

WP4 Shipping & ports

PartiSEApate - sectorial workshop report (final)

“Maritime Spatial Planning - Shipping and Ports in the Baltic Sea”

Organiser: **Region Skåne**
in Skåne European Office,
Rue du Luxembourg 3, 1000 Brussels
24 October 2013

Authors of the report

Peter Askman, Kristina Veidemane, Henrik Nilsson, Jonas Pålsson.

Goals of the workshop were to introduce to the MSP (Maritime Spatial Planning) principles and Baltic vision of the use of marine space as well as to discuss with stakeholders group about MSP and key issues from the Baltic perspective; Focus was on the discussion of appropriate ways, platforms and players for channelling input and information between the industry and the planning parts.

The main issues:

- Give an introduction to Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) with focus on implications of MSP on the shipping & ports sectors.
- Bring together pan-Baltic stakeholders and other international players from the port/shipping sectors to discuss and analyze the importance of marine spatial planning for these sectors, their roles and perspectives.
- Identify considerations from shipping & ports sectors to be taken into account in planning process, including how they should be taken into account.
- Identify main issues for dialogue and collaboration on a pan-Baltic level.
- Discuss the use of existing or new structures for MSP dialogue and collaboration.
- Establish a starting point for upcoming processes and partnerships
- Contribute to recommendations on future development of MSP around the Baltic Sea Region.
- Role of existing institutions in MSP at different levels;
- Development in the port and shipping industries and its effects on MSP in the Baltic Sea Region;
- Considerations on a pan-Baltic strategy on Maritime Spatial Planning in the context of shipping and ports sectors in the Baltic Sea.

Participants

In total 29 persons participated in the workshop.

Country	Institutions
From BSR:	
Denmark	Danish Coastal Authority; Central Denmark EU Office; North Denmark EU Office;
Estonia	None
Finland	CPMR Baltic Sea Commission
Germany	Ministry of Energy, Infrastructure and State Development Mecklenburg-Vorpommern; Informationsbüro des Landes Mecklenburg-Vorpommern bei der EU; s.Pro sustainable projects;
Latvia	Baltic Environmental Forum; VASAB Secretariat;
Lithuania	None
Norway	Jeppesen Norway
Poland	Baltic Ports Organization
Russia	None
Sweden	Region Skåne, World Maritime University, Swedish Agency for marine and Water Management; Göteborg European Office; Region Småland-Blekinge South Sweden; Maritime-insight, Sweden; Port of Oskarshamn; Swedish Maritime Technology Forum; Swedish Coastguard; Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management; Skåne European Office; Association Ports of Sweden; ESPO; Region Västra Götaland;
Outside BSR:	
Italy	Dept. Electrical, Electronic Telecommunication Engineering and Naval Architecture (DITEN), Genova;

1. General information on what was presented at the workshop

The workshop was organised in an introduction section followed by four sessions to address the main discussion issues (see above). Each of the first three sessions had one to three introductory presentations which were followed by discussion and reflection in smaller groups, generating key messages, giving feedback or feedback and questions to the speakers.

2. Introduction

After the introductory presentation by Ms. Angela Schultz-Zehden (s.Pro sustainable projects) on PartiSEApate and on previous outcomes in the BaltSeaPlan VISION 2030, translating MSP into practice – the shipping 2030 scenario, and principles for maritime spatial planning related to shipping. Henrik Nilsson (World Maritime University) explained the setup of the workshop (annex I, II) and distributed working instructions.

3. Session 1 Ports and Maritime Spatial Planning

- Port development yesterday, today and tomorrow (Speaker: Mikael CASTANIUS, Association Ports of Sweden and Swedish representative in ESPO)
- Port development and coastal planning (Speaker: Bogdan OŁDAKOWSKI, Baltic Ports Organization)
- Port of Oskarshamn - Maritime Spatial Planning, thoughts and actions from a port company (Speaker: Anders SJÖBLOM, Port of Oskarshamn)

Key messages from the speakers and reflections/feedback from participants:

- Today there is a limited dialogue and discussion on MSP implications for ports on a pan-Baltic level;
- Major challenges for ports comes from environmental development (especially air quality and noise, as well as impact on marine nature) and land use development;
- Enormous pressure from city developers in this direction: Growing cities versus expanding ports - leading to large consequences: Cities are taking over central port areas.
- Ports are more and more relocating and moving from the city centers (cruisers and some ferries are however often left near the city center)
- Ports are expanding into coastal sea areas, moving closer to the shipping lanes;
- National strategic considerations (strategic ports), costs of port development and modernization, port specialization, improvement of efficiency most probably leading to concentration to fewer ports and a major development of the future ports;
- An increased cooperation for better economic performance between ports is to be expected, some examples (Copenhagen/Malmö Port, Stockholm) already exists;
- A key trend for ports is also that new logistic solutions (road/rail infrastructure) are needed for the regions and their ports.
- Another key trend is that the container ships become larger and have an increased draught. This means that the fairways needs to be deeper and wider and consideration must be taken when pipelines are put on the sea floor;
- As a consequence of above trends/developments, new navigation structures and corridors have to be constructed or designated.
- MSP must take into account that there will be new corridors for shipping due to changes in port relocations;
- MSP planners should establish a continuing dialogue with the transport market players (the driver) to get an image of the future developments and needs of ports/shipping; Also inland industries (another driver) must be taken into account; Coordination with landbased infrastructure planners must be increased;
- We may expect a trend where fewer ports serve an ever bigger catchment area (no local cargo), a trend that might decrease the local acceptance for port industry (e.g., due to caused conjunction, pollution, noise);
- MSP planners should especially focus on the container sector – the bulk market will always finds their “own ways”, independent of shipping corridors; (Routes – that is about containers!);

- Ports are in a difficult situation: On the one hand the pressure to relocate the terminals, on the other hand extremely long duration of the permit/licensing procedures, which also considerably increases costs and times for ports relocation/development. As a consequence, the port and MSP players need to have an increased time perspective for future development.
- Ports are individual players: From a MSP perspective it is not possible to regard ports as group with the same expectations, needs, conditions, perspectives etc. Thus there is a need to integrate quite a large group of different actors, and promote the communication between the players.
- Lessons can be learned from an integrated approach in Singapore, where port administrations, hydrographic administration and coastal services cooperate closely;
- Ports act on the local, regional, national and international arena: The communication level will always depend on the issue;
- Especially the national level has a lacking platform for dialogue and strategic coordination, although one should expect a great interest in well performing ports from national players;
- There is also a communication gap between higher and lower administrative levels;
- Due to the long periods for port development, ports must become involved in MSP at a very early stage. They would also benefit from increased coordination with the city planners.
- There is a strong need for high level people from port organizations/authorities to receive early information on ongoing MSP and contribute to early input to MSP. In reality there is a low interest to be part of the MSP process. It would be helpful if the port organizations could encourage their members to participate in a debate on MSP nationally or at the Baltic Sea level.
- There is a strong need for high level people from port organizations to become early input from MSP. But there is far less interest to be a part of this process.
- Ports might become the “losers” of the planning process, because ports are local industries, very individual and they lack a unified voice. MSP planners have a great responsibility to take account to this fact.

4. Session 2 Shipping and Maritime Spatial Planning

- Shipping development yesterday, today and tomorrow. (Speaker: Niklas BENGTTSSON – Maritime Insight)
- Changing shipping routes – the Norwegian example (Speaker: Geir OLSEN – Jeppesen Marine)
- Harmonization of shipping routes and other maritime uses in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany (Speaker: Gesa KÖHLER, Ministry of Energy, Infrastructure and State Development, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern)

Key messages from the speakers and reflections/feedback from participants:

- Shifts in global/regional trade has huge impacts on shipping volumes and patterns but can be predicted to a large degree without “rocket science” (recent example: Russian oil shipping in the Baltic Sea);
- MSP have to build on the reality of an increased demand for seaborne transports;
- Shipping is going towards sustainable features and smart green solutions, even if it takes time;
- A big increase is expected in general cargo, but most of all in container shipping, for example reefer carriers are almost totally replaced by containers;
- The Baltic Sea can expect larger container carriers (18 000 container-ships!) with specific needs considering navigation, routes and MSP;
- The increasing share of large container ships is supported by a considerable scrapping of older vessels – “three ships are being replaced by one”. The order books are dominated by larger (container) ships. But since ships take several years to be built, this development is lagging behind.
- The anticipated trends in trade can be done without too much difficulties and provides a head start for MSP; Since these shifts happens rather slow, there is time for MSP to take account of them; The timescale for planning should be long – time horizon at least 50 years;
- In the same time the scale of economy is a main driver for shipping over time, which has been illustrated many times in history!
- The example of changing ship traffic lanes in Norway, where the marine environment and fishing areas were drivers, illustrates a successful integration of data and collaboration for planning and execution between national MSP planners and industry;
- Smart MSP may have positive effects on shipping economy (anchorage fees etc)
- MSP contributes to maritime safety – provided transnational collaboration is performed;
- Managing data on board and communication of data is a key issue; That implies integration and harmonization of nautical data, and especially the need to keep things simple: Not too much info should be handled by onboard mariners!
- In the same time improved tools will be needed onboard (ship reporting systems etc.);
- Example from Mecklenburg-Vorpommern shows clear benefits of coordinating shipping routes and offshore wind farms, raw material extraction, nature conservation etc. in the same “office”; In the MVP case today shipping routes/ship density provided the baseline;
- Early discussions with shipping authorities is essential to find smart compromises between green energy strategies and shipping, avoiding long detours for ships and risk for collisions;
- Similarly to ports, the shipping sector is also rather scattered in terms of stakeholders and the sector lacks information on MSP. In average 1-2 ships per single owner, a large number of shipping agents, global acting scene, thus creating a challenge with regard to stakeholder involvement in MSP.
- The shipping industry does not understand MSP and vice versa. Enhanced communication is essential here;
- The focus should additionally be on the merchants and perhaps not the individual shipping companies. The companies ship the cargo as instructed by the merchants, using green routes or going as fast as possible through marine protected areas.

5. Session Three – Platforms for dialogue, structures for cooperation and Maritime Spatial Planning

(Speaker: Talis LINKAITS, Spatial Planning Initiative VASAB)

Key messages from the speakers and reflections/feedback from participants:

- VASAB emphasized the importance to use existing platforms for MSP interactions rather than create new ones and to create tools for transnational and bilateral communication about maritime spatial plans in preparation.
- Some participants pointed at the cargo owner/transport buyer as key driver – the one who pays for the shipping transport and that they should be involved. The ship-owner only acts within the frame given by the cargo owner and the given legislation; But it should be a degree of “what’s in it for me” taken into consideration, to make it interesting for these players to be involved;
- As ports sectors are “business companies” who compete with each other, they have restraint when it comes to communication of information that could be business secrets;
- The question was lifted who should pay for the costs linked to communication of information and data;
- Jeppesen Norway suggested the use international organizations as platforms for dialogue, structures for cooperation and Maritime Spatial Planning. These organization could be IMO (International Maritime Organization), IALA (International Association of Lighthouse Authorities) , IHO (International Hydrographic Organization) and ICS (International Chamber of Shipping); In this regard there would already be an international framework in place. This would mainly refer to shipping since ports were primarily a regional and international interest;
- There was a consensus that it would make sense to work with early drafts of plans to get players from the industry on the arena: with concrete and probably controversial planning issues reactions would be guaranteed! However these drafts should be at a stage where they still can be changed substantially (flexible drafts); this would make it time saving for ship owner. They would be in the position to consider “their ports” and “their straits” in relation to the draft plan. The industry would surely react under these circumstances, but hardly participate actively and continuously in the regular planning process. There would not be enough resources for such an engagement;
- The business sector should however always be invited to dialogue, networks and meetings. In this way stronger links between the public planning organizations and the industry might evolve, mainly on a national/regional level;
- Unfortunately, there is a lack of time, competence and money in the industry to get involved in these issues other than, at best, through the international organizations.

6. Summary

There is a big gap in understanding between the MSP community and the shipping/port community. This need to be bridged and the communities would benefit from a better understanding of each other. MSP could understand the needs of the industry better and take foreseen market development into consideration for plans and the industry could better predict market impacts from MSP and plan business strategies accordingly. This work would

probably best be done through the international shipping and navigation organizations. The workshop came up with some concrete ways forwards in this respect.

Ports are commercially competitive, individual players in a complex context of local, regional and national level actors, on the inland side as well as on the seaside. Certainly they would also benefit from being better involved in land spatial planning as well as MSP.

Ultimately, today most ports and shipping companies lack interest, resources and competence to be part of the MSP process and are left to react to the changes incurred by MSP. To improve this situation, new dialogue mechanisms to communicate between the sectors are needed.

The workshop results and perceptions resulted in new views, gave a good understanding of the situation and perspectives of the port and shipping industry and will be helpful in the preparation and design of future processes for MSP dialogue and collaboration with the industries.

During the workshop discussions it became clear that there are different understandings when it comes to the question of who should approach whom in the initial phase of the MSP process. Shipping and port representatives saw the MSP process as something owned by public bodies and therefore arguing that they need to approach the industry rather than the other way around. Representatives from public bodies, on the other hand, were arguing that they lack information about the development in shipping and port sector thus requesting more initiatives from the industry side in the MSP process.

7. Conclusions based on the workshop questionnaire

Annex I

Setup of the workshop sessions

The workshop is structured around three thematic sessions. At each of these, specific issues pertaining to shipping & ports and its implications for maritime spatial planning were taken up. The way the sessions were setup aimed both at conveying information to workshop participants, and at fostering exchange of knowledge and experiences among participants and lecturers.

The first half of each session was dedicated to a presentation by invited lecturers. In the second half workshop participants were invited to engage with their groups and discuss specific issues related to the theme of the presentation. These given as described in annex II. During this period, participants were also invited to formulate questions or comments relative to the presentation.

The group work encompassed three moments:

1. Individual reflection
2. Discussion in the group
3. Feedback to the plenary

The last ten minutes of each session were assigned to providing feedback to the plenary.

During session one the workshop participants were invited to present themselves to the other group members. Groups were also invited to assign the following roles to two of its members: Chairperson, tasked with ensuring that the group delivers as required and within the stipulated time; and Rapporteur, tasked with taking notes of the discussion, of questions and comments, and then reporting back to the plenary.

Time was limited and was held strictly, urging on keeping reflections, discussions and feedback focused on the essential.

Annex II. Group discussions, reflections, feedback

Session one - Ports and Maritime Spatial Planning

- *Port development yesterday, today and tomorrow* Mikael CASTANIUS, Association Ports of Sweden and Swedish representative in ESPO
- *Port development and coastal planning* Bogdan OŁDAKOWSKI, Baltic Ports Organization
- *Port of Oskarshamn - Maritime Spatial Planning, thoughts and actions from a port company* Anders SJÖBLOM, Port of Oskarshamn

Group assignment

1. Presentation of group members to each other

Briefly present yourself to the other participants in your group. Who are you? What institution do you work for? What is your specific interest in MSP and shipping and ports?

2. Assignment of roles within the group

Assign the roles of chairperson and rapporteur to two group members.

1. Consider the following issues:

How can the engagement of the port industry be increased in planning and decision making of usage of marine areas?

Your own notes

The rapporteur in your group is welcome to report back to the plenary!

Session two – Shipping and Maritime Spatial planning

- *Shipping development yesterday, today and tomorrow* Niklas BENGTTSSON – Maritime-Insight

- *Changing shipping routes – the Norwegian example* Geir OLSEN – Jeppesen Marine

- *Harmonization of shipping routes and other maritime uses in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, Germany* Gesa KÖHLER, Ministry of Energy, Infrastructure and State Development, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern

Group assignment

Consider the following issue:

How can the engagement of the shipping industry be increased in planning and decision making of usage of marine areas?

Your own notes

The rapporteur in your group is welcome to report back to the plenary!



Session Three - Platforms for dialogue and structures for cooperation in Maritime Spatial Planning

- *HELCOM VASAB – a Baltic Sea MSP interaction/communication platform* Talis LINKAITS - HELCOM VASAB

Group assignment

Consider the following issues:

Is there a need for a common and is it feasible to set up a platform where all uses of marine areas are planned and decided on? If so on which level should this be? Today shipping routes are regulated on an international level but most other uses are planned and decided on a national, regional and local level.

Your own notes

The rapporteur in your group is welcome to report back to the plenary!

Session Four – Panel Discussion

- *Is there a need for a new common platform for MSP interaction/communication in the Baltic Sea?*

Your own notes
