH Questionnaire on Dredging

The Questionnaire on Dredging, prepared by the IAPH Ad Hoc Committee on Dredging, Chairman: Mr. A.J. Tozzoli, Director of Port Department, PANYNJ, was circulated to all IAPH regular members for comments.

The questionnaire is intended to study and identify the practices followed by world ports in the disposal of dredged material, with special emphasis on the significance of the “Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matters”, which is often referred to as the London Dumping Convention.

The letter to member is reproduced below with the full text of the questionnaire is carried on page 8.

IAPH Ad Hoc Committee on Dredging

Dear IAPH Member:

At the IAPH Executive Board meeting in Brisbane, Australia, it was agreed that it would be to the benefit of the IAPH membership to develop a better understanding of port dredging practices and their relationship to the London Convention.

As a result, an IAPH Ad Hoc Committee on Dredging has been formed. The Committee includes myself, Director, Port Department, The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey; Mr. Punio Kohmura, Executive Vice President, Nagoya Port Authority; Mr. Herbert Haar, Associate Port Director, Port of New Orleans; Mr. Robert Lorimer, General Manager, Auckland Harbor Board; Dr. H. Molenar, Managing Director, Port of Rotterdam; Mr. B.M. Tukur, General Manager, Nigerian Ports Authority; Mr. Sven Ullman, General Manager, Port of Gothenburg; Mr. John Wallace, President, Maritime Services Board of N.S.W., Sydney; and Mr. F. MacNaughton, Director of Engineering Services, National Harbour Board, Canada.

The Committee has put together the attached questionnaire which we would very much appreciate you answering. Your responses will provide all of us in IAPH with a better understanding of dredging practices and how they are or may be affected by the London Convention.

Please be assured that your responses will be treated in confidence. No port responding to this questionnaire will be identified (unless you specifically indicate on the questionnaire that it is permissible to do so).

The results of this questionnaire will be distributed to the IAPH membership in time for discussion at the May 1981 Conference at Nagoya, Japan. At that time, the future of the Ad Hoc Committee on Dredging also will be reviewed.

For those who may be unfamiliar with the London Dumping Convention, I have included some background information on the Convention, as well as its impact on dredging activities in the United States.

Please return the enclosed questionnaire to the above address as soon as convenient but preferably no later than November 14, 1980.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to get in touch with me or any of the Ad Hoc Committee members.

Sincerely,

Anthony J. Tozzoli
Chairman, IAPH Ad Hoc Dredging Committee
Second Vice President, IAPH

QUESTIONNAIRE ON DREDGING

Background

Forty-two countries have signed the Convention on the Prevention of Marine Pollution by Dumping of Wastes and Other Matters, often referred to as the London Dumping Convention. It is designed to prevent pollution of the marine environment caused by the dumping of toxic materials into the world's oceans and seas. The Convention became effective in 1975.

Parties to the Convention have agreed to prohibit the marine dumping of high-level radioactive wastes, defined as unsuitable for dumping at sea by the International Atomic Energy Agency, and materials (in any form) produced for biological and chemical warfare. Where wastes are found to contain organohalogen compounds (such as Polychlorinated Biphenyls—PCBs), mercury, cadmium, persistent plastics and other persistent synthetic materials, or oil and hydraulic fluids—in more than trace amounts—these too shall be prohibited from ocean disposal.

When PCBs, mercury, cadmium, etc., are found in waste material in less than trace amounts (not defined by the Convention), wastes may be ocean dumped provided a special permit is issued by an appropriate government agency. In addition, wastes containing significant amounts (again, not defined by the Convention) of arsenic, lead, copper, zinc, organosilicon compounds, cyanides, fluorides, pesticides not otherwise prohibited, acids and alkalines, scrap metals and other bulky wastes, or radioactive material not otherwise prohibited also require a special permit to be ocean dumped.

The impact of the London Dumping Convention is being felt most keenly in the United States. Traditionally many ports in the United States have disposed of their dredged materials at government specified sites at sea because this is the cheapest way of disposing of this material. And, until recently, there were few questions about possible harmful environmental effects from ocean disposal of dredged materials. Now this situation has changed.

In recent years, ports in the United States have found it increasingly more difficult, expensive, and time consuming...
to get necessary government approvals to dredge port facilities. This is because greater restrictions are being placed on ocean disposal of dredged materials, often in the name of upholding the London Convention.

Any port wishing to dredge its channels or berths must pass a complicated set of bioassay and bioaccumulation tests. As practiced in the United States, a bioassay test measures mortality differences in sensitive marine organisms exposed to the dredged material and organisms exposed to clean sediment. Bioaccumulation tests are supposed to indicate the uptake of constituents in dredged material by marine organisms by measuring the differences in tissue levels of various constituents between sensitive marine organisms exposed to dredged material and those exposed to clean sediment.

As a result of these and other testing procedures, it often takes more than six months and $10,000 to get the necessary government approvals, and even then there may be conditions or restrictions attached to a permit, such as a requirement that dredged material be covered over with other, cleaner material.

The IAPH supports the concept of reasonable regulation of the disposal of toxic wastes at sea. The purpose of this questionnaire is to inventory the practices followed by world ports in the disposal of dredged material, with special emphasis on the significance of the London Dumping Convention on such practices.

**Questionnaire**

In order to have a clearer idea of dredging practices among IAPH members, we would appreciate your answering the following questions:

1. How much material do you dredge from your facilities?
   - a. Annual maintenance average ______ cu. yds. or ______ cu. m.
   - b. Construction (development) 1975-79 ______ cu. yds. or ______ cu. m.

2. Where is this dredged material disposed?
   - a. On dry land ______ %
   - b. In wetlands ______ %
   - c. In near shore waters (bays, rivers) ______ %
   - d. In the ocean/sea ______ %
   - e. Other (identify) ______ %

3. Who does your dredging?
   - a. ________ Private Contractor
   - b. ________ Port Authority
   - c. ________ Other Government Agency

4. If you dispose of dredged material in the ocean/sea, who determines to where you may dispose of the material?
   - a. ________ National Government
   - b. ________ Local Government
   - c. ________ Port Authority
   - d. ________ Other (specify)

5. a. How far out to sea is your disposal area? b. What is its depth of water?
   - a1) ______ 0-3 miles out
   - a2) ______ 4-13 miles out
   - a3) ______ 13-200 miles out
   - b1) ______ 0-20 feet deep
   - b2) ______ 20-50 feet deep
   - b3) ______ More than 50 feet

6. Are you required to get any government approvals (permits) before you can dredge and dispose of materials? ______ Yes ______ No

7. a. What sort of approval is required?
   - b. What is the name of the permits(s)?
   - c. Is there a particular law(s) requiring this permit(s)?
   - d. To your knowledge, is there any connection between this law(s) and the London Convention?

8. What government agency is responsible for any required approval(s)/permit(s)?

9. In order to get these approval(s)/permit(s), are you required to pass any scientific tests? ______ Yes ______ No

10. Would you describe these tests as bioassays and/or bioaccumulation tests?

(Please refer to the explanation of these tests in the Background section of this Questionnaire.)

a. ________ Bioassay
   b. ________ Bioaccumulation
   c. ________ Both
   d. ________ Other

11. Briefly describe the scientific tests you are required to pass.

12. In the event the material fails to pass the scientific tests, is there a provision in your domestic laws or regulations allowing for a waiver in order to permit ocean disposal of dredged material?

13. Are seasonal restrictions to dredging imposed?

   - ______ Yes ______ No

14. Are you required to make control tests or monitor impacts during or after disposal?

   - a. What kinds of tests or monitoring are required?
   - b. How often and for how long?

15. What is the average length of time it takes to get required government approval(s)/permit(s)?

16. Once approved, how long is the permit(s) valid?

17. a. What is the average cost involved in getting required government approval(s)/permit(s)? (Please indicate unit of currency. b. Also, whether cost is by volume or by permit.)

18. Has the average cost increased as a result of testing requirements?

   - ______ Yes ______ No

19. Were all the dredging permits you requested in 1979 approved?

   - ______ Yes ______ No

20. Is your nation a party to the London Convention?
**IAPH celebrates 25th anniversary**

November the 7th is the date on which IAPH was formally established 25 years ago in Los Angeles (Hollywood-Roosevelt Hotel), USA, and Ports and Harbors wishes to call attention of the readers to the tremendous progress it has made in that space of time.

The graph on the next pages shows the movement in the membership and amount of expenditure on activities over this period.

At the first conference the IAPH Constitution and By-Laws were adopted and the following officers elected:

**President:** Mr. Bennett J. Roberts, Chairman, National Harbours Board, Canada

**1st Vice-President:** Mr. John-Iwar Dahlin, Director, Port of Helsingborg, Sweden

**2nd Vice-President:** Mr. C.W. Chen, Advisor, Ministry of Communication, China

Chief of the Central Secretariat (now called Secretary General): Mr. Gaku Matsumoto, President, Japan Port and Harbor Association

A Board of Directors was established with members elected from 14 countries (73 countries by 1980), as follows:

Brazil, Canada, China, Germany, Japan, Korea, Liberia, Mexico, Peru, Sweden, Thailand, USA, Venezuela, Viet Nam.

Special functions commemorating the 25th anniversary are planned to take place at the 12th Conference in Nagoya, May, 1981, and they will be the Silver Jubilee ceremony and luncheon, commendations of meritorious people, publication of the 25 year history of IAPH and memorial services to the late Mr. Gaku Matsumoto and the late Chujiro Haraguchi, founding fathers of IAPH.

All members are cordially invited to attend the conference and celebrations which will mark and confirm the ever growing strength of our Association.

---

### Questionnaire on Legal Aspects of Vessel Traffic Management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Question</strong></th>
<th><strong>Yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>No</strong></th>
<th><strong>Don't Know</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. If you are aware of any effect the London Convention has had on your dredging activities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. If you would like to add further detail or make additional comments, please do so in the space below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Please indicate if you would prefer your responses be kept confidential or if you have no objection to being identified in any reports or analyses based on this questionnaire.</td>
<td>a. Keep Responses Confidential</td>
<td>b. No Objection to Being Identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for taking the time to answer this questionnaire. Please return to:

---

**Nagoya Conference brochures now published**

The Organizing Committee of the 12th Conference of IAPH at the Nagoya Port Authority announces that the conference brochure (50 pages) and application forms containing all the details of the May 1981 conference will be completed and circulated to all members and the relevant sources by the middle of October.

"As soon as you receive the brochure", Mr. Kohmura, the conference host requests, "please give it your full attention and we, in Nagoya, hope for a prompt and favorable response".

The brochure includes the general programme, details of sessions, ceremonies, ladies programme, necessary information and application forms and hotel reservations.

**Mr. Stuart announces 2 new recipients of IAPH Bursary 1980**

Secretary General Sato was advised by Mr. J.K. Stuart, Chairman of the Committee on International Port Development that the Committee has approved 2 bursaries for middle managers of Yemen Ports Authority to attend courses at Port of Singapore Authority and advised that the sum of US$6,000 to the Director General of the Yemen Ports Authority be authorized accordingly.

The newly approved recipients are: Mr. M.A. Sulieman, Training Officer and Mr. Yeslam Awad Alabas, Assistant Operations Manager, Yemen Ports Authority (Aden), both attending the PSA's following training courses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Destination</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.A. Sulieman</td>
<td>Cargo Operations at Conventional Wharves (22.9.80 – 10.10.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeslam Awad Alabas</td>
<td>Planning and Operations of a Container Terminal (27.10.80 – 14.11.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications to the Bursary 1980 are still available and all members from developing ports who have been slow in sending their entries are again invited to apply now. Details of the conditions for entry were printed in the September 1980 issue of "Ports and Harbors" (pages 7 and 8).

---

**Have you replied to the IAPH Questionnaire on Legal Aspects of Vessel Traffic Management?**

The Questionnaire on this subject was circulated to all IAPH Regular Members on July 15 and to the Board Members on July 22 for their comments, as introduced in the September issue. As of September 30, 1980 some 20...
members had responded. Should you have not yet contributed, please do so even after the original closing date of October 15, 1980.

**IAPH Resolution for IYDP 1981 submitted to the United Nations**

The IAPH Resolution in support of the U.N.'s International Year of Disabled Persons (IYDP 1981), as introduced in the September issue, was placed before the attention of all IAPH Regular Members at its meeting by correspondence called on October 5, 1980, and was approved unanimously. The Secretary-General submitted it to the United Nations (Mrs. Z.L. N'Kanza, Executive Secretary, IYDP, Vienna International Centre), in his communication dated October 20, 1980.

**Mr. Mayne reports on the ESCAP Joint Meetings**

Mr. A.S. Mayne, Chairman of Port of Melbourne Authority and 1st Vice-President of IAPH, represented the Association at the joint meetings of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) held in Bangkok 1st-3rd September, 1980, and recently sent the Secretary General his comprehensive report and also minutes of the various meetings held under the auspices of ESCAP.

Separate meetings of the port authorities and the shipowners were held on September 2nd and a shippers meeting, on September 1st and a joint meeting of shippers, shipowners and port authorities on September 3rd.

According to Mr. Mayne, all the meetings were held in a cordial and amicable atmosphere and it was agreed that there would be further meetings when appropriate.

Mr. Mayne concludes in his report that there is little doubt in his mind that IAPH's future role must include assisting authorities in the ESCAP area as much as possible.

The full reports as received from Mr. Mayne are reproduced in this issue (pages 28-32).

**Paper Contributed by Prof. Kurt Grönfors**

A paper entitled "Towards Uniform Rules for International Terminal Operators", prepared by Prof. Kurt Grönfors, Professor of Maritime Law and Transport Law, Gothenburg University, was contributed to the journal and is carried on page 12.

The arrangement was made possible by the good offices of Mr. Sven Ullman, General Manager of Port of Gothenburg.

**Mr. Raven of SITPRO speaks about Trade Facilitation ESCAP Joint Meeting**

Mr. John A. Raven, Chief Executive & Vice-Chairman of SITPRO UK Board attended the ESCAP Joint meeting of Shipowners, Shippers and Port Authorities in Bangkok on Wednesday 3rd September 1980, and presented a paper entitled "Trade Facilitation—A Practical Project for Port Co-operation".

In his recent communication to the Secretary-General, he stated that the paper could serve as a basis for the Open
Symposium of Committee on Trade Facilitation, which is to be held on May 27, 1981, on the occasion of the Association’s 12th Biennial Conference in Nagoya.

The full text of the paper is carried on page 14.

Mr. Remond, Marseilles represents IAPH at FIATA meetings in Tunis

IAPH has been invited to send a representative to this year’s meeting of FIATA (International Federation of Freight Forwarders Association) which is scheduled to take place in Tunis, Tunisia from September 21st–24th 1980 and especially to attend the meeting on Seaborne and Combined Transport.

As a result of the recent meeting of the general managers of French port authorities, Mr. Yann-Pierre Remond, Commercial Director of the Port of Marseilles Authority was assigned to take part in the FIATA meeting as an IAPH representative, through the kind offices of Mr. J. Dubois, Port of Le Havre Authority.

The report of the meeting by Mr. Remond will be published in this journal as soon as it is received.

Visitors
– From September 8 to September 20, Mr. T.C. Yuan, Director of Keelung Harbor Bureau and his wife, accompanied by Mr. Tseng, Ching-Shu, Dy. Chief of Marine Terminal Department of Keelung Harbor Bureau, visited Japan for the purpose of visiting major ports and negotiating with the manufacturers of ships and equipment in this country.

On September 9, the visitors met Mr. Makoto Yoshimura, Director-General, Bureau of Ports and Harbours, Ministry of Transport, Mr. Nobuji Shimada, Director-General, Bureau of Port and Harbour, Tokyo Metropolitan Government to exchange views and comments. On September 17, they visited Port of Kobe and were met by Mr. Yukio Torii, Director-General. In addition to their visit to factories of Mitsu Engineering and Shipbuilding and I.H.I., they visited the construction site of the Seikan Undersea Tunnel in Hokkaido, on September 13.

– On September 3, Dr. Claes G. Alvstam, Lecturer, Department of Human and Economic Geography, University of Gothenburg, visited the head office and was met by Mr. Kusaka, Dy. Secretary-General and his staff. Dr. Alvstam was visiting this country to attend the 24th International Geographical Congress held in Tokyo. He visited Ports of Tokyo and Kawasaki on August 30, and Port of Yokohama on September 3 respectively.

– On September 8, Ir. D.R.A. Stapel, Managing Director of Schiphol Airport, Amsterdam, visited the head office and met the head office staff, during his two weeks visit to Japan, to attend the Airport Symposium held in Osaka. He, before joining Schiphol Airport, was Dy. Managing Director of Port of Amsterdam, and, was a member of the Organizing Committee for the 8th IAPH Conference in Amsterdam/Rotterdam held in 1973.

– On September 17, Mr. Donald P. Distant, Senior Electrical Engineer of the Port of Singapore Authority, visited the head office and was received by Mr. Kusaka, Dy. Secretary-General and his staff. He also visited Port of Yokohama on September 17 to observe the port facilities. He has been attending MIT for the past year.

– On September 27, Mr. Edward Georgeose Neamé, Principal Engineer, General Directorate of Ports, Syria, visited the head office and was received by Mr. Kusaka, Dy. Secretary-General and his staff. Discussed was the possibility of joining IAPH by the General Directorate of Ports of Syria. He was attending a port & harbour engineering seminar organized by the Japanese Government.

– On September 29, Mr. M.P.K. Fernando, Engineering Manager, Sri Lanka Ports Authority, Mr. Ricardo Vicente Petroni, Professor in Maritime Hydraulics, University of Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Mr. Franz Ulloa Hoffmann, Director General of Planning, Ministry of Public Works and Transport, Costa Rica, visited the head office and were received by Mr. Kusaka, Dy. Secretary-General and his staff. The possibility of joining the Association by Ministry of Public Works and Transport of Costa Rica was discussed. They were attending a port & harbour engineering seminar organized by the Japanese Government.

Membership Notes
Temporary Members
Office des Ports Nationaux
Batiment Administratif-La Goulette-Tunisie
Office Phone: 275.300
Cable: OF PORNATU
Telex: 12386 OPORNA

Port of Tacoma
P.O. Box 1837 - Tacoma, Wa. 98401
Office Phone: (206) 383-5841
Telex: 32-7473

(Port of Tacoma)

(Port of Tacoma)

Papers to the 12th Conference invited

The Organizing Committee of the 12th Conference at Nagoya announces that voluntary contributions of papers by the conference participants will be welcome.

Following will be the conditions for the paper presentation:

a) Any participants can contribute his paper on any port-related subject to the Conference.

b) Those who wish to do so must send their typewritten texts to the Organizing Committee by the end of November 1980.

Organizing Committee of the 12th IAPH Conference
8-12, Irifune 1-chome, Minato-ku,
Nagoya 455 Japan

The Organizing Committee will print all those papers so contributed and distribute them to the participants at the time of registration.

d) Papers to be read at the Assembly will be selected by the Organizing Committee, with consultation with the Head Office.

e) Authors thus selected will be notified by the Organizing Committee of the result by the end of February 1981.
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Towards Uniform Rules for International Terminal Operators

by Professor Kurt Grönfors, LL.D.
Gothenburg University

For almost a century transportation lawyers have focused on problems concerning goods in movement. Liability regimes suited for the carriage of goods have been created nationally. Building on the American Harter Act 1893 international maritime lawyers designed the Hague Rules 1924, which were accepted on a world-wide basis and revised by the Visby Rules 1968. The insurance industry has tied its types of cover to the liability pattern thus launched. An in depth revision of the Hague Rules has been worked out by UNCTAD and UNCITRAL, with the result that a United Nations Diplomatic Conference accepted a revised system for the carriage of goods by sea in 1978, the Hamburg Rules. A UN Diplomatic Conference in Geneva 1980 has added a Convention on International Multimodal Transport after many years of intense studies.

During the same period of time transport economists have increased their efforts to make goods handling more efficient. If you compare conventional handling methods with modern containerised systems, you will get a good picture of the tremendous progress made in recent years.

What seems to have been attracting considerably less interest is goods in rest, i.e. liability and economic as well as administrative problems concerning goods before loading and after discharge or when temporarily stored in transit. There still remains much to be done in this field in order to streamline liability rules and handling procedures referring to terminal periods. Personally, I am convinced that terminal problems will attract more and more interest in the 80'ies.

Some problems immediately arise out of the heterogeneity of the present situation. Terminal operators are sometimes private, sometimes public entities with a wide variety of liability regimes, ranging from non-liability up to a modest one. Some rules are given in statutes, others in by-laws or in various kinds of standard conditions; thus, their legal status varies as much as their contents. There exists a need for uniformity, but as a consequence of the various types of services requested and because of the difference as to the infrastructure such rules cannot be either completely mandatory or completely non-mandatory. What we have to search for is what might at first sight be a contradiction in terms, viz. uniform rules that are both mandatory and optional at the same time, leaving some flexibility to terminal operators and still guaranteeing customers a uniform minimum protection.

International trade and banking interests desire a liability regime with no gaps or loopholes, but the liability level might well be modest or even low. As things stand today, the liability cover for a transit operation might contain important gaps as far as terminal periods are concerned. Such gaps can be filled by extending the carrier's standard conditions to cover terminal periods, and this technique has been successfully used by carriers, especially by those operating modern containerised services. Otherwise, the unabridged cover of cargo insurance remains as the only protection, but even so the reliability of transport documents is considered as diluted by the lack of a modest liability "umbrella" over the whole transit.

From what has now been said, it appears advisable to look upon the terminal operator as a link in the chain between the carrier and his customer. Today, terminal functions contain a wide range of services, and various handling operations are sometimes carried out by different independent operators, such as stevedores and crane drivers, sometimes by a single operating unit, such as the so-called stevedoring companies in Rotterdam.

An effort to attack and to solve these complicated problems has recently been made by the Rome Institute for Unification of Private Law (UNIDROIT). A provisional draft convention has been circulated to the governments interested with a view to having their reactions to the main ideas of the draft. The full text and expiatory notes are printed in the Uniform Law Review 1979 vol. 1, pp. 61-143. Further materials enlightening the suggested text can be found in two earlier documents, UNIDROIT 1978 Study XLIV - Doc. 4 and UNIDROIT 1979 Study XLIV - Doc. 7.

The main idea is to supplement the Hamburg Rules 1978 on carriage of goods by sea and the Geneva Convention.
The draft convention as part of this programme is designed not only as a mandatorily binding convention in the traditional sense of this term but leaves to the parties of the convention the alternative of using a more nuanced method of incorporating the mandatory liability regime into its national legal system. For it is allowed also to guarantee effect to the rules in relation to operators who undertake to apply the rules, and only such operators will be recognized as authorized. The State must introduce, if necessary, appropriate sanctions in the event of misuse of the status as authorized operator, but generally the incentive of acquiring an authorization and of being allowed to handle international traffic might prove to be enough. The introduction of such a system opens up the road for differing between big terminals handling international cargo and smaller terminals handling national goods only and not designed for the higher international standard.

An extra incentive for operators to be recognized as international operators is created by the devise that only such operators are allowed to issue a warehouse document, which can be made negotiable. At the time when the goods are deposited in the warehouse, the bill of lading may have fulfilled its functions and the goods may be sold from the warehouse by the shipper or by a person who bought them during the transport. Still there might remain a need for a negotiable document. Circles in London concerned with the commodities market have required that persons in other countries should provide them with a warehousing warrant which would permit the sale of the commodities against delivery of the document, which would therefore have to be a negotiable character. The availability of such a document could also be of importance for tax reasons as proof that the goods had actually been acquired, so that they might be entered in the balance sheet at the end of the year and written off as assets. In the absence of a negotiable document available for such cases, it would be necessary for the purchaser or his agent to take physical delivery of the goods in order for his title to them to be recognized. The permit to issue a negotiable warrant could therefore be very attractive for terminal operators in many countries.

The draft convention builds around the concept of the International Terminal Operator (ITO), who is defined as any person who undertakes (against payment) the safekeeping of goods before, during or after international carriage, either by agreement or by actually taking in charge such goods from a shipper, carrier, forwarder or any other person, with a view to their being handed over to any person entitled to take delivery of them. Thus, the “umbrella” effect of one person liable for all handling operations during the terminal period is achieved.

As to the structure of the uniform liability, the draft convention bases on the law regarding bailment, which in effect provides a presumption of fault. Such a type of liability corresponds to the Hague and the Hamburg Rules as well as to the Geneva Convention on multimodal transport. This is the minimum standard of liability required. If some operator wants to introduce a higher standard of liability, he is free to do so. By this arrangement the draft safeguards the interests of international trade and banking without preventing local interests to develop further.

In spite of the fact that a complete text has been presented, the draft must be looked upon as a sketch only, produced in order to get the reaction of interests involved as to the main lines. Only after such reactions have been obtained, the work can concentrate on more definite solutions. The final result of the project is intended to serve as a basis for further negotiations in some main agency of the UN, like UNCITRAL. The work of standard conditions incorporating the core of liability rules thus finally arrived at will hopefully be made in cooperation between the organizations mentioned and parallel to the work on a liability convention. Hence, time is now ripe to start a debate on liability problems referring to international terminal operators.
Trade Facilitation—A Practical Project for Port Co-operation

By Mr. J.A. Raven, Chief Executive and Vice Chairman, SITPRO Special Advisor, Committee on Trade Facilitation, IAPH

Shippers, forwarders, ports and customs authorities and road and rail transport operators all have to co-operate in order that goods should move in and out of the world’s ports.

The quality of that co-operation is a determining factor in the efficiency and hence competitiveness not only of the port but of the trade and transport network.

Much attention has been paid in recent years to the physical sub-structure of goods movement—port equipment, road communications, container hardware and improved and specialised ships. Little attention has been paid however to the invisible sub-structure necessary to handle essential information without which the goods cannot clear customs, move from one mode of transport to another, pass into the hands of the buyer, comply with port charging requirements or meet the special provisions governing dangerous goods.

A growing proportion of goods move from inland point to inland point passing through ports of loading and discharge in sealed containers or road vehicles but very often the relevant information is still being handled at these ports because the infrastructure has not been adjusted to match the span of the goods movement. At the same time capital intensive container and roll on/roll off vessels can only earn a proper return on investment if they can be turned round rapidly at the ports they service. Greatly accelerated discharge rates possible with modern loading and handling appliances are in no way matched by the capacity for handling the associated information.

Port information systems therefore need to be modified, simplified and re-tuned to take account of shifts in transport techniques and associated peaking of information through-put. The alternatives are congestion, gross over investment in badly used physical port facilities or, at the best, chronic port inefficiency and inevitable extra costs which not only lessen the competitiveness of the port but also attack the profit margins of the traders and carriers operating through it and cast extra burdens upon consumers who, in the end, pay export and import costs alike.

This incompatibility between modern transport and trading needs and the old conventional information handling system has become acutely noticeable in recent years largely because of the very act of through movement and a whole network of national and international operating bodies has been set up to improve the overall characteristics of the system and to promote improvements at specific points of application where they are most urgent.

Shippers and shipowners in many developing countries are now increasingly familiar with the main features of this work—usually described as international trade facilitation and more and more port operators are taking an interest in this relatively new management technique. The reason is easily understood in the light of the day-to-day dilemma of port managers faced with the current situation. They themselves have very little control over the way in which information is handled in export and import trading and movement. Generally speaking they tend to be the victim of other people’s information handling inefficiencies. They have to handle imports which depend, for customs clearance and onward movement, on information from a mass of individual and often distant shippers. In exports they are dealing with a multiplicity of traders, and forwarders in a highly competitive situation where marketing zeal often outstrips administrative back up. They exercise no control whatsoever over customs or banks though these agencies can be very authoritarian in their own dealings with shippers and forwarders and so play a key part in determining the speed and ease of through port movement.

The total effect is one of many self-centred information systems yielding up essential items of information to the port operator only with considerable difficulty and at a low level of overall reliability and accuracy.

In many European countries, even with well established customs systems and fully experienced traders almost half of all customs import and export entries contain at least one error. During recent enquiries it was shown that two thirds of all requests for payment under documentary credits presented to West Coast banks in the USA were being rejected on first presentation because of incompatibility between the documents and terms of credits.

All these errors and delays hold up the goods at loading or discharging ports but the port manager is powerless to influence the root causes of the problems so presented to him.

Port management interest in trade facilitation must therefore include interest in its practices and promotion by other people. That interest must be sustained and applied and organisations representing or consulting ports on a
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national and international basis should keep facilitation fully in mind as an important element of port policy.

As we have already seen the average port information handling system governing goods movement and associated payment and finance clearance requirements is not so much a coherent entity as an infinitely varied and often extremely difficult task of assembling, processing and distributing items of information from individual systems.

These sub-systems are quite different because they aim at different objectives. The shipowner is interested in operating his vessel or his container system in such a way that he gets a maximum return on his investment. He will arrange voyages whenever possible to keep his ship at sea through the weekend but if he cannot do this he will certainly expect weekend working. If not a through transport operator he may not care overmuch what happens to the goods when they have left his own physical transport system nor will he be unduly concerned with the problems that arise before they enter it.

The Customs Officer has to protect the revenue and guard against narcotics and smuggling. His main interest is in security. He is not primarily concerned with speed of handling because he is not earning a profit and has no incentive to employ large staffs to handle peak loads.

The shipper wants cheap, reliable and speedy movement of his goods through the port. He may or may not be interested in smuggling or narcotics but he certainly has no particular wish to add to Customs revenue. It is very unlikely that he has any knowledge of, let alone concern for, the interests of the shipowner or the connecting road haulier or rail operator and even inside his own business his export manager or buyer may have only minimal contact with his own transport department or banking experts.

The picture is therefore one of conflicting interests which have to be reconciled to a joint common interest and reflected in better common practices if port handling of goods is to be met with reasonable efficiency.

Improvements in the present system will not be brought about by imposing one set of requirements—say the shipowners’ or customs’—upon all others nor will there be a single solution to cover all port operations because each port has special characteristics and these are bound to be reflected in a particular “mix” of information requirements.

There are two major facilitation approaches—technical and institutional. Technically we have to look at two key sectors—the information itself which is usually in the form of paper documents but is more and more likely to appear as input to or output from computerised data handling systems and the requirements for generating, processing and distributing that information which make up the complex procedures and formalities which characterise international trade transactions.

The information itself is fairly easily rationalised. We can reduce information to essentials, re-group it so that one document may take the place of two or more and arrange information on essential documents so that it is in a standard layout on a standard size of paper.

Such standardisation is based upon the United Nations layout key which enables the shipper to take off all his key export documents by a single simple copying process and so greatly cuts errors, improves document handling and helps easy identification of particular items. Similarly it has been relatively easy, by using the consultative resources of the United Nations to arrive at standard methods of data presentation, including codes and formats which will enable international trade participants to communicate directly with each other’s computer systems.

The shipper who can benefit from using such standard documents or data presentations will not find it worth doing so unless, for example, the customs authorities enforce the same standards as part of their requirements. All other interests which require the exporter to provide a document—Chambers of Commerce, insurers, banks, carriers and so forth should be prepared to re-design those documentary requirements into a form based upon the United Nations layout key. Most shipping lines now provide United Nations format Bills of Lading. Some owners accept such Bills produced on plain paper to the same standards by the shipper or forwarder. Many national customs authorities, including the UK, have re-modelled their main entry forms to meet the United Nations key and the International Chamber of Commerce Banking Commission has recently aligned documentary credit application forms.

Port operators also should know about and utilise the UN format for their own key documents. Many operators have already done this particularly where they have introduced standard shipping notes—an important procedural and documentary improvement referred to later in this paper. The benefits of accurate, standard information presented in a familiar and structured format spread to all trade and transport participants—customs, banks, shipowners, road and rail carriers and most of all the port operators themselves who are at the meeting point of so many information flows.

In the same way many organisations and governments are testing or adopting United Nations proposed standards for data interchange in international trade. Any port operator planning to computerise any part of his management system will be advised to find out about and adopt these standards as they are the only way of ensuring that, as he extends his system into international freight handling, he will be able to interface it directly with other trade participants which are themselves using the same standards.

The procedural front is much more complicated and difficult. Even when documents are standardised, procedures tend to remain obstinately differentiated. A standard document may be handled in a different way at different ports and the shipper is often unsure how to handle these differences. There are for example 14 different practices underlying the use of FOB shipment terms at UK ports. In a recent study of 6 British ports SITPRO found not only that procedures at the 6 were different—which was expected—but also that hardly any of them had been reduced to writing—a surprising piece of evidence of the problems faced by the average shipper. It is difficult for even the most efficient documentary or computer system to cope with such informal eccentricities.

In the United Kingdom there was acute congestion of road transport at export ports in the late 60’s. When SITPRO investigated this we found that it was largely due to the unreliable quality of documents presented to the port authorities on the arrival of the goods. Those documents varied from pencil notes on the backs of envelopes to sophisticated computer print-outs. A decision was taken in 1970 to establish—initially at the Port of London, and subsequently at all UK ports—a standard shipping note based on the UN layout key which provided every export consignment with a “passport” setting out in a clear...
standard way all the information required to carry it through the various port operations and see it safely onto the vessel.

The benefit to the port manager of knowing that all the goods entering his port are properly documented for purposes of the port operation is of course incalculable and this relatively simple example of improved documentation has produced important practical benefits for UK export shipments. Once again the benefits spread to shippers, road carriers, port management, wharfingers, stevedores, forwarders and all those who rely on good prompt information for efficient working.

Another useful facility measure is the repositioning of certain key procedures—for example shifting customs clearance of imports from the port area to inland points nearer ultimate destinations.

This shift is closely associated with the development of through movement. It not only moves the most frequent cause of delay—customs intervention—from the processing area of the port itself to a more suitable site but brings the information handling operation into phase with the physical cycle of unitised cargo operation. The documentary information package is stuffed and unstuffed in closer relation to the physical stuffing and unstuffing of the container.

Customs procedures in many countries have been adjusted in terms of the time as well as place of implementation. Customs requirements adjusted much more closely to port or ships operating hours can often save days of delay to cargo, particularly at weekends.

Another cause of delay in ports—again completely outside the hands of port management—is the traditional payment procedure based upon a documentary credit and negotiable Bill of Lading. This system which was built up mainly to cover ship-to-shore transactions such as the Sea Waybill recently introduced in the United Kingdom and the "received for shipment" rather than the "received on board" Bill of Lading.

This system which was built up mainly to cover shipments on sailing-ship voyages still persists in current use although for many types of shipment it is becoming more and more incompatible with rapid intermodal throughput.

The associated need is to check the passage of the goods over the ships rail and to check the documents of title before release at the port of destination is an important contribution to port delay and congestion. Port managers therefore have every interest in encouraging the use by their customers of simplified alternative transport documents such as the Sea Waybill recently introduced in the United Kingdom and the "received for shipment" rather than the "received on board" Bill of Lading.

Another important facilitation reform is the adoption of a standard system of cargo marking reflected in identical documentary references. Every aspect of port operation would be improved if all cargo received for shipment or clearance carried a unique single cargo mark related to a coherent internationally agreed coding system and repeated in relevant paper work so that cargo and documents can be immediately matched up at all points in their respective transits.

Such a system has been devised by the United Nations and could bring to maritime movement the same day-to-day benefits that air cargo derives from the uniquely numbered IATA Waybill.

Again all port users as well as port managers will reap the benefits. Each character cut from shipping marks saves time and money in marking goods, in tracing documents, in transmitting information and in computer usage.

Quicker checking of cargoes and documents, for instance in cargo tallying and checking of documentary credits leads to quicker turn-round of vessels and improved cash flow.

A structured alpha-numeric coding basis for the mark facilitates logical systematic storage, identification and retrieval of goods and documents, while on the safety side there are clear advantages in using internationally recognised symbols for handling instructions and danger warnings.

The problem now is to publicise and promote the UN standard and here port operators should use all their influence with users to move practice in the right direction.

Aligned documents only appeared very late in the history of the old mercantile paper based system but United Nations guidelines are already in being to handle standardisation in data processing and transmission. Given the limited resources of developing countries we can foresee that the use of cheap versatile mini-computers will develop much more rapidly there than the old classical—and expensive—computer systems. Those in any sector of international trade who may use such devices even for purposes which at the moment seem to be restricted to "in house" systems should from the beginning adopt the United Nations data interchange guidelines so that the possibility of future extension and satisfactory intercommunication is built into the system design thus avoiding considerable expense and upheaval at a later stage.

Any port operator who may one day be obliged to receive information from shipowners, customs, banks or other trade participants should in his own interests ascertain whether these standards are being used, as he may otherwise find himself hemmed in by an increasing number of computer systems all with quite different methods of presentation. This will mean a return to paper as a means of manual interfacing—a ridiculous waste of computer facilities.

These are all technical questions and though we can solve them in one way or another at a technical level this in itself will never bring about the radical reform in port information systems which everyone needs. Each port has slightly different problems and will need slightly different solutions. Practical people will quite reasonably oppose complete standardisation in procedures and documents because of these unavoidable differences. Furthermore trade practices and transport techniques—to say nothing of information processing methods—are constantly changing and changes used need to be reflected in adjustments to port procedures.

To manage procedural changes and meet these variations calls for constant consultation and cooperation between various trade participants including port authorities themselves. In many ports the port operator is looked to as the natural agency to establish and maintain usually modest arrangements for facilitation discussions, negotiations and monitoring.

Because of our experience in the UK and elsewhere we strongly recommend the setting up of port consultative committees with substantial input from port operators and other trade and government sectors as a permanent instrument of facilitation, drawing on the work and experience already acquired elsewhere, focusing local interests on practical work, dealing with changes in trade patterns and transport techniques as well as with acute problems and generally tuning up the information system, not only in the
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Annual Report 1979 (Extracts): National Harbours Board, Canada

1. Chairman’s Message (extract)

In 1979, the operating results of the National Harbours Board reflected positively the thrust initiated the previous year when we emphasized planning, control and accountability at both the port and National Office levels. Through clearly delineated national policy and delegated authority, our ports were able to respond to local and regional market demands in an efficient manner and still move towards our objective of financial self-sufficiency. Our net loss of $2.4 million represented only 2% of record operating revenues of $113.7 million in 1979. Exclusive of financial charges and investment income, the Corporation achieved a positive operating income for the first time since 1971. The National Harbours Board now anticipates that it will, on a consolidated basis, achieve its goal of financial self-sufficiency in 1983.

Overall, the National Harbours Board increased operating revenues by 13% in 1979. Despite an extended work stoppage by grain handlers at Montreal and ten-day waterfront labour disputes at Vancouver and Prince Rupert, the total volume of cargo handled at National Harbours Board ports rose 11% to 157.5 million tonnes. These volume increases were achieved in conjunction with the implementation of price increases. We have been able to keep operating expenses to a 5% increase over 1978 which reflects well on the improved productivity of our human resources. The Corporation, in response to changing technology and traffic patterns, undertook extensive capital investments in 1979. Construction began on an extension to our open storage facilities at Saint John. We initiated a major modernization of our grain facilities at Montreal and, in a joint venture with Bunge of Canada Ltd., completed renovations to our grain galleries at Quebec which will greatly increase both our capacity and efficiency.

Construction continued on such critical projects as new container terminals at the Ports of Halifax and Montreal. Construction was completed at the Navy Island Forest Products Terminal in Saint John and the Lynnterm facility in Vancouver. During the year, planning and feasibility studies were undertaken for projects involving the proposed expansion of the Roberts Bank bulk terminal in Vancouver, the Ridley Island grain facility in Prince Rupert, and the Pier B.C. cruise ship facilities in Vancouver. These three projects were all subsequently approved in principle in early 1980.

In addition to our active participation in industrial and commercial projects, the National Harbours Board has co-operated with other government agencies at various levels to provide social and environmental benefits to the people of Canada. In 1979 we participated with Parks Canada in refurbishing wharves required as part of the redevelopment of the Old Port of Quebec.

The importance of our role in the community was further emphasized when, in October 1979, the Town of Churchill hosted a celebration attended by the Governor General of Canada commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Port of Churchill.

During 1979, it was announced that two of our ports would be future sites for important international conventions. Vancouver was named host port for the 1983 world convention of the International Association of Port Authorities, while Quebec was chosen as host for the 1984 convention of the American Association of Port Authorities.

Pierre A.H. Franche
Chairman

2. Investment in the Future

Because of the vastness of Canada’s frontiers, this country is very dependent upon efficient, modern and cost-effective methods of transportation. In order to respond to our environment, increasing consumer demand and modern technology, the National Harbours Board is committed to expanding and improving its facilities. Over the past five years, the National Harbours Board has spent approximately $175 million funded by working capital and loans in the development of new facilities.

In response to a demand for specialized container facilities in 1979, we continued construction of Container Terminal II at Halifax. This is scheduled for completion in 1981 with a total estimated cost of approximately $29 million. In Montreal, Racine Terminal, a public container facility comprising 28.6 acres of land, is approximately half finished with completion scheduled for 1981. In Vancouver, repaving is proceeding for the Centennial Container Terminal, and the Lynnterm facility has now been completed. Rodney Container Terminal at Saint John has proven so successful that construction is now underway on a major extension.

To maintain Canada’s position as the world’s second largest exporter of grain, facilities at both Quebec and Montreal are undergoing a major refurbishing. The Quebec
grain gallery renovations have been completed jointly with industry at an approximate cost of $8.0 million. The Montreal renovation and expansion project is scheduled to be completed by 1983 with a total estimated cost of over $40 million. Included as part of the Montreal project is the expansion of Grain Elevator No. 4 by approximately four million bushels which will allow Montreal to maintain their share of the grain market.

In 1979, agreement in principle was reached between the federal government and a consortium of grain companies to construct a major grain-handling and storage facility at Ridley Island at the Port of Prince Rupert. The total estimated cost will be over $40 million to the National Harbours Board. Private interests will be contributing more than $200 million towards this venture.

Several other commercial facilities are under construction. At Saint John, Pugsley Terminal and Long Wharf Extensions, both multi-purpose transit areas, are in the midst of construction. The Navy Island Forest Products Terminal was completed in 1979. A major modernization and reconstruction of a terminal at Trois-Rivières, with a total estimated cost of close to $12 million, was well underway by year end.

Approval has now been received to expand our major west coast bulk terminal at Roberts Bank near Vancouver. This project, with an estimated cost to the National Harbours Board of over $40 million, is expected to be completed in 1983. Private interests are scheduled to commit over $100 million towards this project. Approval was granted only after an extensive evaluation had been done on the environmental impact such a facility would have on the surrounding area.

In keeping with our desire to enhance the quality of life in Canada, the National Harbours Board has co-operated in a number of significant community redevelopment programs. We are a major participant in the redevelopment of the Old Port section of the City of Quebec. At Vancouver, we are committed to fund and operate a major marine passenger facility which will be integrated with a convention trade centre to be completed in 1982. This new terminal will serve the increased cruise ship traffic calling at major west coast ports.

3. Impact on the Community

Our operations and capital construction projects have a positive effect on Canada’s communities and regions in a variety of ways. A typical major Canadian port can account for up to 10% of all jobs in the area. In addition to people employed directly by us, numerous people are employed as a result of our demand for goods and services from the private sector. The private sector in turn employs individuals such as longshoremen, pilots, tugboat operators, truck and railroad operators, shipping agents, construction workers and maintenance men.

Accessibility to good port facilities also gives rise to the establishment of new manufacturing installations with resulting benefits to a community. A recent economic impact study of a major port on the St. Lawrence River indicated that the handling of general cargo would generate about $44 per tonne for the local economy.

The National Harbours Board continues to be concerned with contributing social and environmental benefits to its communities. Our interest in the Pier B.C. facility in Vancouver and the redevelopment of Quebec City’s Old Port district are prime examples of our concern for and interest in co-operative community programs.

Also this year, in an effort to maintain the existing level of the economy in Trois-Rivières and to assure the continued importance of the pulp and paper industry to that region, we have undertaken major renovations to our port through which this export passes. As an active member of each community we serve, the National Harbours Board contributes grants in lieu of taxes to the appropriate municipalities. In 1979, our contributions amounted to $11.4 million or 10% of our operating revenues.

In an effort to increase our visibility to the public, the Port of Vancouver has a visitors’ viewing gallery at the Vanterm Container Terminal and offers guided tours to the general public. Over 40,000 visitors tour this port annually.

4. Statement of Operations

for the year ended December 31, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(S000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbour services</td>
<td>27,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain services</td>
<td>14,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container services</td>
<td>42,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rentals</td>
<td>21,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping services and</td>
<td>8,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>113,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Depreciation)</td>
<td>12,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating income (loss)</td>
<td>2,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (income) expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense</td>
<td>18,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>14,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of investments</td>
<td>1,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary appropriations</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net loss</td>
<td>2,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Balance Sheet

as at December 31, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(S000's)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>167,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term accounts receivable</td>
<td>7,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>685,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and harbour facilities</td>
<td>291,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>21,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,063,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>568,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIABILITIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>49,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>16,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants in lieu of municipal taxes</td>
<td>7,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>23,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued employee benefits</td>
<td>136,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing provided by province</td>
<td>488,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>136,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in arrears on loans</td>
<td>7,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>538,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQUITY OF CANADA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed capital</td>
<td>350,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>(320,253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>568,787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PORTS and HARBOURS — NOVEMBER 1980 19
Foreign Trade 1979 (Extracts): Port Authority of NY & NJ

1. Chairman’s Statement

1979 Foreign Trade Summary

The Port of New York-New Jersey’s foreign oceanborne general cargo trade rose by 3.6% last year to 16,276,977 long tons, its third highest volume since the World War II year of 1941, despite the effects of an 88-day tugboat strike that severely curtailed cargo operations for most of the second quarter.

The bi-State Port’s oceanborne general cargo exports surged 13.1% to 6,001,880 tons in 1979. Outbound volume benefited from the economic strength and increasing demand of key European and Far Eastern trading partners and the impact of the decline of the dollar in recent years. Inbound general cargo edged downward 1.2% to 10,275,097 tons. The easing of New York’s general cargo imports in 1979 was in line with the national trend. Imports had risen significantly during the business expansion which began in 1975 but leveled off as the expansion reached a more mature phase.

In contrast to the rise in general cargo, New York’s foreign oceanborne bulk cargo trade fell 11.2% to 39.9 million tons in 1979. Petroleum imports, which account for over 95% of the Port’s bulk cargo, fell 10.6% to 38.2 million tons.

The New York air gateway’s foreign air cargo trade fell slightly in 1979. Following three years of economic expansion since the 1974-75 recession, volume was 671,558 tons, down 0.8% from the record year of 1978.

Port Development

The city and state of New York and the Port Authority signed the final agreement in December for the construction and operation of the $20 million Red Hook container terminal, a step in the revitalization of the Brooklyn waterfront, and announced at the same time the award of the first major construction contract on the project. The Port Authority also began developing and marketing its newly established foreign trade zone at the Port Newark and Elizabeth marine terminals. Virtually all of the space in the original zone is committed and the Port Authority Board of Commissioners has authorized the filing of an application to expand the 208,000 square foot zone in Port Newark/Elizabeth to encompass the entire seaport area.

By the year’s end, construction had also been started on a temperature-controlled warehouse at Elizabeth-Port Newark to lease to a major carrier importing Australian and New Zealand frozen meat. The warehouse, with the capacity to handle two million pounds of frozen meat a day, is to be completed by late 1980. Three bulk cargo terminals also started operating in 1979 under Port Authority marine terminal leases:

- a plant for solar drying and distributing industrial salt;
- a storage and distribution center for soda ash, to supply the glass industry of the entire northeastern U.S.; and
- a liquid bulk terminal to handle animal and vegetable oil products.

Work continued on the joint project of the Port Authority, State of New Jersey and New Jersey Turnpike Authority to build a new interchange linking the turnpike with Newark International Airport and the Port Newark-Elizabeth marine terminals.

Potential traffic identified in a Port Authority marketing survey helped convince a Danish firm to build a new $100 million luxury cruise ship with auto transport capacity, designed especially for New York service, that will begin operating from the New York City Passenger Ship Terminal to the Bahamas, with a connecting service to Miami, by 1982.

Port Department Organization

During 1979, the Port Authority reorganized several departments, consolidating functions to meet the changing demands of the coming decade. Activities involving the promotion and physical development of the port itself were united in a new Port Department to establish a unified approach to the operation of marine terminals, domestic development of waterborne trade, and port policy on such concerns as navigational channels and trade research.

A Logistics and Regulatory Affairs Section monitors and intervenes in rate and route cases before Federal regulatory agencies and carriers. It seeks to maintain the Port’s competitive position in terms of land, sea and air transportation services.

The Port Authority’s port sales offices in the United States and abroad continued to solicit trade and promote regional tourism, industrial development and foreign investment for the bi-State Port. An aggressive port information program is conducted through the media of advertising, literature, films, a port magazine and public events. This trade development effort seeks to attract and maintain liaison with those manufacturers, shippers and suppliers who might be expected to receive the greatest benefit in channeling their goods and services via the Port of New York-New Jersey.

Chinese and Japanese narrations were added to prints of the film, “On Line for Service... The Modern Port,” bringing the total to 130 prints in five languages. The Chinese version accompanied the mission to China. The film was produced by the Port Authority to promote, in free showings around the world, the speed and protection that cargo and its documents receive in the Port of New York and New Jersey.

The Harbor Festival of 1979, for which the Port Authority assumed the host responsibility, contributed to the growing tradition that the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Region is the national center for the celebration, by tourists and residents alike, of the Independence Day weekend.

Regional Port Development

To meet regional concerns identified at the Congress for Regional Recovery, the Port Authority created its own offices of Energy, Infrastructure Renewal, Strategic Planning and Waterfront Development.

During the year 1979, the Port Authority embarked on a new campaign to help municipalities revitalize the New
York-New Jersey waterfront, one of the region’s major assets. A federal grant was obtained to develop sites identified as appropriate for commercial, recreational and residential purposes.

The Port Authority also dedicated National Port Week to an alert to the region that the prohibition by the federal government of ocean dumping of dredged materials could effectively cripple the national port industry and endanger regional recovery. By year-end, public and private forces had organized to seek to amend the laws if the necessary permission under existing law were not given.

The Port Authority and the two states are considering the creation of a regional freight planning organization, to plan and develop a coordinated regional freight system, integrating all transportation modes.

Under the Port Authority proposal accepted by New York State in 1978, the state now subsidizes drayage charges on import-export container traffic moving between the rail ramps of New Jersey and the wharves of Staten Island and Brooklyn, thereby equalizing drayage charges throughout the port and improving its competitive position.

Industrial Parks Development

The Port Authority’s industrial park master plan was adopted in July 1979 after consultations with over 300 elected officials, community groups and public and private organizations.

The plan identifies six sites in urban areas, if any of which the Port Authority, with municipal agreement, could proceed to build, market and manage an industrial park as a means of strengthening the region's manufacturing sector and creating new jobs. Agreement with the relevant municipalities and public bodies was being sought by the end of the year.

The plan envisions the development of environmentally sound resource recovery systems and burning solid wastes to supply attractively priced power to industrial park tenants. In a region running out of landfill area, the study of recycling and resource recovery is an environmental consideration important enough to have earned funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Additional federal funding is being sought under existing economic development aid programs.

Congressional consent to the 1979 bi-State legislation authorizing the Port Authority to proceed to develop an industrial park program was confirmed at the end of 1979.

Alan Sagner
Chairman

2. Summary of the Port’s Foreign Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oceanborne Cargo</th>
<th>Long tons</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Exports</td>
<td></td>
<td>875,410</td>
<td>1,197,223</td>
<td>-26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Imports</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,045,845</td>
<td>43,734,211</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bulk Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,921,255</td>
<td>44,931,434</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cargo Exports</td>
<td>6,001,880</td>
<td>5,305,214</td>
<td>+13.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cargo Imports</td>
<td>10,275,097</td>
<td>10,402,910</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Cargo</td>
<td>16,276,977</td>
<td>15,708,124</td>
<td>+3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Oceanborne Cargo</td>
<td>56,198,232</td>
<td>60,639,558</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oceanborne Cargo</th>
<th>Millions of Dollars</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Exports</td>
<td></td>
<td>1793</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>-11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk Imports</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,234.8</td>
<td>4,014.3</td>
<td>+30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bulk Cargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,414.1</td>
<td>4,217.6</td>
<td>+28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cargo Exports</td>
<td>13,694.0</td>
<td>11,774.8</td>
<td>+16.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Cargo Imports</td>
<td>21,522.0</td>
<td>20,471.0</td>
<td>+5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Cargo</td>
<td>35,216.0</td>
<td>32,245.8</td>
<td>+9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Oceanborne Cargo</td>
<td>40,630.1</td>
<td>36,463.4</td>
<td>+11.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Cargo Exports

The Port of New York-New Jersey's foreign oceanborne general cargo exports rose 13.1% to 6,001,880 tons in 1979, reaching the highest levels of outbound traffic since 1974. The buoyant economies of, and increasing demands by, key European and Far Eastern trading partners, coupled with the continued impact of the dollar’s decline, spurred the volume increase.

General Cargo Imports

New York’s foreign oceanborne general cargo imports edged downward slightly in 1979. Volume was 10,275,097 tons, down 1.2% from 1978. The easing of New York’s general cargo imports was in line with national trends. Inbound cargo had risen significantly during the economic expansion which began in 1975, but appeared to top out in 1979 as the national economic expansion reached a more mature phase.

Bulk Cargo (Export-Import)

The Port of New York-New Jersey’s foreign oceanborne bulk cargo trade fell 11.2% to 39.9 million tons in 1979. Petroleum imports, which account for over 95% of the Port’s bulk cargo, fell 10.6% to 38.2 million tons. Other bulk cargo commodities moving via the bi-State Port include gypsum, inedible molasses and chrome ore imports, and refined petroleum product exports.

Value of The Port’s Oceanborne Foreign Trade

The Port of New York-New Jersey maintained its position in 1979 as the nation’s leading port in the value of oceanborne foreign trade, outdistancing its nearest rival in total value, New Orleans, by 25%.

Value totalled $40.6 billion, up 11.4% from 1978. Exports rose 15.8% to $13.9 billion, while imports climbed 9.3% to $26.7 billion.

Leading general cargo export commodities under the value criteria were: machinery (general) — $1.3 billion; road motor vehicles — $862 million; photo supplies — $679 million; and gas engines and diesels — $549 million. Leading general cargo imports were: road motor vehicles — $1.8 billion; coffee — $1.7 billion; and clothing — $1.2 billion.
Annual Report 1979 (Extracts):
Clyde Port Authority

1. Chairman’s Statement

The results of the Authority for 1979 have again turned out more satisfactory than we were entitled to anticipate, particularly so since the start of the year was affected by the road haulage drivers’ dispute. The surplus at £2,094,643 is slightly lower than that achieved in 1978. Regrettably, the beginning of the current year has again been marred by strike action — the container terminal being closed for four weeks in January and the national steel strike which has lost the Port considerable general steel traffic, coal cargoes and also iron ore through Hunterston.

The Hunterston Ore Terminal which was officially opened by the Queen Mother in June ultimately commenced working in November when the inter-Union dispute between the ISTC and the T & GWU was finally resolved. While the steel strike has affected its utilisation during the current year, we hope that the potential of the terminal will ultimately be fully realised. This will benefit both the BSC and the Authority in terms of the bulk transhipment trade.

The Authority have agreed to improve the facilities at the Port of Ardrossan by carrying out a dredging programme to deepen the outer harbour. It was also agreed to provide a workshop and terminal complex for Northern Ireland Trailers Limited which will facilitate increased trade with Northern Ireland.

The technical reports on a replacement breakwater at Rhu were received in the latter part of the year and it was with considerable regret that the Authority decided that in the current inflationary climate the cost of a new solid breakwater was such as to render the whole project unviable. Discussions are in course with interested private developers and hopefully a solution will be found which will still enable the provision of some form of marina facilities at Rhu.

The national economy remains depressed with inflation now at almost 20%, an overvalued pound and the highest interest rates in living memory. The outlook for international trade in 1980 is also far from bright. Like last year, it would be unwise to predict the outcome of the current year against such a backcloth but unless there is an economic upsurge we must anticipate reduced profits in 1980.

After three years as Chairman my appointment to the Chair of the Scottish Development Agency has compelled me to stand down but I am pleased to be continuing my association with the Port as a Member of the Authority. I am happy that James Davidson is to succeed me as a full-time Chairman from 1 April. With his wide experience and knowledge of the industry and the backing of a proven executive team, the future rests in good hands.

R.G. Duthie

2. Report for 1979

Like its predecessor, 1979 began with a depressed level of trading which was exacerbated by the road haulage drivers’ dispute which lasted for over four weeks and cost the Authority around £1.3m. in revenue. By the middle of the year an improvement in trade was noticeable and part of the loss due to the haulage dispute was recovered but overall the trading position reflected the wider industrial scene in Glasgow and the West of Scotland with over 20 companies closing down and involving the loss of nearly 20,000 jobs to the area.

Grain handled at Meadowside Granary at 570,000 tonnes was down some 10% on 1978, largely due to difficulties in Canada. On the other hand, both iron ore at 1,972,000 tonnes and coal at 386,000 tonnes were substantially up on the previous year by 24% and 118% respectively.

The road haulage strike and the loss of a number of services due to rationalisation resulted in reduced activity at the container terminal where the tonnage at 773,000 tonnes was down 15,000 tonnes on the previous year’s record figure. Having regard to the ever-changing pattern of general cargo trade and particularly the advance of ro/ro into containerised shipping, the Authority in the later part of the year decided to examine the need and operational feasibility of a ro/ro facility at the container terminal. Technical investigations and discussions with major customers are in progress.

During the year there was a major development and improvement of the railhead at the container terminal, at a capital cost of over £600,000, which included the introduction of a 30-ton transtainer crane. The scheme was grant-aided under the Railways Act 1974 and commissioned in November.

Total imports and exports of crude oil through the Estuary at 5,326,000 tonnes were up some 370,000 tonnes reflecting in the main almost a 50% increase in fuel oil for the Inverkip Power Station at 843,000 tonnes. On the other hand, imports of Middle East crude to Finnart fell by a further 385,000 tonnes to 2,610,000 tonnes. Exports of North Sea oil from Finnart however increased to 207,000 tonnes.

Safe navigational approaches are vital to a port and the Authority, in common with all other major ports throughout the United Kingdom, converted all buoys, beacons and marks in the Estuary to the internationally approved maritime buoyage system. This scheme was grant-aided by the EEC Regional Development Fund.

The Hunterston terminal was opened by the Queen Mother on 5 June but due to the inter-Union dispute between the ISTC and the T & GWU the terminal did not open until almost six months later, the first ship commencing discharge on 12 November. During the year much time had to be devoted to the negotiations which finally resolved the dispute.
### 3. Consolidated Revenue and Expenditure Account for the year ended 31 December, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On ships</td>
<td>4,279,996</td>
<td>3,795,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On goods</td>
<td>2,834,421</td>
<td>2,608,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On passengers</td>
<td>11,092</td>
<td>9,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo handling</td>
<td>9,892,536</td>
<td>8,565,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes and plant</td>
<td>834,483</td>
<td>622,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and storage</td>
<td>1,365,391</td>
<td>1,178,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haulage</td>
<td>2,072,366</td>
<td>2,002,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry services and facilities</td>
<td>716,475</td>
<td>609,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>1,936,753</td>
<td>2,393,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenue</strong></td>
<td>23,943,423</td>
<td>21,784,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Expenditure</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating and maintenance</td>
<td>5,259,403</td>
<td>5,013,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dredging</td>
<td>897,772</td>
<td>789,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo handling</td>
<td>8,363,238</td>
<td>7,306,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and other general expenditure</td>
<td>4,185,829</td>
<td>3,496,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenditure</strong></td>
<td>18,706,242</td>
<td>16,606,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Operating surplus before dedication</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision for depreciation</td>
<td>5,237,181</td>
<td>5,178,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of port improvement grants</td>
<td>1,251,328</td>
<td>1,183,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating surplus</strong></td>
<td>4,182,080</td>
<td>4,056,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus on disposal of fixed assets</td>
<td>181,738</td>
<td>84,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received</td>
<td>1,136,360</td>
<td>640,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest charges</td>
<td>5,500,178</td>
<td>4,781,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exceptional items</strong></td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Surplus for year before taxation</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital employed in undertaking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross amount</td>
<td>43,062,786</td>
<td>41,349,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate depreciation</td>
<td>21,121,135</td>
<td>20,012,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital works in progress, at cost</td>
<td>21,941,651</td>
<td>21,337,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunterston marine works, at cost</td>
<td>163,192</td>
<td>281,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets</strong></td>
<td>31,585,003</td>
<td>26,229,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td>53,689,846</td>
<td>47,848,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks</td>
<td>144,467</td>
<td>165,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors and payments in advance</td>
<td>5,506,387</td>
<td>5,018,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax recoverable</td>
<td>43,154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term loans</td>
<td>8,140,000</td>
<td>8,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank and cash balances</strong></td>
<td>13,870,307</td>
<td>13,682,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Consolidated Balance Sheet as at 31 December, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank overdrafts</td>
<td>88,008</td>
<td>74,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors and accrued expenses</td>
<td>2,253,512</td>
<td>2,270,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest accrued</td>
<td>276,943</td>
<td>124,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisions</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax liabilities</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current liabilities</strong></td>
<td>3,618,463</td>
<td>2,778,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred liability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred taxation</td>
<td>(347,880)</td>
<td>(358,364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Represented by</strong></td>
<td>63,593,810</td>
<td>58,393,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital debt</td>
<td>46,229,250</td>
<td>43,861,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>11,960,797</td>
<td>9,866,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest of outside shareholders</strong></td>
<td>25,988</td>
<td>2,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port improvement grants</strong></td>
<td>58,216,035</td>
<td>53,729,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total surplus</strong></td>
<td>63,593,810</td>
<td>58,393,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td>2,082,498</td>
<td>2,263,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxation credit</strong></td>
<td>38,088</td>
<td>1,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Surplus for year after taxation</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital employed in undertaking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross amount</td>
<td>43,062,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate depreciation</td>
<td>21,121,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital works in progress, at cost</td>
<td>21,941,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunterston marine works, at cost</td>
<td>163,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets</strong></td>
<td>53,689,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current assets</strong></td>
<td>144,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debtors and payments in advance</strong></td>
<td>5,506,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tax recoverable</strong></td>
<td>43,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term loans</strong></td>
<td>8,140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bank and cash balances</strong></td>
<td>13,870,307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annual Report 1979 (Extracts):
Port of Helsingborg

1. Cargo

Helsingborg broke the previous record in cargo throughput by surpassing the 8 million tonnes mark by a good margin. Beyond comparison 1979 became the best year ever for the port. The total throughput for sea-borne cargo came to 8,229,785 tonnes to be compared with 7,801,922 for 1978. Some sections improved considerably, and dry cargo alone arrived at 7,312,287 tonnes.

Modern handling of unitized cargo is still growing, which reflects the increasing world-wide trend in containerization, and in the use of mechanized and sophisticated methods. The throughput at the Skane Container Terminal recorded an increase of 15 pct compared with the previous year. A volume of 1,253,845 tonnes was handled at the Linjebuss Terminal compared with 1,150,044 in 1978, a growth of 9 pct. Also the RoRo harbour Sundterminalen took a long stride and reached a new record of 754,456 tonnes as against 679,663. This was a highly significant increase of 11 pct over the previous year. The throughput of mineral oils made an increase, even the throughput of oil products increased by 11.4 pct reaching a volume of 592,418 tonnes as against 532,004 in 1978. The RoRo harbour Sundsterminalen handled surpass all previous achieved quantities, and new records were broken within practically all sections. This is in consequence of improved trade conditions and extended possibilities to accommodate additional traffic. Most gratifying is the fact that ferried railway cargo showed a pronounced recovery during the period after a few weak years. Unitized cargo of all descriptions rose considerably.

The performance of the port economy was creditably gratifying with operations turning out better than in the previous year. The financial position of the port has thus been strengthened further. Gross revenue for the year arrived at 44.5 MSEK compared with 38.3 in 1978. Working expenses including interest charges and depreciation came to 37.6 MSEK, meaning an increase of 3.6 MSEK as from 34.0 in the previous year.

Investments during the year accounted for 21.4 MSEK (8.5). The total fixed assets of the port have thus arrived at 144 MSEK after depreciation and including investments added during the year. For the nearest long-range programme the Port Authority includes investment requirements at 170 MSEK for the next 5 years 1980-84. The West Harbour project accounts for the major share of this amount.

4. Revenue Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KSEK</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port dues</td>
<td>24 370</td>
<td>21 090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craneage</td>
<td>3 979</td>
<td>3 612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towage</td>
<td>5 515</td>
<td>4 429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents</td>
<td>6 240</td>
<td>5 890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry revenue</td>
<td>2 119</td>
<td>1 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral revenue</td>
<td>1 910</td>
<td>1 646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44 133</td>
<td>37 955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating and general expenditure</td>
<td>-27 247</td>
<td>-24 681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net surplus before depreciation</td>
<td>16 886</td>
<td>13 274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>- 7 636</td>
<td>- 6 817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net surplus after depreciation</td>
<td>9 250</td>
<td>6 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense</td>
<td>- 2 302</td>
<td>- 2 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net surplus for the year</td>
<td>6 948</td>
<td>4 296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Balance Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KSEK</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>9 206</td>
<td>6 647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed assets</td>
<td>143 793</td>
<td>130 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ASSETS</td>
<td>152 999</td>
<td>136 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities and capital reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>17 835</td>
<td>5 064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction loan</td>
<td>17 071</td>
<td>12 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45 906</td>
<td>36 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital reserves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves in fixed assets</td>
<td>103 354</td>
<td>97 976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working capital</td>
<td>3 739</td>
<td>2 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>107 093</td>
<td>100 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL LIABILITIES AND CAPITAL</td>
<td>152 999</td>
<td>136 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation to the funds 1980</td>
<td>1 641</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated surplus 1980-12-31</td>
<td>3 959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Report 1979 (Extracts):
Ports Authority of Fiji

1. Chairman’s Review

Since its inception four years ago, the Ports Authority of Fiji (PAF) continues to make progress in improving and expanding Fiji port facilities and services. Industrial peace at the docks which prevailed throughout the year under review, enabled the ports to handle more ships and cargo without interruption. 1979 was another successful year of operation for the Ports Authority of Fiji.

In view of the changing mode of transportation in the South Pacific, there is an increasing demand by both international and regional shipping for container and roll-on roll-off wharf facilities. A project costing $11 million to rehabilitate and upgrade the Port of Suva will be implemented next year. Port studies are being undertaken in respect of Levuka, Lautoka and Savusavu in Vanua Levu with a view to establishing a modern and efficient port system in Fiji.

In the Port of Lautoka general maintenance and upgrading programmes were undertaken to ensure a high standard of operation and service at the wharves.

In Levuka the re-construction of the old wooden wharf structure which was built in 1923 should be completed early next year. The new concrete pier will provide the port with a wharf apron wide enough for dual vehicular traffic and the berthing of ships on both sides. The project financed by PAF cost $600,000.

In keeping with good industrial and staff relations, PAF continued to improve working conditions and amenities for its employees. Cold water drinking fountains for port workers and staff were installed in the wharf areas. Efforts to landscape and beautify the ports in Suva, Lautoka and Levuka have achieved good results. Benches and stools surrounding an illuminated water fountain garden area at the entrance of Kings Suva Wharf, provide an attractive rest place for the public and tourists.

Fiji’s strategic location in the South Pacific is of great significance in the pivotal port concept of modern shipping and transportation. Natural harbour and improved shore facilities, modern plant and equipment and efficient port services coupled with fast shipping turnaround and cargo flow will enable Fiji to play an increasingly important role as an entrepot centre to service the South Pacific Region.

The ports and the many port related activities have a strong impact on the socio-economic structure of the country. Effective control of our ports is of fundamental importance to the welfare and life of the community.

PAF is confident of the future. It will continue to expand and upgrade its facilities and services in the best interests of shipping, trade and commerce.

Hon Tomasi R. Vakatora
CHAIRMAN

2. Trade and Shipping

There has been a change in the pattern of shipping and cargo handling in Fiji ports over the last 4 years. More container and ro-ro ships are calling in Fiji ports, resulting in large increases in containerised imports. In view of the small tonnages of cargo exported in containers, a large imbalance exists. In order to obtain the maximum benefit of containerisation this imbalance should be reduced as much as possible.

The ports in Fiji handled 1.549 million tonnes of cargo in 1979 as compared to 1.377 million tonnes in 1978. This represents an overall increase of 172,402 tonnes or 12.5%.

The total cargo handled in all Fiji ports included 428,997 tonnes mineral oil, 397,343 tonnes sugar, 155,652 tonnes molasses and 567,314 tonnes general cargo.

During the year a total of 902 vessels totalling 7.845 million GRT called in at the ports in Fiji. This represents an increase of 45 vessels over the 1978 figure of 857 vessels totalling 7.871 million GRT.

The increase in the number of vessels was attributable to more frequent visits of smaller passenger ships.

3. Revenue and Appropriation Account

for the year ending 31 December, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wharfage</td>
<td>607,488</td>
<td>492,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockage &amp; Berthing</td>
<td>640,988</td>
<td>586,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Dues</td>
<td>463,607</td>
<td>484,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Services &amp; Storage</td>
<td>393,294</td>
<td>163,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargo Handling Service</td>
<td>4,235,746</td>
<td>3,565,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPS, Services &amp; Storage</td>
<td>297,526</td>
<td>136,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>1,140,110</td>
<td>853,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Revenue</td>
<td>125,669</td>
<td>353,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td>7,904,428</td>
<td>6,635,994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Depreciation)</td>
<td>(635,527)</td>
<td>(628,686)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>5,094,475</td>
<td>4,463,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING SURPLUS</td>
<td>2,810,860</td>
<td>2,172,421</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER REVENUE</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest from Investments</td>
<td>143,546</td>
<td>146,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>2,015</td>
<td>4,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental from Properties</td>
<td>18,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus for the year</td>
<td>2,973,686</td>
<td>2,323,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Unappropriated Balance brought forward</td>
<td>9,332</td>
<td>119,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grant for purchase of Capital Items (1976–1979)</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Prior Years Adjustments</td>
<td>126,519</td>
<td>33,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit before Appropriation</td>
<td>2,936,499</td>
<td>2,409,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESS APPROPRIATION</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government of Fiji</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Fund</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Reserve</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reserve</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,930,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNAPPROPRIATED SURPLUS</th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CARRIED FORWARD</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>9,332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Statement of Financial Position as at 31 December, 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1979</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THE FUNDS EMPLOYED WERE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Fund</td>
<td>2,968,750</td>
<td>2,968,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Grant</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Reserve</td>
<td>2,750,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Reserve</td>
<td>1,580,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappropriated Surplus</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>9,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,325,249</td>
<td>5,978,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page bottom)
Progress Report 1979 (Extracts):
Kelang Port Authority

1. Trade
The volume of cargo handled at Port Kelang in 1979 reached an all time high of 6.59 million deadweight tonnes. This was a 12.5% increase over the 5.86 million deadweight tonnes handled in 1978.

The upward for containerised cargo continued during the year. A 20.4% increase was registered in the volume of containerised cargo handled, which hit the one million mark at 1.07 million tonnes. Containerised cargo for 1978 is a year. A 20.4% increase was registered in the volume of containerised cargo handled, which hit the one million mark at 1.07 million tonnes. Containerised cargo for 1978 was 889,613 tonnes. 16% of the cargo handled at Port Kelang was containerised, compared to 15% in 1978. Containerised cargo consisted of rubber, frozen goods, timber, chemical, machinery and component parts, plastic and household goods.

Exports through the port totalled 3,082,097 tonnes which formed 47% of the total tonnage handled. Imports were 3,514,828 tonnes. Although imports exceeded exports by 432,731 tonnes, the high prices enjoyed by 3 of the country’s major primary commodities—rubber, timber, palm oil—boosted export earnings. Exports through Port Kelang were valued at $5,620 million while value of imports was $5,401 million.

2. Development
The year 1979 was a year of accelerated development for Port Kelang.

Several major projects were planned and other minor ones carried out to further improve operational efficiency in the port.

Major extension programmes were planned for the North Port.

The ro-ro ramp at Berth No. 8 is scheduled for completion in May 1980. The ramp measuring 45 m long and 8 m wide cost $10 million.

The $16.5 million dry bulk terminal is in the process of development. The first phase was already completed in late 1977. This comprised the construction of 426 m bulk wharves for bulk vessels up to 36,000 dwt. The second phase entails the installation of 2 high speed cranes, construction of conveyor systems and additional warehouses for bulk storage.

The Authority has drawn up plans for the construction of 55,740 m² (600,000 sq.ft.) of warehousing space for bulk cargo. Initially 2 godowns of 9,290 m² (100,000 sq.ft.) capacity each would be built.

Another multi million dollar project for the North Port is the development of a liquid bulk terminal on a 15 hectare (37 acre) site, adjacent to the dry bulk terminal. The terminal will handle refined vegetable oil and liquid chemicals. The Authority will construct 426 m of dolphin wharves for tankers up to 60,000 displacement tonnes, as well as pipeline gantries.

A $2 million timber terminal is also underway at the North Port. The terminal on a 6 hectare (14.8 acre) site, will be managed by a subsidiary of the Malaysian Timber Industry Board. It is scheduled for operations by mid 1980. Two covered storage sheds of 16,722 m² (180,000 sq.ft.) with capacity for 12,000 cu. tonnes of timber and an open yard of 18,860 m² terminal.

Other projects included slab paving in the additional 12.1 hectares (30 acres) container stacking yard with the scheduled date of completion as April 1980, resting of the CFS (completion May 1980), and construction of an administrative and shipping office in North Port (scheduled date of completion February 1981).

In the South Port, a $3.5 million project to construct dolphins to strengthen liquid berths No. 1 and 2 commenced in October. Scheduled date of completion is November 1980. When completed the wharves will safely be able to accommodate tankers up to 30,000 displacement tonnes.

3. Income and Expenditure Account
for the year ended 31 December, 1978

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1978</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATING REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landing &amp; Shipping</td>
<td>27,997</td>
<td>24,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevedoring Charges</td>
<td>30,675</td>
<td>27,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Container Charges</td>
<td>29,481</td>
<td>24,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>10,270</td>
<td>10,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services to Ships</td>
<td>8,097</td>
<td>7,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharfage</td>
<td>13,230</td>
<td>11,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag Hire</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>3,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane Hire</td>
<td>3,048</td>
<td>2,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>1,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilotage</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>2,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry Items</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133,278</td>
<td>118,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Early in man's history, he learned to specialise. A man that did his best work with a hammer became a carpenter. The one that grew the biggest vegetables became a farmer. And goods and services were traded.

When life became more complex, money was invented. It enabled trade to take place on a higher level. And it created the need for another type of specialist. The banker.

We at Fuji Bank are proud to be following the traditions of that first banker. For the past 100 years we have been assisting both individuals and corporations in all types of business transactions.

We maintain offices all over the world. And stand ready to provide both capital and financial advice to those who request our services.

Today's world is more complex than that of the first banker. He did his best to help then. We do our best to help now.

© FUJI BANK
Tokyo, Japan
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International maritime information: World port news:

Report of the Meeting of Chief Executives of Port Authorities at Its First Session (ESCAP)

(See news on page 10 captioned “Mr. Mayne reports on the ESCAP Joint Meetings”.)

Organization of the session

1. The first session of the Meeting of Chief Executives of Port Authorities was held in Bangkok on 2 September 1980.

Attendance

2. The meeting was attended by chief executives or their representatives of 8 national port authorities: Australia, Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Thailand. A representative of the ASEAN Port Authorities Association attended the meeting and the representative of Simplification of International Trade Procedures Board (SITPRO) was also present as observer. The International Association of Ports and Harbors was also represented by its First Vice President.

Opening Address

3. In his welcoming address the Chief of the ESCAP Division for Shipping, Ports and Inland Waterways noted that the secretariat had been involved in shipping and port development matters for some considerable time. He noted also that there had been qualitative changes in the needs of the region and many new berths and better equipment had become available in ports through 1960s and 1970s. ESCAP recognized however the need for the development of management resources in ports in the region and, whilst it had developed a multi-faceted programme for assistance, had concentrated its activities in the field of management training at both top level and middle level. Other elements in the programme related to planning for technological change and containerization, operational, financial planning and physical planning. He hoped that the meeting would be able to find a number of common areas for co-operation with shippers and shipowners of the region.

Election of officers

4. The meeting elected Mr. Wimal Amarasekera, Chairman of Sri Lanka Ports Authority as Chairman and Mr. Mohd. Fadzil Yusof, General Manager of Johore Port Authority as Vice Chairman.

Agenda Item 3: ESCAP Programme of Work in the Field of Port Development

5. The meeting noted the various elements of the ESCAP work programme and expressed its support and approval for comprehensiveness and relevance to regional needs.

6. The training of port personnel at all levels was seen to be a high priority. Strong management support was needed however, to carry through training programmes and the importance of the development of training activities with properly trained instructors at each port was emphasized.

7. The meeting was able to view parts of the video programme on Container Terminal Management and Operations prepared by the secretariat and commended it for its efforts to date in developing the programme. The meeting strongly recommended this to be continued and expanded as a matter of priority and urged the secretariat to secure the funds and support necessary to undertake a comprehensive programme. It suggested that, in addition to the present project on Container Terminal Management and
Operations, the secretariat prepare other tapes on:

(i) conventional handling;
(ii) bulk handling operations;
(iii) clearance and information systems related to containerization (”the invisible side of containerization”);
(iv) the structure and functioning of a Port Consultative Committee.

Other projects could be adopted in due course.

8. The meeting urged the secretariat to disseminate as widely as possible to ports throughout the region the completed video programmes and reports relating to port development and operations.

9. The meeting also noted the availability through ESCAP of various forms of technical assistance and suggested the continuation of such assistance in an expanded form if possible to ports in the region. In this respect it was emphasized that a high degree of specialization was required for the analysis of problems in ports and there was need now for several experts to be made available on a short term basis. These would usually be seconded from another task.

10. The significance of proper clearance procedures and port information systems was noted by the meeting and the secretariat was strongly urged to continue and expand its programme in this field. It was noted that poor documentation was a major factor in the slow clearance of cargo. An allied factor, however and one of great concern to many port authorities in the region was the problem of delay in transporting cargo away from the port due to a lack of capacity in inland transportation systems.

**Agenda Item 4: Areas of Co-operation Among Port Authorities, Shippers and Shipowners**

11. The meeting noted a number of major problem areas in which co-operation between shippers, shipowners and port authorities would be most profitable:

(I) The need for co-operation and good communication in relation to port expansion and development programmes.
   (a) Port authorities require information from shippers and shipowners in order to make effective development programmes. Since lead times for new construction are relatively long and much infrastructure is very expensive, ports in the developing countries cannot afford to make mistakes in their expansion programme. At the same time ports are aware of the need for security of the commercial information particularly of shipowners.
   (b) The ports emphasize the importance of port Consultative Committees and urged shippers and shipowners to give these Committees their full co-operation.
   (c) In the development of new shipping technology it is particularly important for all parties to recognize the hindrance due to the lack of development of internal transport facilities. This is particularly important in relation to containerization development. It underlines also the significance of good communications between shippers, shipowners, port authorities and government ministries involved.
   (d) Because of the high cost of investment in facilities and the resultant improvement in ship turnaround time it should be possible for shipowners to bear some of the development costs.

(II) The need for co-operation by all parties in relation to the problems of information handling and documentation.
   (a) Much information originates with the shippers and correct information is vital. But other parties such as banks, customs and other Government departments etc. are involved.
   (b) All parties are urged to co-operate in the adoption and use of standard documentation.
   (c) The late arrival of ships documents to port authorities creates significant delays in the handling of cargo.

(III) The need for understanding and co-operation in relation to congestion in ports. Very often there is no single or simple solution to port congestion. It is imperative therefore that all parties refrain from accusation and co-operate in relieving congestion.

(IV) The identification of cargo, marking and packaging and problems related to the presentation of cargo by shippers. All parties should co-operate to promote the standard shipping mark system and present cargo in a uniform and proper condition.

(V) The co-ordination of shippers and shipowners activities, as for example in the despatch by rail from up-country locations to the port in the absence of knowledge about ship arrival, creates problems in the port.

(VI) Because of the significance of customs activities in most of the region the close co-operation between ports, shippers, shipowners and customs authorities, at national and international levels, is essential.

**Agenda Item 5: Other Matters**

12. The meeting agreed to convene in 1981 at an appropriate time.
Report on the Joint Meeting of Chief Executives of National Shippers' Organizations, Shipowners' Associations and Port Authorities on its First Session (ESCAP)

I. ORGANIZATION OF THE SESSION

1. The first session of the Joint Meeting of Chief Executives of National Shippers' Organizations, Shipowners' Associations and Port Authorities was held in Bangkok on 3 September 1980.

Attendance

2. The Joint Meeting was attended by chief executives of 15 ESCAP countries: Australia, Bangladesh, China, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Pakistan, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka and Thailand. The representatives of Federation of ASEAN Shippers' Associations (FASA), the Association of Shippers' Councils of Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka (ASCOBIPS) and the Federation of ASEAN Shippers' Councils (FASC) were present. The representatives of the Simplification of International Trade Procedures Board (SITPRO), the Ministry of Communications of the Government of Thailand and ASEAN Port Authorities Association (APPA) were also present as observers. The International Association of Ports and Harbors (IAPH) was also represented by its First Vice President.

Opening Address

3. In his welcoming address, the Chief of ESCAP Division for Shipping, Ports and Inland Waterways stated that during the past several years the shippers expressed their concern over the problems of adequacy of shipping services, high freight rates and suitability of ship types used. The ESCAP secretariat was requested to assist the shippers in solving such problems.

In the implementation of various programmes to meet request, the ESCAP Division for Shipping, Ports and Inland Waterways received extrabudgetary assistance from various sources. He pointed out that Norway had given a considerable amount of funds which enabled the Secretariat to undertake ship users' co-operation programmes rather intensively.

At the last session of the Joint Meeting of Chief Executives of National Shipper's Organizations and Shipowners' Associations it was clearly pointed out that both vessels and cargoes accrued large parts of their costs in ports. Consequently it was unanimously agreed at that meeting to request the ESCAP secretariat to invite the representatives of the port authorities in the region to participate at their next session. He therefore welcomed the holding of the first session of the Joint Meeting and expressed the hope that it would prove to be beneficial and successful.

Election of Officers

4. The Meeting elected Mr. V.D. Chowgule, Chairman, All India Shippers' Council, New Delhi as Chairman and Messrs Vicente Coloso, Adviser, Philippines Shippers' Council, Manila Varirangkura, Director, Board of Trade and Vice-Chairman, Thai Shipowners' Association, Bangkok, and Wimal Amarasekera, Chairman, Sri Lanka Ports Authority, Colombo, Vice-Chairmen respectively.

The Chairman stated that in the ultimate analysis the interests of shippers, shipowners and port authorities were common in that the prosperity of the regional member countries was closely interlinked with the accelerated growth and expansion of international trade. He felt that a forum like this would help strengthen the channel of communication which was so essential for meaningful consultations for achieving a level of infrastructural facilities and services commensurate with the needs and demand for trade. He emphasized that in view of the heavy demands on the foreign exchange resources of the member countries resulting from high oil prices, it was essential that there should be a dynamic approach to the planning of shipping services and port facilities to meet the increasing foreign trade. In this respect he pointed out the need for closer co-operation with national shipping lines of this region and co-operation between these shipowners would be most welcome.

Adoption of the Agenda

5. The following agenda was adopted:
1) Election of officers
2) Adoption of the agenda
3) Preparation of reports by spokesmen of shippers' organizations, shipowners' associations and port authorities
4) Port clearance procedures and simplification of documentation
5) Concept of joint planning
6) Co-operation between shippers, shipowners and port authorities
7) Other matters
8) Adoption of the report.

II. REPORTS BY SPOKESMEN OF SHIPPERS' ORGANIZATIONS, SHIPOWNERS' ASSOCIATION AND PORT AUTHORITIES

6. The spokesman for the shippers, Mr. Vincente Coloso informed the meeting that shippers were eager to develop co-operation, and not confrontation, with shipowners and port authorities and thus welcomed this historic first Joint Meeting among the three major maritime sectors in the region. He reported that at the shippers meeting held earlier they had endorsed the recommendations of the Joint Working Group on Shippers' Co-operation at Both Ends of the Trade, which established the mechanism for co-operative working relationships between them and the European Shippers' Councils; and that shippers' co-operation at sub-regional level had been advanced with the recent formation of the Association of Shippers' Council of Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka (ASCOBIPS) in addition to the first sub-regional grouping, the Federation of ASEAN Shippers' Councils (FASC).

7. He also reported that the shippers had likewise endorsed the recommendations of the Joint Working Group on Co-operation between Shippers' and Shipowners in the region, which provided the necessary linkage for such co-operation, and with port authorities.

8. He said that priority attention need be given to the improvement of existing port facilities and services which would include port information systems and trade facilita-
The meeting noted that the ESCAP secretariat should:

(i) continue with the existing projects on Port Clearance and Port Management Information Systems;
(ii) draw upon the co-operation of the Customs Co-operation Council and request it to send an observer to future meetings;
(iii) assemble materials currently available on Port Clearance Procedures etc. including the recent publication by the Melbourne Port Authority and present to the next meeting, possibly with a covering paper;
(iv) consider a further study on facilitation re containerization ('the invisible of containerization').

It was also suggested that:

(i) port authorities, shippers and shippers should review the composition, scope and effectiveness of Port Consultative Committees;
(ii) shippers, shipowners and port authorities should pursue any facilitation topics together with national facilitation bodies wherever these have been established. Where there are no such bodies shippers, shipowners and port authorities should consider promoting their establishment;
(iii) national shippers' organization should inform their European Shippers' Councils colleague of ESCAP developments; shippers should inform the International Chamber of Shipping and port authorities the International Association of Ports and Harbors.

IV. CONCEPT OF JOINT PLANNING

The implications of the concept of joint planning of shipping services were briefly outlined in the annotated agenda. Moreover, the meeting had before it, in order to illustrate the point further, report of a Regional Workshop on Joint Planning of Shipping Services, held at Bangkok from 10-21 September 1979.

In introducing the item, the representative of the secretariat pointed out that the element of ocean transport cost is increasing its relative importance in the c.i.f. values of foreign trade of the region. This implied that mistakes in the planning process for ocean services would be increasing.
ly detrimental. It was important therefore, that the basis of economic interests on which shipping services are planned should be enlarged. This could be achieved by involving the interests of trade (the shippers), individual ports, and of individual and groups of countries in the broad planning process.

The representatives of all interested parties (ports, shipowners and shippers) expressed support for this concept. In discussing how it could be further developed, there was general agreement that during the initial stages the efforts should be concentrated at the national level. One would envisage that shippers, port authorities and shipowners at the national level would co-operate, inter alia, by exchanging relevant information, for the purpose of future shipping services attaining the highest possible degree of efficiency. In this respect, the meeting felt that at the national level it would be most beneficial and useful if the chief executives of shippers' organizations, shipowners' associations and port authorities could meet as frequently as necessary.

It was pointed out that in some countries the structure of trade make sectoral consultations between the involved parties useful.

It was further pointed out that joint planning of shipping services would be of a relevant concept both in the short term and in the longer term. While consultations at the national level would—at least for the foreseeable future—be most relevant in the short term, the meeting agreed that international consultations would be important especially for long range planning.

V. CO-OPERATION BETWEEN SHIPPERS, SHIPOWNERS AND PORT AUTHORITIES

Under the item, the discussions under the previous agenda items were summarized by the Chief of Division of Shipping, Ports and Inland Waterways. The meeting agreed that at its next session the following would be the central items of its agenda:

(a) simplification of procedures and documents.
(b) reports for national consultative meetings as appropriately organized between shippers, shippers' associations and port authorities for the purpose of joint planning and other relevant consultations.
(c) containerization.
(d) the incidence of freight charges in the trade of countries in the ESCAP region.

The meeting requested the ESCAP secretariat to provide suitable background information, in co-operation with other organizations. The secretariat was also requested to arrange further joint meetings at a frequency commensurable with progress in substantive work and other activities of ESCAP.

VI. OTHER MATTERS

The meeting agreed that the future sessions of chief executives of national shippers' organizations, shipowners' associations and port authorities be held in the member countries of the region, whenever possible. The representative of India offered to host the next sessions of the meetings in India.

The Meeting recorded a vote of thanks to Mr. V.D. Chowgule, the Chairman of the Meeting for the able manner in which he successfully guided the deliberations of the Meeting. It also recorded its thanks for the excellent facilities and assistance provided by the ESCAP secretariat.

VII. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

The Meeting adopted the report.

IMCO helps draft counter measures: agreement reaches on Caribbean

The Caribbean Sea is not only one of the most beautiful in the world—it is also one of the most environmentally threatened.

Contamination by petroleum hydrocarbons seems to be the most serious marine pollution problem. The production, conversion and transportation of petroleum products are the most significant economic activities in the Wider Caribbean Region.

The Region is potentially one of the largest oil producing areas in the world and offshore production, at present, accounts for nearly one-third of the total production. This proportion is expected to grow significantly in the future.

At present there are 73 refineries, with a total refining capacity of over 12 million barrels of oil per day, located within the Region. Some of the largest refineries are located in island States and Territories.

As a result of these production and refining activities, an intensive tanker traffic is generated both in east-west and north-south directions. Tanker movements through restricted channels and in the vicinity of some ports increases the risk of accidents in these areas.

During the past three years, IMCO has been regularly consulted by the United Nations Environment Programme concerning the development of an action plan for the protection and management of the environment of the Caribbean region. The substantive aspect of the draft action plan was approved and at a UNEP meeting of Government-nominated experts in Caracas in January IMCO was represented by Mr. D.T. Edwards of the Marine Environment Division.

On the basis of the draft action plan prepared at the Caracas meeting, the UNEP/Economic Commission for Latin America Caribbean Environment Project in cooperation with the Governments of the region and specialized UN Agencies is developing specific projects to give effect to the goals of the plan. The next step will be a meeting in late 1980 to finalize the details of the plan and obtain Government approval of the financial and administrative arrangements to carry it out.

The draft plan calls for action in a wide range of fields including fisheries, watersheds, natural disasters, energy, human settlement, tourism, environmental health, marine pollution, coastal zone management and education and training.

The areas which are of most concern to IMCO are marine pollution and training. As far as the former is concerned the plan outlines a number of assessment and management activities.

It proposes the determination of technical knowledge and existing national and regional anti-pollution capabilities; studies on the sources of pollution by hydrocarbons and other hazardous substance; studies on the effects of exploration, exploitation, refining and transportation of these substances and on the effect of oil pollution on
tropical ecosystems; and the identification and monitoring of hazards which might arise from the transport of substances other than oil and petroleum hydrocarbons.

As far as management is concerned, the draft action plan points to the need for regional and sub-regional cooperation in tackling accidental spills at sea; the coordination of existing contingency plans and promotion of further plans; and the development and strengthening of national capabilities.

The plan envisages an intensive training and technical assistance effort especially in the early stages. It also gives high priority to the development of a regional manpower base, environmental education at all levels and the promotion of media seminars and campaigns concerning environmental issues.

Publications
1. “FACILITIES IN PORTS FOR THE RECEPTION OF OILY WASTES” (Results of an enquiry made in 1976-1978)
   Sales No. 80.02.E, £4.50 (English)
   IMCO Secretariat, Publication Sections, 101-104 Piccadilly, London W1V OAE, U.K.

2. “Liner Shipping in the Eighties”
   Report on the International Symposium held at Bremen in October 1979: In this publication competent authors from all over the world deal with liner shipping problems as they are envisaged to decisively influence the industry during this decade: Commercial, political, and scientific points of view are presented with a notable stress on the former two.

   386 pages, DM 120.00 plus postage
   Institute of Shipping Economics, Werdenerstrasse 73, D-2800 Bremen 1, Federal Rep. of Germany

3. “Security of a Maritime Lien” by S.T. Harley, R.D. Extra Master, Barrister at Law and V. Batra, B. Sc., MBA, Master Mariner: A comprehensive study of the complexities involving the application of maritime liens on ships and their cargoes in countries throughout the world. 67 pages, £55.00
   Export Consultancy Services, Marine Reporting Services, Shaw House, 27 West Way, Botely, Oxford U.K.
   For further information contact the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, 80 Broad Street, New York, NY 10004, U.S.A.

4. “THE GROWTH OF STEAM COAL TRADE”
   A review and forecast of international trade in thermal coal and shipping requirements: 1980-90
   Price US$240.00 and £95.00 for U.K. only
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St. Lawrence Seaway 1979

The U.S. St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation has issued its Annual Report for 1979. Well written and handsomely illustrated, this informative document reviews significant happenings of 1979 and takes a look backward over the 20-year period of the Seaway’s operations. Since its opening in 1959, the Seaway has moved over 800 million metric tons of cargo, with the average annual movement tripling to in excess of 55 mmt in recent years. Since 1959, moreover, the navigation season has been extended by about four weeks. One major result has been the transformation of the major harbors of the Great Lakes into international seaports. Direct income benefits to Great Lakes’ ports from commerce moving through the Seaway’s Montreal-Lake Ontario section are now estimated to be nearly $2 billion annually. The “good” news for U.S. taxpayers is that the Seaway Corporation is self sustaining from revenues generated from tolls and other user charges. Through 1979, the Corporation has returned over $60 million in construction debt and interest payments to the U.S. Treasury.

Highlights for 1979:
- 55.3 million metric tons of cargo, including 51.4 mmt of bulk and 3.9 mmt of general cargo.
- $11 million in revenues, $6.3 million in operating expenses, $2 million in revenue bonds retired.
- extensive maintenance program for the Eisenhower and Snell locks, navigational aid replacements and improvements, and enhanced capability to deal with oil spills.
- continued efforts to develop a marketing program for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence System and to implement a permanent navigation season extension.

$47.7 million Roberts Bank expansion agreement signed

Roberts Bank, located 33 kilometers south of Vancouver, presently consists of a 22 hectare bulk facility for the export of coal, and is soon to undergo a $47.7 million expansion for terminal facilities, including a widening of the existing causeway.

VANCOUVER—Construction on the $47.7 million Roberts Bank coal port expansion project is expected to begin immediately under an agreement signed here today between the federal government and the Province of British Columbia.

Federal Transport Minister Jean-Luc Pepin, Federal Cabinet representative Senator Ray Perrault, B.C. Minister of Industry and Small Business Development Don Phillips, and B.C. Minister of Lands, Parks and Housing Jim Chabot participated in the signing ceremony on behalf of their respective governments.

Through the National Harbours Board and the Port of Vancouver, the federal government will spend an estimated
$47.7 million for the development of additional terminal facilities and for the widening of the existing causeway.

At present there is only one coal loading facility which has a throughput capacity of 10 million tonnes a year. Expansion plans call for increasing shipping capability in stages to an ultimate capacity of 40 million tonnes a year.

Following the signing, Mr. Pepin said he was delighted to be able to sign "this historic agreement which will be of great help to the economic development of Western Canada by allowing increased shipments of coal from southeast B.C. and Alberta. It will thereby increase the strength of Canada's position in world trade. I am especially happy to have been able to conclude this agreement through frank negotiations with Mr. Phillips, providing for the transfer of land and water lots, without prejudice to the final resolution of legal ownership, from the province and the B.C. Harbours Board to the National Harbours Board."

Mr. Phillips said: "The Province of British Columbia will benefit tremendously from this very important port development project which will help ensure the viability of our resource and commodity industries for decades to come."

Mr. Phillips also noted that the province, through British Columbia Harbours Board and British Columbia Railway, will expand rail access to the port and make a capital contribution to the causeway widening.

Senator Perrault stated that the federal government is prepared to proceed with the final design, taking into account environmental and social impact assessment. "The expansion will be in line with the principles established by the Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP) in its 1979 report."

$1.5 million has been included in the project for further navigational, habitat and social impact studies and assessments. An environmental review committee has been established to coordinate environmental and social studies with public expressions of possible concerns.

Canada's first-ever passenger hydrofoil service launches between Port of Toronto and Niagara-on-the-Lake

The world's largest commercially-operated hydrofoils—Queen of Toronto, Princess of the Lakes, Prince of Niagara—each accommodates more than 200 passengers and makes the cross-lake trip in 70 minutes. The Norwegian-built craft are scheduled to make frequent daily trips from the docks at the foot of Yonge Street where the company has set up passenger facilities at Marine Terminal 27.

Two vessels will be in operation at all times with a third in rotating maintenance. The hydrofoils, which can 'fly' across the lake at speeds up to 36.5 knots, are 125 feet in length and are registered in Panama.

Royal Hydrofoil Cruises Inc. expects that the vessels, which will operate six months a year from mid-May through the end of October, will run at 50 per cent of capacity during the first season. The company is starting off with five roundtrips per ship each day and hopes to draw heavily from tourists visiting both Niagara Falls and Toronto.

Berthing priority for domestic coal vessels: U.S. House of Representatives

With coastwise coal shipments expected to surge over the next few years as domestic utilities convert from oil to coal fuel, the House of Representatives has approved legislation that would give coal-hauling vessels in the domestic trades priority berthing ahead of those waiting to load export coal. That provision was attached to Senate-passed legislation relating to the documenting of certain vessels for service in the coastal trades. The language reads:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, any vessel engaged in the coastwise transportation of coal produced in the United States, from a port in the United States to another port in the United States, shall until June 30, 1987, have the priority to berth at any such ports ahead of any waiting vessels engaged in the export trade of coal produced in the United States.

It provides, however, that the Secretary of Commerce may eliminate priority status of coastwise shipping if he deems it in the national interest. In the past, berthing priority has been accorded coast-wise colliers as a matter of tradition. But recently, however, apparently due to rising demand for coal berth access by foreign-bound coal ships, pier operators have been notifying domestic trade carriers that traditional preferences would no longer be honored because no legal basis exists for extension of the privilege. The amendment would provide the necessary legal basis.

Dredged material research: U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station

The U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi, has put out a comprehensive Publication Index and Retrieval System containing the abstracts of more than 200 technical reports produced as a result of the Corps' Dredged Material Research Program (DMRP). The first chapter presents abstracts of DMRP Synthesis Reports, containing, in each case, a summary of findings for each of the major DMRP objectives with particular emphasis on the significance and applicability of the information. Chapters two through nine abstract reports on major DMRP field test and demonstration projects concerned with the effects of dredged material disposal in open water and the use of dredged material for habitat creation.

The abstracts summarize, without additional judgements or comments, information that has already appeared in DMRP reports. Chapter themes include the effects of dredging operations on water quality and aquatic organisms; spatial and temporal distribution of dredged material discharged into hydrological regimes; pollutional properties of dredged material and assessment techniques; physical, chemical and biological treatment of material; design, operation, and management of confined disposal areas; effects of marsh and terrestrial disposal; habitat creation and development; productive uses of dredged material; and aquatic disposal field investigations.
New Massport Terminal to have two PACECO Portainer® cranes

New Massport Paceco Low Profile Portainer® cranes will be similar to these at Maher Terminals at Port Elizabeth, New Jersey.

The Massachusetts Port Authority recently ordered two (2) Portainer® crane from Paceco, Inc., a Subsidiary of Fruehauf Corporation, Detroit, Michigan, to be used at its new container handling facilities at Castle Island in South Boston, Massachusetts.

Both of the dockside cranes are of the Paceco Low Profile design and will have lifting capacities of 40 Long Tons. The Low Profile design conforms to air traffic regulations for the area. Characteristic of this design, the Portainer® cranes will have a maximum height of 114 feet, and a 115 foot outreach for ship loading and unloading. Outfitted with telescopic spreaders, the cranes will handle 20'35'/40' containers.

Boston, New England's most completely equipped port serving containerships, is being enlarged with the addition of 1000 feet of berth space and support facilities covering 10 acres at the Castle Island Terminal site.

Corps begins new Lock and Dam No. 26

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun construction of one of the largest projects ever undertaken in the Midwest—replacement Lock and Dam No. 26, near Alton, Illinois. The new lock will be downstream from the junction of the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers, and upstream from St. Louis, Missouri. The ten-year project will be developed in three phases, and will feature a 1,200 foot-long lock and a gated spillway with nine gates, and an overflow dike.

The present, outmoded facility put into operation in 1938, consists of two 110-foot wide locks, one being 600 feet long, the other 360 feet. The dam is a gated section with thirty 40-foot wide tainter gates and three 80-foot wide roller gates. This replacement project is vital because traffic between the Upper Mississippi, the Illinois, the Ohio and the Lower Mississippi River must pass through the present Locks and Dam No. 26. Dramatic increases in Mississippi River traffic over the past 40 years have strained the capacity of the present system. The average waiting time at the old locks is in excess of 20 hours. Additionally, the small locks force many of the tows to be double locked, that is, separated, locked into sections, and reassembled after lockage—an expensive operation.

Over five billion dollars worth of tonnage now struggles through the costly bottleneck at the two locks. Grain, chemicals and energy commodities account for over 80% of this traffic. Under the best conditions, the two limited size locks have a capacity of only 73 million tons; whereas, the single replacement lock is designed for an annual capacity of 86 million tons. The new lock itself should be operational in about eight years.

Other features of the project include a visitor's center located on the Illinois side and a recreational park and wildlife refuge on the Missouri side of the dam. Although presently referred to as a $540 million project, the projected cost of the project, adjusted for inflation, may reach $800 million by time of completion in January 1989.

The project is finally underway following a five-year court battle in which railroads and environmental groups opposed construction of the facility. Although the most recent decision in favor of commencing the project has been appealed, the appeal is expected to fail.

Attendance record established at port seminar in Charleston

More executives attended the 1980 American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA) Port Finance Seminar in Charleston than ever before in AAPA history. Sixty-two persons, not including panelists, registered for the highly-praised June 17-20 event, head-quartered at the Mills House Hotel.

The array of speakers and discussion leaders was replete with recognized specialists in their field. It was arranged by G. Luther Rosebrock, AAPA finance committee chairman, and Douglas S. Murray, seminar chairman. Mr. Rosebrock is the S.C. State Ports Authority's director of finance and Mr. Murray, finance and administration director, Virginia Port Authority.

Activities began June 17 with an SPA evening reception at the Mills House. Greetings were extended at the opening business session by Mr. Rosebrock, Mr. Murray, SPA Executive Director W. Don Welch and AAPA President Clifford B. O'Hara. Mr. O'Hara is commerce director, Port Authority of New York and New Jersey.

Three port officials discussed the first topic, "Ports, Their Users and the FMC", reviewing recent FMC decisions on port tariff rates. The panelists were F. William Colburn, administration director, Houston; Benjamin R. Powel, general counsel, Galveston, and Oury L. Selig, deputy executive director, Galveston. Serving as moderator was William H. Urban, Jr., controller and assistant treasurer, New Orleans.

The afternoon meeting dealt with "Current Developments in Financial Reporting for Governmental Enterprise Operations." Addressing the subject were James L. Williams, partner, Deloitte Haskins & Sells (Houston); William E. Thompson, senior vice president-internal control director, Alabama Bancorporation, and Marion F. Siedow, finance director-associate executive director, Port of Portland. Mr. Rosebrock was moderator of the session.
Lee K. Barba, Richard H. Nicholls and Mitchell E. Menaker appeared on the seminar's segment the next morning, with Mr. Murray as moderator. They spoke on "Recent Trends in Port Financing", "Interfacing Effectively with the Financial Markets", and "Structuring and Marketing Port Bonds", respectively.

Mr. Barba is vice president-public finance division, Lehman Brothers Kuhn Loeb. Mr. Nicholls is a partner and Mr. Menaker an associate with Mudge Rose Guthrie & Alexander.

Thursday afternoon's sessions involved "Measurement of Port Profitability in an Inflationary Economy, Using Current Replacement Cost in Reporting and Analysis". The three panel participants were Touche Ross & Co. executive Michael S. Katz, manager-management services; J.H. Loux, III, senior consultant-management services, and Robert L. Gerth, partner-audit, Seattle office. Robert W. Goethe of Savannah, assistant executive director, Georgia Ports Authority, acted as moderator.

An early-evening harbor cruise with light hors d'oeuvres climaxed June 19 activities. Luncheons were included in the program for all three working days.

At the final morning session, J. Ron Brinson, AAPA executive vice president, presented a Washington update on legislation and trends affecting operation of ports. He was followed by Robert W. Wardwell, project manager, U.S. Maritime Administration, who explained the agency's recent study on port pricing.

Robert R. Nathan, board chairman, Robert R. Nathan Associates, then delivered a stirring economic forecast. Mr. Nathan stressed implications in the next five to seven years regarding port investment decisions, inflation and public policy. The moderator of the meeting was Robert B. Hinkley, finance director, Tampa Port Authority.

**Port of Houston leads nation in foreign tonnage**

During 1979, for the first time in history, the Port of Houston led the nation in a major category of port activity, becoming No. 1 in foreign trade tonnage. Statistics of the U.S. Department of Commerce put Houston's 1979 foreign trade tonnage at 64,899,500 tons, up almost 4% over the 62,490,000 tons of 1978. At the same time, foreign trade tonnage at New York decreased more than 10%, from 67,038,500 tons in 1978 to 60,183,000 tons last year.

The change is the more notable since shipments of crude petroleum, the major commodity moved through the Port of Houston, declined by 6% in 1979, from 33,043,018 tons to 31,027,265 tons. In fact, overall import tonnage decreased at the Port of Houston last year. The decline was 1.3% from 42,440,000 tons in 1978 to 41,874,500 tons in 1979.

A jump in exports through the Port of Houston combined with a decline in imports at New York to move Houston into the top spot.

Houston exports increased almost 15%, from 20,050,000 to 23,025,000 tons from 1978 to 1979.

Total tonnage at the Port of Houston last year was 122,383,558, an increase of 12% over the 1978 total. The foreign trade was valued at $18.5 billion.

``Sister Port`` relationship links NY-NJ Port and Tokyo

A proclamation establishing the Port of Tokyo as a "Sister Port" of the bi-state Port of New York and New Jersey, thereby affirming a relationship that will promote closer commercial, social and cultural exchanges between the two ports, was signed at ceremonies held recently at the World Trade Center. Port Authority Chairman Alan Sagner signed on behalf of the bi-state port and Governor Shunichi Suzuki of Tokyo signed for the sister port of Tokyo.

Following the signing, Chairman Sagner stated, "I am hopeful that such an affiliation will contribute to the trade between both ports and enhance the economy of our two great metropolitan regions. In addition, the agreement will provide a channel of professional information which will be mutually beneficial." Governor Suzuki, who also serves as Tokyo Port Administrator, noted that the two ports share many similarities. He pointed out that they both serve two of the world's largest metropolitan centers and added, "We face many of the same challenges, both in the economic and trading activities of our two areas and in our urban problems. I hope that we will have increasing exchanges of information and technology which will mutually benefit our ports in terms of management, planning and development."

Prior to the signing of the proclamation, Governor Suzuki was accompanied by various Port Authority officials including Chairman Sagner on a tour of the container facilities at the massive marine complex operated by the Port Authority at Port Newark and Elizabeth. Mayor Kenneth A. Gibson of Newark and a representative of Mayor Thomas G. Dunn of Elizabeth were on hand to welcome Governor Suzuki and Chairman Sagner to the complex. In the photo below, taken during the tour are (left to right): Port Authority Port Department Director Anthony J. Tozzi, Tokyo's Chief of Liaison and Protocol Fumio Arai, Port Authority Commissioner Milton A. Gilbert, Governor Suzuki and Chairman Sagner.
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Oakland/Yokohama united as sister ports

Yokohama is Japan's number one port and Oakland is the largest container port on the United States West Coast.

There are two interesting historical episodes that have linked the two ports. In 1870—110 years ago—the first ship to be dispatched from Japan across the Pacific to America sailed from Yokohama. It was the sail and steamship Kanrin Maru and when it entered San Francisco Bay, it docked on the eastern shore, now the Port of Oakland.

And in 1893 Jack London, the author of adventure stories and Oakland’s most prominent citizen, sailed from Oakland aboard the famous three-masted sailing ship, Sophia Sutherland, a schooner of 150 tons. After spending 100 days in the waters north of Japan hunting fur seal, London came to Yokohama, stayed there two weeks, and then sailed for 37 days back to Oakland.

Today there are many ships linking the two ports, carrying the trade of the two nations, primarily in containers. Japan is Oakland’s most important trading partner with approximately 40 percent of all the cargo moving over the Port’s wharves originating in or destined for Japan.

Oakland and Yokohama are directly linked by 20 steamship lines, carrying more than 260,000 short tons of cargo a year.

Yokohama plays an important role as the gateway to Japan, handling 118 million tons of cargo in 1978, including 53 million tons of foreign trade.

A delegation from the Port of Oakland visited the Port of Yokohama to participate in official ceremonies featuring the signing of documents linking the two ports as Sister Ports.

Thomas L. Berkley, then President of the Oakland Board of Port Commissioners and leader of the delegation, speaking at a lunch to mark the occasion, said that the delegation was pleased that the Port and City of Yokohama had selected Oakland to be its Sister Port.

The Yokohama ceremonies included the official signing of documents in the offices of Yokohama Mayor Michikazu Saigo, who originally proposed the port affiliation, a celebration luncheon, a tea ceremony and Japanese music festival, a parade marking the 121st anniversary of the Port of Yokohama, a reception hosted by the Port of Oakland, and a lecture-seminar for business and maritime leaders.

The documents signed by the two ports referred to the mutual friendship and trade already established between Yokohama and Oakland and expressed the desire on the part of both ports for an increased flow of commerce across the Pacific between the two major shipping centers.

FTZ in Oakland licensed

The Oakland International Trade Center has been granted a license to operate a Foreign Trade Zone on a 13-acre site near the Port of Oakland’s marine terminal facilities and the Oakland International Airport.

The license was issued by the City of Oakland upon being granted authority to establish the FTZ by the
Foreign-Trade Zones Board, U.S. Department of Commerce.

Oakland International Trade Center, a private California corporation, is refurbishing a 130,000 square foot building on the site to serve as the FTZ’s initial facility with plans for future expansion.

Thomas L. Berkley, President of the Oakland Board of Port Commissioners, said the setting up of the FTZ would benefit Oakland’s economy as a whole by stimulating business as a result of the many advantages in having a duty-free area for the handling and storing of foreign goods.

He said that both the City and the Port would benefit because the FTZ would create additional employment and provide services aimed at assisting not only large firms but the small businesses as well.

**$1.7 million government grant allowed for port improvement: Delaware River Port Authority**

Mayor William J. Green, City of Philadelphia, has recently announced that the $1.7 million United States Commerce Department grant recently received by the city for port improvements will be spent on three individual projects.

The first of these is the rehabilitation of Pier 78 to provide work space for the assembly of goods by firms participating in the foreign trade zone operation. Pier 80 will be modernized to improve the handling of general cargo.

Piers 46 and 48 will be demolished to make way for a proposed port emergency center to house the U.S. Coast Guard base and Philadelphia’s Fire and Police Harbour units.

**City of Richmond names Sal N. Bose as Port Director**

City Manager, Joseph A. Salvato, recently appointed Mr. Bose as Port Director following his tenure as Acting Port Director upon the retirement of Captain Thomas R. Eddy.

A registered professional engineer in the states of California and New York, he is also a member of the Institution of Civil Engineers in London, England, is a Fellow of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and a member of the Technical Committee on Containerization, Barge Carriers and Ro-Ro Vessels of the IAPH.

**GPA tonnage another record year**

Tonnage statistics for fiscal 1980 evidence a continuation of Georgia Ports Authority’s record setting growth. Total GPA activity for the year reached 5,777,597 tons, compared to 4,577,861 tons for FY 78/79. The 1,192,738 ton jump represented an increase of 26 percent.

CONTAINERPORT volumes played an important role in the overall growth pattern. Tonnages increased from 940,504 last fiscal year to 1,416,676 this year, for an improvement of 51 percent. This year’s CONTAINERPORT growth rate actually outstripped 1979’s phenomenal 47 percent figure.

Dry bulk cargoes continued to fare very well. Substantial increases in soybean and wheat volumes led the surge. Soybean volumes more than doubled, totalling out at just over 600,000 tons. Wheat rose from just 25,599 tons to over 600,000 tons. Wheat rose from just 25,599 tons to 600,000 tons.
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some 128,347 to become a major component in GPA’s dry bulk picture. Overall, dry bulks moved up from 747,042 to 1,129,263 tons, for an increase of 51 percent.

General cargoes continued to occupy a starring role in GPA’s overall situation with 1,885,527 tons. This represented a small increase of just over 61,000 tons. Breakbulk volumes continue to remain high and steady, proving that substantial increases in other modes, particularly container, have not come at the expense of break-bulks. Commodities making strong showings during the year included iron and steel, rosin, clay, synthetic staple fiber, linerboard, naval stores, and woodpulp.

These statistics again indicate the role Georgia Ports Authority has played in the development of the Port of Savannah, accounting for approximately 50 percent of the port’s total volume. GPA and the many private terminal operators and maritime service organizations have employed a pervasive team spirit to mold Savannah into the foreign commerce leader among South Atlantic ports. GPA’s General cargo continued to occupy a starring role in GPA’s overall situation with 1,885,527 tons, this represented a small increase of just over 61,000 tons. Breakbulk volumes continue to remain high and steady, proving that substantial increases in other modes, particularly container, have not come at the expense of break-bulks. Commodities making strong showings during the year included iron and steel, rosin, clay, synthetic staple fiber, linerboard, naval stores, and woodpulp.

These statistics again indicate the role Georgia Ports Authority has played in the development of the Port of Savannah, accounting for approximately 50 percent of the port’s total volume. GPA and the many private terminal operators and maritime service organizations have employed a pervasive team spirit to mold Savannah into the foreign commerce leader among South Atlantic ports. Figures such as those Georgia Ports compiled in FY 1980 are widening the gap even further.

**Kings Island turning basin funds approved in Savannah**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has announced the awarding of the contract for enlargement of the Kings Island Turning Basin in Savannah. The project will enlarge the Basin to dimensions of 1,500 feet by 1,600 feet by 38 feet at mean low water, with a two foot allowable over-depth. Estimated completion time will be mid-summer of 1981.

The Basin is located adjacent to Georgia Ports Authority’s CONTAINERPORT. It is being enlarged to facilitate turning of larger vessels including second and third generation container ships and bulk carriers. Currently, some difficulty exists in turning larger classes of vessels at lower tide stages or when CONTAINERPORT berths are at full utilization. Enlargement of the facility will allow turning regardless of the tide or occupancy status. The mid-1981 completion will make the Basin available for use prior to the end of construction of GPA’s fourth container berth, scheduled for the summer of 1982.

**Antwerp port promotion in 1979**

Antwerp port promotion activities in 1979 were characterized by several important changes and alterations in a number of public relations media and techniques with a view to updating and rationalizing them.

This is dealt with in the 1979 report of the Port of Antwerp Promotion Association which shows how the techniques were updated and diversified and gives details of the activities of the Association and of its public and private P.R. partners. As usual it also includes a survey of the evolution of port traffic and of work carried out on the port’s infrastructure and superstructure.

**Movement of shipping and cargo traffic in 1979**

In periods of crisis the transport sector is greatly influenced by the (uncertain) economic and social circumstances. The greatest repercussion is generally felt on the transport of cargo. It is thus striking that most European seaports recorded increases in their traffic. This was also true of Antwerp.

In 1979 17,425 seagoing vessels called at the port (as opposed to 17,382 in 1978). The total tonnage rose from 97.8 million G.R.T. to 103.5 million G.R.T., a new record confirming the fact that more and more large vessels are calling at Antwerp.

As far as the cargo traffic is concerned, the (semi-official) figures of the Harbour Master’s Office of the City of Antwerp point to an overall increase of 11.1% with regard to 1978. The 80 million ton mark has been surpassed and the record year of 1974 (76 million tons) has been considerably improved upon.

**Accessibility of the port**

The favourable development of cargo traffic in 1979 was accompanied by a sharp increase in the dimensions of ships. The largest vessel noted in 1979 had a tonnage of 164,365 dwt. The largest cargo which arrived in Antwerp was 91,193 tons of iron ore.

Seagoing vessels are not only larger, they are also more deeply laden. In 1978 only 24 vessels were recorded which had a draught of over 13 m. (42’6”). Over the first nine months of 1979 this number had already risen to 42.

**Expansion works and investments**

In 1979 the municipal authorities and various business circles spoke hard words about the credit and port policies of the central authorities. In this regard Antwerp is of the opinion that competition between Belgian ports and in the ports themselves is desirable and healthy on condition that the competitive conditions are not disturbed by government measures and credits favouring one particular port. These measures include favourable tariffs, laid down by the central authorities (piлотage, railway tariffs) and pressure on dockworkers’ wages.

With regard to its infrastructure works Antwerp is anxious about the consequences of delays in financing various schemes, either already under way or planned, precisely at a time when the government is busy investing billions of francs in new port infrastructure at the coast, the profitability of which is problematic and which could lead to the shift of some types of Antwerp traffic to other Belgian seaports. This does not mean that Antwerp is merely wringing its hands and viewing the future darkly. A clear illustration of the confidence which Antwerp firms continue to have in their port is provided by the construction of the New Harbour Dock which has entered into its final phase. There was been competition between a number of firms in order to obtain good concessions with regard to the berths there.

**Industrial function of the port**

Antwerp’s industrial function continues to be very important. One quarter of its port traffic originates in or is bound for industries established in the port zone. According to data supplied by the Harbour Master’s Office traffic at the industries’ own quays in the port increased by over 12% in 1979. Various firms last year made further investments.

In all 1,800 million BF were invested in 1979 for the construction of various firms and other installations (including the biological water purification station.)

(Continued on page 42)
Air Block Fenders Assure Perfect Berthing & Mooring

Developed by Yokohama Rubber, ABF's (Air Block Fenders) are epoch-making pneumatic rubber fenders featuring bolt installation on the quay wall.

The low reaction force of ABF's assure less stress to quay wall and vessel, inclined berthing can be enlarged, while contact pressure performance is outstanding.

ABF's are excellent against rolling, swaying, yawing and all other forceful movements of wind and waves. This means maximum safety and shock-protection whether berthing or mooring—with no possibility of damage to the ship hull or berthing structure.

Several years of severe testing in Japan under adverse conditions has proven the quality and performance of this important harbor equipment.

An additional advantage is that problems inherent in solid type fenders are solved by the new ABF design. Yokohama Rubber's ABF's are the most advanced types available today. They enjoy wide use and give users complete satisfaction.

For further information, please contact your local agent of Yokohama Marine Products or write to;

THE YOKOHAMA RUBBER COMPANY LTD.

HEAD OFFICE: C.P.O. Box 1842 Tokyo 100-91, Japan. Tel: Tokyo 432-7111 Telex: J24673, J24196 YOKORUCO Cable Address: YOKORUCO TOKYO
HOUSTON OFFICE: One Houston Center, Suite 1910 Houston, Texas 77002 U.S.A. Tel: 713-654-8123 Telex: 77-5472 YOKORUCO HOU
LONDON OFFICE: 3rd Floor Standbrook House, 2-5 Old Bond, Street London W1X3T.B, England. Tel: 01-499-7134/5 Telex: 885223 YOKOCO G
Updating and rationalization of public relations techniques

True to its task the Port of Antwerp Promotion Association in 1979 once again concentrated its activity on the international promotion of the interests of the Antwerp community.

Efforts were made to update public relations techniques especially at the level of audio-visual media, port publications and documentation and the concept of promotional events. The guidelines were drawn up by the Board of the Association and were mostly worked out in ad hoc working groups, in which both private sector and public services, in particular the General Management of the Port, were represented.

Port works, installations in 1980:
Port of Antwerp

(Extract from “HINTERLAND”’s editorial by Mr. R. L.M. Vleugels, Director General: The extraordinary budget of the City of Antwerp for 1980 provides for an amount of 750 million BF to be allocated for works and installations in the port. The budgetary proposal of the Ministry of Public Works have also been submitted to Parliament.

These provisions make it possible to obtain a picture of the progress being made on existing projects and of the new appropriations of the authorities.

The accessibility of the port, i.e. the navigability of the river Scheldt, will be further improved. The necessary funds have been allocated in order to carry out current maintenance as well as dredging with the aim of increasing the depth in the river and in the Scheur approach channel. For this there is a three year programme which will make it possible for vessels with a draught of 45’ (13.71 m) to arrive at the port and with a draught of 42’8” (13.00 m) to leave it on any high tide, naturally within the period of one tide. At the present time ships with a draught of a little more than 44 feet can arrive in the port on a favourable high tide. These schemes form a preliminary stage towards increasing over the next few years the accessibility of the port, in the world» (500 m long and 68 m wide), will in a few years time guarantee increased accessibility to our port. To give a comparison: the present Zandvliet lock is also 500 m long but has a width of 57 m.

Alderman Heerma asserts importance of quality and service in ‘80s

‘The most important objectives for the Port of Amsterdam in the 1980s are quality and service,’ Alderman Heerma said recently. In thinking in terms of port users, Amsterdam must centrate more on ‘made to order’ rather than ‘ready to wear’ as a medium sized port,’ Alderman Heerma said.

Admitting that one swallow did not make a summer when announcing the first quarter results, Mr. Heerma noted a number of new developments and initiatives. These included:

- The re-structuring of the Nieuwe Rijnvaart Maatschappij whereby many port-related firms now have a participation. This ensures continuation of a good inland liner service to and on the Rhine.
- The new Cargill sunflower seed plant in the Western port which is discussed elsewhere in this issue.
- The developments regarding ADM/NSM in the light of the malaise in the shipyard sector in Europe. Amsterdam Drydock Company is now the most modern repair yard in Europe.
- Wijsmuller’s investment in four powerful new harbour tugs to be operated by its port tug division Goedkoop in the Port of Amsterdam.

Alderman Heerma went on to note forthcoming improvements in the infrastructure in the port area, highlighting these developments:

- The fact that in 1981 unbroken pushbarge convoys of four units will be able to pass unimpeded along the Amsterdam-Rhine Canal to the continental hinterland. This places Amsterdam on the same competitive level as Rotterdam and Antwerp.
- The fact that the Ham Railway Tunnel would be completed in 1983, thus making it possible to replace the Ham Railway Bridge.
- The fact that the green light is expected this year on a deepwater dry bulk goods terminal outside the looks at IJmuiden adjoining the Hoogovens steel plant.

All in all, Alderman Heerma expressed his confidence in the continued growth of the Port of Amsterdam.

Port of Garston ahead at half-year

The British Transport Docks Board’s Merseyside port of Garston continued to achieve steady growth during the first half of 1980. Total traffic at 540,621 tonnes was 3.3 per cent higher than in the corresponding period of 1979, with exports 3.4 per cent up and a growth in import volume of 2.8 per cent.

During the six-month period Garston announced the introduction of a new container and general cargo service to Dublin, operated by Irish Sea Ferries Ltd., and the placing of the main contract for a new coal terminal.

Commenting on the half-year figures, Mr. Tony Winfield, docks Manager at Garston, said: “Our growth has again been undramatic but steady. When our record is compared with the drop in business through other Merseyside ports, it is clear that the BTDB’s positive investment policy is paying off.

“The Docks Board have invested a lot of money in our new container terminal, which opened last year. There is a firm commitment to spend a further £1½ million over the next twelve months to make Garston an even better port. That adds to our confidence in looking for continued growth in trade through port.”
Hitachi Container Terminal Systems—raising standards in the handling industry

Hitachi, Ltd., with many years of experience in container handling and advanced technologies for machinery, electrical equipment, computers and systems engineering, supplies the safest, most reliable hardware and software on the market, and integrates them into the world’s most efficient container terminal systems.

QUAY CONTAINER HANDLING SYSTEM
- High Reliability
- High Speed
- Telescopic Spreader
- High Response Sway-Stop System

YARD CONTAINER HANDLING SYSTEM
- Automatic Crane Positioning System
- Automatic Container Chucking System

FOR HIGH EFFICIENCY
- Rail-Mounted Transfer Crane

FOR HIGH MOBILITY
- Rubber-Tired Transfer Crane

FOR FREIGHT CAR SERVICE
- Rail-Mounted Transfer Crane

CONTAINER TERMINAL CONTROL SYSTEM
- Communications System (Inductive Radio System)
- Control Computer System (HIDIC 80 Series)
- Data Processing Computer System (HITAC M, L Series)

Hitachi, Ltd., Heavy Industry Dept., International Sales Div. 1, No. 8-2, Otemachi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 100, Japan
Telephone: Tokyo (03) 270-2111 Cable: “HITACHY” TOKYO Telex: J22395, J22432, J24491, J26375 (HITACHY)
NPC report on the problem of locking larger ships

The substantial increase in ship size over the past decade has created many problems for ports; in particular those with enclosed docks entered through locks designed with smaller ships in mind have often found it necessary to turn away trade because of restricted capacity of the lock. Such decisions are often difficult to reach, and the National Ports Council have been examining the problem in an effort to make decision-making easier for the Dockmaster, and the results of this study, which was carried out for the Council by the British Transport Docks Board’s Research Station, have now been published*.

The problem becomes critical at a point where the clearance is so small that it is difficult for water displaced by the vessel to leave the lock. A decision whether or not to accept the vessel is largely governed by what is known as the “blockage factor”—the ratio of the size of the vessel in cross section to the size of the lock. The aim of the study was to provide Dockmasters with readily usable data on which to base such decisions.

The study led to the production of a simple method, illustrated with examples, by which the behaviour of any vessel during the locking process can be predicted. The researchers believe that a potential problem arises where a vessel has a blockage factor in excess of 0.76, and the appropriate data for any specific British port facing such a problem may be obtained either from the Council or from the BTDB Research Station.

* “The Locking of Ships with High Blockage Factors”. Published by the National Ports Council, Commonwealth House, 1-19 New Oxford Street, LONDON, WC1A 1DZ PRICE: £15.00.

HHLA’s latest results for first half of 1980 indicate recovery from setbacks of previous year

The warehouse town of the Free Port area, Port of Hamburg. Here, in the old, soundly-built premises covering a surface of about 500,000 square meters, goods from all over the world are stored.

The Hamburger Hafen- und Lagerhaus-Aktiengesellschaft (HHLA), Port of Hamburg, presented its report and accounts for the year ended December 31, 1979—the 95th in its history.

The report shows that HHLA handled 6,855,000 tons in 1979, an increase of 0.5 percent compared with the previous year. The growth rate was insufficient compared with previous year’s results. Since, 1979 got off to a bad start due to unfavorable weather which resulted in widespread interruptions of operations and damage to building and equipment. Recovery costs came to DM7 million. This unexpected setback could not be entirely compensated for during the year in spite of a generally favorable business situation and good handling outputs.

In the first six months of 1980, HHLA handled 3,441,000 tons and the EDP forecast is that by the end of 1980, the 7 million tons mark will most likely be surpassed for the first time. The number of containers handled during the first six months of 1980 amounted to 206,670 (20-ft-base), up 14.2 percent over the previous year. In weight, containers showed only a comparatively modest growth of 3 percent with a total of 3,480,000 tons handled. Nevertheless the container cargo was able to increase its share of the overall volume of cargo handled to more than 50 percent.

The 66% increase in tp/ro traffic in the first half of 1980 was most satisfactory, compared with the same period for last year. Approximately 500,000 tons were handled. Warehousing business continued on an upward trend. However, in the fruit sector, a drop in demand for bananas resulted in a decrease of 5.7 percent to 678,000 tons. Thus, HHLA is now able to start making up for the damages incurred in 1979.

DM79 million was left over after a cut in investments in 1979. DM15 million went to forestry products terminal extensions; DM14.9 million for fruit terminals; DM1.2 million for storage and handling areas for empty and leasing containers and DM28 million for cranes and mechanical handling equipment. In addition, HHLA also spent DM19 million on flood prevention measures in 1979, in spite of a strain on resources. Consequently, HHLA has been able to afford shippers and consignees not only for optimum handling and warehousing facilities but above all for safety measures for their merchandise. This will continue for decades to come.

BANDARI COLLEGE, A new training college for port and shipping personnel at Mombasa, Kenya

Historical Perspective

BACKGROUND: BANDARI COLLEGE is a training and staff development institution, built and jointly operated by KENYA PORTS AUTHORITY and its subsidiary, KENYA CARGO HANDLING SERVICES.

Together, the two organisations employ a workforce of 12,500. Of these, two hundred are senior and middle management cadres 3,000 in the supervisory grades; 2,500 clerical staff, and 7,000 manual grades; including unskilled dock workers.

Prior to the establishment of BANDARI COLLEGE, Kenya Ports Authority and Kenya Cargo Handling Services operated separate training units, whose main training emphases were port operations and maintenance of technical equipment. In the case of senior and middle manage-
ment personnel, training was offered to selected employees who were sponsored for courses in other institutions. This training procedure gradually proved uneconomical, and the training needs of most employees could not be met satisfactorily. The establishment of BANDARI COLLEGE has rectified this. However, in the case where this newly formed development institution cannot meet or supply certain specialised courses, employees will still be sponsored to the relevant institutions as before.

KENYA PORTS AUTHORITY and KENYA CARGO HANDLING SERVICES, like many other commercial and industrial organisations, operate in a dynamic environment. Market technology, personnel and other changes often have far-reaching effects on organisations and it is necessary for them to be prepared to cope with these developments.

Whilst a port should provide efficient and economic service, it must also contend with rapidly changing technology (e.g. CONTAINERISATION), in the port and shipping industries.

Hence the establishment of BANDARI COLLEGE. "BANDARI" is a Kiswahili word for "seaport". Accordingly, courses at the College are orientated towards the port's shipping and the transport industry in general.

Training program

I OPERATIONS COURSES: These deal primarily with the teaching of theoretical and practical knowledge, skills, methods and means to be instilled into the students, in order that they might on completion, join their colleagues already on-the-job, as valued assistants already grounded in practical experience.

II TECHNICAL TRAINING COURSES: These concern the actual maintenance and repair of port facilities, equipment, machinery and vehicles, essential to a smooth and continuing flow of port activities.

III ADMINISTRATIVE COURSES: These enable a proper accounting, distribution and application of port services and materials, essential to enable the operations of the port schedules.

IV OTHER COURSES: These comprehend miscellaneous but important aspects of port and port-related activities. They are quite selective and not applicable to the mainstream of port activities courses.

V SEMINARS & WORKSHOPS: Simultaneously, and with the activities of the classes themselves, these functions enable participants to exchange views and experiences to their mutual benefit.

Significant growth of container terminal: Wellington Harbour

Since the opening of the Thorndon Container Terminal nine years ago, 460,000 containers or approximately five million tonnes of cargo have been handled at the complex.

During this time, the terminal has grown significantly both in terms of its physical size and in the volume of containers handled, bringing about increases in staff and container handling equipment.

In 1971, the terminal comprised one berth served by one quay crane, and seven acres of land. During the last six months of that year, it handled six ships and exchanged 1,700 containers using two straddle carriers.

Today there are two berths served by three quay cranes, and 60 acres of land. More than 80,000 containers are exchanged from 180 ship calls each year, worked by a fleet of 18 straddle carriers.

In 1975, management of the terminal passed from Maritime Container Terminals Limited to the current operators, Container Terminals Limited.

The aim of this change was to develop the terminal and provide facilities and services in Wellington to meet the projected increase in cargo volumes.

This followed the shipping line's decision to carry containerised cargo between New Zealand and Europe, Japan, the East and West Coasts of North America and the Caribbean.

Overall control of the operation was retained in New Zealand by the appointment of the Shipping Corporation of New Zealand as major shareholders in the company.

Cost explosion reaching 'dangerous proportions'

The cost explosion which has, and is continuing to take place in New Zealand, is reaching dangerous proportions and is undermining our ability to trade.

The general manager of BluMSport A.C.T. (N.Z.) Ltd., Mr. R.C. Whyte, told delegates that escalations in transport, wharf and harbour costs posed a "serious threat" to our import and export trades. "This cost explosion cannot be absorbed any longer and must inevitably fall back on the cargo," he said.

On transport costs, Mr. Whyte said delegates would be only too aware of the increases in New Zealand's road and rail costs, both of which were determined by Government. "While I believe the railways are, and will continue to be, a very efficient operator when it comes to moving our exports from the point of origin to the ports, there is a three-fold problem."

"Firstly, they are burdened with socio-political services which are provided at a tremendous loss, and unless a clear policy is determined and a restructuring takes place, this loss will inevitably and insidiously be subsidised more and more by their freight revenues."

"It is time to stop knocking the railways and recognise not only their invidious position, but also their professionalism and integrity."

"If we do not, there will be a danger of their being unable to keep and attract the right people into their industry and if that happens, we will also suffer dearly in cost and efficiency."

The "escalation" in harbour board charges, particularly those made, over the last four years, were also a matter of concern, Mr. Whyte said.

"The uninterrupted upward path of these costs is very alarming—more so, I believe, because basically the boards are not accountable to anyone for their commercial performance."

"While some boards make serious attempts to contain costs, I believe that greater efforts could be made to reduce costs and thus reduce the increases which, in the present conditions, inevitably have to be made."
South Australia’s ports system has bounded into the “Exporting 80’s” with its best overall financial performance since 1969-70 and its best exporting record for many years.

Exports from the Port of Adelaide alone in the fiscal year jumped by 48.2% and for the State’s port system as a whole by 27.5%.

Much of the improvement was due to record cereal crops and bumper rural conditions throughout the State, but there was a continuing improvement in general cargo handling underlying the seasonal factors.

The Department of Marine and Harbors finished the year $9.5M ahead of the red ink bottle, although interest, redemption and other standing charges reduced the contribution to general revenue to $0.2M.

The Minister of Marine, Allan Rodda, says the all-ports performance is tangible evidence of the State Government’s drive to boost South Australia’s economic achievements through solid commercial and industrial development.

“We’ve had record rural output in recent years and this has contributed substantially to export activity”, the Minister said, “but we are operating under the increasingly serious disability of an inefficient Conference centralisation of South Australian container exports through the Port of Melbourne. This has made our achievement more noteworthy in the general cargo field, especially when you consider that 76% of our containers are handled through Melbourne and that 80% of all general cargo travels in containers these days.

“The State Government is determined to channel the flow of South Australia’s export and import containers through the Port of Adelaide and, where applicable, through other of the State’s major deepsea outports. Our negotiations with the overseas Conference lines are approaching fruition and the shipping lines involved have been left in no doubt that the inefficient and outdated centralisation which still prevails imposes an intolerable burden on the State economy and on the competitive position of South Australian commerce and industry”.

ABC Containerline’s “Prestigious” made the Line’s first call at the Port of Adelaide in September, exchanging 276 TEU at the Container Terminal, No. 6 Outer Harbor.

Asian importers (50.6%) with the Middle East as the next largest customer (34.5%). Europe and the USSR took 6.6%.

Export tonnage for the State through its own ports was 11.3 m tonnes, of which 2.1 m tonnes went out through the Port of Adelaide. The number of ships using SA ports rose by 6.1% to 3159, while the gross registered tonnage of vessels using the ports system increased by 11.3% to 21.9 m tons.

The Minister said the port authority’s receipts from all sources rose by 32% to $23.0M, with expenditure rising by 15% to $13.6M, including costs associated with non-revenue producing items undertaken by the Department of
Mr. Rodda said that, as well as working closely in conjunction with industry and commerce to achieve a greater range of shipping services, the department was also involved in a continuing program of major works designed to further assist the State's trading position through the provision of modern facilities at major ports. These included dredging, wharf reconstruction, the preparation and marketing of large-scale industrial estate areas for port-related industries and the planning and provision of new cargo handling facilities. Duplication of the existing container terminal wharf and crane equipment were high on the list of priorities and this would be undertaken when the Conference lines involved provided direct services of the kind required.

South Australia's largest exporters were amongst private companies represented on a new shipping users committee working closely with the government in negotiations with the Conference lines for direct sailings. They regarded such services as essential if South Australian exporters were to hold and improve their competitive position on overseas markets. Much had been achieved by exporters through design and technology, coupled with expertise developed in a wide range of manufacturing areas, but this position was being eroded through centralisation costs and delays.

Major exports through the Port of Adelaide included cereals (just on 1.0 m tonnes), cement clinker 0.2 m tonnes, iron and scrap steel 0.1 m tonnes, ores and concentrates 0.04 m tonnes, non-ferrous metals 0.04 m tonnes, wool 0.04 m tonnes, meat and meat preparations 0.03 m tonnes, animal feeds 0.03 m tonnes, tallow 0.02 m tonnes, fruit and fruit preparations 0.02 m tonnes. The five major outports operated by the Department of Marine and Harbors and three private ports operated in conjunction with the department exported mainly cereals, metals, ores and concentrates, gypsum, salt and dolomite.

**Effects of over-centralisation: South Australian Ports and Shipping Journal**

OCL's Ron Eaton, chairman of the Australia to Europe Shipping Conference, told a recent NSW section of the Chartered Institute of Transport meeting that, while employer-employee relations in the shipping industry had improved considerably, industrial disputes were making it almost impossible to run an efficient shipping industry.

He proposed the need for a re-examination of the dispute-settling mechanisms of the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Australia had one of the world's best ranges of shipping services, but ships spent more time in port than in any other developed country. On one recent occasion there were 63 ships at anchor off Sydney Newcastle and Port Kembla on the NSW coast because of industrial disputes and some had been there for four weeks.

Mr. Eaton's claims are supported by recent waterfront industry time lost figures from the Federal Department of Transport. These show that New South Wales accounted for 31 pc of total time lost during March, second only to Victoria's 40 pc. The Port of Sydney alone recorded 28 pc of total time lost in capital ports, again just behind Melbourne's 30 pc.

Both ports are heavily centralised, with significant evidence of over-centralisation in some areas, as the handling of South Australian container cargo through Melbourne illustrates. In such cases, the effects of industrial time lost are accentuated because stoppages also delay cargoes for areas not involved in industrial action.

By contrast, South Australian ports and the Port of Adelaide recorded only a 7 pc time loss in the period mentioned, but SA importers and exporters, in many cases, were forced to bear the added burden of time lost in the Port of Melbourne (30 pc) where their container cargoes were centralised. At present, 76 pc of SA containers move through the Port of Melbourne and along a single-track rail landbridge of 800 k.

The State's major importers and exporters are working to have direct shipcalls replace the Melbourne landbridge and Mr. Eaton's concern is a further indication of the urgency of such moves.

**Port Kembla plans new coal terminal**

(News from Soros Associates, Associate Member of IAPH). The new coal terminal for Port Kembla in New South Wales, Australia was designed by Soros-Longworth & McKenzie for 15 M.t.p.a with 16 grades of coal in its Stage I phase, scheduled for completion in 1982.

The terminal will load vessels of 110,000 DWT and vessels up to 160,000 DWT can be partially loaded. Coal will be received simultaneously by truck and unit train. The design of the facility includes a number of innovations for system reliability, simplicity of operation and maintenance and it breaks new ground in environmental protection for coal handling.

The Master Plan for Stage II provides expansion to 25 million t.p.a. capacity, without interruption in operations. A future second loading berth may be added either in shore or offshore, where 250,000 DWT vessels can be accommodated within 1,000 meters in partially sheltered waters.

An artists rendering of the Stage I facility is shown in photo.
Korea Welcomes Participants in Nagoya Meeting

A message from
Mr. Rhee, Bomb June Administrator,
Korea Maritime and Port Administration

Hoping that the participants to the 12th IAPH Conference at Nagoya, Japan will have a good forum for frank exchange of ideas and discussion regarding the many problems that today face the ports and harbors of the world and wishing their success in strengthening international understanding and goodwill, I take pleasure of inviting you to my country to observe the developments of the major ports of Korea before or after the conference.

Korea's principal port of Busan which opened in 1876 is the largest one in the nation having a cargo handling capacity of 14 million tons. And the new container terminal which was constructed in 1978 gives a yearly handling capacity of 300,000 TEU.

Port of Incheon, Korea's second largest port, is situated on the west coast. It is noted for its newly built huge lock system and well-developed tidal basin, which is the largest lock facility in the Far East.

Besides the inspection tour of ports and harbor, for those who are interested in sightseeing I am also willing to arrange a visit to some of the places of interests.

Korea is a nation of long history as well as a rich cultural heritage in which the people take great pride. It is located less than two-hour flight from Nagoya, Japan.

Seoul, capital of Korea, is one of the ten largest cities in the world with the population of more than eight million. Since its selection as the royal capital of the Yi Dynasty (1392-1910), Seoul has well preserved much of its cultural heritage and many sagas of its rich past.

Kyoungju, situated on the way to Busan is the pride of Korea and the home of much of its history. It is also getting worldwide attention since it was chosen one of the world's ten historic cities by UNESCO.

I sincerely hope that you would take the geographical advantage and explore the land of Oriental beauty in Korea soon.

Thank you.
Thoughtfulness. It's part of our tradition.

One word says it all: "Okyakusama." It means you're an honored guest first, a customer second.

You'll feel the difference it makes the moment you step aboard JAL. Thoughtfulness in providing a hot oshibori towel to freshen up with, a soft pillow you don't have to ask for, a happi coat to relax in. It's our way of showing sincere concern for your every need. Because thoughtfulness for your comfort is part of the traditional service of Japan Air Lines. Worldwide.

The way we are is the way we fly.

JAPAN AIR LINES
Official Carrier for the 12th Conference of IAPH
The Mitsui System can speed up and rationalize container handling to give increased benefits from container transportation. Developed in 1972, this system has proved its efficiency at the busy Ohi Pier, Port of Tokyo, and it could be working for you in solving your container terminal problems, particularly those in the fields of cargo information and operations systems.

1. Yard Plan Computer System
2. Yard Operation Computer System
3. Data Transmission and Oral Communication System
4. Transtainer® Automatic Steering System
5. Transtainer® Operation Supervising System
6. Portainer® Operation Supervising System

MITSUI Engineering & Shipbuilding Co., Ltd.
Head Office: 6-4, Tsukiji 5-chome, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, 104 Japan
Cable: "MITUSOSEN TOKYO", Telex: J22624, J22621
Material Handling Machinery Sales Department Tel: 03(3) 544-3677
Systems Headquarters Marketing Dept. Tel: 03(3) 544-2727
Overseas Office: New York, Los Angeles, Mexico, London, Duesseldorf, Vienna, Singapore, Hong Kong, Rio de Janeiro