PORT OF KARACHI

Karachi, due to its geographical and strategic location was known as the Gateway to Asia. Considered as a safe harbor since time immemorial, Karachi was a small fishing village in the early nineteenth century. Historians note its proximity to a place from where a part of Alexander’s army boarded the ship since time immemorial, Karachi was a small fishing village in the early nineteenth century. Historians note its proximity to a place from where a part of Alexander’s army boarded the ship as the port of entry to India. Karachi Port is now handling over 12.5 million TEUs containers of general cargo, including 553,000 TEUs containers of liquid cargo and 11.0 million tons of dry cargo, which constitute about 80% of the country’s exports. Related article on page 33.
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1 The incident with the leaking tanker Castor in the Mediterranean, which was refused entry into a port in early 2001, revived international concern about the availability of adequately equipped "places of refuge". The issue was raised in IMO, notably by the Secretary-General, who called for global consideration of the issue as a matter of urgency.

2 It seemed appropriate to IAPH to investigate the subject of places of refuge, in order to assist the Legal Committee. IAPH assigned this task to its Legal Protection Committee. The results of the investigation are given below in Paragraph 3. Paragraph 13 contains information on an IAPH Resolution on the "Provision of Safe Havens". In Paragraph 16 IAPH has identified items which need to be clarified systematically in order to provide an integrated approach to places of refuge. All the points brought forward could be put to the IMO Legal Committee for its consideration when discussing the subject of places of refuge.

Conclusions of the IAPH study on Places of Refuge

3 The right of ships in distress to seek refuge is an old established and universally accepted one under international law. Remarkably, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Montego Bay, 10 December 1982, ("1982 UNCLOS") does not refer to this right directly in any of its provisions. Nor is it mentioned in the Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, Geneva, 9 December 1923 ("1923 Ports Convention"). Nevertheless, no authoritative textbook denies that this right exists. It is regarded to be an absolute, humanitarian right. Any type of ship, including warships, may invoke this right, provided there is a genuine distress, whatever its cause. If rightfully invoked, it creates an autonomous exception to the territorial jurisdiction of the coastal State where refuge is sought. The right is limited by its purpose: to overcome the distress by seeking shelter, carrying out the necessary repairs, etc.

4 This right of ships in distress may come into conflict with another absolute right under international law, the right of self-protection of any sovereign State and port. If a ship in distress poses a serious threat to a fundamental interest of the State or port where it seeks refuge, there may be such conflict. Many writers take the view that, eventually, these two absolute rights should be balanced. Such a balance implies that, at least, in the first instance, the coastal State must judge whether any of its vital interests is threatened by the entry of a ship in distress. If so, the coastal State has to balance its duty to offer refuge and its right to self-protection. In IAPH's view, this implies that not only a coastal State but a port as well, is entitled to stipulate conditions of entry, if and to the extent that the fulfilment of such conditions could redress the balance in such a way that entry of the ship in distress can be allowed.

5 It should be remembered that the Legal Committee has discussed the subject of places of refuge previously in connection with article 11 (entitled "Co-operation") of the International Convention on Salvage (1989). At the time, it was suggested that there should be a clearly spelled-out obligation for States to admit vessels in distress to their ports. This suggestion was endorsed by some delegations, but others expressed doubts on the desirability of including a so-called "public law" rule in a private law convention. It was also pointed out by those opposing the inclusion of such an obligation, that the interests of coastal States would need to be properly taken into account in any such provision. Doubts were also expressed on whether such a provision would in fact affect the decisions by the authorities of coastal States in specific cases (LEG 54/7, paragraph 40). Some delegations, on the other hand, suggested that this article should place stronger obligations on States. Accordingly, several proposals were introduced either to pre-designate ports of refuge or to ensure the effectiveness of an adequate contingency plan.

6 The Legal Committee finally decided to avoid including any specific or far-reaching obligations which in its view
would delay the entry into force of the Convention by imposing stricter require-
ments upon States (LEG 56/9, para-
graphs 87 to 95). Instead, it approved, as a compromise, the current text of article
11 of the Convention, which provides that States Parties shall:

"Whenever regulating or deciding upon mat-
ters relating to salvage operations such as
admittance to ports of vessels in distress or
the provisions of facilities to salvors, take into
account the need for co-operation between
salvors, other interested parties and public
authorities in order to ensure the efficient and
successful performance of salvage operations
for the purpose of saving life or property in
danger as well as preventing damage to the
environment in general."

7 As to “free access to ports” there is
no basis in international law that would
oblige States the unfettered entry of for-
eign ships into their ports generally.
Assuming that the port is located in
internal waters, the port State is, in prin-
ciple, sovereign to exercise its exclusive
jurisdiction on its territory, which
includes its internal waters.

8 The international conventions that
could include provisions relating to this
subject are, in addition to the above
mentioned 1982 UNCLOS and 1923 Ports
Convention, the Convention and Statute
on Freedom of Transit, Barcelona, 20
April 1921 (“1921 Transit Convention”) and
the International Convention and
Statute concerning the Regime of
Navigable Waterways of International
Concern, Barcelona, 20 April 1921 (“1921
Waterways Convention”). As to the
order of importance of these conventions
for the subject of free access to ports, it is
observed that 1982 UNCLOS is the
more relevant convention for the follow-
ing reasons:

(i) As to the same subject, any later
convention, as between the same
State Parties, prevails over an earlier
convention;

(ii) Any development in law, or in State
practice recognised by law, on the subject of access to ports between
the early twenties and sixty years
later, may be expected to have been
reflected in the provisions of UNC-
LOS and

(iii) UNCLOS is widely accepted as the
codification of the 1982 status of the
international law of the sea, including
the law of navigation.

9 UNCLOS, however, does not include
specific provisions relating to entry of
ports. It only touches on it in two articles
in an indirect way. Within the section
relating to the innocent passage of ships
in the territorial sea (articles 17 - 32), arti-
cle 25 (2) states:

"In the case of ships proceeding to internal
waters or a call at a port facility outside inter-
nal waters, the coastal State has also the
right to take the necessary steps to prevent
any breach of the conditions to which admis-
sion of those ships to internal waters or such
call is subject."

10 This article clearly assumes that condi-
tions may be imposed on ships seek-
ing entry to ports. This is remarkable,
because it follows an article where it is
explicitly said that a coastal State may not
impose conditions on foreign ships, which
have the practical effect of deny-
ing or impairing the right of innocent
passage through its territorial sea. Appar-
ently, the imposing of such condi-
tions on ships desiring to enter ports is
allowed under the LOSC. The second rel-
levant provision in UNCLOS is article 211
(3) that appears in a section relating to
pollution prevention. This provision also
includes a referral to certain pollution
prevention-related conditions for the
entry of foreign vessels into their ports.
Here again, this article confirms the right
of coastal States to restrict entry to their
ports.

11 Furthermore, UNCLOS includes a
section on the right of access of land-
locked States to and from the sea and
freedom of transit (Part X, articles 124 -
132). The core provision is article 125
that starts as follows: Land-locked
States shall have the right of access to
and from the sea for the purpose of exer-
cising the rights provided for in this
Convention. To this end, land-locked
States shall enjoy freedom of transit
through the territory of transit States by
all means of transport. This freedom
however is not absolute. In the third
paragraph of this article it is said that
the freedom of transit in no way shall
infringe the legitimate interests of the
transit State. It may be concluded from
these provisions that a coastal State has
a limited authority to deny entry in its
ports of vessels flying the flag of a land-
locked State, or even flying the flag of
another State, when such vessels desire
to load or discharge goods in transit from
or to a land-locked country.

12 Do any of the three old conventions
mentioned in paragraph 8 change the
picture that arises from the provisions of
UNCLOS? The 1921 Transit Convention
certainly does not. This Convention
does not even include the statement of
principle that land-locked countries have
the right of access to the high seas. It
only provides some rules on transit.
Neither does the 1923 Ports Convention.
The core of this Convention is the prohi-
bition of port States to be discriminatory.
In article 2 this convention provides that
vessels of contracting States have to be
granted equality of treatment compared
with the port States’ own vessels. Such
equality of treatment must be taken into
account as regards freedom of access to
the port, the use of the port, and the full
enjoyment of the benefits as regards
navigation and commercial operations.
Nowhere in the convention does it pro-
vide that all vessels of contracting States
themselves must have free access to a
port of any other contracting State, not
even under certain conditions. The most
far-reaching provision in this respect
may be found in article 9 of the 1921
Waterways Convention. After stating in
article 9 that nationals, property and
flags of contracting States must enjoy
equal treatment to that accorded to the
national, property and flags of the ripari-
an State under whose sovereignty or
authority the port is situated, the article
continues as follows: The equipment of
ports situated on a navigable waterway
of international concern, and the facil-
ties afforded in these ports to navigation,
must not be withheld from public use to
an extent beyond what is reasonable
and fully compatible with the free exer-
cise of navigation. However, it should be
borne in mind that this convention relates
to the regime of navigable rivers
only. And it may be noted that in the
1923 Ports Convention, concluded only
two years later and specifically related
to ports, this provision of article 9 of the
1921 Waterways Convention is not
repeated.

13 From the above paragraphs it may be
concluded that, under international
law, no general right of freedom of entry
to ports exists. In principle, port States
are allowed to close ports, wholly or
partly, or to close ports for certain cate-
gories of ships, e.g. all ships carrying
nuclear waste. However, any such
restriction may not result in discrimina-
tion between home- and foreign flagged
vessels. In the case of a ship in distress
seeking refuge the coastal State as well
as a port has to balance its duty to offer
refuge and its right of self-protection.

14 Given the necessity to balance
between the interests of a ship in dis-
tress seeking refuge and the right of a
port to self-protection, IAPH felt it ap-
propriate to develop basic elements for a
joint port approach on this subject. These basic elements for this joint port approach were, inter alia, as follows:

(i) In full recognition of its broad community responsibility, the International Association of Ports and Harbors, IAPH, is aware that apart from maritime administration, the international port community has a pivotal role in ensuring that disabled ships are provided with adequate assistance and facilities as may be required.

(ii) In the process of discharging this responsibility, IAPH members will act from the conviction that the safety of human life at sea should be addressed as a first priority. However, actions to safeguard human life at sea should not compromise the safety of life ashore.

(iii) As a second priority this principle should also be applied to mitigate effects that such incidents might have on the coastal or port environment.

(iv) Lastly, any actions in connection with the discharge of such responsibilities should also take account of commercial considerations regarding the port’s operation as well as the integrity of the ship’s hull or structure.

(v) While maintaining the principle stated above, the measures to be taken should be weighed against the risks incurred in a process in which each step is identifiable.

(vi) It was agreed that the name “Ports of refuge” did not adequately cover the subject matter; instead the term ‘Safe havens’ was proposed as being more appropriate.

15 These basic elements were endorsed by IAPH’s policy body, the IAPH/IMO Interface Group and ‘translated’ into a resolution, which is attached in the annex to this document. This resolution has also been submitted to the 47th session of IMO’s Marine Environment Protection Committee as document MEPC 47/5/4.

16 Furthermore IAPH felt appropriate to identify the items, which have to be worked out systematically in order to reach an integrated approach between all parties concerned on the subject of places of refuge for ships in distress. In the view of IAPH these are the following:

(i) considering a geographical regional approach in order to achieve the designation of waters or places of refuge accessible to ships in distress and equipped as necessary to handle them;

(ii) considering a supranational approach on a methodology to assess all operational elements for handling ships in distress;

(iii) considering a legal framework for immunity for those responding to ships in distress or offering them shelter and more generally in the event of an accident, a liability that is incumbent on the ship rather than the port; and

(iv) considering a special fund for damage caused by offering shelter to a ship in distress if no special designated waters are available. The whole question raises the issue of compulsory insurance for all shipping, once again.

17 IAPH offers to collaborate with the Secretariat of IMO and other Organizations on the subject of places of refuge for ships in distress for which the above paragraphs are meant to provide input.

Action requested of the Legal Committee

18 The Committee is invited to take note of the above and comment as appropriate.

ANNEX
RESOLUTION

Adopted by the IAPH Board of Directors in May 2001

PROVISION OF SAFE HAVENS

WHEREAS, as a result of recent incidents “safe havens” or ports of refuge have become a matter of international attention to, among others, the International Maritime Organization and;

WHEREAS, the International Association of Ports and Harbors is aware that, in addition to Maritime Administrations, the international port community has a pivotal role in ensuring that assistance and facilities be provided under conditions of maritime distress and;

WHEREAS, there is a recognition that in discharging their responsibility directed at the safety of life at sea without however compromising the safety of the on-shore population, the need to mitigate environmental damage to the port as well as to coastal areas and as well as certain operational and commercial needs of the port;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that coastal States be urged to review their contingency arrangements to provide adequate assistance and facilities to disabled ships; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that contingency arrangements are directed at the safety of life at sea without however compromising the safety of the on-shore population, the need to mitigate environmental damage to the port as well as to coastal areas and as well as certain operational and commercial needs of the port.

IAPH

International Association of Ports and Harbors

Come and visit us at
http://www.iaphworldports.org
to know more about IAPH, the world port community and much more!

- The latest news and information on the world maritime scene
- Calendar of forthcoming IAPH events and other maritime-related events
- Links to IAPH member and other websites
- IAPH publications on-line *
- Online Open Forum *

* limited to IAPH members only - if you need assistance in entering the Members Area with your password, please contact us at info@iaphworldports.org
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1. Introduction

The world in which we live and conduct our business is subject to rapid change. Globalisation and liberalisation of trade accelerate that process. Open frontiers lead to less involvement and control of regulatory authorities and all elements in the logistic chain can be potential targets for illegitimate organisations.

However, since the tragic events of September 11, 2001 consideration has also to be given to the use of ships and their cargoes as potential terrorist weapons. There is consequently a need to re-assess existing ship and related port security plans to address potential terrorist activities. This is all the more important in view of the economic importance of most ports for their national economy.

Ship security is the responsibility of international organizations such as the International Chamber of Shipping, ICS, and proposals to that effect have been prepared by them.

Port security is first and foremost a responsibility for the Port Authority and an issue which is dealt with in IAPH. Ports differ widely in their characteristics, lay-out and vulnerability and it is therefore not practical to develop detailed and uniform standard comprehensive port security plans. However, IAPH believes that it is possible to develop generic guidelines for port authorities from which specific issues can be selected to address in respect to each port, to a greater or lesser degree, threats applicable to them. This paper provides guidance on these issues.

To be effective, it is very important that ship and port security plans can be dovetailed together to form a comprehensive set of security measures relevant to the specific location. Guidance thereon is contained in the joint ICS/IAPH submission to IMO.

Port authorities are usually the main orchestrator of their port as a logistic nodal point and as such they can provide a valuable contribution to the establishment of an integral port and maritime security policy.

Such a policy should address the source of the potential threats as well as minimization of the effects. The approach can be visualised as follows:


2. Port security policy

The port security policy should be developed in close co-operation of all the authorities involved. Its main characteristic is that it addresses two main elements: the port area as a whole and the individual companies operating in the port.

1. Multi-disciplinary (overall) Port Security Plan

The overall port security plan can be considered to be the scenario, describing all measures that need to be taken with regard to the security of the port as a whole. Apart from a description of the measures and the facilities available for these measures, it should also contain a description of the division of responsibilities of the different actors.

The plan should address all the elements of the security chain, from sensitisation initiatives (creating awareness) to the actual organization of incident combating and cyclic policy review. It is essential that the overall co-ordination rests with a Port security Committee in which all relevant authorities closely co-operate. These may differ from country (port) to port, but they will almost always include the Port Authority, Police, Justice department, Customs, Fire brigade, medical services and the environmental department. It is also imperative that this Port security Committee works closely together with the local port industry. That co-operation is necessary for creating awareness and involvement and to mutually develop security toolkits.

2. Port Facility Security Plans

As said, the overall Port Security Plan requires the active involvement of the local port industry. Through that co-operation generic guidance should be developed for the individual port facilities, terminals, industries etc., so as to enable these to develop their own custom made Facility Security Plan. Such a plan should contain measures to increase the alertness of personnel, to counter criminal infiltration of the organization, secure the company area and its installations. It should also pay attention to procedures for calamities, information supply, communication and education and training of personnel.

3. Essential conditions for a successful port security plan

The approach as described before requires a number of essential conditions in order to be successful.

- Awareness among all relevant partners, authorities and private enterprise
- Vulnerability assessment
- Knowledge, experience in security matters
- Co-operation
- Information management
- Communication

4. Awareness

In the introductory paragraphs it is argued that ports are susceptible to criminal activities, including acts of terrorism. However, experience shows that in general, this is not experienced as such in the average port industrial community. As a result, there is no or insufficient basis for initiating activities, investing funds and co-operating with other actors. For that reason, it is necessary to develop a programme aimed at creating awareness among the industry by explaining the various potential threats, in terms of calamities as well as economic damage.
5. Vulnerability assessment

It will be clear that the measures described in the Port or Facility Security Plan should be directed at those areas where they are likely to have the maximum effect. For an effective security approach it is therefore essential that risk analyses are conducted both at overall port level as well as on individual port facility level. Weak spots, both in a physical sense as well as in an organizational sense should be made visible through the analysis process. Vulnerability assessments should be carried out at regular intervals and be part of the management process of the port or the port facility.

6. Knowledge and experience

Knowledge and experience in security issues are essential elements for a successful approach. These elements are usually not available at individual company level. By establishing a Knowledge Centre in which all relevant authorities co-operate, and make their knowledge and experience available to the local port industries, this deficiency can be remedied. Such Knowledge Centre may also serve as central platform for addressing complex security issues and could also facilitate education and training of port facility personnel. Obviously care should be taken to secure the integrity of the information handled through the Knowledge Centre.

7. Co-operation

The nature of port security is very complex and it therefore requires close and intensive co-operation between all actors involved. This will range from local co-operation between the port industry and authorities to international co-operation between authorities and ports and port organizations. In this context co-operation between the service providers in the port should be addressed. These service providers are often the first to personally contact the ship and its crew. Pilots, tug boat companies, linesmen and suppliers of other services such as drinking water and bunkers, should be trained in identifying potential danger and in ways how to handle such situations.

8. Information management

An effective security system requires high quality information and information exchange. Accurate and timely information is crucial for the identification of potential threats and for taking the proper counter measures. It is necessary to lay the responsibility for information collection, interpretation and dissemination with an experienced organization such as the police. This focal point should maintain close contact with relevant national authorities as well as local parties in the port area, both authorities and industry.

9. Communication

Proper and unambiguous information to the relevant parties, including the population in areas adjacent to the port is of importance in order to create a firm basis for the measures to be taken. A communication plan should therefore be part of the Port Security Plan. At regular intervals the population should be informed about security projects without endangering the integrity of these plans by disclosing sensitive details.

10. Preventive measures

Preventive measures must be taken on the basis of local circumstances. They are aimed at protection of the port and its industrial complex as well as persons on board (passengers and crew) and ashore (port personnel and inhabitants of nearby living quarters).

11. Cargo inspections

Cargo inspections aimed at identifying weapons, drugs, explosives and other matters of a threatening nature. Rather than inspect cargo at random, inspections should be targeted. Targets will be established on the basis of document checks in combination with a system of risk analysis. This will enhance the probability that targeted cargo proves to be non-compliant with regulations or to contain contraband.

Since containers are considered to be most susceptible to criminal activities, special attention should be paid to containerized cargo. Suitable equipment is X-ray machines, portable detection equipment and sniffer dogs.

In order not to disturb the logistic process in an unacceptable manner, the number of physical checks should be carefully chosen. Percentages will differ from port to port, but experience has shown that even a limited percentage, coupled with a targeted approach based on risk analysis, can provide an acceptable security level.

12. Identification check of passengers and crews

In most cases the responsibility for checking the identification of both crews and passengers rests with the seaport police or the immigration authorities. For passengers this will involve a passport check. For crew members an identity card based on the provisions of ILO will serve as a suitable identity document.

13. Identification check of port personnel

For personnel engaged in the port industry this issue should be part of the facility or industry security plan. For personnel engaged in security enforcement: To be developed.

14. Integration with Maritime Security

A Port Security Plan is not enough to guarantee security and reliability throughout the total logistic chain, including the hinterland of the port and the sea transport. To that end, similar measures as described above, need to be developed for the individual links throughout the logistic chain.

15. Concluding remarks

Regarding sea transport, including the immediate ship/shore interface IMO is presently developing international regulations that should be endorsed at a diplomatic conference in November or December 2002. It will be essential that regulations relating to maritime security dovetail with port and port facility security plans. Close co-operation of all international actors is necessary to ensure the establishment of effective measures to ensure maritime security both at sea as well as in ports and their hinterland.

IAPH is dedicated to play an active role in this process. This document should provide the basis for generic guidance for ports to develop their own custom made security plans based on their particular characteristics.

Abu Dhabi, April 23, 2002
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J oint Submission by ICS and IAPH

PREVENTION AND SUPPRESSION OF ACTS OF TERRORISM AGAINST SHIPPING

Port and Maritime Security

Guidance for the Development of Ship and Port Security Plans

SUMMARY

Executive summary: This paper outlines the need for ships and ports to work together in developing security plans and proposes a framework for the content of such plans.

Action to be taken: Paragraph 10

Related documents: MSC.75/NSW G papers and report

1. Introduction

Ports and ships have long been potential targets for criminals and now consideration also has to be given to the use of ships and their cargoes as potential terrorist weapons. There is consequently a need to re-assess existing ship and port security plans to address potential terrorist activities.

Since both ships and ports differ widely in their characteristics, layout and vulnerability, it is not practical to develop detailed and uniform standard comprehensive ship or port security plans. However, IAPH and ICS believe that it is possible to develop generic guidelines for ship operators and port facilities from which specific issues can be selected to address in respect of each port and ship, to a greater or lesser degree, threats applicable to them.

To be effective, it is very important that ship, port and port facility security plans can be dovetailed together to form a comprehensive set of security measures relevant to the specific location. This document provides guidance for the development of interrelated ship, port and port facility security plans.

2. Security Policy

Shipowners, port authorities and others involved in the port industry need to consider their own responsibilities with regard to security. To accomplish this, various steps need to be taken, such as:

• to appoint and empower suitably senior staff members with overall responsibility for security within the port facility, shipping company and individual ship;
• to assess the security risks and to minimise the implications of any incident;
• to co-operate with the responsible authorities and to act on advice from those authorities;
• to promote security awareness amongst all employees;
• to give a commitment to provide appropriate security guidance and advice;
• to establish a reporting and recording system for incidents.

In all cases, the following issues need to be addressed:-

• responsibility for handling different types of incidents;
• promulgation of information to other parties involved;
• issuing guidance or instructions to employees;
• liaison with other authorities;
• methods of communication in different circumstances;
• plans for handling media interest;
• plans for informing and supporting the relatives/next of kin of persons involved.

The approach can be visualised as follows:

Awareness → Pre-planning → Preparation → Prevention → Resolution → Follow-up

3. Individual Ship and Port security plans

Individual ship and port security plans should be developed in close co-operation with all the relevant industry stakeholders and authorities involved. Their main characteristics are that they should address either the ship or port as a whole as well as the individual components.

The security plan can be considered as:

• defining appropriate scenarios;
• describing all measures that need to be taken to address those scenarios;
• describing the resources available to assist the application of those measures;
• describing the responsibilities of the different entities involved;
• providing contingency plans in the event of incidents occurring.

The plan should address all the elements of the security chain, from awareness initiatives to the actual organization of incident combating and subsequent policy review.

4. Port Security Plan

It is essential that the overall co-ordination rests with a Port Security Committee in which all relevant authorities closely co-operate. Such authorities may differ from country to country, or even from port to port within a country, but they will almost always include the port authority, police and other law enforcement or security bodies, the justice department, customs authority, fire and other emergency services and the environmental department. It is also imperative that the Port Security Committee works closely together with port users and others located within the port environment.

Such co-operation is necessary for creating awareness and involvement and to mutually develop security toolkits.

5. The Port Facility Security Plan

The overall Port Security Plan requires the active involvement of the local port industry. Through that co-operation generic guidance should be developed for individual port facilities, terminals, industries etc., so as to enable these to develop their own, custom-made Facility Security Plan. Such a plan should contain measures to increase the alertness of personnel, to counter criminal infiltration of the organization and to secure the company area and its installations. It should also pay attention to procedures in the event of incidents, information supply, communication and education and training of personnel.

6. The Ship/Port Interface

An essential element in overall security
is the liaison between the visiting ship and the port and the respective persons responsible for security.

Between them, the following issues need to be addressed:

a) The security of the immediate ship environs, quay side:
   • mooring lines, linesmen and their means of transportation
   • gangway, access control of people boarding lighting
   • traffic alongside the quay
   • overhand equipment: cranes, other loading/discharging equipment
   • other?

b) The security of the immediate ship environs, water side:
   • ships alongside: bunkers, water, supplies, ship/ship cargo transfer
   • ship service providers, tugs
   • other?

7. Ship Security Plans

The development of ship security plans needs to be considered in respect of each individual vessel. The essential focus is the protection of the perimeter of the ship from unauthorised access and, within the vessel itself, the identification and protection of secure areas, vulnerable points and essential services.

8. Essential elements of a security plan

A number of essential elements should be addressed:

• Security awareness among all relevant partners, authorities, private enterprise and employees
• Vulnerability assessment
• Knowledge, experience in security matters
• Co-operation
• Information management
• Communication

8.1. Awareness

In the introductory paragraphs it is accepted that both ports and ships are susceptible to criminal activities, including acts of terrorism. However, experience shows that in general, the possibility of serious criminal activity is seldom recognised as such by an individual ship operator or port. It is necessary, therefore, to develop programmes aimed at creating awareness by identifying various potential threats and their impact, in both human and economic terms.

8.2. Vulnerability assessment

Measures described in individual ship or port security plans should be directed at those areas where they are likely to have the maximum effect. For an effective security approach it is therefore essential that risk analyses are conducted both at overall as well as an individual level. Weak spots, both in a physical sense as well as in an organizational sense should be revealed through the analysis process. Vulnerability assessments should be carried out at regular intervals.

8.3. Knowledge and experience

Knowledge and experience in security issues are essential elements for a successful approach. These elements are usually not available at individual company level. By establishing a network in which all relevant authorities participate, this deficiency can be addressed. Such a network may serve as a central platform for addressing complex security issues and could also facilitate education and training of port facility personnel. Care needs to be taken to secure the integrity of the information handled through the network.

8.4. Co-operation

Port and ship security is a complex issue which requires close and intensive co-operation between all the actors involved. This will range from local cooperation between the port industry, port users and authorities to international co-operation between authorities and ports, port organizations and the shipping industry.

Co-operation between the port users and service providers in the port is essential. Port users include visiting ships, passengers boarding and disembarking and cargo or stores deliverers and collectors. Service providers are often the first to personally contact the ship and its crew. Pilots, tug boat companies, linesmen and suppliers of other services such as stevedores, and those providing other services to ships such as drinking water and bunkers, should be aware of the potential threats and the ways of handling such situations.

8.5. Information management

An effective security system requires high quality information and information exchange. Accurate and timely information is crucial for the identification of potential threats and for taking the proper counter measures. It is necessary to lay the prime responsibility for information collection, interpretation and dissemination with an identified and experienced organization such as the police or other security organisations. This focal point should maintain close contact with relevant national authorities as well as local parties in the port area, both authorities and industry. In the case of ships, the flag state has responsibilities here.

8.6. Communication

Proper and unambiguous information to all relevant parties, including the population in areas adjacent to the port, and the personnel involved with the ship, is of importance in order to create a firm basis for the measures to be taken. A communication plan should therefore be part of the port, ship operator or ship security plan. At regular intervals all relevant parties should be informed about security projects without endangering the integrity of these plans by disclosing sensitive details.

9. Preventive measures

Preventive measures must be taken on the basis of local circumstances. They should be aimed at protection of the ship, the port and its industrial complex as well as persons on board (passengers and crew) and ashore (port personnel and others potentially affected).

Issues to be considered include

• Briefing the personnel involved
• Access control, personal identification and authorisation
• Liaison with port security
• Threat assessment in respect of stowaways, drug trafficking, terrorism, other unlawful activity, civil unrest
• The identification and protection of secure areas
• The identification and protection of vulnerable areas/facilities or essential services
• Lighting arrangements
• Alarm systems
• The provision and role of security personnel
• Contingency plans in the event of unauthorised boarding, bomb threat, suspicious packages
• Searching – for stowaways, drugs, explosive devices
• Notification to authorities and others
• Ship to shore communications
• Reporting procedures
• Reaction to incidents
• Training of personnel
• The provision of security equipment

10. Action to be taken

The Committee is requested to note the views of IAPH and ICS on the concept of developing generic ship, port, and port facility security plans and to endorse this approach.
EMBERS of IAPH will remember the survey that was carried out last year and in which members were asked to report details of incidents with fumigated cargoes. The response to the enquiry was massive and proved that problems with fumigated cargoes in containers are a worldwide concern. The results of our enquiry were submitted to IMO in support of a Canadian request to IMO to issue a circular in which member states are invited to bring the risks of fumigated cargoes, and hence the necessity to adhere to the requirements of the IMDG Code, to the attention of all involved in the handling of such cargoes. This circular has been issued as DSC/Circ.8 and is reproduced hereunder. Paragraph 2 refers to fumigated Cargo Transport Units, such as containers.

We would urge our members to enquire with their respective authorities whether the circular has been followed up and, if that is not the case, to request these authorities to do so as a matter of urgency. Alternatively, IAPH member ports may consider to bring the contents of this circular to the attention of the companies in their port that are known to handle fumigated containers.

---

**Problems with fumigated containers**

**INCIDENT REPORTS INVOLVING DANGEROUS CARGOES**

1. **The Sub-Committee on Dangerous Goods, Solid Cargoes and Containers (DSC), at its sixth session (16 to 20 July 2001), considered a number of reports on casualties and incidents involving dangerous cargoes submitted by Governments and international organizations concerned.**

2. **The Sub-Committee's attention was particularly drawn to:**

   1. **an incident (DSC 5/7/6) on board a ship concerning an explosion involving cargo declared on the Bill of Lading as "Iron Oxide Fines" comprising 40% of the shipment, the remaining 60% being Direct Reduced Iron (DRI) fines. The requirements of the BC Code with respect to the transport of the cargoes concerned should be duly observed and complied with.**

   2. **a recent inspection of Cargo Transport Units (CTUs) unloaded in ports (DSC 5/7) indicated that some were under fumigation, but not actually declared as such and in some cases, these aerated CTUs arrive with "Degas Certificates" stating that the fumigant has been removed and when opened, still have a high level of fumigant inside. The requirements of the IMDG Code with respect to the transport of CTUs under fumigation should be duly observed and complied with as improper procedures of fumigation and misdeclaration of CTUs under fumigation could have serious consequences, especially at final destinations where the container first gets opened.**

   3. **an incident (DSC 5/7/5) of a charcoal fire on board a ro-ro passenger ship. The lorry and its trailer were not reported to carry any dangerous goods. The crew found charcoal packed in paper bags and matches. MATCHES, SAFETY (UN1944) belong to class 4.1. CHARCOAL is sometimes dangerous, sometimes not. The provisions of the IMDG Code do not apply to a consignment of charcoal which passes the test for self-heating as reflected in the United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods, Manual of Tests and Criteria and is accompanied by an appropriate certificate from a laboratory accredited by the competent authority. No such a certificate was found and the consignment of charcoal was not reported to be dangerous goods. Self-ignition of the charcoal is believed to have caused the fire.**

3. **Member Governments are invited to bring the above information to the attention of shipowners, ship operators, shipmasters, shippers and all other parties concerned requesting that appropriate action be taken in accordance with the provisions of the relevant IMO instruments.**

---

**Launch of Tokyo News Service's Website**

Tokyo News Service, Ltd. has posted its website "S&TN OnLine" on the Internet. Provided on this homepage for easy reference are liner shipping schedules and related data extracted from Shipping and Trade News and Sea Sprite.

With use of the website initially being offered free of charge, we would like to invite you to sign up to access the latest updates on the homepage by first entering the information requested on the registration page.

**URL:** http://www.tokyonews.co.jp/marine

**Information posted:** 1. Sailing schedules a. Liner shipping schedules (export/import) to and from Japan b. Liner schedules (export) from Asian countries other than Japan c. Feeder schedules to and from Singapore 2. Ship details 3. Telephone and fax numbers of shipping firms and agents 4. Surcharges 5. News (in preparation)

---

By the courtesy of Ishikari Bay New Port Authority
IAPH Committee Report

Trade Facilitation Committee

Attendants:
• Emili Arbós
  Port of Barcelona Authority, Chairman
• Santiago Milà
  Port of Barcelona Authority, Secretary General
• Jean Denel
  Port Autonome du Havre
• Volkhard Erdelbrock
  DAKOSY, Hamburg
• Ian Flanders
  Port of London Authority
• Richard Biagioni
  Port of Marseille Authority
• Alan Long
  Maritime Cargo Processing plc

AGENDA & OPENING REMARKS

The Chairman welcomed everybody and thanked Mr Ian Flanders and the Port of London Authority for hosting the meeting as well as for the visit expected for the following day. This meeting was expected to be held in December but due to the illness of Mr Flanders and the difficulties of some members in attending, the final date was agreed for the 11th February. Mr Arbós, on behalf of the attendants, said that he was glad that Mr Flanders was recovered and back to work again.

INCOMING INVITATIONS

Regarding the Unique Consignment Identification for Customs Purposes, the Chairman explained that the Recommendation was approved in 2001 and that the work is currently focussed on the Guidelines that accompany the Recommendation and that are expected to be presented in April 2002.

The dossier given to the attendees included a copy of the Recommendation and the first draft of the Guidelines as well as the comments of the USA and Canada delegations. The Chairman explained that the guidelines detailed the scope and structure of the UCR, the benefits of implementing it, who should implement it and how the implementation should be undertaken. As the meeting could read, the submission of the Canada Customs provided an overview of the different scenarios for the UCR Process (straight shipment, split shipment and consolidated shipment).

As far as the TFC proposition regarding the UCR is concerned, Mr Ian Flanders had prepared a document which had been included in the documentation sent to the attendees. The Chairman informed that this proposition had been sent by e-mail to TFC members so that they could make amendments/proposals. As Mr A. Long was attending the WCO meeting where the guidelines had to be discussed, the Chairman informed that it had been sent to Mr Long to be presented at the WCO as the IAPH opinion regarding this subject.

Regarding the WCO Working Group on Customs Reform and Modernisation, the Chairman noted that this group had as main objective assisting member administrations to identify their key problems and designing and helping implement comprehensive action plans to overcome the identified problems.

The Chairman stated that two documents of this Working Group had been included in the papers: The first document reflected the findings of several reviews, consultations and the WCO’s experience in conducting the programme over the last 10 years. The second document described the future focus, content and operation of the WCO’s new programme and it was based on the first one.

The next following subject discussed at the meeting was the document sent by Mr Jean Denel, from Le Havre Port Authority, who attended the "UNCTAD expert meeting on electronic commerce and international transport services" representing IAPH and TFC.

The Chairman gave the floor to Mr Denel who explained that the document included in the documentation was a brief summary of the main conclusions and recommendations that arose at the mentioned meeting. There was a first set of recommendations addressed to national governments and enterprises, encouraging the governments to simplify administrative regulations and practices and to improve connectivity and access to the Internet.

Moreover, it included recommendations addressed to the international community that highlighted the importance of co-operating and co-ordinating their activities and strengthening their legislative, technical and financial assistance to developing countries.

Finally, the document included Recommendations addressed to UNCTAD from which was highlighted that UNCTAD should prepare guidelines for the establishment of model port community systems and logistics platforms in developing countries.

At this point, the Chairman commented on the document prepared by the UNCTAD and included in the dossier "Electronic Commerce and international transport services". As the Chairman informed, this document reviewed the impact of e-commerce on the organisation of transport and the current paper-based legal framework of international trade transactions.

In addition, the document underlined a number of legal issues and uncertainties arising from the application of the existing laws and transport conventions in an electronic environment, including the challenge of replacing the negotiable bill of lading by an electronic alternative. The UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce, dealing with carriage of goods (articles 16 and 17) set out general principles for transfer of rights and obligations through the use of electronic messages. While part of this Model law cover-
ing e-commerce in general had been widely adopted by the states, articles 16 and 17 had received very limited support.

In addition, attempts to facilitate the development of electronic transport documents were also reviewed in the document, especially the Bolero and GlobalTrade projects. It was suggested that while legislative solutions were needed, experience had shown that it could be many years before a complete legal framework was in place.

In the meantime, contractual systems, supported by voluntary rules binding on the parties were being developed to carry out the functions of the traditional bills of lading. Such systems made use of registry systems, as in the case of Bolero, to transfer the rights and entitle the goods among the members; or alternatively the system of sea waybills was adapted to achieve such functions, as in the case of GlobalTrade. The wider use of non-negotiable sea waybills would facilitate the transition to electronic commerce.

The next point discussed at the meeting was the World Bank GFP Distance Learning Initiative.

In order to keep the Committee informed of the latest developments of this project, the Chairman informed that Marc J ulhel had sent more documents. The first document sent was an update of the project where, after a short introduction, the pilots were explained and it was announced that once the first pilot was completed in Macedonia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, the World Bank expected enough interest in other countries to take the information and use the learning model to launch their own local Distance Learning Initiative program.

Then, the Chairman commented that the attendants could find in the documentation the IMO document “Electronic Data Interchange of clearance of ships. IMO compendium on facilitation and electronic business”. In the document, IMO affirmed that many of the difficulties associated with information flows could be eliminated with the use of the standardised documentation system which the FAL Convention and IMO provide. Finally, the Chairman stressed the fact that the work undertaken by UN/CEFACT was underlined in the document, especially the importance that the EDIFACT standard, as an international standard, had at replacing paper documents by EDI messages.

With this Compendium, the IMO presented a Recommendation on the layout of several forms in electronic format: general declaration, Cargo declaration, ship’s stores declaration, crew list, passenger list and Dangerous goods notification and manifest.

The next subject of discussion was the TFC involvement at the SMGD (User Group for shipping lines and Container Terminals), proposed by the representative of the Port of Marseilles. The Chairman highlighted that Mr Kondoh, from the Tokyo Secretariat, showed his interest in remaining informed about the initiatives of this organisation.

At this point, Mr Arbós gave the floor to Mr Biagiioni, the Port of Marseilles representative at the meeting.

Mr Biagiioni explained that the SMGD is working on the development and promotion of EDIFACT messages for the maritime industry. Participants usually create workgroups for solving particular questions regarding EDI messages and they work closely with UN/EDIFACT board and ITIGG (International Transport Implementation Guidelines Group) to harmonise implementation.

The members attending decided to not be active members of the SMGD for the following reasons:

- the “core-business” was not port authorities
- it might be really difficult, regarding the members’ schedules, to attend every meeting
- the minutes of the meeting were available on SMGD web site

Finally, it was decided that Richard Biagiioni would be in charge of regularly following the Minutes and reporting any important information to all TFC members as well as making a short report of these minutes at the TFC meetings.

**PARTICIPATION IN OTHER INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEES**

The Chairman noted that the attendants could find in the documentation the mail sent by the Tokyo Secretariat expressing its interest in being represented at the UNCTAD meeting on electronic commerce and international transport services, which was held from the 26th to the 28th September.

Mr Jean Denel, from Le Havre Port, was the person who represented IAPH and TFC. As he reported, the emphasis of the meeting was put on the need to:

- get a strong international legal involvement in the development of laws and practices to enhance e-commerce, especially in world wide trade and international port services;
- work on electronic alternatives to negotiate transport documents;
- encourage shippers to use alternatives to the Bill of Lading, for instance the Sea-Waybill;
- higher resort to web-tracking services;
- and recommend open standard for community information systems together with best practices and operations facilitation.

The Chairman referred then to the mail sent by the Tokyo Secretariat, and included in the dossier, regarding the important WCO meeting on “protection of society”, where the Tokyo Secretariat expressed the IAPH interest to be represented there, especially after the events of 11 September.

Due to the fact that neither the TFC Chairman nor the TFC Secretary General were able to attend, an invitation letter was sent to TFC members. The Chairman explained that several answers accepting the invitation were received and that the first answer was from Mr Jangana, from Gambia Ports Authority, who was the person attending. A report of this meeting was expected and the Chairman informed that as soon as Mr Jangana sent it to the TFC Secretariat, it would be sent to TFC members by e-mail.

The next subject discussed was the meeting that he had with Mr Braems, from the IAPH Committee on Legal Protection, on 1st February.

Mr A. Long was attending the WCO Permanent Technical Committee meetings, the Chairman emphasised that it could be a good input if Mr Raven provided the committee with reports and other useful information regarding WCO meetings.

The Chairman stressed that it was a generous offer as TFC members could not attend as many WCO meetings as they wished. As they were already attending regularly to UN/CEFACT meetings, and Mr A. Long was attending the WCO meetings, offered to attend WCO meetings and supply relevant reports and other information to IAPH.

The Chairman stressed that it was a generous offer as TFC members could not attend as many WCO meetings as they wished. As they were already attending regularly to UN/CEFACT meetings, and Mr A. Long was attending the WCO meetings, offered to attend WCO meetings and supply relevant reports and other information to IAPH.

After a short discussion, the meeting agreed that the attendance of Mr Raven should be on behalf of TFC and coordinated with the TFC Chairman and the other TFC members attending at the WCO meetings.

Afterwards, Mr Milà informed about the meeting that he had with Mr Braems, from the IAPH Committee on Legal Protection, on 1st February.

Mr Milà reported that Mr J Jacques Braems, from the port of Dunkirk and member of the Committee on Legal Protection, had asked him for a meeting in order to discuss the common items of both committees.

At the meeting, Mr Braems suggested that there were several subjects regarding electronic signature and other sub-
projects related to e-commerce, on which the Committee on Legal protection was working that would require the opinion of the experts of the Trade Facilitation Committee.

As the TFC is focused on the technical area, Mr Milà reported his stress that the TFC expert’s opinion should be complementary to the legal point of view of the Committee on legal protection.

The fields of co-operation would be:
- electronic signature
- codes of conduct
- best practices

Finally, it was agreed to send an affirmative response regarding this possibility of collaboration and wait for the answer of the Committee on Legal Protection as Mr Braem would propose it for approval at the next meeting of the Committee in April.

**NEW ELECTRONIC COMMERCE DEVELOPMENTS.**

Regarding the progress of the ebXML, Mr Milà reviewed the steps taken until then: active participation of a TFC-Port of Barcelona representative at all the ebXML meetings held; joint meeting with the EDIFACT Working Group Chairman, Pierre Georget (January 2002); EDIFACT working Group meeting in Barcelona in March 2002; agreement of co-operation with the Committee on communication and networking (from November 1999); space at the web-site for TFC work on standards (from January 2002) and agreement of co-operation with the Committee on legal protection (February 2002).

As next steps to be undertaken by the Committee in this arena, Mr Milà explained that, since the field of maritime standards was so wide and since the IAPH is a ports association, he believed that the TFC work should be focused on the port standards as it is in the specific interest of ports.

Moreover, Mr Milà reported on the new UNCEFACT structure and commented that it was a good opportunity to be more active on the standards work of this organisation.

Finally, Mr Milà referred to the support of IAPH to the IT in ports declared in a speech of Mr Satoshi Inoue, IAPH Secretary General. The meeting concluded that, as a consequence of this support, the TFC Secretariat should ask the IAPH Secretariat for funds for undertaking the TFC projects on standardisation.

The following item of the agenda was an update of one of the most important projects in e-business that had been followed up by TFC since its beginning: bolero.net. Mr Steve Kirby, from Bolero.net, had been invited to the meeting to give a short update of the latest developments undertaken by Bolero. The presentation is attached and the following notes summarise the additional comments:

Bolero aims to align message development with existing standards where appropriate (with SWIFT, ISO, UN recommendations etc.) and to avoid “re-inventing the wheel”. While original work related to the Bill of Lading, other documents are now involved and are being targeted (shipping instructions etc.). More obscure documents are handled too, such as Certificates of origin, accompanying administration documents etc., with work being based on the paper versions. New trades are gradually being taken on, such as the Coffee and Sugar Trades.

Increasingly there is more similarity with EDIFACT as a more generic structure is introduced. Standards are developed independently of syntax, based on information modelling and there are 4 releases per year.

If there is a potential new customer in a sector where Bolero has standards, a gap analysis will be conducted to determine if changes are needed. If this is the case this is achieved by use of a standards development plan. Requirements are analysed and agreed and any proposals for change are sent to the Panel of Experts. New standards can be built but the old ones can still be used. 78 documents are now defined with moves now outside the Banks and Logistics arena.

There are two phases to the development process:
- Phase 1: CMP (Core Messaging Platform) can be made ebXML compliant.
- Phase 2: deals with the core activities, the Core Components and Business Process, moving from UML to XML. Bolero are actively involved and maintain a watching brief.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Finally, the programme of the next United Nations Forum on Trade Facilitation, expected to be held in May 2002, had been included in the dossier. In the present edition the title of the forum was “Trade facilitation: the importance of simpler procedures for world trade”. Mr Milà informed that he was planning to attend and would make a report.

Those present concluded that there was no other business to be discussed.

**ARRANGEMENTS FOR NEXT MEETING**

Following the proposal of coinciding TFC meetings with some international conference regarding logistics and e-business, the Chairman proposed that the following TFC meeting be held during the next international logistics exhibition that was taking place in Barcelona in June 2002. Several seminars about logistics, ports and e-business had taken place at the latest edition and were expected for this year’s edition also.

The attendants agreed with this proposal and decided to hold the next TFC meeting on 7th June, with a visit to the exhibition the previous day, 6th June.

---

**ATTENTION!**

Your Bank Transfer to IAPH Head Office

Due to a merger, the bank and its branch name for IAPH’s bank account has been changed since April 1. Former account will be accepted during transition period until end June. Please pay your kind attention when you make a remittance to IAPH Head Office. The new details appear below. Thank you!

Mizuho Bank, Ltd.
Marunouchi-Nakadori Branch, Tokyo Japan
Bank Swift Code: MHBKJPJT
Account No.: 883953 (unchanged)
The United Nations Working Group for the Development of E-Commerce Meets in Barcelona

The United Nations EDIFACT Working Group met in Barcelona from the 18th to the 22nd March, hosted by the IAPH Trade Facilitation Committee (TFC) and the Port of Barcelona. This working group is part of a wider organization, UNCEFACT, from which IAPH, through its Trade Facilitation Committee, holds the Vice-presidency.

UNCEFACT (United Nations Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business) has as its main objective to improve the ability of business, trade and administrative organizations, from developed, developing and transitional economies, to exchange products and relevant services effectively - and so contribute to the growth of global commerce. Moreover, it is focussed on the worldwide facilitation of international transactions, through the simplification and harmonization of procedures and information flows. The results of UN/CEFACT’s work are publicly available for the use and benefit of all Governments and organizations.

The EDIFACT Working Group, formed by more than a hundred first level specialists in the fields of banking, software, transport, users and institutions, is the organization in charge of developing and maintaining the standard UN/EDIFACT, which has become the universal language of electronic data interchange used worldwide.

In the meeting that took place in Barcelona, this United Nations organization advanced in the development of a new version of this language which is to be used in the Internet, that is to say, not just from one computer to another but through a system which is supported on a 100% basis by the net.

This will make it easier to use, will place it within the reach of small and medium companies worldwide and will facilitate the introduction of international e-commerce into developing countries. This fact, together with a generalised use of new technologies around the whole planet – will support a revolution in the current operation of international commerce which will allow the United Nations to contribute positive solutions to globalisation efforts.

In this sense, Mr Santiago Milà, UNCEFACT Chairman and IAPH TFC Secretary General, has underlined the integrating spirit that follows this project, especially in view of helping developing or transition economies. This process will receive a new impulse at the meeting which will take place in Barcelona next May, hosted again by the IAPH Trade Facilitation Committee and the Port of Barcelona.

Not yet? Write immediately to “newsletter@iaphtworldports.org” for your Subscription

IAPH Online Newsletter Launched

On April 4, the first IAPH Online Newsletter was sent out to members who gave e-mail addresses to the Head Office.

We appreciate very much the quick responses from enthusiastic subscribers that have been introduced in subsequent Online Newsletters.

In the process of dispatch, we found that most of the e-mail addresses which we, the Head Office, have, are for general information, and it is rather difficult for us to send e-mail messages like the Online Newsletter to individuals directly. For this purpose, please inform us of your individual e-mail address if you need direct information via e-mail from the Head Office. Needless to say, we will be responsible for protecting members’ personal information.

Looking forward to receiving your comments and/or suggestions

Visitors

On March 19, a delegation from Indonesia - Ir. Ari Purnomo, Head of Sub-Division of Dredging and Reclamation, Directorate of Port and Dredging, Directorate General of Sea Communication, Ministry of Communication; Ir. Wijayanto, head of Sub-Division of Port Facilities and Equipment, Directorate of Port and Dredging, Directorate General of Sea Communications, Ministry of Communication; and Ms. Wisno Wihandani, Technical Survey Section, Directorate of Port and Dredging, Directorate General of Sea Communication, Ministry of Communication - visited the Head Office during their OCDI training course, and exchanged views on recent trade affairs in the region with Dr. Satoshi Inoue, Secretary General; Rinnosuke Kondoh, Deputy Secretary General; and Tatsuki Hioka, Under Secretary.
Membership Notes

New Members

Regular Member

Klaipeda State Seaport Authority-KSSA (Lithuania)[Regular]
Address: Kssa, J.Janonio 24, LT5800, LITHUANIA
Tel: 370-6-499-600
Fax: 370-6-499-777
E-mail: stury@port.lt;marketing@port.lt
Website: http://www.port.lt
Mailing Addressee: Mr. Sigitas Dobilinskas, Director General

Associate Member

International Infrastructure Management Pty Limited
(Australia)[Class-D]
Address: Level 14, Central Plaza One, 345 Queen Street, Brisbane, Queensland 4000, AUSTRALIA
Tel: 61-7-3220-1111
Fax: 61-7-3220-1211
E-mail: graham.mulligan@iiml.com.au
Website: http://www.iiml.com.au
Mailing Addressee: Mr. Graham D. Mulligan, Managing Director

Changes (Changes involved are underlined)

Port of San Diego (U.S.A.) [Regular]
Executive Director: Mr. Bruce B. Hollingsworth

Korea Port & Harbour Association-KPHA (Korea) [Class B]
President: Mr. Jae-Bok, Lee

Nassau Port Department (Bahamas) [Regular]
Tel: 242-326-5677

Pusan East Container Terminal Company Limited (Korea) [Class-D]
Address: cnkim@pect.co.kr / hylee@pect.co.kr
E-mail: cnotrade@pect.co.kr
Website: http://www.pect.co.kr
Mailing Addressee: Mr. G. D. Mulligan, Managing Director

Indonesia Port Corporation I (Indonesia) [Regular]
Tel: 62-61-6610220/6610270/6611330/6611630
Fax: 62-61-6610906
E-mail: Tevial@pmu.indo.net
Commercial Director: Mr. I Wayan Bajera
Personnel & General Affairs Director: Mr. Eko W ardaya
Corporate Secretary: Mr. Armen Lubis

Port of Palm Beach District (U.S.A.) [Regular]
Street Address: Port of Palm Beach District, 1 East 11th Street, Riviera Beach, FL 33404 USA
Postal Address: remains unchanged

Ports and Shipping Organization (Iran) [Regular]
Tel: 98-21-8896369 (for Alternate Director)
Fax: 98-21-8896370 (for Alternate Director)

Port of Göteborg AB (Sweden) [Regular]
Acting President: Mr. Eric Nisson

Transport Events Management Sdn Bhd. (Malaysia) [Class-D]
Address: 53-3, 2nd Floor, In, US 9/55, 47620 Subang Jaya, Selangor Darul Ehsan, MALAYSIA
Tel: 60-3-8023-5352
Fax: 60-3-8023-3963

Port & Urban Projects Bureau, City of Kobe (Japan) [Regular]
(Formerly City of Kobe)
Director General: Mr. Yoshihiro Koshiba

City of Osaka (Japan) [Regular]
Director General: Mr. Hideo Igarashi

Port of Kita-kushu (Japan) [Regular]
Director General: Mr. Norihiko Yamagata

Port of Hakata (Japan) [Regular]
Director General: Mr. Yuzaburo Sakai

Yokkaichi Port Authority (Japan) [Regular]
Executive Vice President: Mr. Kiyoshi Sato

Penta-Ocean Construction Co., Ltd. (Japan) [Class A-2-1]
Chairman, Representative Director and President: Mr. Hideaki Kato

Dublin Port Company (Ireland) [Regular]
WBSITE: http://www.dublinport.ie
E-mail: econnellan@dublinport.ie

World Trade Institute (U.S.A.) [Class D]
Address: 551 Fifth Avenue, 8th Floor, New York, NY 10176, USA
Tel: 1-212-346-1925
Mailing Addressee: Ms. Donna Sharp, Executive Director

Tomakosai Port Authority (Japan) [Regular]
Executive Vice President: Mr. Susumu Naruse

Contributors to the Special Port Development Technical Assistance Fund 2001 - 2003

- No Fresh Donations in this month -

(in order of receipt)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>US$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Autonome d'Abidjan</td>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Brisbane Corporation</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives Ports Authority</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam Municipal Port Management</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Ports Corporation</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Susumu Maeda</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Department, Hong Kong</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver Port Authority</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johor Port Authority</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal Port Authority</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana Ports and Harbours Authority</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam Port Authority</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagoya Port Authority</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Houston Authority</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sea Ports Corporation</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kobe</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 13,080
The Impact of Environmental Issues on Port Management and Development

2nd International Conference on the Straits of Malacca
October 2001

Graham D. Mulligan
Managing Director, International infrastructure Management Pty Limited
(Former CEO, Port of Brisbane Corporation)

&

Brad P. Kitchen
Manager Environment, Port of Brisbane Corporation

Abstract

This paper describes the increasing importance of environmental issues in port management and development. It identifies the key issues to be taken into account if ports are to adapt to the global trends of increasing environmental awareness, and greater expectations of environmentally responsible development and operation.

Australia’s third largest container port, the Port of Brisbane, is located immediately adjacent to a marine park. As the Port Manager, the Port of Brisbane Corporation is only too aware of the potential for environmental impacts. However, operating in this environment also presents opportunities by way of demonstrating effective and responsible environmental management practices.

This paper provides examples of the Port of Brisbane Corporation’s environmental leadership and progress towards best-practice environmental management through discussion of five key elements that make up the Port of Brisbane model: Environmental Policy, Environmental Management Systems, Community Consultation and Liaison, Strategic Planning and Monitoring and Reporting. The cultural change brought about within the organisation to adopt these principles is perhaps the most critical outcome.

In the future, a successful and sustainable port will include environmental issues as a key component of all business planning and operations.

Introduction

Environmental issues are achieving greater prominence worldwide in all aspects of business operation. Developments in scientific understanding, community and stakeholder expectations and the need to demonstrate sustainability, require port managers to adopt a new direction in port management. It is likely that some port developments may not be sustainable if the above issues have not been adequately considered. A sustainable port needs not only address the timely transfer of inward and outward cargos, and the development of infrastructure to support these movements, but will be required to ensure such activities are undertaken with due consideration to the surrounding natural environment.

This paper examines some specific examples of how the Port of Brisbane Corporation is operating the most environmentally responsible port in Australia, and achieving substantial progress towards world’s best-practice in environmental management through integrated management of the port and the surrounding environment.

The Port of Brisbane operates under an Integrated Management System, which has been third party accredited to ISO14001 standard. Achieving and maintaining such a standard of environmental performance requires time, effort and resources, but when considered as part of the overall business management, it makes good sense. The concept of triple-bottom line reporting over the past few years supports the importance of the environment in the business context. The Port of Brisbane model identifies five key elements in achieving best practice environmental management in its operations. These include:

- Environmental policy
- Environmental Management System
- Community consultation and liaison
- Strategic planning
- Monitoring and reporting.

Through adequately and continually incorporating the above elements into our business operations, the Port of Brisbane sees itself as well positioned to provide port services into the future.

Background

The Port of Brisbane is Australia’s second largest Capital City Port by volume and its third largest container port. Just 10-12 sailing days from major Asian ports, with port facilities extending nearly 16 kilometres upstream. The hub of the port’s activity is the Fisherman Islands complex, located at the mouth of the Brisbane River. Major navigation channels extend for 90 km through Moreton Bay, which is a Marine Park and has areas designated as being of international conservation significance. Substantial areas of habitat used by rare and threatened species occur immediately adjacent to the Fisherman Islands complex. In the summer months, Moreton Bay is used by up to 50,000 shorebirds that migrate to
Australia from the northern hemisphere (e.g. Japan, Siberia, China, Alaska). Moreton Bay is one the major feeding areas for shorebirds on the east coast of Australia, and in recognition of its importance to migratory shorebirds, substantial areas of the bay are listed as Ramsar sites.

The Corporation is planning to reclaim up to 270 hectares of land over the next 25 years, by extending the existing reclamation area to provide additional wharfege and associated “back-up” lands. Port expansion is necessary to cater for the strong growth of the Queensland economy and associated import/export requirements. The expansion will also avoid the need to deposit silts resulting from maintenance dredging in the Marine Park and has been designed, in consultation with Government Agencies, to have minimal environmental impacts and not affect the conservation values of Moreton Bay.

The Port of Brisbane Corporation incorporates environmental issues as a key component of its business operation. This approach to doing business is necessary as the port is located adjacent to an environmentally significant area (i.e. a Marine Park). A high emphasis must be placed on effective environmental management, in order to manage and cater for the increasing concentrations of shipping traffic and port related activities.

The Port of Brisbane Corporation owns and operates its own dredging fleet, which dredges not only the shipping channel in Brisbane but also the channels for 8 other ports along the coastline of the State of Queensland. Five of these ports are adjacent to or within the Great Barrier Marine Park; a World Heritage listed area.

Environmental Issues in Port Development and Operation

Ports need to take into account environmental issues to a far greater extent than they have occurred in the past. Successful ports are increasingly those that are able to adapt their operations to reflect the changes in community, regulatory and business attitudes on environmental issues. In addition, environmental legislation relating to port operation and management is only likely to increase, as ports are required to become more accountable.

The increasing importance of environmental issues in port development and management will affect the viability of many ports and the potential for many to expand their operations may be severely constrained. Ports that do not plan and manage environmental issues will be unlikely to survive in the future global marketplace.

Community values and expectations, from an environmental perspective, have changed markedly over the past decades and a high level of importance is now placed upon protecting our environment. Some of the key issues that have confronted the Port of Brisbane over the past few years have included:

- Concerns Regarding the Impacts of Dredging
  Following the introduction of containerisation in the 1980’s, and the consequent increase in ship sizes, many ports without naturally deep harbours have had to include dredging operations to remain viable. The increased need for dredging and associated dredged material placement may have adverse environmental impacts unless carefully planned and managed. Additional dredging typically results in a need for increased at-sea disposal of dredged material, which is opposed by some fisheries/conservation groups.

- Changes in Community Values and Regulatory Requirements
  The community and Government regulators now expect ports to operate in a manner that does not result in significant adverse effects to the environment. Many historically well-accepted port operations are no longer considered appropriate. The ongoing campaign by conservation groups with respect to the restricting use of tributyltin (TBT), and the increasing publicity of ship groundings and oil spills, indicate the growing importance of environmental issues in port management.

- Increased Shipping Traffic
  The potential to transport organisms in ballast water and via hull fouling is now well recognised. Community and conservation groups are well aware of potential impacts associated with marine pests and the issue is invariably raised during discussions of increases in shipping movements. Management measures, such as deballasting in designated areas, have the potential to have a substantial impact on port operational procedures and cost efficiencies.
A Trend Towards Demonstrated Environmental Ethics in Business Dealings

Businesses are choosing to trade with companies that have a high level of environmental responsibility and are able to demonstrate this. A port, which has a poor reputation for environmental management (eg. degraded water quality, routine minor oil spills), is unlikely to be considered an attractive trading partner for many of the larger companies that are attempting to portray a high level of environmental responsibility. Globalisation is leading to increasing competitiveness and the level of environmental responsibility shown by a port is likely to play an important role in determining long term trading partners.

Port of Brisbane Corporation has recognised and acknowledged these as possible constraints to business, if not effectively management.

Port of Brisbane Model

The five key elements of an environmentally responsible port, and those that have been adopted at the Port of Brisbane, include:

1. Environmental Policy
2. Environmental Management Systems
3. Community Consultation and Liaison
4. Long Term Strategic Planning
5. Effective Monitoring and Reporting

Whilst these form the basis, or mechanics of environmental stewardship, effective environmental management often requires a cultural shift in both management and the workforce to achieve an acceptable outcome. The cultural shift by management requires positive leadership and promotion of concepts through the allocation of appropriate and adequate resources. The cultural shift of the workforce may require a variety of management strategies in order to achieve the desired outcome. Each of the five elements, plus the cultural shift are discussed in the following sections.

1. Environmental Policy

A clear and well-defined Environmental Policy is a key ingredient in effective environmental management. The Environmental Policy must have commitment from the highest level of management, and reflect community values and expectations. Additionally, it needs to be regularly updated to account for changes in technology and community attitudes.

The Port of Brisbane Corporation Policy commits the Corporation to “a high standard of environmental performance...” (i.e. above legislative requirements). The policy is signed off by the CEO, endorsed by the Board of Directors, and is reviewed and updated as necessary each year to account for business or community shift operations or expectations.

2. Environmental Management Systems

An effective Environmental Management System is crucial to effective port environmental management, as it provides the basis to manage all impacting processes. All aspects of port operation are subject to an environmental risk assessment and management actions are identified to address those of highest risk. Specific schedules, budgets and responsibilities are defined for each action. Activities of lesser risk are prioritised taking into account regulatory and budgetary issues.

The Environmental Management System cannot be a generic system simply transferred from another port or business. The system must be specific to the issues faced by the individual port and that port’s operational characteristics. Also, it cannot stand alone in isolation to the other management processes of the Corporation and the operations of the port in general. The system must fully integrate with all other systems, which ensure the operational effectiveness of the port. A fully integrated management system that incorporates environmental management eventually leads to each staff member becoming his or her own self environmental manager. When your business achieves this level of acceptance amongst its staff, then and only then, do you have a sustainable environmental management system (the cultural shift).

In order for the Environmental Management System to have credibility in terms of Government regulators and community perceptions, it needs to be auditable by a third party. The audit of the system needs to be benchmarked against national and international standards. The days when ports could say, “it’s OK, we are handling our environmental issues in an acceptable manner,” are being overtaken by a requirement for the level of environmental management to be transparent.

The Port of Brisbane Corporation has placed a high level of emphasis on its Environmental Management System. The Corporation now has an Environmental Management System that covers all aspects of port operation from planning new developments to dredging to the use of any new chemical agent at the port. The system is independently audited on a six-monthly basis and in June 2000 was accredited to ISO14001 level, the international standard for environmental management. The Port of Brisbane was the first port in Australia / New Zealand to achieve this level, a feat the Corporation is justifiably proud of.

Ports that do not have an Environmental Management System will face considerable difficulties in both effectively managing the environmental impacts associated with their operation, and more importantly, being able to demonstrate appropriate environmental management to the community, government regulators, and potential business partners.

The presence of a benchmarked, independently audited Environmental Management System provides a level of confidence for regulators, the community and business partners. It provides a basis to ensure that any new development activities will be managed in the agreed manner and that there is a system of “checks and balances” for regulators to be able to verify that appropriate management practices have indeed been implemented.

3. Community Consultation and Liaison

The increasing prominence of environmental issues over the past few decades has primarily been driven at a community level. Many changes in government regulations relating to port operations have arisen as a result of concern initially expressed by community/conservation groups.

Community consultation and liaison, therefore, forms a key component of
environmental management. Individual ports must develop local partnerships with community groups.

For effective consultation on any port issue, but particularly in regard to environmental issues, the public must be informed of the economic and social importance of ports to the general community. Ports need to promote the valuable role they play in terms of providing employment, the links they play in a region’s transportation network, and how the prosperity of the port is linked to the prosperity of the community. Ports should communicate how environmental impacts associated with port operation are being effectively managed including schedules for assessing, prioritising and addressing impacts.

Additionally, ports need to recognise that community values and perceptions change over time and in response to the level of information available. A proactive and successful port will identify issues of community concern in their early stages prior to these becoming causes for public concern, which may lead to the introduction of stricter regulatory controls. In this regard, ports need to place far greater emphasis on explaining and promoting their effective environmental management.

The Port of Brisbane places considerable emphasis on community consultation. Port tours (ranging from community to school groups) are run regularly, explaining the benefits of port operation and the emphasis on environmental management. Other activities include a Green Day (an open day for environmentalists) to enable informal discussions between conservation groups and port environmental staff. Many of these groups rarely have the opportunity to see the port and are sceptical of the level of commitment to environmental management. The Green Day seeks to overcome that scepticism. The Corporation also makes extensive use of printed material, a dedicated Internet site, media articles, media releases, environmental performance reports, etc., to promote port activities and inform the community of the operations underway.

The Corporation has a Consultative Group that includes a broad range of community groups and other stakeholders formed several years ago in association with the Land Use Strategy (see below). A Consultative Group specifically for environmental issues is currently being convened. The Group will provide a forum for discussion of all port operations that may have an environmental effect, and enable both the community and the Corporation to gain a better appreciation of key issues of concern and options to minimise potential impacts.

4. Land Use Strategy

A Land Use Strategy is essential for successful long-term environmental management. Land Use Strategies clearly identify plans for areas of operation, infrastructure and conservation value. They provide the community with an indication of where and what future port activities will be undertaken, and can help avoid potential concerns with respect to changes in port operation or expansion. In this regard, it is vital that the community is consulted in developing land use strategies, as this is a key opportunity for ports to indicate and justify their long-term plans for growth and to explain this to the community.

The Port of Brisbane Land Use Strategy indicates those areas of high ecological value, areas for future infrastructure requirements and areas where further studies are required to determine the conservation status of specific lands. The strategy was developed in consultation with a broad range of stakeholders that now have an appreciation of the basis for the long-term direction of the port.

The Corporation places particular emphasis on ensuring its’ operations do not adversely affect the flora/fauna values of areas designated as having conservation significance. All development on port lands is required to be consistent with the Corporation’s Development Guidelines.

These Guidelines specify the need for environmental risk assessments for new developments and require both Construction and Operational Environmental Management Plans are submitted with any development application. These must include site-specific details of environmental management activities (eg. for stormwater and air quality) proposed to mitigate potential adverse effects to nearby areas of conservation value. All Environmental Management Plans must specify responsibilities for task implementation, monitoring and reporting.

5. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

Perhaps the greatest impact of environmental issues on port operation and management relates to environmental monitoring and reporting. Historically, ports have placed a relatively low emphasis on such activities. However, with the increasing awareness of environmental issues, this aspect has assumed far greater prominence. Whilst there are costs associated with undertaking monitoring and reporting activities, these are relatively minor compared to the potential benefits.

Environmental monitoring is essential to demonstrating the effects and impacts of port operation. Environmental monitoring provides a basis for the port to:

• quickly identify potential impacting processes to enable environmental management
measures to be put in place prior to such impacts becoming significant; and/or
- respond to reports of environmental harm resulting from port operation with scientifically valid and verifiable data.

Ports are commonly considered “easy targets” for accusations of environmental damage, which is not surprising considering their scale and conspicuousness. A port that does not have a detailed knowledge of the impacts of its operations on the adjacent environment is extremely vulnerable to unfounded claims.

There is an old but highly relevant saying that “you can’t manage what you don’t measure.” Environmental monitoring needs to involve indicators (or measures) that are well defined, quantifiable, and relate to both regulatory requirements and community concerns. The results of monitoring these indicators should be routinely reported to the public. There are benefits in ensuring that such reporting is transparent, and involves both the bad with the good results.

Environmental monitoring need not be complex or expensive, if appropriately planned and focussed on the key issues.

The Port of Brisbane has over the past two years placed a high emphasis on environmental monitoring and reporting. The Port now holds detailed information on the environmental status and impacting processes on areas within and adjacent to the port. Researchers and Government regulators now come to the port to seek environmental information. This situation clearly elevates the status and perceptions of the port, as well as providing the port with the capacity to quickly identify any potential impacts before they become an issue.

The Port of Brisbane routinely reports the results of its environmental monitoring. Reporting not only includes ecological resource health, water and soil quality but also staff hours spent on community liaison, public presentations and education. Reporting even includes data on efforts to introduce recycling and the proportion of recyclable material found in bins located at various field- and office-based situations. These measures demonstrate how effectively the port is progressing towards environmental sustainability and best-practice management.

The Port of Brisbane’s initial Environmental Performance Report was published in 1999. This was the first such report by an Australian port, and committed the port to specific actions in terms of environmental management. The report provided a direction for the future and informed the community of where the Corporation was heading from an environmental perspective.

The second Environmental Performance Report, published in 2000, quantified a broad variety of operational, management, and environmental condition indicators. Results of environmental audits on a broad range of impacting processes, which are undertaken by Corporation staff on at least a six-monthly basis, were documented and discussed. The Report provided a basis for the community to assess how the port was operating, the potential impacts of its operation, and enabled the community, via an enclosed feedback card, the opportunity for comment on the management achievements.

The third Environmental Performance report due for release in November 2001 will extend on the themes set in the previous year. With data from several monitoring periods now available, the Port is able to comment on trends and make valid argument on the condition of the port environment.

The Cultural Shift

The five key elements used on the Port of Brisbane model form the mechanics to better environmental management. The physical change, or success of these mechanisms can only be realised if they are embraced by the organisation as a whole. This can be referred to as the cultural shift.

Cultural shift requires the entire staff, including contractors, to consider the environmental implications of all activities. Whilst it must be driven by senior management, it must have input by the workforce. Without input, there will be no ownership. Without ownership, the environmental management becomes “tokenistic,” which limits the potential for sustainable integration and management of environmental issues.

To ensure the effectiveness of the Port of Brisbane model, environmental considerations form part of every day operations. From the purchasing of goods, to the work practices used in our reclamation operations, every employee has as a condition of employment, a position description that defines their individual and collective roles and responsibilities in managing the environment. Individual performance reviews and key performance indicators which include environmental targets are set and monitored to promote environmental ownership within the workplace. The cultural shift cements the five elements of the Port of Brisbane model, and ensures continual improvement through developing a sustainable operation.

Conclusions

This paper has discussed some of the key issues associated with operating an environmentally responsible port, and why the increasing focus on environmental issues associated with port operations will continue in the future.

The Corporation’s commitment to environmental management has resulted in increased internal costs for the Corporation, but in the long term, the emphasis on impact prevention will be far more cost effective than an approach that relies upon impact remediation and restoration activities. The Corporation promotes itself as a “green port,” in the belief that it will form a key factor in determining future trade partners and business deals.

Environmental Management Systems, long term environmental planning and monitoring have become essential components of a successful port. Ports that undertake and report on such activities are likely to be sustainable and able to effectively accommodate and promote the increase in trade associated with globalisation.
WCO/ICC Joint Conference: Impact of IT on Customs

The WCO organized in cooperation with the ICC an IT Symposium, which was held on February 11 and 12, 2002 at the WCO headquarters in Brussels. Under the headline “Information Technology and Customs: The new economic reality” the WCO brought together over 350 Customs administrators, business leaders, government representatives and industry experts to facilitate collaboration in addressing the impacts of sophisticated information technologies on trade and Customs procedures. The event was regarded from both business and Customs representatives as a big success and the WCO will soon start the preparations for a follow-up Symposium within the next two years.

The discussions provided an opportunity for industry and customs experts to compare the WCO vision of a modern IT-based customs service with trends and best practices in global trade. The symposium also provided a platform to discuss possibilities for cross-sector cooperation to address the digital divide, which presents a major technical barrier to economic and social development.

Speakers from business and the public sector focused in their presentations on:

- IT-trends in Customs and business domains for cargo and passenger clearance
- Digital divide and capacity building
- Global logistics and supply chain solutions
- Legal questions related to IT and e-commerce.

Speakers said the complexity of today’s business operations made it even more essential that customs authorities harmonize their procedures internationally to take account of supply chain complexities.

Describing the Internet as “an enabling infrastructure, not a solution,” Sergio Giacoletto, Executive Vice President of Oracle EMEA, said Customs could make use of e-business technologies to increase efficiency and improve performance provided procedures were overhauled.

The Internet was no silver bullet that would alone deliver the reforms necessary to fully modernize customs administrations and business operations around the world, Mr Giacoletto said. Processes must first be improved and simplified in order to leverage technology.

Speakers underlined the growing importance for business of close collaboration with Customs as business itself becomes increasingly global. They pointed out that businesses traditionally focused on domestic markets were now expanding operations internationally - making the world both smaller and more complex. Businesses that previously had no need to understand and comply with global customs procedures now find it critical to do so.

Mr Giacoletto told the conference: “Without updated and accurate customs information, business shipments are unpredictable and costly, making supply chains difficult to manage. By providing a technology framework to expose information and processes to the Internet, Customs administrations can eliminate the complexity of non-automated customs procedures and provide the information businesses need in one environment, while simultaneously lowering the cost of supplying the information.”

Duty rates, product origin information, and country specific regulatory requirements could all be integrated into a company’s supply chain. This would speed production and ensure compliance with domestic and international regulations - and in turn enable businesses to provide efficient and predictable services to meet customer demand.

The Oracle executive outlined some of the advantages to Customs employees of Internet functionality - the ability to access shipments and shipment information quickly, securely and from any location. “The Internet can enable secure access to a centralized Customs database containing all shared information on their exporters and importers from every port.”

“Access controls in the database and applications can ensure that only those persons with the proper authority can access relevant data. Passenger data, shipment data, hazardous material data, historical data, can all be centrally accessed from remote customs locations.”

Furthermore, remote Customs offices could use mobile devices to access information from a shipment that they were seeing for the first time. Importers could use mobile phones to access the Internet and electronically transfer funds to Customs for payment of duties and taxes.
IACS Takes Actions to Improve the Safety Regime for Bulk Carriers

New requirements to enhance the safety of bulk carriers were announced today (March 15) by the International Association of Classification Societies (IACS). Igor Ponomarev, IACS Chairman, told a briefing in London: “This important initiative involves all IACS members and is directed primarily at existing bulk carriers. Taken together with our extensive work programme concerning new vessels, these IACS measures address continued public and industry concerns over bulk carrier safety following recent losses. The new initiatives for existing vessels will, inter alia, accelerate the schedule for strengthening of the foremost cargo hold’s transverse corrugated bulkhead and double bottom, address the strength of the side structure in cargo holds, increase requirements for forward hatch covers, require the installation of improved bulwarks or breakwaters when the ships are not fitted with a forecastle, and will further increase the requirements of the IACS Enhanced Survey Programme (ESP) earlier in the service life of these ships.

“Bulk carrier safety is our central priority for 2002. Our objectives include progressing the measures we announce today for existing ships and completing our reassessment of strength requirements for hatch cover scantlings - a key recommendation of Mr Justice Colman’s Re-opened Formal Investigation (RFI) report into the loss of the Derbyshire. The Association is also pursuing a rapid and successful conclusion of its recently commenced work to improve the side structure integrity of existing bulkcarriers.”

For future new buildings, the Association intends to complete major elements in the work programme of the IACS Bulk Carrier Safety Steering Committee. This committee has over the last months had various consultations with the industry, which have given IACS valuable input to our work.

The IACS Chairman added: “Our new, eight-point package of requirements for existing bulk carriers contributes to the International Maritime Organization’s fast-track regulatory programme in this area. A number of the new measures follow through on the risk control options set out in the IACS Formal Safety Assessment study of fore-end water-tight integrity, submitted to the IMO in January of last year. The new measures apply to existing vessels with a length of 150 m or greater, although some will also apply to smaller vessels and, in certain cases, to new vessels.”

The new requirements for existing ships consist of two sets of actions. The first set, consisting of three measures, has been adopted and will take effect on January 1, 2003:

1. Earlier implementation of SOLAS Chapter Xll requirements. The objective is to bring forward the reinforcement of the corrugated transverse bulkhead between No. 1 and No. 2 holds and the double bottom of No. 1 hold. This is now to be complied with at 10 years for vessels under 10 as of July 1, 2003 and at the due date of the next Intermediate or Special Survey (whichever comes first) after July 1, 2003 for vessels of 10-15 years of age as of July 1, 2003. Previously, these requirements were applied at 15 years. The changes are introduced through the adoption of a new revision of IACS UR S23, which covers the early implementation of the already existing IACS UR S19 and UR S22 for existing single side skin bulk carriers.

2. Adoption of a new revision of UR Z102 (Hull Surveys of Bulk Carriers). This amended Unified Requirement now extends ESP requirements for close-up surveys at Special Survey No.2 and also requires Intermediate Surveys of bulk carriers of 10-15 years of age to have essentially the same scope as Special Survey No.2.

3. Extended application of IACS’ UR S24, requiring the installation of water ingress detection and alarms in all cargo holds of existing bulk carriers, as well as newbuildings.

The remaining five measures, to be introduced in the second phase of actions towards existing bulk carriers, are under development. The target is to complete the requirements in time to give owners sufficient notice to plan for and implement the modifications by the due date of the next Intermediate or Special Survey commenced on or after January 1, 2003. These measures are:

4. Requirements for the installation of an improved bulwark or breakwater on existing bulk carriers when not fitted with a forecastle, and a forecastle on new vessels, to provide more protection for forward hatches and fore-deck fittings.

5. Requirements to increase the integrity of fore-deck fittings on existing and new bulk carriers, to resist green water loading.

6. Implementation of hatch cover requirements within the forward 0.25 L of existing vessels that are generally equivalent to UR S21 requirements for new vessels. UR S21 is currently under review for revision in light of the findings of further model tests carried out by the UK with input from IACS in conjunction with the findings of the RFI on the loss of the Derbyshire.

7. Implementation of requirements for the strength of side shell frames of existing vessels taking into consideration IACS UR S12, which today is applicable only for side frames of new bulk carriers.

8. Fitting of water ingress detection and alarms for spaces forward of the cargo area.

IACS has established a Fast Project Team to address measures 4, 6 and 7. It is intended to complete measure 7 by end-July 2002 and measures 4 and 6 by end-September 2002. Detailing of measures 8 and 9 are scheduled to be completed by end-March and end-June 2002, respectively.

The full text of the measures already detailed and approved by IACS can be found on IACS website (www.iacs.org.uk). The requirements not yet detailed will be released as soon as they are approved, for the industry to have as much lead time as possible in preparation for necessary modifications and strengthening of bulk carriers affected.

Meanwhile, IACS work continues, as stated above, on developing revised requirements for hatch covers and foredeck fittings in response to the RFI report’s recommendations. The report called for more model tests. IACS reacted swiftly, producing the specification for the tests - performed at MARIN, in The Netherlands. The test data were received by IACS in November 2001. This allowed IACS to commence a full reassessment of hatch cover strength requirements (UR S21) under extreme sea conditions. Initial work suggests further development of S21 may be required, to address some damage flooding scenarios.

Requirements for new bulk carriers are also being considered. Current work has produced a set of proposals, from the IACS Bulk Carrier Safety Steering Committee, for harmonised notations and standard loading conditions for bulk carriers. These proposals, which are developed in co-operation with the industry, are expected to be adopted over the next few months.
Highlights on the Miami Cruise Conference

The market at a glance

Early 6.9 million North Americans enjoyed cruising in 2000, an increase of 992,000 cruisers - or 16.8 percent - over the previous year, according to Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA).

The remarkable increase is the largest single jump in passengers carried since the industry began reporting numbers in 1980. It more than doubles the previous high water mark set in 1986, when some 472,000 additional cruisers set sail.

The increase in passengers also outstripped the capacity growth during last year, with 11 percent new berths added to the North American cruise fleet. The industry capacity utilisation was in excess of 90 percent. Such impressive growth can be attributed to several factors.

The fourteen new vessels that joined the North American fleet last year were safer, more spacious, more environmentally friendly, and more exciting than ever to perfectly match the public’s requirements. In addition, access to information through the Internet sites of cruise companies and travel sellers has made it easier for consumers to learn about cruises and more comfortable about booking. People are going to their travel agents better informed and ready to purchase. According to CLIA, cruises of about a week in length continue to make up more than half of cruise vacations and showed a 14.3 percent increase in 2000. Short cruises of one to five days in length make up more than a third of sailings, and grew at a rate of 18.5 percent last year.

The Caribbean and the Bahamas, taken together, continue to be the most popular cruise destination, accounting for more than half of all cruises. Europe and the Mediterranean were the fastest growing areas in 2000, and together accounted for about 15 percent of cruisers.

Looking at 2001, CLIA estimates an increase in berths of about 8.5 percent, and passenger growth tracking at that rate as well. Since 1980, the average annual growth in the industry has been about 8 percent and a conservative estimate would place increases for this year at the industry average.

CLIA reports that more than 68 million Americans are cruise prospects, with a stated intention to cruise in the near future. The industry plans to tap into this group through continued investment in new ships and new cruise vacation options, including new cruising destinations and ports of call, new onboard alternatives in dining, entertainment and facilities, and aggressive promotion that appeals to a new type of cruiser. Compared with 15 years ago, when the average cruiser was 56 years old, today’s new cruiser is 46, and current cruise prospects average 43 years of age. With capacity projected to continue to increase each year, the future offers extraordinary opportunities for the industry, its customers and suppliers. This increase in capacity is driven by a record number of new ships coming into service. Between 2000 and 2004, ICCL member lines are expected to bring 32 new ships into service at a cost of approximately $12 billion.

Economic and social impact of the cruise industry on the territory

The benefits of North American cruise industry to the U.S. economy are evident. A study conducted by Business Research and Economic Advisors (BREA) and WEFA, Inc. measured the direct and indirect economic benefits to the cruise industry in 1999 and provided an estimate of the growth of the industry and its contribution to the U.S. economy through 2002. Total economic benefit of the cruise industry was estimated in the region of $15.5 billion, of which direct spending of cruise lines and passengers on goods and services was $8.1 billion and total wages generated for U.S. employees were $7.0 billion. Jobs generated by these expenditures were 24,901.

The industries that most heavily benefited by cruise industry spending were:

• airline transportation $1.8 billion; transportation services (including travel agents, ground transportation and excursions) $1.4 billion; energy $1.2 billion; financial services $1.0 billion; business service $927 million; food processing $717 million. Capital expenditures in the U.S. by the cruise lines more than doubled between 1997 and 1999 while other purchases rose 30%. In total, spending in the U.S. associated with the industry increased by nearly a third between 1997 and 1999, to $8.8 billion.

Other fast facts to show the dramatic economic and social impact of the cruise business are:

• $627 million was spent by the North American cruise industry on capital expenditures during 1999, primarily incurred for vessel maintenance.
• The cruise lines paid $78 million in wages and salaries, employee benefits and wage local taxes.
• As a result of the direct and indirect jobs generated by the spending of the North American cruise lines and their passengers, almost $7.0 billion in wage income was earned by workers in 1999.
• The North American cruise industry’s passengers from other countries increased by almost 50% between 1993 and 1998.
• The Caribbean islands (including the Bahamas) remain the most popular destination for cruise passengers, accounting for almost 43% of the destination capacity of the cruise industry in 1999.
• The European market (including the Mediterranean) experienced the strongest growth in capacity since 1997, 53% over the two-year period. By the end of 1999, this region accounted for 20.2% of the capacity of the North American fleet, up from 15.5% in 1997.
• Comparing 1998 to 1990, cruise ship embarkation from North American ports have increased by almost 70 percent.

Growing awareness of self-policing needs

A major step for the cruise line industry to establish standards in areas that go above and beyond both U.S. and international requirements has been made.
with the International Council of Cruise Lines (ICCL) members unanimously agreeing to set mandatory policies for passenger and crew safety, security, environmental practices, operational procedures, health safety and sanitation.

Membership in the association now is contingent upon adherence to the policies, and each member line is to integrate ICCL’s standards into its Safety Management System (SMS), which will ensure compliance through internal and external audits conducted by independent third-party auditors that are mandated by the International Safety Management (ISM) code, applicable to internationally operating passenger ships since 1998.

ICCL represents the interests of 16 passenger cruise lines in the North American cruise market and more than 65 cruise industry suppliers. Its member lines operate 93 vessels that carry more than 6 million passengers each year and account for approximately 90 percent of the North American passenger cruise line industry. ICCL has also teamed up with CLIA Cruise Line International Association on an initiative to educate the public, media and travel agents about the global cruise industry.

The new Cruise Industry Coalition will communicate cruising’s excellent track record in areas like safety and the environment. Efforts will include charitable events in communities hosting cruise ships, educational symposia for travel agents and the public, research studies and a toll-free number for media enquiries. Both moves show unequivocally that, as the industry grows, the spotlight is on the much delicate issues and a toll-free number for media enquiries. Both moves show unequivocally that, as the industry grows, the spotlight is on the much delicate issues.

Irrespective of the high cost relevant to the adoption of such measures, it makes a lot of sense as the implementation will however not be as high as the immediate (and potentially on future sales) cost of major disaster at sea. Equal consideration can be made for the port industry involved in the sector. It is not acceptable a cruise business going at double speed; lines are making huge efforts to keep the pace of the demanding needs of the modern travel industry in terms of safety, security, operations accuracy and efficiency, by means of technological innovations and by enhancing the general skills and knowledge of the business.

Ports, the main interface of lines with the market of consumers, can’t be stepped behind!

**INTERNATIONAL MARITIME INFORMATION**

**INTERTANKO: Sets up Latin American Panel**

The inaugural meeting of INTERTANKO’s Latin American Panel took place in Miami on March 1, 2002. The meeting was attended by members and associate members from Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Venezuela. Attending from INTERTANKO’s Secretariat were Peter Swift, Svein Ringbakken and John Fawcett-Ellis. The Panel elected Mr Jose Peraza, Heidenreich Marine Caracas as Chairman with the following to serve as Vice-Chairmen: Mr Michael Schroeder, Sociedad Naviera Ultragas; Capt. Jose Luis Hernandez, PMI Comercio Internacional SA de CV; and Mr Elizio Araujo Neto, Transpetro.

The Panel will provide both a focus and a forum for members’ interests in maritime developments in Latin America and internationally. The panel will initially spend time on developing its work programme and strategy. The next meeting is planned to be held towards the latter part of this year.

---

**Top 30 Container Ports in 2001**

(Throughputs in TEU)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank 2001</th>
<th>Rank 2000</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>% TEU difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
<td>18,100,000</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>15,520,000</td>
<td>17,040,000</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Busan</td>
<td>7,906,807</td>
<td>7,540,387</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kaohsiung</td>
<td>7,540,000</td>
<td>7,425,832</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>6,334,000</td>
<td>5,613,000</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>5,944,951</td>
<td>6,275,000</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5,183,520</td>
<td>4,879,429</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Shenzhen#</td>
<td>5,076,435</td>
<td>3,993,714</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
<td>4,689,000</td>
<td>4,248,247</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Long Beach</td>
<td>4,462,958</td>
<td>4,600,787</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>4,218,000</td>
<td>4,082,334</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Port Klang</td>
<td>3,700,000 *</td>
<td>3,206,753</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>3,501,820</td>
<td>3,058,866</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>New York/NJ</td>
<td>3,180,000 *</td>
<td>3,006,493</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Bremen/Bremerhaven</td>
<td>2,896,381</td>
<td>2,712,420</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Felixtowe</td>
<td>2,800,000 **</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Manila</td>
<td>2,796,000</td>
<td>2,867,836</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>2,770,000</td>
<td>2,889,452</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Qingdao</td>
<td>2,640,000</td>
<td>2,120,000</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Gioia Tauro</td>
<td>2,488,332</td>
<td>2,652,701</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yokohama</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>2,318,479</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Laem Chabang</td>
<td>2,336,653</td>
<td>2,195,024</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tanjung Priok</td>
<td>2,222,496</td>
<td>2,476,152</td>
<td>-10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Algeciras</td>
<td>2,151,770</td>
<td>2,009,122</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Kobe</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>2,265,992</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Tanjung Pelepas</td>
<td>2,050,000</td>
<td>418,218</td>
<td>390.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NagaoyA</td>
<td>1,890,000</td>
<td>1,911,920</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>1,830,125</td>
<td>1,884,494</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Keelung</td>
<td>1,815,854</td>
<td>1,954,573</td>
<td>-7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>1,726,605</td>
<td>1,732,855</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *: estimated; **: CI estimates; #: includes Chiwan, Shekou & Yantian terminals; San Juan has revised its figure for 2000 since CI Yearbook was published. Sources: Ports and CI Yearbook (Containerisation International, March 2002 issue)
Sixth International Conference on Coastal and Port Engineering in Developing Countries (COPEDEC VI)
September 15-19, 2003, Colombo, Sri Lanka

Objective of the COPEDEC Conference is open to all and provides an international forum where coastal and port engineers from developing countries can exchange know-how and experience amongst themselves and with their colleagues from industrialised countries.

Theme of the Conference
Engineering the Coastal Environment is the theme of COPEDEC VI.

The conference promotes the presentation and exchange of information among professionals on a broad range of subjects covering:
• Port and Harbour Infrastructure Engineering in Developing Countries
• Port and Infrastructure planning and Management in Developing Countries
• Coastal Sediments, Hydrodynamics and Control
• Coastal Zone Management in Developing Countries
• Coastal and Port Environmental Aspects

Abstracts
The selection of papers for presentation will be based on a two-page abstract, written in English. The abstract must include the major points to be covered in the paper and highlight the paper’s significance to the conference theme and relevant subjects.

Each abstract must include the names, affiliations, address/country of each author. Underline the last/family name of all authors and indicate the subject from the list within which your paper best fits. In the case of multiple authorship, one person must be specified as the contact. The mailing address, fax number (with international codes) and e-mail address of the contact author should be provided as additional information.

Five hard-copies of the two-page abstract or one digital copy (e-mail word document) should be forwarded to the COPEDEC Permanent Secretariat before the 30th of September 2002.

Paper Selection Secretary
COPEDEC Permanent Secretariat
C/o Lanka Hydraulic Institute Ltd.
John Rodrigo Mawatha Katubedda, Moratuwa, SRI LANKA
Telephone: 94-1-651306
Fax: 94-1-650470
E-mail: copedec@lhi.lk

Authors will be notified of the acceptance/rejection of papers by mid-December 2002. Authors whose contributions are accepted for presentation will be required to submit digital copies of their formatted abstracts and their final paper before June 1, 2003. The papers have to be presented by one of the authors at the conference. The author/s must guarantee such a presentation. The extended abstracts will be published in book form and the complete proceedings will be made available in digital form on compact disc.

Further Announcements / Inclusion in Mailing List
All those who respond to this announcement by forwarding abstracts will receive further announcements of the conference.

Others who are interested in participating in the conference are requested to contact the Local Organising Secretariat, in order to ensure that their names are included in the mailing list for the next announcement.

The Local Organising Secretariat
COPEDEC VI - COLO MBO 2003
C/O Ace Travels & Conventions (Pvt) Ltd.
315 Vauxhall Street, Colombo 3, Sri Lanka
Tel: +94 1 300589
Fax: +94 1 331816
E-mail: acetrvl@eureka.lk

Quality Shipping Conference
July 10-11, 2002,
Copenhagen, Denmark

One of the key questions in international shipping is why responsible states and operators involved in shipping continue to accept substandard shipping and those who facilitate such trade. The Copenhagen Quality Shipping Conference will focus on this important question in order to find ways of dealing with the problem.

Conference will focus on the following themes:
1. The role of the Flag State.
2. Decent Working and Living Conditions for Seafarers.
3. The Human Element.

Conference fee:
Registration after May 1, 2002: 3,500 DKK
(470 euros)

For further information:
www.qualityshipping.dk or write to
Danish Maritime Authority
38 C Verundsgade-P.O.Box 2605-DK-
2100 Copenhagen
Tel: +45 39 17 4400
Fax: +45 39 17 4401
E-mail: qs@dma.dk

30th PIANC Congress
SYDNEY 2002
September 22-26, 2002
Sydney, Australia

The 30th congress of the International Navigation Association will be held in Sydney, September 2002. An Organizing Committee has been established under the auspices of PIANC and with support from government, industry and academic representatives of the Australian ports and har-
New Publications

**IACC:**

“A to Z of International Trade”

A new ICC book offers traders a good grasp of the technical language of international trade, an asset more vital than ever as more business goes global.

The new ICC business tool is A to Z of International Trade. The book can be ordered online from the Business Bookstore or from national committees around the world.

This is a dictionary providing definitions of over 2,000 common business terms, the book selects those the user may need to clarify and provides cross-references to more detailed information.

Nine in-depth sections cover the major areas of trade: air transport, bank collections, e-commerce, Incoterms, insurance, letters of credit, sales contracts, liner vessel shipping and vessel chartering. Plus 160 business terms in English, French, German, Italian and Spanish and a detailed bibliography.

Respected US journalist and consultant Frank Reynolds edited the book. He brought to the task 35 years of hands-on experience in international trade.

• Price: 59.00 euros

For further information:

International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Business Bookstore
http://www.iccbooks.com

**PIANC:**

“BULLETIN” No.109-2002

“Recreational Navigation and Nature”

Report of Working Group 12 of the Recreational Navigation Commission

“Vessel Traffic and Transport Management in the Inland Waterways and Modern Information Systems”


For further information:

PIANC General Secretariat
Graaf de Ferraris-gebouw
11th floor Boulevard du Roi Albert II 20, B-3, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium
E-mail: info@pianc-aipcn.org
URL: www.pianc-aipcn.org

**ICOPMAS 2002**

The 5th International Conference on Coasts, Ports and Marine Structure
October 14-17, 2002, Ramsar, Iran

The overall theme is “Regional-Cooperation in Port and Coastal Engineering and Maritime Affairs”

For further information:

ICOPMAS 2002 Secretariat
Post & Shipping Organization
No. 751, Enghelab Eslami Ave.,
Teheran 15994, Iran
Tel: 98 21 890 4096
Fax: 98 21 890 4193
E-mail: icopmas@ir-pso.com

**SIBCON 2002**

Singapore International Bunkering Conference
September 26-27, 2002
Shangri-La Hotel, Singapore

Theme:

From Customer Service to Customer Satisfaction: Towards Bunkering Excellence in Today’s Market

For further information:

IBC Asia (Pte Ltd

No. 1 Grange Road, #08-02 Orchard
Building, Singapore 239693
Tel: 65-6732 1970
Fax: 65-6733 5087 / 65-6736 4312
Contact: Ms Cassie Mah
Direct Line: 65-68355102
E-mail: cassie.mah@ibcasia.com.sg

**IACP:**

8th International Conference of Port Cities
October 22-25, 2002, Dalian, China

Port Cities and World Trade
Urban strategies and industrial dynamics

Topic 1
The port city as a logistic center
Topic 2
The new urban functions

Registration Fees:

IACP member
before June 30: 580 euros / US$510
before September 10: 670 euros / US$590
after September 10: 760 euros / US$670

Non-IACP member
before June 30: 670 euros / US$590
before September 10: 760 euros / US$670
after September 10: 850 euros / US$750

For further information:

International Association of Cities and Ports (IACP)
45, rue Lord Kitchener
76600 Le Havre, France
Tel: +33(0)2 35 42 78 84
Fax: +33(0)2 35 42 21 94
E-mail: bureau@aivp.com
site: www.aivp.com
The Americas

MARAD: OECD Working Group to Brainstorm on Port Security


Government and industry leaders will be meeting March 7-8 to develop ideas for port security around the world. The Ad-Hoc Working Group is led by OECD’s Maritime Transportation Committee chair Bruce Carlton, Associate Administrator for Policy and International Trade at MARAD.

Mr. Carlton expressed the hope that the discussions will be open and encourage an international dialogue on this important matter. “We must participate in these international forums because port security problems require international solutions. It is vital that we work with other countries and international agencies worldwide, as well as with all the modes within the Department of Transportation and other agencies in the U.S. government.”

This international initiative complements and augments the extensive domestic work being done in port security, such as the Port Security Grant Program, which is being administered by MARAD and the U.S. Coast Guard on behalf of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA).

Maritime Administrator William G. Schubert says Mr. Carlton will apply a balanced approach, one that recognizes the critical need for secure ports without sacrificing the efficient flow of international commerce. Captain Schubert added, “The world’s markets are dependent upon safe, secure and reliable port operations across the globe, because maritime transportation is the dominant component of our international trade infrastructure, carrying over 95 percent of the volume of U.S. overseas foreign trade.”

The meeting will be a workshop, including not only government officials but also members of the shipping industry, and the agenda reflects a relatively “zero-based” approach to defining the future work of the MTC. Mr. Carlton said, “This workshop will not duplicate the work of other international governments or organizations. We will not, for example, list or discuss the number of existing port security measures because other working groups have already done that. The goal of this meeting is to assess the economic and political impact of security measures on international trade and economic growth. We also hope to accelerate and reinforce the work the International Maritime Organization (IMO) accomplished in February.”

That IMO Intersessional meeting called for a number of elements in the Safety of Life at Sea Convention (SOLAS) to become mandatory. Those elements would require written ship security plans to be carried on each ship, security training for ship and company security officers and for shore-based personnel, and port security plans to be developed according to SOLAS guidelines.

The MTC is the only international forum that looks at the maritime sector from both the policy and economic perspectives. The OECD helps governments tackle the economic, social, and governance challenges of a globalized economy. The United States Maritime Administration (MARAD) promotes the development and maintenance of an adequate, well-balanced United States merchant marine and frequently represents the maritime interests of the United States in international forums such as the OECD.

Halifax Port Corporation

Halifax: New Officers for Halifax Port Authority

Alan Abraham, Jr. Appointed as Chair

T he Halifax Port Authority is pleased to announce the election of Mr. Alan Abraham, Jr. as Chair, and Mr. Gerald McConnell, Q.C. as Vice-Chair of the Authority. Mr. Gerald Blom has also accepted a three-year appointment to the Board of Directors.

Mr. Abraham is the founder and President of Green Waste Systems, the second largest waste removal company in Atlantic Canada. He has served on the Board of Halifax Port Authority since March 1999, most recently as Vice-Chair.

Mr. McConnell is the President and CEO of Etruscan Resources Inc. He was first appointed to the Board of Directors of the Port Authority in March 1999, serving as Chair of the Human Resources Committee and as a member of the Audit Committee.

“I am looking forward to maximizing the opportunities ahead for the Port of Halifax. The Port is well-positioned for growth and the Board is committed to ensuring a secure and financially successful future for Halifax Port Authority,” stated Mr. Abraham.

The Halifax Port Authority is a government business enterprise mandated by the Federal Minister of Transport.

The HPA leads in the development of the Port of Halifax, serving as an economic catalyst and has a mandate to be financially viable. The Port of Halifax has a total annual impact of $670 million and an employment impact of over 9,000 direct and indirect jobs.
Los Angeles: January Container Statistics

PORT of Los Angeles container traffic continued to climb in January with a total of 408,236 TEUs. Imports totaled 210,394 TEUs, compared to 201,491 in January 2001, an increase of 4.4%. Exports showed a 1% increase with the movement of 83,122 TEUs. Overall, loaded imports and exports increased by 3.4% with 293,516 TEUs as compared to January 2001 with 283,876 TEUs.

Larry Keller, Port of Los Angeles executive director, stated, “The January container statistics are a positive start to 2002. The Port had a record-setting January with 408,236 TEUs as compared to January 2001, an increase of 4.4%. Exports showed a 1% increase with the movement of 83,122 TEUs. Overall, loaded imports and exports increased by 3.4% with 293,516 TEUs as compared to January 2001 with 283,876 TEUs.”

Fiscal year figures to date (July – December) total 3.2 million TEUs, which is a 6.7% increase over last fiscal year.

TEUs are twenty-foot equivalent units, a standard maritime measurement used when counting marine cargo containers.

Montreal: MPA pledges complete cooperation in improving port security

THE Montreal Port Authority (MPA) will continue to cooperate fully with government authorities once they have determined which actions should be taken in response to recommendations from the Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence. The MPA is also proposing the formation of a coordinating committee in an effort to formalize the existing partnership amongst stakeholders concerned with security at the Port of Montreal.

The MPA made these statements today after studying the Senate Committee’s recommendations on security at Canadian ports.

“We share the Senate Committee members’ concerns for security at the country’s points of entry and for all aspects of the transportation of illicit merchandise,” said Dominic J. Taddeo, MPA president and CEO.

“This is not an issue exclusive to Montreal. The Committee members were clear: major Canadian ports are reviewing the issue, as are other port authorities in the U.S. and around the world, as well as major maritime organizations, for some years now. I am referring to the International Association of Ports and Harbors, the American Association of Port Authorities, the Association of Canadian Port Authorities and the International Maritime Organization, all organizations that we are closely involved with,” added Mr. Taddeo.

Collaboration of stakeholders

The Port of Montreal, which is owned by the government of Canada, is managed by the MPA, an autonomous local organization. The MPA manages and promotes the Port’s activities, and is administered by a board of business professionals from the Montreal area.

Within its mandate, the MPA is responsible for the safety of people and goods on its territory. It has no authority whatsoever in criminal matters or public security, nor does it have access to police or customs information. Within its mandate, the MPA has always done everything in its power to ensure that the organizations responsible for these matters receive full cooperation.

Responsibility for fighting crime and ensuring national security is formally shared between many stakeholders. “When we talk about Montreal, we are talking about the RCMP, the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Transport Canada, Sûreté du Québec, the Montreal police department and various international police organizations,” explained Mr. Taddeo.

“We have always cooperated fully with these stakeholders. Not only is it our duty as good corporate citizens, but it is also in our best interests as a business entity responsible for promoting the Port,” he added.

Ongoing measures

Over the years, the MPA has taken a host of measures to ensure the security of the port infrastructure for which it is responsible. It has invested in a state-of-the-art control centre that is connected to 40 strategically-located cameras connected by fibre-optic cables. This allows continuous surveillance of the entire port territory.

In June of last year, the MPA signed an agreement protocol to reinforce its anti-smuggling partnership with Customs and Revenue and the Shipping Federation of Canada.

On issues related to crime and national security, the MPA is currently working with the Canada Customs and Revenue Agency to improve container inspection centre and to set up a new mobile inspection unit. These two projects alone will require additional investments amounting to $5 million.

Global solutions

The MPA will continue to offer its complete cooperation to all stakeholders while keeping in mind that the problem is global in scope and that uniform methods and procedures will have to be introduced world-wide if they are to be effective.

This is the case, for example, in the control of container contents. Currently, the problem is usually dealt with at the point of entry. The objective shared by stakeholders today, however, is to tackle the problem at its source, at the point of departure of the container, and to thereby stop trafficking and smuggling where it starts.

The MPA is an autonomous federal agency that finances all of its own projects and functions on a commercial basis. The Port of Montreal creates 17,600 direct and indirect jobs and generates $2 billion in economic spin-offs annually for the Montreal region, Quebec and Canada as a whole.

Oakland: Port of Oakland and BNSF Announce Opening of the Joint Intermodal Terminal

New Facility to Take 20,000 Truck Moves a Year off Interstate 80

THE Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company (BNSF) and Port of Oakland announced on March 4 they have reached an agreement for BNSF to operate the Port’s newly built Joint Intermodal Terminal, to be known as Oakland International Gateway. BNSF will also be able to provide service to other third parties for this facility, which will also benefit the community by taking more than 20,000 truck moves a
year off Interstate 80.
Scheduled to open in mid-March, this 85-acre, near-dock facility has the capacity to initially accommodate 250,000 containers per year and the capability to expand to meet future growth. Oakland International Gateway also features 13,300 feet of loading and unloading track that can accommodate 410 40-foot containers at a time. The facility also contains an additional 10,100 feet of storage and support tracks and parking for 1,245 containers. Total construction cost for the facility is $38 million, with $22.1 million coming from federal grants through ISTEA and TEA-21 funding.

Oakland International Gateway will tie into BNSF’s rail network by way of trackage rights and specific access conditions approved by the Surface Transportation Board (STB) to BNSF as part of the 1995 Union Pacific/Southern Pacific Merger Settlement Agreement.

“This facility will provide the shipping community with additional capacity on the West Coast and give BNSF’s customers a direct link to our rail network - as opposed to a 12-mile truck dray over the highways to our intermodal facility in Richmond,” said Steve Branscum, group vice president, BNSF Consumer Products Marketing. “As a result, BNSF is able to offer customers more flexible and efficient service.”

Commissioner Phillip Tagami, president of the Oakland Board of Port Commissioners, stated, “We are very excited to have BNSF as a partner at the Port. Not only will this facility generate additional business for the Port, but it will also benefit the community by eliminating the truck haul now required.”

Branscum added, “This is an excellent example of public/private partnerships that not only improve the way of life for the community by reducing highway traffic and pollution, but also assist the shipping community with more efficient and competitive transportation solutions.”

The Port of Oakland, celebrating its 75th anniversary, is the fourth largest container port in the country. Established in 1927 as an independent department of the City of Oakland, the Port spans 19 miles of waterfront and more than 900 acres of maritime terminal facilities. Port facilities include 10 major container terminals covering almost 575 acres; the Metropolitan Oakland International Airport which covers an area of over 2,500 acres; 1,100 acres of commercial, industrial, recreational and other land; 950 acres of underdeveloped land; and about 9,700 surface acres of water area.

Through its subsidiary, The Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company, BNSF operates one of the largest rail networks in North America, with 33,000 route miles of track covering 28 states and two Canadian provinces. BNSF is an industry leader in Web-enabling a wide variety of customer transactions. The rail network moves more intermodal traffic than any other rail system in the world, is America’s largest grain-hauling railroad, and hauls enough coal to generate more than 10 percent of the electricity produced in the United States.

San Diego: Added to Dockwise Yacht Transport’s list of exclusive markets

OW there’s a new way to get your yacht into or out of San Diego. Starting March 25, Dockwise Yacht Transport -- one of the premier yacht transport companies in the world -- is adding the Port of San Diego to its list of exclusive markets.

Using unique semi-submersible heavy transport vessels providing hassle-free, float-on/float-off yacht transportation capability, the company specializes in carefully shipping yachts between various prime yachting destinations. The company will disembark yachts at the Port of San Diego’s Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal, adding one more type of cargo to the diverse array of products handled by the terminal. The terminal is already known for processing other heavy-lift cargo such as steel beams for the San Diego Convention Center and the new Downtown Ballpark, parts for giant turbine engines, and more. The terminal also specializes in handling bulk and break-bulk products such as produce, soda ash and fertilizer. And the Port’s largest ever containerized cargo operation will begin later this year with the arrival of produce imports by the Dole Fresh Fruit Company.

“We pride ourselves on being able to efficiently handle a wide variety of vital cargo for our customers,” said Jim Pugh, Senior Director of Maritime for the Port of San Diego. “Dockwise Yacht Transport will add a unique new angle to this terminal’s diverse capabilities. We look forward to their arrival and to assisting the yachting lifestyle in San Diego and around the world.”

Dockwise Yacht Transport is a service of Dockwise Shipping B.V., headquartered in the Netherlands. Dockwise operates the world’s largest heavy transport fleet, comprised of fourteen specialized semi-submersible heavy transport vessels. Three of these vessels, ‘Super Servant 3’, ‘Super Servant 4’ & ‘Dock Express 11’ are dedicated yacht carriers. In total, the company plans to ship 600 yachts in 2002 between Europe; the Caribbean; Mexico; Vancouver, B.C.; the West Coast of the United State, and the South Pacific. It’s first vessel to serve San Diego arrived at the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal from Vancouver on March 27. A second call will arrive at the Tenth Avenue Marine Terminal from Vancouver on Aug. 29, with a return to Vancouver on Aug. 31.

Dockwise has had a very positive response from yacht owners in the San Diego area. The first vessel is full on the northbound leg in March.
ESPO: Transport Council Addresses Port Services’ Directive

At the meeting of the Transport Council in Brussels yesterday, the Commission’s Directive proposal on market access to port services was tabled. Although the idea was to have a presentation of the work carried out in the Council working group so far without further debate (so-called “Etat des travaux”), several Ministers decided to make a statement on the Directive.

The French Transport Minister argued that piloting should be excluded from the Directive and that the social legislation of Member States should not be jeopardized by certain provisions of the Directive (i.e., self-handling, right to employ own personnel). He was joined in this statement by the Belgian Minister Isabelle Durant. Germany defended the view that a Directive would only have sense for technical-nautical services. In that respect, the maritime access to ports should be included in the scope of the Directive. The Danish Minister said his government was completely in favour of the Directive proposal. Finally, the UK asked for more consideration of the specificities of ports in Europe (such as integrated ports) and the relevant market in which ports compete with each other.

The debate on the Directive will now continue in the Council working group. The next working group meetings are scheduled on April 10 and 17. The Spanish Presidency has prepared a first compromise proposal as a basis for these further discussions.

Other Relevant Topics Raised at the Council Meeting

Transport Ministers reached a political agreement on two proposals, a Regulation and a Directive, aimed at simplifying procedures regarding existing committees dealing with maritime safety and pollution prevention. Further aim is to speed up the integration of international rules in Community legislation.

The Council also came to an agreement regarding the GALILEO programme, notably to release the Community budget of 450 million euros to finance the development phase of the project. In the same context, the Council reached a political agreement on the proposed Regulation to establish the company “Galileo,” based in Brussels, which will be responsible for the management of the development phase of the GALILEO project. Finally, Transport Ministers reached conclusions on Euro-Mediterranean co-operation in the field of transport and had an initial debate on the Commission’s Transport White Paper.

Ipswich: Double record for Port of Ipswich

A double record was achieved at Associated British Ports’ (ABP) Port of Ipswich recently when the largest-ever vessel (in dead-weight tonnage terms) to arrive at Ipswich discharged the largest-ever fertiliser shipment to be handled by the port.

Arriving at Ipswich from Puerto Jose, Venezuela, the 23,586-tonne m.v. Malabar Light discharged 11,333 tonnes of bulk fertiliser for ConAgra Resources (Europe) Ltd, at ABP’s Coldock Terminal, for bagging and distribution to farms throughout East Anglia and beyond.

Robert Smith, Port Manager, Port of Ipswich, said:

“We are handling increasingly larger vessels and shipments at Ipswich, which is a tribute to the first-class facilities and equipment that the port provides.”

The previous record for the port’s largest consignment of fertiliser was also held by ConAgra Resources (Europe) Ltd - when m.v. Sinega discharged almost 11,000 tonnes of fertiliser at Coldock Terminal in November last year.

Göteborg: Eric Nilsson - Acting President

In connection with the general assembly of the Port of Göteborg AB shareholders today, the board of the company appointed Mr. Eric Nilsson acting president of the company. At the same instance, Mr. Gunnar Nygren, president of the company since 1996, retired from his position.

Mr. Nilsson, who is 54 and joined the company as executive vice president in January, 2001, will be acting president of Port of Göteborg AB until further notice.

Mr. Nilsson, who has a background in finance and logistics, has held the position of executive vice president of Port of Göteborg AB with special responsibility for marketing and port authority functions. He keeps these special responsibilities as acting president.

London: Port of London in joint marketing initiative with Thailand

The joint-marketing initiatives pioneered by the Port of London Authority (PLA) with ports around the world has been further expanded, with the signing of an agreement between London and the Port Authority of Thailand (PAT).

This is the third such agreement entered into by the PLA, which already has similar arrangements with Spain’s
Algeciras Bay Port Authority (APBA) and the Port of Hamburg in Germany. Discussions on a possible agreement with PAT started during 2000, when a ministerial delegation from Thailand visited the PLA. Negotiations on the final agreement have now been concluded.

There are many similarities between the two ports. The Port of London broke through the 50 million tonnes per annum mark again in 2001, while in Thailand, the Port of Bangkok and the container facility at Laem Chabang together handled a total of 35 million tonnes last year.

London and Thailand both have active riverside terminal operations and existing purpose-built container facilities, which directly serve the local markets of their respective capital cities. In addition, both ports have plans to develop separate additional major container facilities.

With the continued worldwide growth in trade, there is a natural potential for increased movements between the two countries. PAT sees this as an opportunity for Laem Chabang to become a major regional port for the SE Asian region, both for direct and transhipment services to Europe and the rest of the world.

The development of the second berth by Tilbury Container Services now makes the Port of London an important container port, which it is hoped will benefit from this new relationship.

Longer term, the planned development of “London Gateway” by P&O provides the Port of London with the opportunity to greatly expand its deepsea container operations. It should become the UK’s largest container facility serving not only the markets of the capital and south-east of England, but also the other major regional markets of the UK and north-west Europe.

The agreement will establish a cross-flow of maritime business between both ports, while ensuring that the independence of their port facilities is preserved. Joint co-operation will primarily be in the pooling of market intelligence and, when appropriate, the sharing of new business leads where involvement by both ports would benefit the prospective client.

Other areas of co-operation will include all aspects of marketing, which will extend to speaking opportunities and attendance at major international conferences and exhibitions. Both organisations will co-present new business presentations to prospective clients.

Commenting, Simon Sherrard, PLA Chairman said: “S.E. Asia is an important trading partner for the UK and Europe, both in raw materials and manufactured goods. By entering into this new arrangement, both PLA and PAT believe that the prospects for both ports to gain an increased share of the volumes will be enhanced.”

Dr Wichai Sungprapai, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners for the Port Authority of Thailand, said: “We are keen to build a relationship with the Port of London to expand trade between our two areas. Globalisation means there is more competition than ever before and this alliance strengthens the position of both ports.

“Through this Agreement we will be able to offer a one-stop shop for businesses wanting to ship goods direct from SE Asia into the UK’s important markets of London and south-east England. In addition, the excellent road, rail and sea transport links available from the capital open up other major markets throughout the UK and into mainland Europe”

Port of Rotterdam

Rotterdam: Co-Operation between Oman and Rotterdam

On Sunday, March 24th, the Government of the Sultanate of Oman and the Rotterdam Municipal Port Management signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the development and future management of the new Port of Sohar in the North of Oman. The MOU was signed by the Oman Minister of Transport, HE Malik Bin Sulaiman Al Ma’ari and by the Commissioner for the Port of the City of Rotterdam, Mr Peter van Dijk signed in the capital Muscat.

To underline the importance of this event for Oman, the Minister of National Economy, Ahmad Bin Abdul Nabi Maacki, was present at the ceremony as well as a Netherlands / Rotterdam delegation headed by the Minister of Transport, Public Works and Watermanagement of the Government of the Netherlands, Mrs Tineke Netelenbos.

The relationship between the Government of the Sultanate of Oman and the RMPM can be best described as a joint venture and will carry the name: Sohar Industrial Port Corporation (SIPC). Both partners, on an equal basis, will reserve finance for the joint development and management of the project, the contracting of short-term experts and the execution of various studies as required and initiated by the SIPC.

During the coming months, the parties will work out the plan of approach with regard to detailed spatial planning of the industrial site, marketing, training and the establishment of the Sohar Industrial Port Authority.

In the period between the signing of the MOU and the implementation of the plan of approach, the Government of the Sultanate of Oman and the RMPM will jointly expediently execute all necessary activities related to supporting potential users of the Sohar Industrial Port.

The Port of Sohar is situated in the north of the Sultanate of Oman, approximately 200 km north of the capital Muscat, strategically located on the Arabian Sea coast and outside the Arabian Gulf. The distance to Dubai by highway is approx. 150 km.

The first vessels will be able to call at the port early 2003. The total infrastructure of the port and the industrial area will be completed within two years. At that moment the Government of the Sultanate of Oman has invested approx. US$ 250 million in the building of the breakwaters, the dredging of the larger part of the port basin to a depth of 16 meters, the reclamation and preparation of an industrial area of some 2,000 hectares, the construction of 1,100 meters of quay wall and two jetties for the loading and discharging of liquid bulk cargoes.

Sohar is the (coastal) end destination of a gas pipeline from one of the gas fields in the Interior of Oman. Gas is an excellent basis for the petro-chemical and chemical industry. The Government
of the Sultanate of Oman is presently in the final stages of negotiations concerning the establishment of a refinery, a methanal plant and a fertilizer plant as well as an aluminium smelter. All trends indicate that the petro-chemical and chemical industries (production and storage) will increasingly establish themselves closer to the sources in the Middle East. This creates excellent opportunities for Sohar and the synergy between the industrial complex in Sohar and other ports in the world, inclusive of the Port of Rotterdam (one of the largest petro- and petro-chemical complexes in the world).

Northern Europe and the cruise capital of the UK was further reinforced at the end of 2001 when Cunard announced that it has committed to the commissioning of a new cruise liner at a cost of £300 million to be based in Southampton from 2005, a year after Cunard’s Queen Mary 2, the world’s largest cruise liner, makes her inaugural sailing from Southampton.

P&O Cruises has also announced a further increase in the capacity of its Southampton-based UK cruise fleet with the introduction in late 2002 of the 77,000-tonne Oceana, shortly before the expected completion of the reconstruction of P&O’s cruise terminal in Southampton’s Western Docks. Southampton is the home port of P&O Cruises.

Southampton: Southampton Cruises to Success in Miami

Associated British Ports’ (ABP) Port of Southampton has come out on top again, this time at the world’s largest cruise conference currently being held in Miami, Florida. The port has won two highly prestigious awards - ‘Northern Europe’s Most Efficient Terminal Operator’ and ‘Northern Europe’s Best Turnaround Port’.

This news arrives straight from Miami, where an ABP delegation is currently attending the world-renowned event, which has become a show-case for global cruise lines and ports.

The awards - a result of votes cast by the cruise-line operators themselves - were presented by the leading cruise publication, Dream World Cruise Destination.

Upon hearing the news, the initial reaction of, Andrew Kent, ABP Port Director, Southampton, was:

“This is the first time Southampton has been nominated, and to win not just one award but two is very good, indeed! To have been recognised by the world’s leading cruise companies in this way is a credit to all of the people involved in making such a success of cruise operations at the Port of Southampton.”

The Port of Southampton continues to go from strength to strength and is set for another bumper season with 176 cruise calls booked for 2002, compared to 165 calls made last year.

The port’s position as a key player in

Zeeland: Closer Cooperation Between Ports of Zeeland and Rotterdam

Zeeland Seaports, the port authority for Vlissingen and Terneuzen, and Rotterdam Municipal Port Management are planning to step up their cooperation. A proposal to this effect will be discussed at short notice by Rotterdam City Council and the authorities in Zeeland. The two port authorities want to expand their existing joint operating company Exploitatiemaatschappij Schelde-Maas (ESM). The new venture, ESM-2, will have far more land at its disposal than its predecessor had: almost 600 ha. in total. Furthermore, each partner will raise their equity by 50 million euros. To start with, ESM-2 will operate as a development company for all sites as yet undeveloped in Vlissingen.

ESM

ESM was founded in 1995 as a 50/50 joint venture between the Port of Rotterdam and Zeeland Seaports. It develops and exploits the Port Scaldia area within the port of Vlissingen, This dock and adjoining terrain (100 ha.) are intended for companies handling break bulk whose operations cannot be accommodated in Rotterdam.

ESM -2

ESM-2 will develop and exploit all Vlissingen sites which are not yet allocated. Besides the Scaldia dock area, these are the 180-hectare Westerschelde Container Terminal (WCT), the Nieuwlandterrain (110 ha.) and around 200 additional hectares belonging to other sites. Zeeland Seaports will deliver land to ESM-2 as soon as there is a customer for it. For the Nieuwlandterrain there is an agreement with Cobelfret to establish a roll-on/roll-off terminal. Meanwhile, Antwerp-based Hessenatie has signed an agreement for WCT. Once the planning procedures have been finalized, construction of the terminal can take place between 2003 and 2008. The cost of the building project has been estimated at between 280 and 300 million euros.
Pakistan coastline is approximately 1100 km in length, of which 330 km is in the Sindh Province and 770 km is in the Baluchistan Province. Along the coastline there are two international ports - Karachi Port and Port Qasim. All foreign trade passes through these two ports. Karachi Port is the premier Port of Pakistan. It remained the only port of Pakistan for about three and half decades after the independence of Pakistan when Port Qasim emerged. Karachi Port is still the first choice for business and tradesmen and is the primary port of Pakistan for its well-established facilities, experienced staff, and proximity to the city. It is handling about 70% of the entire dry and liquid cargo of the country, including transit cargo for Afghanistan and Central Asian Republics.

Strategic Location

Karachi Port has been historically handling Afghan Transit Cargo since decades. Highway network connecting major cities of the two countries already exist. The potentials of the strategically placed Karachi Port may be very effectively utilized to serve the regional market of shipping sector encompassing regional transhipment, transit trade of dry cargo to and from Afghanistan and Central Asian Republics, and transit trade of petroleum products of Central Asian Republics.

The Beginning

History of Karachi Harbour is spread over centuries. Historians have identified it with Korakel where the fleet of great conqueror Alexander the Great had anchored. In view of its location, what is now Karachi Port, has been considered a safe harbour from time immemorial. As a trading center, Karachi is known to have been flourishing since the 18th century and the port handled all kinds of boats and merchandize sailing to and from Bombay and other ports on the Western Coast of India and also ports in the Arabian Sea like Muscat and Dammam.

From Harbour To Seaport

In 1840 Karachi consisted of an anchorage only, situated in a lagoon between islands of Manora and Keamari. The conversion of Karachi harbour into a modern seaport began over a century ago. Sir Charles Napier, the first Governor of Sindh, realized the strategic importance, vast size, and potential of this natural harbour and the immediate necessity of practical measures for its development. He conceived, and implemented the basic harbour training and protection works, which brought far-reaching results and laid the foundation of a great port - the Karachi Port.

Organization

Under the Karachi Port Trust Act of 1886, which is an Act of Parliament, the
management of affairs of the port of Karachi is vested in a Board of Trustees. The Board is a corporate body and consists of 11 trustees including the Chairman. Five of the trustees are elected representatives of the private sector organizations; the Government nomi-

nates five others representing the public sector. The Chairman of KPT is appoint-
ed by the Government of Pakistan. He heads the trust and serves as a full time Chief Executive. The KPT administration is divided into six divisions, each headed by a General Manager.

Port Statistics

Karachi Port is a deep natural port with an 11.5 km-long navigable channel and a 12.2 meter-deep approach channel. It provides round the clock safe navigation to tankers, modern container vessels, bulk carriers, and general cargo ships up to 75,000 DWT. The port has 30 dry cargo and 3 liquid cargo handling berths including a privately operated modern container terminal – the Karachi International Container Terminal (KICT). The Port is handling about 26 million tons of cargo per annum which includes 14 million tons of liquid and 12 million tons of dry cargo and 650,000 TEUs. Presently about 1600 ships are visiting Karachi Port annually and the berth occupancy is about 45%, which shows that there is enough capacity in the port to handle more cargo.

The port channel and fairways are maintained by Port’s own dredging flotilla. The port provides shipside and dock facilities for handling heavy lifts, container-bulk, break bulk, and liquid cargo by means of requisite quay and heavy lift cranes, floating cranes, and shore-based equipment. The port area for cargo transit is 100 hectares and an additional area of 60 hectares is available in the close proximity of the Port, which may be developed for port related commercial activities. The port is adequately backed up with nationwide rail and road services for swift cargo transportation.

Development Plans

KPT aims at providing modern and user-friendly facilities to port users for import and export of all types of cargo. Port development plans have conventionally been focused on national trade requirements. However, swift changes in regional shipping trends and global economic conditions call for a repositioning of Karachi Port services to respond to market demands and adapt to the current scenario. Accordingly, KPT visions to transform the port into a modern, competitive and user-friendly port, which would also be a transshipment hub of the region.

For realizing this vision Karachi Port has embarked upon a comprehensive port modernization plan. Deepening of channels to accommodate deep draft vessels at all tides is the first step in this direction. In Phase-I the navigable channel is being dredged to 13.5 meter depth. In Phase-II this would be increased to 16.5 meters. Reconstruction of one oil pier is underway, which will enhance the liquid cargo handling capacity to 24 million tons per annum from present 18 million tons per annum.

Computerization of port operations and installation of electronic aids to monitor port activity is aimed at bringing efficiency and agility to the system. A new container terminal is being established in the private sector. Procurement of new craft and equipment is also on the anvil. Deep draft berths at the mouth of harbour are also being planned to enable swift and effective cargo handling. Port tariff is under revision to enable swift and effective cargo handling. Port tariff is under revision to enhance cost efficiency and competitiveness.

In expanding business the focus is at capturing new markets and looking beyond the national trade, seeking share in the burgeoning global volume of containerized trade. Transhipment facilities are being developed accordingly. A dedicated area has been designated for the purpose with 24-hour handling facilities. Other concessions include free period of 30 days, application of only one-way wharfage, and exemption from Dock Labour Cess. KPT is in the process of taking feed back from the port users to devise a set-up to further facilitate transhipment. Special terms can be discussed for providing additional facilities.

Private sector participation in Port operations is being encouraged. A dedicated container terminal in the private sector is in operation, whereas another dedicated container terminal on newly constructed berths with 13.5-meter draft is also being established. Bulk and general cargo terminals are also planned to be established in the private sector.

A Final Word

Karachi Port is a vibrant organization keeping pace with the changing economic and market scenarios in the region by agile repositioning to suite the user’s demands and would continue to serve the trade and business community, both local and regional.

MPA: Singapore wins “Best Seaport in Asia” award for the 14th time

SINGAPORE has won the ‘Best Seaport in Asia’ award at the 2002 Asian Freight Industry Awards (AFIA), making it the 14th time that the Republic has been awarded this top honour by the maritime community. Organised and held annually by Cargonews Asia, the AFIA awards recognise the best cargo transportation players in the world covering seaports, airports, shipping lines, air cargo carriers, container terminal operators, and total logistics operators.

Mr Chen Tze Penn, Director-General, Maritime and Port Authority of Singapore (MPA) received the award at a ceremony held at The Hilton Singapore this morning.

The Port of Singapore has continued to achieve steady growth in its vessel shipping tonnage. 2001 saw the port attaining a new record of 960.1 million
Traffic. for the upswing in cargo and container pickup in the global trade and the terminal operators in Singapore cited a million TEUs handled a year ago. Port increase of 11.9 per cent from the 1.18 million TEUs handled in January 2002, an increase from 24 million tonnes in January 2001. Container throughput too showed an increase. A total of 1.32 million TEUs (twenty-foot equivalent unit) was handled in January 2002, an increase of 11.9 per cent from the 1.18 million TEUs handled a year ago. Port terminal operators in Singapore cited a pick-up in the global trade and the improving global economic conditions for the upswing in cargo and container traffic.

MPA: Investigation into the bunker fuel contamination in the Singapore Port

The Maritime and Port Authority of Singapore (MPA) has completed its investigations into the bunker fuel contamination in the Port of Singapore. The MPA investigations began in mid-November 2001 following reports of vessels being supplied with contaminated bunker fuel. Its investigations sought to identify the parties responsible for supplying contaminated ship’s fuel and to trace the source of the contamination.

The investigations covered the collection and testing of oil samples taken from bunker tankers alleged to have supplied contaminated fuel to affected ships and from oil terminals. The MPA also conducted interviews with cargo officers of bunker tankers, bunker suppliers and operators, and road tanker operators. Staff of Meridian Petroleum and Bunkering Pte Ltd, the operator of the two bunker tankers, namely, MT Alexandra and MT Memphis, involved in the sale of contaminated bunkers to ships were also interviewed.

Results of the Investigation

Capt Khong Shen Ping, Director (Port), MPA, said, “The results of our investigations have shown that the bunker contamination problem is not widespread. While the ships affected - 14 reported cases to MPA - form a small percentage of the 21,000 vessels that lifted bunkers in Singapore last year, the MPA views bunkering malpractices, in this case supply of contaminated bunkers, seriously as they tarnish Singapore’s reputation as a leading and quality bunkering port.”

“We have identified and taken decisive actions against those responsible for supplying contaminated bunkers. From our investigation, the source of contamination of bunker fuel could have come from waste oil from shore-based sources. The results of our investigation were made possible by the close co-operation and assistance received from various organisations including the ENV, the Health Sciences Authority (HSA), the Police, the Singapore Shipping Association (SSA), oil majors, fuel testing laboratories and other bunker suppliers.”

Conclusion

Said Capt Khong, “The bunkering industry is a multi-billion dollar industry. It forms an important component of the Singapore port’s economic activities. Hence, the MPA and relevant government agencies are committed to safeguarding the interest of bunker buyers in Singapore. The MPA will continue to work closely with members of the industry and other concerned parties. For instance, it is presently working with the Singapore Shipping Association (SSA) on an accreditation scheme for bunker suppliers. The scheme would include a demerit point system to improve the quality and reliability of bunker suppliers and to deter bunkering malpractices. We have also drafted other proposals to tighten up supervision of the bunkering industry. These proposals are now being evaluated by the appropriate authorities. With the co-operation of the bunkering industry and the support of shipowners, charterers and operators, Singapore will continue to be an attractive bunkering port providing quality bunkers and value-for-money services to ships.”

Nagoya Ever Growing into the Future

According to a report published by the Nagoya Customs Office, the Port of Nagoya handled international trade cargo worth 9,172,438 million yen in 2001. This puts the Port in the top place among major Japanese ports in terms of international trade value for the first time in its history, overtaking the Port of Tokyo just by a narrow margin. This success demonstrates the strength of the Port of Nagoya, backed by a highly competitive industrial region in its hinterland.

This growth at the Port of Nagoya is mainly attributed to the increase in export cargo values for such items as automobiles, office equipment and aircraft. As for imports, cargo values for garments and office equipment were at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Port</th>
<th>Export</th>
<th>Import</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nagoya</td>
<td>6,559,563</td>
<td>2,612,875</td>
<td>9,172,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>4,309,953</td>
<td>4,832,835</td>
<td>9,142,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yokohama</td>
<td>5,755,784</td>
<td>3,017,089</td>
<td>8,772,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kobe</td>
<td>3,982,631</td>
<td>2,044,266</td>
<td>6,026,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Osaka</td>
<td>1,601,768</td>
<td>2,704,747</td>
<td>4,306,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Japanese Customs
The Port of Nagoya also ranked first in Japan in terms of total cargo throughput for 2001.

To keep pace with this steady growth in cargo, as well as the increasing size of container ships, the Port of Nagoya plans to expand its facilities by constructing 2 additional container berths on the south side of Tobishima Pier. These berths, with a quay length of 700m and water depth of 16 m, will feature an earthquake-resistant structure.

Furthermore, the Ise Bay Highway, which traverses the Port of Nagoya, has now been extended westward and will be connected with the 2nd Meishin Highway in the near future. This will further enhance the smooth distribution of cargo to and from the Port.

**Project for Tobishima Pier South Side Container Berths**

- **Depth:** 500m
- **Water Depth:** 16m
- **Quay Length:** 700m (350m x 2 berths)

**Sydney: Internationally voted the number one destination**

With its beautiful Harbour, spectacular vista and recent upgrade of the Overseas Passenger Terminal, it’s no wonder Sydney has won another cruising destination accolade.

Sydney Ports Corporation received an award, this week, as the port of Sydney was voted number one in the category of “Best Destination Experience” in the Dream World Cruise Destinations Awards 2001.

The award that was announced at the Seatrade Miami Convention earlier this week and was based on a survey of international cruise lines asked to nominate the port which they feel offers the best travel experience.

“Sydney has won many other Dream World Cruise Destinations awards including “Best Destination” in the ‘rest of the world’ category in 1996 and 1999 and “Best Port Welcome in 2000,” said Greg Martin, Sydney Ports Corporation’s Chief Executive Officer.

Over the past five years World by Travel and Leisure magazine awarded Sydney “the Best Value City” three times and “Best Foreign City” by Conde Nast Traveller, for six consecutive years.

Mr Martin said, “these awards are complimented each year by the number of International Cruise liners visiting our magnificent Harbour. In the 2001/2002 cruise season, Sydney has hosted a total of 26 ship calls from overseas.

This year’s schedule has seen Sydney’s two passenger terminals graced with some of the most eminent cruise liners in the world including Cunard’s QE2, P&O’s Aurora and Oriana, Silversea’s Silver Shadow and Royal Caribbean Line’s Legend of the Seas.

Sydney is the only port in Australia to boast two passenger terminals, the Overseas Passenger Terminal in the heart of the Harbour at Circular Quay and Wharf 8 in Darling Harbour.

“With the natural beauty of the city, best viewed by those lucky enough to travel by sea, and the contemporary cruising facilities it is no wonder the international community voted Sydney number one.

Both terminals are located in the middle of the city, hence, the more than 100,000 passengers visiting each year, are within walking distance from Sydney’s world renowned icons such as the Sydney Harbour Bridge and Sydney Opera House.

Both terminals are owned and managed by Sydney Ports Corporation. The Overseas Passenger Terminal has recently undergone a A$22 million renovation and a A$20 million fit out to improve amenities and house new restaurants.

Mr Martin said “the OPT is now aligned with Wharf 8 in providing visitors with world class amenities and with its refurbishment gained four new restaurants, making six in total”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sydney: Internationally voted the number one destination</th>
<th><strong>Project for Tobishima Pier South Side Container Berths</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>