

**OPS Workshop 2, Gothenburg 13 November 2008**

***Participants***

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Title</b>
Thomas Mattsson	ABB	Area Sales Manager
Michiel Jak	Altran	
Kazuhiro Harakawa	Bemac Uzushio Electric, Japan	Corporate Planning Section
Wiert-Jan De Raaf	Clinton Climate Initiative	Director Ports & Shipping
Jan Smits	HOLLAND MARINE EQUIPMENT	Project manager innovation
Jochen Kress	Ministry of economic affairs and ports , Environmental unit, Bremen	
Paul De Rache	Port of Antwerp	Manager Energy Projects
Åsa Wilske	Port of Göteborg	Environmental Manager
Per Lindeberg	Port of Göteborg	Electrical Manager
Wolfgang Becker	HPA Hamburg Port Authority	
Hendrik Hollstein	HPA Hamburg Port Authority	
Jean-Paul Raffini	Port of le Havre Authority	Deputy Head Environment Security and Quality Mission
Hans-Erhard Schmidt	Siemens AG	
Jussi Mantynen	Siemens AG	

**Introduction**

Asa:

We get more and more questions why we don't connect all ships. We want to see a market evolving.

Wiert:

Win win situation: accelerate the creation of a market. Ports get cleaner air, suppliers earn money, less co2 etc. We will work with suppliers to see how they can add to the creation of the market. Cooperation will be important.

ALERT: no shipping lines, no terminal operators!!

JP Raffini, Le Havre → working on OPS for ferry. Liability is key issue there.

## Presentation Michiel part I

Port authorities – shipping lines – local authorities

Roro/ferry – cruise – container

Slide 4: is speed reduction an alternative for shore power? → NO

OPS can be used as a means to balance out expansion activities

OPS could be an economic benefit for the entity selling the power/operating the system → but not always clear which organisation benefits

→ does Stadtwercke Lübeck get economic benefits from OPS? They work directly with Stora Enso. Port authority was not involved

=> key issue: interface management of all involved stakeholders.

Standards:

- Are not approved yet.
- Final vote in 2010. ISO works on the shore side, IEC mainly on ship side.
- It should be a standard for the future. But participants want their current approach to be the standard.
- ISO more based on American standards. IEC more European.
- Standards effective? Then only counting for future built ships.
- Existing solutions will not be changed
- DNV, Germanischer Lloyd also demand to meet certain standards in order for a ship to apply for certain certificates. These certificates play an important role for insurance.

Slide 9: what is the impact on local air quality? That depends on the impact of shipping on local air quality (is only one of the sources). → wish to know how much the air quality improves from OPS.

Port of Los Angeles: in the future: if the shore is equipped with OPS then ships will be obliged to connect (it was said that one of the reasons that LA can do that is because they have no significant competitors in the neighbourhood). PoLA and Port of Long Beach's goal is to connect 80% of all vessels latest 2014.

Cost: (Asa) make visible what the cost per container or tonne cargo is. That makes it easier to communicate and convince investors (also the cargo owners who want to be green)

OPS versus bunker or diesel? → also take into account that in the future other fuels might be applicable, like LNG for short sea shipping.

## Presentation Michiel, Part I: the design of the toolkit

Slide 22:

- where is “construction” or “civil engineering”?
- grid design
- more details on “benchmarking/compared with alternatives” → in calculation or more in general what alternatives you could consider
- shouldn't the terminal operator be a target group to involve? (Asa), Paul: I don't think they are the decision makers, they do what the shipping line asks them to do.
- Port authority should be port authority/terminal operator

Slide 23 :

- terminals → berths → ships
- crew: on ship and on shore
- is enough power available
- billing and metering: what kind of model could you use? → important point of the business case

Slide 24:

- in Scheveningen the cost of 1 extra decibel noise has been calculated at eur 21 per citizen
- where does the power come from? Is it of influence when it comes from a local power plant or does it come from an integrated grid that you can't influence?

Slide 25:

- “frequent changes or long movements etc” should be “Flexibility of the quay”
- “cost developers” mean: what developments are there that will influence costs? Like fuel prices, tax, electricity prices, environmental ship index, port dues etc existing infrastructure in the terminal area as well as in the superposed grid
- Security: reliability of supply. Safety: no accidents
- Should we include sensitivity analysis (Paul)? Some items are very volatile.

General:

- Toolkit should indicate where you can get the answers
- Is it feasible? If not: why not?
- Could we get different scenario's of combinations of stakeholders in different roles regarding OPS.
- How to involve the right stakeholders once you start with the toolkit? Who is the initiator and who is the coordinator of the process? Should the toolkit be geared to ports? → no, three target groups but make sure that you indicate the playing field to the users in the early stages of the process.
- How to involve other stakeholders in this process? Shipowners, IAPH
- Why is Maersk against OPS?
- Ports want to grow and OPS might be a necessary ingredient for that.

### **Discussion on the process:**

- We must ask ourselves – how reliable is the answer you get from the Tool Kit? We can't make a Tool Kit that covers a deep analysis for an investment. It shall give you ammunition and arguments for discussion prior to decision making. It shall be possible to discuss values from different points of view depending on who you are.
- .... if it is possible – split the cost in two sections, one for the shipowner and one for the Port Authority.
- When a shipowner comes and wants OPS – then sit down and compare the lists and if the outcome is YES, then start a project and it will hopefully be a win win situation.

### **Next steps**

First question: Is this what we expect from the toolkit?

- Hamburg (Becker): need more time to think
- Le Havre (Raffini): now is the time to get feedback from ship owners. Not sure if feedback from local authorities is needed. Depends on who is in the driving seat.
- BeMac (Harakawa): we need ship owners, f.i. involve China Shipping and NYK (38 ships to make ready for OPS), we need ships pro and con (Maersk)
- Bremen (Kress): first impression positive but want to get feedback locally
- HME (Smits): it covers a lot. I hope that ports will take the lead. Basis of toolbox is already there. Will this help to introduce OPS in the world fast?
- Antwerp (De Rache): I think ports are not ready to lead yet. They only ask economical questions. This toolbox will help but will it provide all the answers?
- ABB (Mattson): toolkit good to have for discussion
- Gothenburg (Lindeberg): suppliers can you lower your prices due to larger quantities? Siemens, Bemac, ABB: open for discussion about that but costs will depend on many factors.
- Siemens (Mantynen): toolkit is great to combine cost and environmental side. Siemens has toolkit for economic calculations. Ship owner involvement is very important.
- Siemens (Schmidt): add shipowners in the process with experience and without. We need the same solutions in the ports. Take away the stomach ache of the cruise liners then you win the race. Cruise liners make their plans two years in advance.
- Altran (Jak): also be able to focus on economic business case only.
  
- Report + description of the toolkit + background info (WJ – Asa)
  
- Next meeting in Lübeck (invitation from Ralf Giercke via Siemens), shipowners (to invite ECSA, European Community Shipowner's Association, was discussed but ended up in rather invite individual shipowners) and IAPH attendance is a condition. But do something new then.
  
- Inform IAPH, get them to join. (Wiert)

Wiert to send notes of this meeting + description of the toolkit

Documents are put on the web of [www.portgot.se](http://www.portgot.se)