

The EU Directive on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues: The results of a second survey on the provision and uptake of facilities in North Sea ports

Angela Carpenter *, Sally M. Macgill ✕

School of Earth and the Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to evaluate the results of a survey of the availability and uptake of port reception facilities within the North Sea area. The evaluation is based primarily on original survey data from the autumn of 2002 which followed on from a similar survey conducted in the summer of 2000. The EU Directive on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste etc. (Directive 2000/59/EC) was due to enter into force in December 2002, and required all EU ports to provide reception facilities to meet the needs of the vessels normally calling in at them. This paper examines the readiness of North Sea ports to meet that requirement and also considers the actual uptake levels of facilities, where ports were able to provide such information.
© 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: European Union; North Sea; Port reception facilities; MARPOL 73/78; Waste discharge

1. Introduction

Carpenter and Macgill (2003) examined the current availability of port reception facilities within the North Sea area following a survey in the summer of 2000 and noted that it was the intention of the authors to conduct a second survey in the autumn of 2002 to “expand on the results discussed in [that] paper, and to examine whether any positive impact of the Directive is apparent” (p. 32). That second survey was undertaken in late 2002, with responses received from ports around the same time as Directive 2000/59/EC was due to be transposed into national law in all EU member states (end of December 2002).

The EU Commission (2000) set out the specific requirement that all EU ports provide reception facilities for vessels normally using that port, these facilities covering a wide range of ship-generated waste including oily waste, chemical waste, sewage and garbage. All wastes generated on board vessels visiting those ports were to be discharged into reception facilities, unless vessels had sufficient capacity on board to travel to their next port of call, with a system of vessel documentation and inspections to ensure that vessels were capable of reaching that next port without the need to discharge waste illegally at sea. The Directive also includes a requirement for advance notification by vessels to ports of their intention to use facilities, a fee system to encourage use of facilities and a system to monitor compliance by vessels and the provision of adequate sanctions for non-compliance.

One hundred and ninety-five North Sea ports in Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom were approached using postal surveys to determine the levels of provision of port reception facilities available in those ports prior to the

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 113 343 6717; fax: +44 113 343 1590.

E-mail address: a.carpenter@env.leeds.ac.uk (A. Carpenter).

✕ In Memoriam. Sally Macgill, Professor of Integrated Environmental Management in the School of Earth and Environment, was killed in Thailand during the Tsunami of 26th December 2004.

Table 1
Survey responses: (1) summer 2001 and (2) autumn 2002

Country	Survey response details					
	Surveys issued	Returns details				No response
		Survey 1 only	Survey 2 only	Both surveys	Other	
Belgium	8	0	0	1	3	4
Denmark	7	1	0	2	0	4
Germany	13	0	4	3	1	5
The Netherlands	23	1	1	4	6	11
Norway	61	8	6	9	4	34
United Kingdom	83	11	7	24	13	28
Totals	195	21	18	43	27	86

Source: Carpenter (2005, Table 7.1, p. 145).

introduction of the EU Directive. Norway was included, although not an EU member, in order to provide a comprehensive picture of provision of facilities in the region. The surveys were issued to ports, based on information published by the Marine Environment Protection Committee of the International Maritime Organization in a number of circulars examining provision of facilities under MARPOL 73/78 annexes, and also to a large number of ports identified in the [Fairplay Ports Guide \(2001\)](#). A breakdown of the number of surveys issued by country, and the number of responses to each of the two surveys, appears at [Table 1](#).

Eighty-two ports (42%) provided usable responses to either one or both surveys. There was no response to either survey from 86 ports (44%). The remaining 14% is made up of ports in the category “other”. Of the 27 ports in this category, 5 were either unable to complete the survey or sent port brochures and 13 could not be contacted as their address details were incorrect. The remaining 9 ports indicated specific reasons why they could not complete the survey: 2 are classified as not North Sea; 3 are not responsible for any vessels calling in; 3 no longer receive any vessels; and 1 is exempt from the Directive as it only receives military vessels. If we exclude these 9 ports, the response rate is 82 ports out of 186 (44%).

While 42 out of the 83 UK Ports (50%) provided returns to one or both surveys, two port returns covered three separate port localities and one response covered seven separate ports, bringing the actual total UK response rate up to 52 (63%). However, because it is not clear whether each separate port has all or only some of the facilities identified in those specific cases, the returns for these groups of ports have been considered as a single entity for the purposes of this analysis, and the number of UK responses is given as 42.

2. Provision of reception facilities in 77 North Sea ports—general information

Carpenter and Macgill (2003) provide a broad range of background data from the summer 2000 survey on

the types of business activities undertaken in the North Sea region, the physical environment and geographical location of ports, and on vessel numbers and sizes, and passenger numbers. This illustrates the very varied range of port types operating in the region. For example, one port in The Netherlands is spread out for many miles along a river estuary, is located in both urban (city) and rural areas, has vessels calling in ranging from very large tankers through to smaller vessels including fishing vessels, and undertakes 15 different business categories identified in the survey. In this port, reception facilities are provided for all categories of wastes, with a large number of contractors available to collect and handle vessel wastes. At the other end of the scale, there are a number of ports on the East Coast of Scotland situated in rural areas that are only used by small fishing vessels and the occasional small cargo vessel. The reception facilities provided in these ports are generally skips or bins on the quayside for oily waste or garbage.

[Table 2](#) provides a breakdown of facilities provided by vessel type in 77 ports, together with details of whether those facilities are actually used by vessels. Using the most recent data supplied by ports, 51 indicated that they provided reception facilities for all vessel types calling in, including the largest port surveyed which provided facilities for 11 different categories of vessels. A further 26 ports indicated that they provided facilities for all vessel types calling in, together with facilities for additional categories of vessels which do not normally use those ports. Only 24 ports specifically indicated that they did not provide facilities for all vessel categories. Two of the reasons for this were that some ports had very small numbers of vessels of those types using the port (generally less than 50) when compared to the numbers of other vessels using the port (several hundreds or even thousands), while a number of other ports identified that facilities were not provided for vessels in Category N—Other in their survey returns as those vessels did not readily fall into any of the vessel categories specified in the survey.

[Fig. 1](#) further examines the number of vessels in each category calling into the 77 ports, and illustrates the

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/9465772>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/9465772>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)