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SUMMARY

The core idea behind the brand-new event was to highlight ports as well as port-related trends and businesses from many – sometimes very different – angles, hence the “360” part added between the two other. Therefore, the first edition of the Harbours 360 Conference touched upon both “must-have” themes like shipping alliances and container terminal expansion projects, but also dug deeper in search of not-so-obvious topics which would make the event stand out from the crowd, i.a. next-gen trucks, how to increase rail capacity without laying new tracks, e-ferries, pros & cons of automation, not to mention a very successful in-depth session and panel debate on the new Silk Road.

The two-day event, swiftly organized by our partners from Actia Forum and hosted by the Port of Antwerp in its seaside head office, kicked off with opening speeches delivered by three Secretary General Musketeers, namely Isabelle Ryckbost (ESPO), Lamia Kerdjoudj-Balkaid (FEPORT) and Patrick Verhoeven (ECSA), supported by Antwerp’s CCO Luc Arnouts and Harbours Review’s Przemek Opłocki. All have underlined not only the originality of the conference’s name, but also its relevance, because thanks to uniting diverse port stakeholders in one place and at the same time, one can break through the so-called “silo thinking” and build a better mutual understanding of the whole transport and logistics web inside as well as around harbours.

Challenges ticked off
In his welcoming speech, Luc Arnouts focused on the port’s cargo generating power by getting the sea-hinterland connectivity in place, meaning not only trouble-free ship-rail/truck/barge transhipment within the harbour, but also reaching farther e.g. all the way to China in building sound relationships in the wake of new opportunities such as the new billions of dollars Silk Road (one of the reasons behind setting up by Antwerp its own taskforce in this field).

Isabelle Ryckbost presented a list of the main challenges seaports are currently facing, among many cargo volumes being concentrated in port clusters, opportunities and threats arising from the energy transition, the new TEN-T policy, removing barriers standing in the way of a single internal EU maritime transport market (e.g. the lack of EU port policy), or the ongoing economic war with Russia. Patrick Verhoeven supplemented this list with the ship-owners’ bullet-points, incl. what we have learnt from SECA implementation which in turn can help policymakers and the industry itself to better prepare for other emission and eco-rules lurking on the horizon (GHG, NOx, ballast water, etc.), operational difficulties with scrubbers (e.g. sludge discharge), the need for one EU-wide single window, overcoming the abovementioned “silo thinking”, while on the global agenda – the necessity for Europe to manage its way in negotiations with China and the US.

Lamia Kerdjoudj-Balkaid highlighted the somewhat up-and-down dependency modern terminals have to deal with. On the one hand, they are subject to policies...
forged (or not) at the top EU level, while on the other hand – terminals must adapt to downstream market trends, particularly container ships it seems growing beyond belief with every new order. Lamia also mentioned the “prisoner’s dilemma” occurring in the world of seaport terminals, when each and everyone is calculating what’s best for him or her – to cooperate or to defect? – when it should be pretty clear that the first ought to be the go-for option.

There’s no other way than forward

Having mentioned bigger and bigger ships, the first session of Day 1 – exceptionally moderated by MTBS’s Director, Steven Bouckaert – was opened by Drewry’s Consultant, James Kyritsis and his presentation on bigger ships and bigger ports. James talked in detail about today’s TEU arms race resulting in a ship cascading effect, more pressure put on terminal capacity in light of increased call sizes, push for the lowest costs in times of all-time low freight rates, as well as the formation of alliances or mergers as in the Chinese COSCO and CSCL case.

“Never waste a good crisis,” was on the other hand the key takeaway from Chris Coek’s speech, Port of Antwerp’s Manager Policy & Strategic Projects. For Antwerp this means shifting towards the supply chain way of thinking, when the port authority is an active landlord bringing together various transport modes to form one swift network of moving goods to/from/within the port, whereas in the “good-ol’ never to come back days” it was only about the end of one’s nose. The post-crisis times also extorted a clearer focus on anticipating the future but also on resilience from port authorities, Chris underlined.

Lars Nennhaus, Vice President Port Development from Duisport, presented not only Europe’s largest dry port, but explained how Duisburg has risen and maintained its position over the years. Once a coal and steel hotspot, Duisport cooperated closely with industries deploying demand-focused investments to become a container major, thus prevailing on the market when more and more goods came in box-stuffed. Lars also talked about peculiarities of developing an in-city port, where e.g. one needs to reach for brownfields to keep pace with market drifts. Asked about Duisburg-China rail services and their economic sustainability when the Chinese are subsidizing them, Lars compared these services with start-ups, which also need a helping hand in the early days in order to grab a firm foothold in the long-term. Harbours Review’s contribution to Day 1 was the presentation Top 20 European box seaports 2009-2014 full of statistics for the past six years (Fig. 1 and 2).

Start-up promotion of intermodal is often more than needed and here port authorities can help by deploying financial aid in the form of taking minority stakes in inland terminals.

“Never waste a good crisis.”
The post-crisis times extorted a clearer focus on anticipating the future but also on resilience from port authorities.

“Never waste a good crisis.”

The first session was followed by a panel discussion on ports and terminals’ responses to market affairs. Luc Arnouts talked about the need to increase hinterland accessibility by helping market players leave their “trenches” and see the bigger picture with the potential for win-win opportunities. Maria Dolors Lloveras, the Port of Barcelona’s Market Analysis Manager, presented in detail barriers standing in the way of developing intermodal services in Spain, ranging from different gauges and electrical systems to inland terminals not interested in services to/from seaports, something nowadays luckily undergoing a positive change thanks to i.e. Barcelona’s efforts. Luc and Lars Nennhaus agreed with Maria that start-up promotion of intermodal is often more than needed and here port authorities can help by deploying financial aid in the form of taking minority stakes in inland terminals. Steven Bouckaert summed up the discussion, “To be a successful port nowadays is to be a gateway port, not dependent on one business leg,” (e.g. alike some ports on container transhipment, one of the takeaways from the Top 20 European box seaports’ figures).
Liner conferences like consortia remained unregulated in Europe until the mid-1980s, but following a lengthy review, the European Commission (EC) adopted the consor-tia regulation in 1992. The new rules provided a limited exemption under EU competition rules for consortia and VSA agreements with market shares of up to 35% (now 30%) but significantly excluded price cooperation. That was an important signal to the shipping indus-try of the EC’s intent to deal with price fixing. It also importantly recognised that consortia and VSAs potentially presented other com-petition problems, like the ability to influence prices by virtue of their market power.

Since the late 1990s the scale and scope of cooperation traditionally associated with consortia and VSAs has changed dramatically. The emergence of a new breed of global deals such as the Grand Alliance or the New World Alliance, and more recently the blocked Worlds P3 Alliance, has pointed to larger and more integrated forms of cooperation which are potentially game-changing for the liner shipping industry and its customers.

The new direction suggested by the doomed P3, and possibly by the G6 and CKYX agreements, appears to follow that of the main aviation alliances. No doubt many would argue that what’s good for the airline in-dustry is good for the container shipping sec-tor. Supporters of such maritime and aviation alliances cite the benefits of code and vessel sharing, reduced costs arising from joint op-erations, common investments and purchas-ing, cheaper fares and rates as well as a wider range of services for customers. Similarly, market dominance concerns are dismissed on the basis that there is no evidence of ex-cessive profits or exorbitant prices. Another common factor appears to be a desire to co-operate rather than compete head-on for en-hanced market shares through, for example, a merger and acquisition.

In the main these benefits are championed by the global alliances themselves and those who have sanctioned them. Customers are generally supportive of consortia and VSAs because they want to share in the potential benefits. However, they have to take these as-sumptions wholly on trust (although to its credit the US Federal Maritime Commission did pro-pose some quite stringent monitoring condi-tions for the P3).

Before the Chinese blocked the P3, the EC indicated that it did not consider there were any present grounds to intervene under EU competition law, effectively leaving the door open to taking action at a later date, if necessary. However, there appears to have been no serious intention to undertake a com-petition analysis of the P3’s compatibility with EU competition rules or, indeed, respond to questions submitted by the Global Shippers’ Forum (GSF) concerning some of the legal issues raised by the P3, particularly those minds the news on the COSCO (member of the G6 Alliance) and CSCL (Ocean Three) merger announcement.

Dennis Kögeböhn, Partner at HPC Hamburg Port Consulting, took up the question, “Is terminal automation the answer to all issues?” What’s sure, for the time being there’s not a thing like “one size fits all” concerning terminal automation, because there are both different levels of automation as well as various investment motivations, not always being pure balance sheet calculations. Labour costs, an ageing population, but most importantly the need for stability and reliability (as terminals are parts of production lines) are the key drivers for automation, which – surprisingly at first glance – do not automatically stand for higher container moves performance than traditional man-in-STS facilities.

Economics and efficiency is another kettle of fish in the case of terminal automation; for some it’s more or less a must, whilst for others it is rather a case of ambition, where bottomless pots of gold and the “Because I can” and “I will be the first” attitude tilt the scales even if it will take ages for labour costs to match capital and operational expenditures of a fully-automated container sea terminal.

Feature Article

Chris Welsh was appointed Secretary-General of the Global Shippers’ Forum in 2011. From 1997-2010 Chris was Secretary General of the European Shippers’ Coun-cil (ESC) where he played the prominent role in negotiating EU shipping and air cargo markets, spearheading a series of successful maritime legislative campaigns culmi-nating in the repeal of anti-trust immunity for liner shipping conferences in trades to and from Europe in 2006. Chris has held a variety of senior man-agement roles for the UK Freight Trans-port Association, and is currently Direc-tor of Global and European Policy and a member of FTA’s Leadership Board. In 1992 he established FTA’s Brussels operations and in 2010 set up FTA Ireland, a new independent multimodal logistics trade association for Irish ship-pers and logistics investors.

Chris holds a Master’s Degree in Busi-ness Administration (MBA), is a Char-tered Member of the Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport (CILT) and a Member of the Chartered Manage-ment Institute (CMI).

Chris’ question at the end of his presentation, “When will the first mega alliance crumble?” echoed unanswered the most, everybody having in the back of their minds the news on the COSCO (member of the G6 Alliance) and CSCL (Ocean Three) merger announcement.

After the panel discussion, Chris Welsh, Secretary General of the Global Shippers’ Forum, addressed the topic Container carriers – depressing freight rates, ship cargo capacity arms race, and the rise, downfall, and resurrection of shipping alliances. Chris gave a shipper’s perspective on the falling freight rates across the spot market, the sharp decrease in bunker prices, extreme volatility on the container shipping market with cost cuts not matching drops in revenues and with megaships further aggravating the unstable situation. Chris also asked, “Is the alliance model the right one?” The shipping alliances, as they seem today, do not particularly add to market competition, if not the opposite due to less flexibility, lower reliability in regards to delivery time, as well as less innovation. Nonetheless, Chris’ question at the end of his presentation, “When will the first mega alliance crumble?”, echoed unanswered the most, everybody having in the back of their
"Delayed, but on their way," said William Todts from the Transport & Environment delivering a presentation on next-gen trucks, which are to be safer (both in the eventuality of car crashes and pedestrian hits) as well as more efficient (-5% fuel consumption), thus cleaner, thanks to better aerodynamics. The EU is currently working on new weight and dimension rules for trucks and trailers, making it possible to witness rounder lorries in a couple of years (2020-2022).

William emphasized the role of new truck designs in axing transport emissions, as heavy goods vehicles are just too big to be ignored when combating climate change.

"The shoebox shape of European trucks did evolve. In the early 1990s lorry cabs had become so short and uncomfortable that drivers and trade unions started protesting. A relatively swift review of the dimensions law followed to increase cab length to approx. 2.3 m to make working conditions more acceptable for drivers. The dimensions law hasn’t changed once.

Today Europe’s trucks are safer, cleaner and more efficient than their American counterparts, and only kids dream of American-style trucks on European roads. But it is also increasingly clear that the space constraints caused by the dimensions law are hindering progress and that Europe’s truckmakers have more or less made the most of the current design.

There will be further demands to improve the fuel economy, air pollutant emissions, noise levels and, in particular, safety. Indeed, with just 3% of vehicles, trucks are responsible for 25% of EU road transport emissions and every year around 400 million barrels of oil are needed to fuel European lorries, at a cost of around EUR 60 bln. The total health cost associated with air pollution from trucks is estimated to be around 45 bln with infrastructure, congestion and noise costs adding another 130 bln in external costs. Finally, trucks are twice as dangerous as cars per kilometre driven; 4,200 people died in lorry crashes in 2011.

Round nose eco perk

We, at Transport & Environment (T&E), believe European trucks need to continue improving. Shifting goods to other modes is a laudable ambition and one that we wholeheartedly subscribe to, but it is equally clear that trucks will allegedly protect the national railways from the competition of ever longer and heavier trucks. Other countries introduced similar restrictions. Often safety concerns played a role too. When the EU decided to create the single market in the 1980s, it needed to create common standards for good transport and it copied the system that existed in member countries.

This decade-old choice for a length limit that applies to the whole vehicle has had a profound impact on the way trucks are designed in Europe. The nature of the haulage market is such that cargo space always gets priority, so European truckmakers created an ultra-compressed cab-over-engine design that allows maximum space for the trailer.

The shoebox shape of European trucks did evolve. In the early 1990s lorry cabs had become so short and uncomfortable that drivers and trade unions started protesting. A relatively swift review of the dimensions law followed to increase cab length to approx. 2.3 m to make working conditions more acceptable for drivers. The dimensions law hasn’t changed once.

Today Europe’s trucks are safer, cleaner and more efficient than their American counterparts, and only kids dream of American-style trucks on European roads. But it is also increasingly clear that the space constraints caused by the dimensions law are hindering progress and that Europe’s truckmakers have more or less made the most of the current design.

There will be further demands to improve the fuel economy, air pollutant emissions, noise levels and, in particular, safety. Indeed, with just 3% of vehicles, trucks are responsible for 25% of EU road transport emissions and every year around 400 million barrels of oil are need- ed to fuel European lorries, at a cost of around EUR 60 bln. The total health cost associated with air pollution from trucks is estimated to be around 45 bln with infra-structure, congestion and noise costs adding another 130 bln in external costs.

Finally, trucks are twice as dangerous as cars per kilometre driven; 4,200 people died in lorry crashes in 2011.

Round nose eco perk

We, at Transport & Environment (T&E), believe European trucks need to continue improving. Shifting goods to other modes is a laudable ambition and one that we wholeheartedly subscribe to, but it is equally clear that trucks will

S
ure, there was a difference between Mercedes and DAF but compared to the flashy American trucks I had seen on television, these shoeboxes were rather uninteresting and so we quickly turned to sports cars again. I did wonder why our trucks were so boring but didn’t really give it much thought at the time.

It was only later when I started working in the transport sector that I found out why American lorries are so different from European ones. It doesn’t have anything to do with aesthetics or European truckmakers being less creative than their American counterparts. It isn’t even related to the American preference for big things in general. The truth is more prosaic: Europe has a dimensions law that limits the overall length of trucks while the US only limits trailer lengths.

Shoeboxes

Vehicle-length restrictions were first introduced in the 1950s in Germany, allegedly to protect the national railways from the competition of ever longer and heavier trucks. Other countries intro-duced similar restrictions. Often safety concerns played a role too. When the EU decided to create the single market in the 1980s, it needed to create common standards for good transport and it copied the system that existed in member countries.

This decade-old choice for a length limit that applies to the whole vehicle has had a profound impact on the way trucks are designed in Europe. The nature of the haulage market is such that cargo space always gets priority, so European truckmakers created an ultra-compressed cab-over-engine design that allows maximum space for the trailer.

The shoebox shape of European trucks did evolve. In the early 1990s lorry cabs had become so short and un-comfortable that drivers and trade un-ions started protesting. A relatively swift review of the dimensions law followed to increase cab length to approx. 2.3 m to make working conditions more accept-able for drivers. The dimensions law has not changed once.

Today Europe’s trucks are safer, cleaner and more efficient than their American counterparts, and only kids dream of American-style trucks on European roads. But it is also increasingly clear that the space constraints caused by the dimensions law are hindering progress and that Europe’s truckmakers have more or less made the most of the current design.

There will be further demands to improve the fuel economy, air pollutant emissions, noise levels and, in particular, safety. Indeed, with just 3% of vehicles, trucks are responsible for 25% of EU road transport emissions and every year around 400 million barrels of oil are need-ed to fuel European lorries, at a cost of around EUR 60 bln. The total health cost associated with air pollution from trucks is estimated to be around 45 bln with infra-structure, congestion and noise costs adding another 130 bln in external costs.

Finally, trucks are twice as dangerous as cars per kilometre driven; 4,200 people died in lorry crashes in 2011.

Round nose eco perk

We, at Transport & Environment (T&E), believe European trucks need to continue improving. Shifting goods to other modes is a laudable ambition and one that we wholeheartedly subscribe to, but it is equally clear that trucks will
Across the EU there’s a lot of talk about an eco-friendly road-to-rail modal shift, but rail operations are business ventures, therefore in order to attract cargo owners, cost reductions must be implemented. But how to do it when as of today a freight train in Europe cannot exceed 750 m, way below kilometres long double-stacked train sets seen in the US? As a response, the Marathon project has successfully carried out field tests of 1,500 m mega-trains in Europe, highlighting both energy and manning savings this solution delivers.

Next, Franco Castagnetti, Marathon Project Leader as well as NewOpera Aisbl President and Capacity4Rail Partner, showed how European railways can gain more capacity without putting new tracks on the ground. Across the EU there’s a lot of talk about an eco-friendly road-to-rail modal shift, Franco said, but rail operations are business ventures, therefore in order to attract cargo owners, cost reductions must be implemented. But how to do it when as of today a freight train in Europe cannot exceed 750 m, way below kilometres long double-stacked train sets seen in the US? As a response, the Marathon project has successfully carried out field tests of 1,500 m mega-trains in Europe, highlighting both energy and manning savings this solution delivers. Moreover, Franco proposed other measures as a way forward, incl. combining containerized and conventional cargo on the same train, deploying automation when feasible as well as investing in a resilient infrastructure to minimize the negative impacts of i.e. extreme weather phenomena.

Day 1 was concluded by Alexander van den Bosch, the new Director of the European Federation of Inland Ports, who said that intermodality is not a question of “If?”, but “When?”, taking into account its efficiency, lower transport costs and eco-friendliness perks, particularly in light of ambitious EU emission targets, not least because of European economies’ competitiveness. What is needed to support intermodality, though, is more innovations and cooperation.
China is going global. After a rocketing GDP transformation made in-house, the Chinese state and privately-owned enterprises are turning towards foreign direct investment. The so-called One Belt, One Road initiative will create a New Silk Road Economic Belt, which will not only rail & sea connect the main industrial cities in China with the biggest trading centres, but will also bring new development opportunities, including for countries of the Baltic Sea region.

The second day of the conference was by all means dominated by the new Silk Road, also known as the One Belt, One Road initiative (一带一路), a development strategy of the Chinese government to offshore their GDP growth by – to put it vividly – rail-binding the country with Europe. The first session started with Thomas Kargl, CEO of the Far East Land Bridge (FELB) company, giving his insights on the success of the project, as Lithuania is one of the key countries to successes. Li Jianhong, the Chairman of the Chinese National Corporation for Overseas Investment between agriculture ministers of both countries was interested in exporting Lithuanian agricultural products to China. In March 2013, the Chinese Ambassador to Lithuania and China warmed a bit. Both countries are interested in developing natural resources and are planning to construct a new port in Klaipėda. They also plan to construct a new rail connection to connect Klaipėda with the Chinese port and to the Port of Talinn. Thanks to Chinese funds, rail will be expanded and modernized (e.g. a dock on industrial parks facilitate the Chinese exporting companies agreed between the present authority and the China National Corporation for Overseas Economic Cooperation (November 2012)).

The second day of the conference was by all means dominated by the new Silk Road, also known as the One Belt, One Road initiative (一带一路), a development strategy of the Chinese government to offshore their GDP growth by – to put it vividly – rail-binding the country with Europe.

The OBOR initiative is part of President Xi Jinping’s ‘Chinese Dream’ also announced in the Mediterranean Sea. It includes a rail route based on middle eastern state-owned rail company functions as a Swiss watch as such conduct simply seems to be a little bit odd in 2015, China has already begun some underdeveloped parts of Asia. China is now looking for new investments in Europe, especially in rail and sea transport. The One Belt, One Road initiative is a development strategy of the Chinese government to offshore their GDP growth by – to put it vividly – rail-binding the country with Europe. The first session started with Thomas Kargl, CEO of the Far East Land Bridge (FELB) company, giving his insights on the success of the project, as Lithuania is one of the key countries to successes. Li Jianhong, the Chairman of the Chinese National Corporation for Overseas Investment between agriculture ministers of both countries was interested in exporting Lithuanian agricultural products to China. In March 2013, the Chinese Ambassador to Lithuania and China warmed a bit. Both countries are interested in developing natural resources and are planning to construct a new port in Klaipėda. They also plan to construct a new rail connection to connect Klaipėda with the Chinese port and to the Port of Talinn. Thanks to Chinese funds, rail will be expanded and modernized (e.g. a dock on industrial parks facilitate the Chinese exporting companies agreed between the present authority and the China National Corporation for Overseas Economic Cooperation (November 2012)).

Chinese investments in Europe, especially in rail and sea transport. The first session started with Thomas Kargl, CEO of the Far East Land Bridge (FELB) company, giving his insights on the success of the project, as Lithuania is one of the key countries to successes. Li Jianhong, the Chairman of the Chinese National Corporation for Overseas Investment between agriculture ministers of both countries was interested in exporting Lithuanian agricultural products to China. In March 2013, the Chinese Ambassador to Lithuania and China warmed a bit. Both countries are interested in developing natural resources and are planning to construct a new port in Klaipėda. They also plan to construct a new rail connection to connect Klaipėda with the Chinese port and to the Port of Talinn. Thanks to Chinese funds, rail will be expanded and modernized (e.g. a dock on industrial parks facilitate the Chinese exporting companies agreed between the present authority and the China National Corporation for Overseas Economic Cooperation (November 2012)).

Taking into consideration all the uncertainty and volatility of the sea container market, clients are today searching for flexibility and here alternative rail choices step in (e.g. less-than-container load up to block train offer).
There are still a lot of challenges to overcome, but in the best case scenario we’ll have rail services going across the new Silk Road with no financial support from the side of the Chinese government sooner rather than later.

asked about securing backhaul cargo to Asia, participants harmoniously pointed at EU food products, demand for which is particularly high in China due to their quality. However, maintaining the right temperature throughout the whole journey can be quite challenging and long distance rail reefer technology must advance to ensure reliable services.

asked about widening the competitiveness of rail transports, so that it will become a sounder cost-time option compared both to sea and air freight, the panellists responded that actually Europe-China rail services weren’t designed to bite into them, but to serve a market that has emerged as a consequence of transport and logistics developments. For instance rail services are ideal for intermediate goods as well as for just-in-time deliveries, which – as the panellists underlined – do not equal as soon as possible, but rather when the client really needs them. Asked about securing backhaul cargo to Asia, participants harmoniously pointed at EU food products, demand for which is particularly high in China due to their quality. However, maintaining the right temperature throughout the whole journey can be quite challenging and long distance rail reefer technology must advance to ensure reliable services.

part of the Silk Road, because in PKP CARGO’s Malaszewicze on the Poland-Belarus border the European standard and the wide gauges meet. Today the terminal enjoys a sort of transhipment monopoly as an effect of the ongoing war in eastern Ukraine, which makes it impossible to ship freight through Ukrainian Railways’ network up to the Euroterminal Sławków in central-south Poland, which is also wide gauge-connected. All of this makes it clear why the Chinese have set up a joint venture with PKP CARGO aimed at developing Malaszewicze towards serving Silk Road trains. Asked about widening the competitiveness of rail transports, so that it will become a sounder cost-time option compared both to sea and air freight, the panellists responded that actually Europe-China rail services weren’t designed to bite into them, but to serve a market that has emerged as a consequence of transport and logistics developments. For instance rail services are ideal for intermediate goods as well as for just-in-time deliveries, which – as the panellists underlined – do not equal as soon as possible, but rather when the client really needs them. Asked about securing backhaul cargo to Asia, participants harmoniously pointed at EU food products, demand for which is particularly high in China due to their quality. However, maintaining the right temperature throughout the whole journey can be quite challenging and long distance rail reefer technology must advance to ensure reliable services.

DB Schenker’s Martin Ritterhaus summed up the discussion, there are still a lot of challenges to overcome, but in the best case scenario we’ll have rail services going across the new Silk Road with no financial support from the side of the Chinese government sooner rather than later. Aleksandra added that China is evolving towards a new market for more and more goods made in Europe, a potential win-win situation for rail and logistics companies from the Continent and Chinese consumers as Europe remains flat, while the Middle Kingdom’s demand for high quality products is on the rise.
Among the project’s specific objectives is to introduce purely electric terminal tractors and the hybrid rubber tyred gantry (RTG) crane, including the 100% electric SEA-RTT, the SEA-EcoRTG based on engine downsizing and hybridisation, the SEA-RTG Dual Fuel based on LNG diesel, the SEA-EcoRS reachstacker, the SEA-EcoLift forklift as well as an LNG supply station specifically designed for port equipment, and finally the SEA-Lightning real-time dynamic terminal lightning system. “The prototypes of the vehicles are now finished and they are currently being tested in the Noatum Container Terminal in Valencia,” Marta Sáez Prado, Valenciaport Foundation Director of Communication, commented on the project’s tangible developments.

Secondly, the SEA TERMINALS’ proposal is to expand the real-time operation management model that minimizes existing bottlenecks in the operations of terminals by assigning different operational modes. The SEAMS Platform will be capable of receiving live information from equipment and from the terminal operating system, calculating in turn the best mode of operation for each type of equipment at any given moment.

The Baltic Ports Organization, as a communication partner of SEA TERMINALS, organized a seminar in March 2015 devoted to technical aspects and general views on the whole initiative, as well as a workshop during the BPO Conference in Riga (September 2015) on energy efficiency management in port terminals. The project was also one of the main issues discussed during the LNG Transport Forum in Valencia (October 2015).

Sea terminals have directly linked eco-efforts to economic gains. By investing in both wind/solar power as well as in less fuel consuming equipment, terminal operators cut their bills on energy.

After the panel discussion, a session on new technologies and innovation in ports kicked off. Conor Feighan from FEPORT analyzed emission reduction schemes undertaken by sea terminals, which have directly linked eco-efforts to economic gains. By investing in both wind/solar power as well as in less fuel consuming equipment, terminal operators cut their bills on energy. Real life demonstration of such an approach was presented by Eduardo Olmeda, Valenciaport Foundation’s R&D Project Manager, who in the course of the SEATERMINALS project oversaw the creation and deployment of eco-enhanced terminal handling equipment such as a fully electric tractor, a hybrid diesel-electric RTG, an LNG-powered reachstacker, not mentioning a real-time dynamic terminal lightning system, all proven to reduce emissions without any additional operational difficulties (or with even better performance as in the case of the electric tractor, more peppy than its traditional counterpart).

The Harbours 360 Conference was closed by the session on the latest ro-ro & ferry and SECA developments. Actia Forum’s Head of Consulting Department, Maciej Matczak, elaborated on half a year into the Sulphur Directive enforcement and up-to-date consequences of it. It seems that the terror inspiring date of the 1st of January 2015 appeared to be toothless hitherto, however, not because everyone prepared themselves well in advance, but thanks to shocking low oil indices, making this year’s prices of low sulphur bunker land below those of non-compliant heavy fuels one year earlier.

Johan Roos, Executive Director of Interferry, expressed the voice of the ferry industry on what went wrong with SECA and how such experiences can help to steer clear from making the same mistakes with rules on monitoring, reporting and verifying CO₂ emissions.
One future way of dealing with SECA or any other emission restrictions is placing a bet on fully electric ferries. Another approach is to consider full electrification of shipping. 

One future way of dealing with SECA or any other emission restrictions is placing a bet on fully electric ferries, something brought closer by Eliza Gagatsi, E-ferry project Impact Manager. Apart from new rules-caused motivations, there are other reasons for taking the e-revolutionary step like “plug-in” power cheaper and cleaner that bunkers, first mover perception or potential benefits of using new ship building materials (the use of which the E-ferry project in also investigating) resulting in lowering the weight of a vessel, hence a drop in propulsion power demand. Members of the E-ferry initiative are currently designing their fully electric ship to be built for domestic operations in Denmark; the impacts of the demonstration will subsequently be evaluated for market uptake (e.g. across the Greek archipelagos) and upgrades.

Clocking up till next year

Contrary to the popular saying, the first edition of the Harbours 360 Conference wasn’t a spoiled pancake, quite the opposite thanks to the first tier speakers, sharp-eyed moderators and an active audience. We’re now waiting to roll the year round to once again circle 360 degrees around ports, putting the spotlight on both the most burning questions as well as on niche topics.

The plug-in Holy Grail

by Henrik Hagbarth Mikkelsen, Green Ferry Vision’s Project Coordinator

Fossil fuel-generated pollution in general is unquestionably one of the most serious issues negatively impacting the health of both our societies and the ecosystem. While many are doing a great job to improve traditional combustion engines to further cut fuel consumption by another one or two percent, there is yet a completely different path to follow. Ferries 100% plug-powered are moving from being a sci-fi titbit, to becoming a ready-to-use concept.

Indeed, the potential is tremendous. A 2014 early survey conducted by the Zero Emission Marine Organisations (ZEEMO) has estimated that at that time in Norway 47 out of 125 so-called “fanhäls” ferries were suitable for fully electric operation, while another 34 could become possible candidates. A similar Danish study undertaken by Herson in 2013 concluded that 10-16 out of 14 Danish domestic ferry routes could benefit from fully electric ferries. These early studies, however, were based on somewhat restricted assumptions. Firstly, that the ferries which were selected for the survey were already highly fuel efficient, a condition that today is not uncommon. Secondly, that the existing ferry operators did not have a strong financial interest in replacing their current propulsion technology with alternative propulsion systems. In addition, carbon footprint reduction was not considered as an additional incentive in the decision-making process.

Change the approach, access higher.

The “E-ferry” concept & design of the Green Ferry Vision project changes the above premises by simply turning up the “ampe”. The possible charging power and battery capacity of any known electric ferry have been multiplied by a factor of four making the technology beyond that of the art. Suddenly, the target routes are not only short ferry trips as evaluated in the early surveys but also medium-range inland connections and inland waters routes of up to 30-60 nautical miles. Given the high charging power and extremely low running costs the Green Ferry Vision project design makes it possible to move high-value goods and passengers all over Europe in considerably reduced time and cost-effective way.

Get ready!!

According to the case study, four small E-ferries can replace the existing three conventional ferries of the same size. The potential savings are around 15-20% compared to current operations. If the “lunch break” charging option could be used as well as a ‘lunch break’ charge it may be possible to have a break charged for 1-2 hours for longer trips.

The electric motors of 700 kW each will be able to give the E-ferry a speed up to 15-18 knots, that may not sound impressive, though it will be a vast return from the resource-hungry conventional ferries, typically navigating at around 9-13 knots. Only little battery packs and electric motor systems will need to be made as the potential savings are substantial. Overall, the cost of an E-ferry is expected to be smaller, saving even more costs and bringing the ship more “slender”.

Fully electric ferries for domestic waters

Ferries 100% plug-powered are moving from being a sci-fi titbit, to becoming a ready-to-use concept.
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DAY 1: 20/10/2015
Container & Intermodal

08:30-09:00 Registration + welcome coffee

09:00-09:30 Opening speeches
Isabelle Ryckbost, Secretary General, ESPO
Patrick Verhoeven, Secretary General, ECSA
Przemysław Opłocki, Head of Marketing & Sales, Harbours Review
Luc Arnouts, CCO, Antwerp Port Authority
Lamia Kerdjoudj-Belkaid, Secretary General, FEPORT

09:30-10:50 SESSION & PANEL: Port strategies in Europe
Keynote speech: New challenges for ports in Europe; bigger ships, bigger ports
James Kyritsis, Consultant, Drewry Shipping Consultants
Strategy of the European hub port – Port of Antwerp Case study
Chris Coeck, Manager Policy & Strategic Projects, Antwerp Port Authority
Overview of the container market in the EU – top 20 box seaports
Przemysław Myszka, Editor-in-Chief, Harbours Review
Solutions of an inland port to meet the challenges of the future – the Duisport case study
Lars Nennhaus, Vice President Port Development, Duisport

10:50-11:15 Coffee break kindly sponsored by

11:15-12:30 PANEL DISCUSSION: Catching up the future market in Europe
— How different ports are responding to bigger ships-trend?
— EU port market: North and South and regional markets
— Building new terminals or optimizing existing capacities
— Building alliances in the port industry – is this a future?
Panellists: Maria Dolors Lloveras, Market Analysis Manager, Port of Barcelona
Lars Nennhaus, Vice President Port Development, Duisport
Luc Arnouts, CCO, Antwerp Port Authority
James Kyritsis, Consultant, Drewry Shipping Consultants

12:30-13:30 Lunch break

13:30-14:30 SESSION CONTAINER MARKET: Facing the market challenge
Container carriers – depressing freight rates; ship cargo capacity arms race; and the rise, downfall, and resurrection of shipping alliances
Chris Welsh, Secretary General, Global Shippers’ Forum
Is terminal automation the answer to all issues?
Dennis Koegelboohn, Partner, HPC Hamburg Port Consulting GmbH

14.30-16:00 SESSION INTERMODAL: Effective transport solutions on land
Next-gen trucks – longer, safer and more efficient
William Todts, Programme Manager, Transport & Environment
Increasing rail capacity without laying new tracks
Franco Castagnetti, NewOpera Aisbl President, Capacity4Rail Partner and Marathon Project Leader
Three-in-one – rail+barge+truck – the inland ports case study
Alexander van den Bosch, Director, EFIP – European Federation of Inland Ports

16:00-16:15 Summary & end of the first conference day

16:15-17:00 Drink & snack / networking
# EVENT AGENDA

## DAY 2: 21/10/2015
Silk road, intermodal, ro-ro and ferry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Moderator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30-09:00</td>
<td><strong>Registration + welcome coffee</strong></td>
<td>Alan Arent, Event Director, Harbours 360 Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00-11:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION INTERMODAL: Connecting Europe with Asia – Euroasian Landbridge</strong></td>
<td>Nicolai M. Noeckler, Director, Business Unit Asia &amp; Pacific, Trans Eurasia Logistics GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is it start or the end route?</td>
<td>Thomas Kargl, CEO, Far East Land Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boost of traffic in one or both directions on the Euroasian Landbridge?</td>
<td>Pascale Pasmans, Senior Advisor Intermodality &amp; Hinterland, Port of Antwerp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transport from Europe to Asia</td>
<td>DHL Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optimising the distribution of goods to their final destination</td>
<td>DHL Freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong> kindly sponsored by VRT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:30</td>
<td><strong>PANEL DISCUSSION: Sea transport vs. Rail transport</strong></td>
<td>Przemysław Opłocki, Head of Marketing &amp; Sales, Harbours Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panel moderators:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Przemysław Myszka, Editor-in-Chief, Harbours Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aleksandra Kocemba, Intermodal Transport Manager, Raben Transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aart Klompe, CEO, DB Schenker Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sławomir Knap, Director of Multimodal Transport, Hatrans Logistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jakub Garstka, Representative of the Board, Hatrans Logistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td><strong>Lunch break</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION: New technologies and innovation in ports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are European ports modern?</td>
<td>Lamia Kerdjoudj-Belkaid, Secretary General, FEPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How European Commision is assisting port industry?</td>
<td>Remi Mayet, Deputy Head of Unit, Ports and Inland Navigation, DG for Mobility and Transport, European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SeaTerminals Project</td>
<td>Eduardo Olmeda, R&amp;D Project Manager, Valenciaport Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-16:00</td>
<td><strong>SESSION RO-RO: Meeting the SECA challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Half a year into the SECA enforcement – aftermath</td>
<td>Maciej Matczak, Head of Consulting Department, Actia Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can MRV implementation learn from our SECA experience?</td>
<td>Johan Roos, Director of Regulatory affairs, Interferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-ferry project; to design, to build and to demonstrate</td>
<td>Eliza Gagatsi, E-ferry Impact Manager, E-ferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00-16:15</td>
<td><strong>Summary &amp; end of the conference</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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