The indirect effects of the new low sulphur requirements in ECAs in RoRo shipping

Thalis Zis Harilaos N. Psaraftis Postdoctoral Researcher Professor



DTU Transport Department of Transport



Presentation Outline

- Background
 - SECA regulation
 - Anticipated impacts
 - Fuel prices
 - Market picture
- Study Motivation
 - Effects to Ro-Ro operators
 - Costs for shippers
- The RoRoSECA project
 - Objectives
 - Methodology
- Initial findings
 - Route selection
 - Case studies
- Future work

Background

• As of January 1st 2015:



				Year
Areas	2005-2012	2012-2015	2015-2020	2020 (or 2025)-
Within SECA	1.5	1	0.1	0.1
Outside SECA	4.5	3.5	3.5	0.5

3 DTU Transport, Technical University of Denmark



We are here..



EU regulation on sulphur

- Use of sulphur limit of a maximum 0.1% sulphur content
- Since 2005 for:
 - Ships at berth (longer than 2 hours)
 - Inland waterways
- Compliance could be achieved only by:
 - Use of scrubber systems
 - Use of alternative marine power (AMP), also known as shorepower and cold ironing
 - Use of low sulphur fuel (e.g. Marine Gas Oil)

The immediate implications of the 0.1% limit on SECA

- It now affects all activity phases of a vessel
- Makes the case for scrubbers more appealing
- Perhaps cold ironing is less attractive now
- Whichever the abatement option, the operating costs will be higher than the case with the 1% limit

The wider implications of the new limit..

- On SECAs (is the environmental improvement significant?)
- Understanding the effects of the regulation on short sea shipping
- Dissecting the effect of low fuel prices on modal shares changes
- Proposing policies and operating practices to minimize and reverse the negative impacts

Anticipated impacts from studies



Source: The impact on short sea shipping and the risk of modal shift from the establishment of a NOx emission control area in the North Sea

(North Sea Consultation Group, 2013)

8 DTU Transport, Technical University of Denmark

Press releases before the new limit

SECA SHUTS DOWN TRANSFENNICA IBERIAN SERVICE

The Dutch-owned short-sea shipping line Transfennica (part of the Spliethoff Group) has announced that it is to cease its "Motorways of the Sea" ro-ro service between Bilbao, Portsmouth and Zeebrugge at the end of this month (December).

The decision is a direct result of the introduction of stricter new low-sulphur emission controls from 1 January 2015 in the Baltic Sea, the Kattegat, the North Sea and English Channel. A further SECA extends in a 200 nautical miles wide belt along the coasts of the USA and Canada.

SECA requirements lead to new European rail link

CARRIERS: Railway company ERS is opening a new route in Europe in light of rising customer demand following the implementation of new sulphur regulations. Many customers and countries are willing to change their mode of transport in order to save money.

DFDS closes Sassnitz-Klaipeda connection

Publication date: 2013-08-30 Tags: maritime, germany, denmark, lithuania



DFDS Seaways has decided to close the ferry service between Sassnitz, Germany and Klaipeda, Lithuania with effect from the end of September.

Previously a busy connection, the route has over the years become economically unviable. As Vice President of DFDS, Anders Refsgaard, stated: "We have fought hard to get new customers and improve revenue and profit, but unfortunately without success". He added, that with the outlook on continued decline in profits, and in light of the new sulphur regulations to be introduced from 1 January 2015, the company does not believe that it will be possible to turn the tide on the crossing.



Some surprising evidence ahead of Brexit referendum...





But were they right in predicting?

Stena Line records 16% yearly growth on North Sea route



Stena Britannica sails between the UK port of Harwich and the Hook of Holland in the Netherlands

DFDS Wraps Up Record Year, Expects Higher Revenue in 2016



Danish shipping and logistics company DFDS posted a profit of DKK 1.07bn (USD 151m), up by 89pct when compared to last year's DKK 571 million.

For the full-year 2015, the group reported revenue increase of 5% to DKK 13.5bn. Organic revenue growth, adjusted for route closures and acquisitions, was 7% mainly driven by 7% higher freight shipping volumes and 8% more passengers. In the fourth quarter, organic revenue growth was 10%.

P&O breaks Channel freight record in 2015

By Charlie Bartlett from London

P&O Ferries transported more freight between Dover and Calais in 2015 than any other year in its "modern history," amounting to 1,340,317 trucks.

The result is a 22% year-on-year increase over 2014, and is due in part to disruptions at the channel tunnel, which caused a 172% year-on-year increase in HGVs on is separate Teesport to Zeebrugge route throughout the month of July.



The group pressed a sixth ship back into service on the English Channel that month in order to increase capacity.

Actual Fuel prices



Findings of relevant study

- The competitive position of RoRo shipping in comparison with road transport became worse, since the difference in fuel price has become smaller.
- The fuel price difference decreased from around \$1,240 (HFO-diesel) to around \$900 (MGO- diesel) per tonne of fuel
- the first available evidence shows that RoRo shipping has largely been able to cope with the fuel price increases. Some of the largest RoRo operators report outstanding financial figures over 2015.

Source: SECA Assessment: Impacts of 2015 SECA marine fuel sulphur limits .First drawings from European experiences. CE Delft



Presentation Outline

- Background
 - SECA regulation
 - Anticipated impacts
 - Fuel prices
 - Market picture
- Study Motivation
 - Effects to Ro-Ro operators
 - Costs for shippers
- The RoRoSECA project
 - Objectives
 - Methodology
- Initial findings
 - Route selection
 - Case studies
- Future work

Effects to Ro-Ro operators

- Ship operators can either use low-sulphur fuel, or retrofit vessels with scrubber systems
- MGO is more expensive, while scrubbers increase overall fuel consumption, and require significant capital costs
- Increased operating costs could lead to changes in
 - vessel deployment
 - frequency of service
 - sailing speed
 - existence of certain routes
- Some of the additional costs will be passed over to clients through the Bunker Adjustment Factor (BAF fuel surcharges)

Cost to shippers

- Shippers would see increased fare rates due to the SECA regulation
- Eventhough MGO is now cheaper than what HFO was before the new limit, shippers would pay even less if HFO was still allowed
- Changes from ship operators on service may affect mode choice for shippers
- Reliability of certain services is at higher risk
- Is it possible to isolate the effects of the new limits from certain events that also affect mode choice? Including:
 - Low fuel prices
 - Competitive services shutting down
 - An overall change in transport demand

The RoRo SECA project



http://www.roroseca.transport.dtu.dk/





Presentation Outline

- Background
 - SECA regulation
 - Anticipated impacts
 - Fuel prices
 - Market picture
- Study Motivation
 - Effects to Ro-Ro operators
 - Costs for shippers

The RoRoSECA project

- Objectives
- Methodology
- Initial findings
 - Route selection
 - Case studies
- Future work



The RoRoSECA project

- 2 year project
- Funded by the Danish Maritime Fund (DMF)
- Case studies with DFDS
- New decision making tools
- An overview of the project...



RoRoSECA project Tasks:

- First Year
 - Task 2.1: Scenario Definition and data collection

- Task 2.2: Modal split model and calibration

- Task 2.3: Emissions Calculator for Ro-Ro ships
- Second Year
 - Task 3.1: Policy measures to reverse effects
 - Task 3.2: Operators measures (speed reduction, frequency, fleet etc)

Objectives of WP2



Methodology

- First Year
 - Identify Routes for examination
 - Gather necessary data
 - Estimate Benchmark scenarios (emissions, shares, costs)
 - Calibrate model
 - Consider different scenarios based on fuel prices
- Second Year
 - Policy measures to reverse effects
 - Operators measures (speed reduction, frequency, fleet etc)



Linking the various modules together





Current DFDS network

- 18 Routes (22 links)
- ~38 vessels
- Up to 535 departures/week, 13 countries, 30 ports
- 4 main areas
 - North Sea (9 Routes, 20 vessels)
 - Baltic Sea (5 Routes, 7 vessels)
 - Cross-Channel (3 Routes, 6-7 vessels)
 - Mediterranean (1 Route, 1-2 vessels)







Route selection criteria

- Geographical balance
- Chain configuration
- Volume
- Commodity mixture
- Vessel types
- Data availability



Proportion by Region

By Sailing Distance & Frequency

By Vessel and Route Capacity

Cargo type and value

Ro-Ro, Ro-Pax, Cruise, abatement



Geographical Balance

- 4 in North Sea
- 2 in Baltic Sea
- 1 Cross-Channel
- 1 recently shut down
- 1 Non-SECA





Chain Configuration

• Distance



Frequency of Service



Sailing Distance Travelled per Week





Vessel Type and Technology

- Cruise Ships (1 MGO, 1 scrubbers)
- Ro-Ro (mixture of vessels with scrubbers or using MGO)
- Ro-Pax (4 MGO, 2 scrubbers)

Other Criteria

- Representation of Diverse mix of countries (9 in proposed)
- Include important hubs (Immingham, Gothenburg, Klaipeda)
- Terminals at large container ports (Felixstowe, Rotterdam)
- Select the cross channel Route with most competition (Dover Calais)



North Sea Routes

- Gothenburg Ghent
- Esbjerg Immingham
- Rotterdam Felixstowe
- Copenhagen Oslo





Baltic Sea Routes

- Klaipeda Kiel
- Klaipeda Karlshamn





Cross Channel Route

• Dover - Calais



Summary

- 7 Routes (+1 recently shut down, +1 not affected by SECA)
- Analysing data of up to 38 vessels (due to changes in deployment)
- 240 out of a maximum 535 departures/week
- Significant proportion of total travel distance (43.4%)
- Significant proportion of total maximum capacity (43.48%)



Methodological Framework





Perspective of the Shipper

• General Case – Hierarchical Structure



Road B

Land modes

Process





Perspective of the Shipping Company

- Identify Revenue with a given Transport Demand
 - Passengers
 - Freight Rate for Cargo
 - Miscellaneous (Food, Drinks, Casino etc.)
- Identify Costs
 - Fuel
 - Port
 - Staff
 - Maintenance
 - Other
- Formulate Profitability Function
 - If Route non-profitable, consider shut down
 - Re-run modal split





Presentation Outline

- Background
 - SECA regulation
 - Anticipated impacts
 - Fuel prices
 - Market picture
- Study Motivation
 - Effects to Ro-Ro operators
 - Costs for shippers
- The RoRoSECA project
 - Objectives
 - Methodology
- Initial findings
 - Route selection
 - Case studies
- Future work



What happened 2014 vs 2015 (Dover – Calais) considering only cargo



Environmental Balance

- Identify Baseline Emissions prior to Reversal actions
- Emissions estimation for each mode at each Route
- Model to predict new balance after Ro-Ro operator or policy action taken

DTU

Process of estimating the impacts of SECA



A Binary logit model

• Probability of selecting mode i is

$$P_i = \frac{e^{-\lambda \cdot GC_i}}{\sum_{i=1}^2 e^{-\lambda \cdot GC_i}}$$

Where GCi is the Generalized Cost of mode i:

 $GC_i = TC_i + a \cdot TT_i$

Where TCi is the Travel Cost (ℓ/m), TTi is the Travel Time (hours), a is the value of time (ℓ/m *hours)

• λ is a scale parameter that acts as a weight attached in the choice. The larger the value, the greater the implication of a change in cost in one of the modes



Example for different λ



Two simple case studies

- Case Study 1: Sweden (Gothenburg) to Belgium (Ghent)
 - Via Gothenburg -Ghent (maritime I)
 - Via Gothenburg Frederikshavn (maritime II)
- Case Study 2: Kaunas Hamburg
 - Via Klaipeda Kiel (maritime I)
 - Via Baltisjk Sassnitz (maritime II)
 - Fully Land Based (Road Only)
- Cargo depreciation at 3%, freight rate 0,022€/km*lm
- Fuel Case I: What actually happened (force use MGO with actual prices)
- Fuel Case II: What would happen if HFO still allowed (Actual prices)

Two simple case studies

				Ti	ransport opti	ion			
	Road only				via Maritime I		via Maritime II		
	Share (%)	Distance	Time	Time (h) Share	Distance	Time (h)	Share	Distance	Time (h)
		(km)	(h)		(km)	Time (n)			
Case Study				60 $\frac{1067}{(1067)}$	1067	22	40	1209	22.4
1	-	-	-		32	40	(100)	23.4	
Case Study	40	1 40 1	21.2	24	1058	20.16	20	1047	26.0
2 48	1481 21.2	24	(735)	30.16	28	(430)	20.8		

	Transport option					
	Road only		via Maritime I		via Maritime II	
Case Study 1	Fuel Case I	Fuel Case II	Fuel Case I	Fuel Case II	Fuel Case I	Fuel Case II
New Gen. Cost	-	-	56.75	45.9	67.9	62.5
New Share	-	-	62.28	67.73	37.72	32.27
Case Study 2	Fuel Case I	Fuel Case II	Fuel Case I	Fuel Case II	Fuel Case I	Fuel Case II
New Gen. Cost	56.61	56.61	55.69	47.5	48.07	43.7
New Share	47.89	47.61	24.38	25.35	27.73	27.04

Conclusion

- Maritime shares would increase (proportion-wise)
- Maritime shares would have increased further if HFO was still allowed
- Maritime shares would drop at fuel levels of 2014 using MGO
- Profitability of ship operator is masking the negative effects of the regulation – a happy coincidence
- Once this happens, what measures could be used to revert any possible disadvantages?
- Find out more, in year 2 of







Thank you - Questions?

The work presented has been in the context of the project:

"Mitigating and reversing the side-effects of environmental legislation on Ro-Ro shipping in Northern Europe"

funded by the Danish Maritime Fund.

Contact: tzis@transport.dtu.dk