UNCTAD
Transport Newsletter

No. 34
Fourth Quarter 2006

Contents

NOTE

The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

UNCTAD/SDTE/TLB/MISC/2006/5

Published by the

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)

Trade Logistics Branch, SITE

Palais des Nations

Geneva

www.unctad.org

Editorial

Dear readers:

Welcome to the fourth 2006 issue of our Transport Newsletter.

UNCTAD's Commission on Enterprise, Business Facilitation and Development will meet next February. Please see page 4 for further information also on our background document.

Four articles in today's Transport Newsletter look at shipping issues, introducing the 2006 Liner Shipping Connectivity Index (page 8), information on direct liner shipping services between countries (page 19), a new OECD tonnage system to measure shipbuilding activities (page 15) and the SAFE Port Act (page 15).

Two articles deal with trade facilitation issues, notably our joint UNCTAD/ECE workshop on Strengthening National and Regional Trade Facilitation Organizations (page 4) and the GFP featured topic regional partnerships (page 14).

Finally, we briefly present recent publications and proceedings on the time factor in liner shipping services, the Panama Canal expansion, and the role and governance of seaports (page 19).

For feedback, comments and suggestions for our next UNCTAD Transport Newsletter (First Quarter 2007), please contact Jan Hoffmann at jan.hoffmann@unctad.org before March 2007.

The Trade Logistics Branch Team

Geneva, December 2006

Subscriptions

To subscribe or unsubscribe to the UNCTAD Transport Newsletter, please use the following online form: http://extranet.unctad.org/transportnews.

For past issues of the Transport Newsletter, please visit www.unctad.org/transportnews.

Commission on Enterprise, Business Facilitation and Development

UNCTAD's Commission on Enterprise, Business Facilitation and Development will meet for its eleventh session on 19–23 February 2007 in Geneva. Item 4 of the agenda is "Efficient transport and trade facilitation to improve participation by developing countries in international trade".

Trade facilitation and transport connectivity are important determinants of developing countries' supply capacity and competitiveness in global markets. Countries need to establish an appropriate regulatory and legal framework that reflects national circumstances and priorities. In view of the above, the UNCTAD secretariat's background document (TD/B/COM.3/80) discusses four related topics in the area of trade logistics that are of particular interest for developing and landlocked developing countries.

The first chapter deals with trade and transport facilitation, with a special focus on setting facilitation priorities. As their resources are limited, countries need to prioritize which trade and transport facilitation measures they should undertake, and in which order.

The second chapter examines the issue of international transport, with a special focus on maritime transport connectivity. Although containerization has helped improve connectivity between practically all countries, major differences remain that have a bearing on transport costs and trade competitiveness.

The third chapter looks at the legal and regulatory framework for transport and trade facilitation, with a special focus on security and environmental issues.

The fourth chapter considers the three issues of facilitation, transport connectivity and the legal framework from the perspective of landlocked developing countries (LLDCs). In view of their geographic disadvantage, trade facilitation, improved transport connectivity and legal reforms are of paramount importance for LLDCs.

The background document is available via http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/c3d80_en.pdf
For more information about the Commission see
www.unctad.org/Templates/Meeting.asp?intItemID=1942&lang=1&m=12715&year=2007&month=2

Strengthening national and regional trade facilitation organizations

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's Centre for Trade Facilitation and Electronic Business (UN/CEFACT) organized a two-day workshop on "Strengthening National and Regional Trade Facilitation Organizations" from 31 October to 1 November in Geneva.

The meeting aimed:

- To identify best practices in establishing effective national and regional trade facilitation bodies and ensuring their sustainability;
- To highlight the needs and main challenges in facilitating trade at the national and regional level; and
- To present the latest developments in trade facilitation tools and instruments.

More than 50 representatives of national and regional trade and transport facilitation organizations from 30 countries attended the workshop and participated actively in the discussions.

Current challenges and opportunities of trade and transport facilitation bodies

Many different governmental departments and agencies, service providers and stakeholders of the business community are involved in trade facilitation efforts. First, national trade facilitation bodies were set up in the 1970s with a view to facilitating consultation between government institutions and the business community and enhancing policy coherence through inter-ministerial coordination. On the basis of their positive experience, in 1974 UNECE issued a special recommendation (UN/CEFACT Recommendation No. 4) calling for the establishment of national trade facilitation organizations. While such bodies initially focused on the simplification and standardization of trade documents and procedures, their scope has since been broadened to include transport issues, EDI and paperless trade.

At the present time, trade and transport facilitation committees and organizations vary in composition, institutional and legal set-up, and objectives. They range from well-structured institutions that receive public and private financial support to less formal or informal groups of stakeholders who meet irregularly to discuss topics of common concern. Their activities may include (a) supporting and advising governments in the formulation of a trade and transport facilitation policy; (b) providing advice, information, training or other services to their institutional members; (c) analysing and carrying out research; and possibly also (d) contributing to the implementation of trade facilitation measures. While some are operationally oriented and draw together different national service providers with a view to supplying local trade facilitation solutions, others are geared to foreign policy coordination or the provision of essential services for the business community. UNCTAD and the World Bank supported the establishment of national trade and transport facilitation committees as part of national trade facilitation technical assistance projects, and UNECE actively supported the creation of so-called PRO Committees. The term "PRO Committee" refers to national committees on facilitation of international trade procedures, whose establishment was recommended by the UNECE Working Party on Facilitation of International Trade Procedures in 1974. These committees place the emphasis on trade procedures as non-tariff barriers to trade. However, many national trade facilitation bodies faced difficulties in sustaining their activities beyond project timelines and funding, and were therefore dismantled.

With the WTO negotiations on trade facilitation within the framework of the Doha Development Round, the question of policy coordination and private–public sector consultation has returned to the forefront of concerns. Such bodies could provide a mechanism for needs analysis and strengthening of policy coherence, thus enhancing countries' participation in the negotiations. At the same time, new technologies were being developed, in particular in the field of information and communication technologies (ICT), paving the way for new trade facilitation applications such as the electronic Single Window. Thus, there is a new momentum for strengthening national trade facilitation bodies whilst addressing the sustainability challenges they face.

Workshop findings

Participants from Sweden, Pakistan, United Kingdom, Nepal, Paraguay, France, Albania and Senegal presented their national experience in establishing trade facilitation organizations with a focus on structure, mandate, and funding as well as challenges to their work. It became

clear that different rationales for coordination and consultation led to different institutional settings, ranging from informal negotiation support groups under the auspices of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, such as the one established in Paraguay, to quasi-autonomous trade facilitation bodies with limited governmental influence and funding. ODASCE,[1] for example, funds its activities and secretariat exclusively through voluntary members' contributions and paid-for services. Among the different structures and experiences of national trade and transport facilitation bodies, participants were able to identify national ownership, political will and commitment, sufficient resources, and private-sector involvement as key factors for the success of such coordination bodies. In this respect, it was interesting to note that, while in some countries the business community drives the process and work of trade facilitation bodies (SITPRO, ODASCE, SWEPRO), the private sector in other countries fails to actively participate in such efforts, especially where economies are characterized by many SMEs. Nepal's and Pakistan's experiences showed that management of the coordination process is equally important to its objectives and that, therefore, such trade facilitation bodies should be equipped with a permanent secretariat and their work guided by a long-term action plan.

Countries benefit as much from their own trade facilitation efforts as from those of their trading partners, which means that regional and international cooperation is essential. The regional trade facilitation coordination bodies SeciPRO (PRO committees of the Southeast European Cooperative Initiative) and EuroPRO (joint platform of European PRO committees) presented their work aimed at providing a platform for their members for joint advocacy and sharing of experiences. The Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat's (PIFS) experience with actively supporting member countries in setting up trade and transport facilitation committees provides useful insight into the kind of support a regional governmental organization can supply through networking and expertise.

Following these presentations, participants discussed the challenges faced by their organization in ensuring sustainability, identifying trade facilitation priorities and in setting up mechanisms for consultations between Government and traders. The discussion was structured around three themes, each one being addressed by a working group. The themes were, respectively:

- Sustainable funding;
- Strengthening of consultation and interaction between government and the trading community; and
- Structure and elements for prioritization of trade and transport policy objectives.

In general, participants found that there was a need to tailor the revenue mechanism to each country while stressing that public and private partnerships provided a sustainable basis for the work of trade facilitation bodies. In their view, an inclusive and comprehensive policy mechanism offered the best means for the identification and assessment of the priorities of a national trade facilitation reform process within the framework of regional and international agreements and the country's economic development objectives. Paperless trading, Single Window and transit simplification were identified as ranking high among trade facilitation priorities. Key points from the discussions are presented in Annex A.

On the second day, representatives of the participating international organizations described how they supported national and regional trade facilitation organizations and presented a summary of the trade facilitation tools and standards they offered. Presentations highlighted UN/CEFACT trade facilitation standards, recommendations and tools, UNCTAD seminars,

[1] ODASCE is a trade facilitation body in France.

research activities and technical assistance projects, the World Bank trade facilitation negotiations support programme and the World Customs Organization Time Release Study Guide. Speakers agreed on the important coordinating role played by the Global Facilitation Partnership for Trade and Transportation (GFP). UN/CEFACT encouraged TF Pro Organizations to participate actively in the standards development process and indicated that regional events such as the UN/CEFACT biannual Forum were excellent ways of building regional awareness and launching new initiatives.

The closing panel discussion summarized the questions raised during the two-day workshop and focused on perspectives to strengthen the work of national and regional trade and transport facilitation bodies and international organizations dealing with trade facilitation. During the wrap-up round table, participants concluded that the following components were crucial for most TF organizations:

- A sound mechanism for analysing TF priorities;
- Research on TF impact and benefits;
- Mechanisms to finance PRO organizations;
- Identification of a champion (leadership);
- Trained staff;
- Use of ICT and internet collaborative tools;
- Taking up new challenges for trade, such as security measures; and
- Addressing integrity issues.

It also emerged from the round table that trade facilitation and non-tariff barriers were particularly challenging for the least developed countries.

Throughout the discussions, it became increasingly clear that the structure of the coordination body was as important as its mandate and that, therefore, resources should be provided to allow for a permanent institutional set-up, including a secretariat and trained staff. International organizations should continue their information and training efforts while strengthening collaboration among each other. Participants stressed that high-level involvement of Government would foster not only independent funding but also political commitment to the trade facilitation reform process, which is of particular importance to developing countries. National trade facilitation bodies should also be proactive in awareness-raising and efforts to develop the tools and solutions to build a compelling case for support by decision makers. Given the importance of finding global solutions to trade facilitation, international organizations should further develop and promote simple and comprehensive standards and tools. The impact of new security measures on trade facilitation efforts should be given as close attention as the question of integrity of government officials. Workshop participants underscored the usefulness of creating a community of practice that could possibly be supported through the GFP platform. In the same spirit, a mentoring scheme for PRO organizations was suggested.

Follow-up and way forward

Participants discussed the possible individual and collective follow-up activities to the workshop. Individually, many PRO organizations were planning to step up their efforts to promote TF among governmental agencies and the business community, using materials and information from the workshop. Some organizations considered that the workshop demonstrated the importance of involving all stakeholders in the TF dialogue and, in particular, local authorities and SMEs, as well as countries that are not WTO members. Participants also hoped that they could further strengthen the bilateral and regional contacts

they had established during the workshop by jointly promoting common TF interests, holding regional meetings, centralizing and coordinating TF initiatives at the regional level, and establishing a mentoring scheme between well-established and less well-established organizations.

Finally, participants focused on the support they needed from the international organizations. They considered the following activities to be particularly useful:

- Bringing together existing TF tools into a comprehensive framework (a simple, understandable and comprehensive model);
- Running training workshops and providing technical support and capacity-building to national TF organizations;
- Helping national organizations raise awareness of TF benefits (through national and regional meetings and seminars) to provide an impetus for TF needs assessment;
- Promoting national TFOs and disseminating success stories;
- Assisting with the creation and reinforcement of regional and global networks and with developing regional TF programmes;
- Reaching out to the developing countries;
- Addressing the financing issue, especially for participation in international meetings;
- Bringing in relevant stakeholders, such as national chambers of commerce; and
- Developing a recommendation that would call for financial support from Governments for TF organizations, because it is crucial for sustainability.

Participants also called for a greater coordination between different agencies working in the area, which they considered to be crucial for creating a shared vision of international trade facilitation standards, which could be promoted by national and regional organizations.

Presentations can be downloaded via
www.unece.org/trade/workshop/geneva_oct06/welcome.htm and
http://r0.unctad.org/ttl/ttl-ppt-2006-10-31to11-01.htm

Birgit Viohl, Associate Economic Affairs Officer, Trade Logistics Branch, UNCTAD, birgit.viohl@unctad.org, and Azhar Jaimurzina, Associate Economic Affairs Officer, Global Trade Solutions Branch, UNECE, azhar.jaimurzina@unece.org.

Liner Shipping Connectivity Index – LSCI 2006

In Transport Newsletters No. 27 (1st Quarter 2005) and No. 29 (3rd Quarter 2005), we presented an index that provided an indicator of liner shipping connectivity for 162 countries in mid–2004 and mid–2005, respectively. In the present article, we provide an update on the different components of the index with data for July 2006. The components of the index are again generated from data obtained through Containerisation International Online (www.ci-online.co.uk; accessed in July 2006). They reflect the services, vessels and their TEU[2] capacity deployed by international liner shipping companies.

[2] TEU stands for a twenty-foot equivalent unit. The number of TEUs reflects the container carrying capacity of a ship, not the actual containerized trade carried.

(1) Deployment of container ships

"Fleet deployment" is the number of ships that national and international liner shipping companies assign to liner services from and to the country's ports.[3] A larger number of ships is an indicator that a country's shippers have more opportunities to load their containerized exports, i.e. that they are better connected to foreign markets.

Table 1 shows the 10 economies with the highest number of container ships deployed on liner services from and to their ports in 2006, together with the respective data for July 2005 and July 2004. Five of the top 10 countries experienced positive growth during the last year, two countries recorded practically no change, and three countries experienced a reduction in the number of ships deployed on services from and to their ports between July 2005 and July 2006.

Table 1: Fleet assignment (number of ships)

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	change 2006/2005
1	China	1 448	1 354	1 228	6.9%
2	Hong Kong (China)	1 242	1 175	1 166	5.7%
3	United States	1 037	1 094	1 074	-5.2%
4	Singapore	947	930	916	1.8%
5	United Kingdom	842	825	861	2.1%
6	Germany	821	820	810	0.1%
7	Netherlands	797	797	785	0.0%
8	Belgium	777	793	774	-2.0%
9	Rep. of Korea	706	767	734	-8.0%
10	Malaysia	700	607	588	15.3%

Source: www.ci-online.co.uk, *July2006.*

In terms of changes over the last two years, globally, 81 countries received a larger number of ships in July 2006 than in July 2004, 18 countries saw no change, and the remaining 63 countries recorded a decrease in the number of vessels.

(2) Deployment of container carrying capacity (TEU)

A similar picture is obtained if we look at the deployment of container carrying capacity, i.e. by considering the number of slots for 20–foot equivalent units (TEUs) (table 2). As a consequence of the introduction of larger vessels, nine of the top ten countries recorded positive growth during the last year, versus only one country (Republic of Korea) that experienced a decrease in TEU deployment.

Table 2: Fleet assignment (TEUs)

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	change 2006/2005
1	China	5 068 909	4 442 070	3 928 913	14.1%
2	Hong Kong (China)	4 345 864	3 936 129	3 749 697	10.4%
3	United States	3 162 767	3 014 748	2 978 193	4.9%
4	Germany	2 689 753	2 341 410	2 249 857	14.9%
5	Singapore	2 672 541	2 477 400	2 471 635	7.9%
6	United Kingdom	2 599 120	2 204 620	2 169 336	17.9%
7	Netherlands	2 411 338	2 120 237	2 083 832	13.7%

[3] For the purposes of this article, "deployment" and "assignment" are used synonymously. Although a ship can only be deployed at one place at one point in time, if it is assigned to a given route covering several countries it will effectively be deployed to these same countries over a period of time.

8	Taiwan Province of China	2 264 185	2 001 254	1 959 434	13.1%
9	Rep. of Korea	2 092 781	2 215 415	2 110 367	-5.5%
10	Malaysia	2 046 129	1 737 298	1 716 361	17.8%

Globally, 100 countries recorded positive growth between July 2004 and July 2006, 2 countries experienced no change, and the remaining 60 countries saw a decline.

(3) Number of liner shipping companies

This indicator is of particular interest in view of the recent mergers in the shipping industry.[4] Globally, the market share of the largest liner shipping companies has been increasing over the last years, and there have been concerns about the resulting process of concentration of market power. In fact, all top 10 countries (table 3) recorded a smaller number of shipping companies that provide services from and to their ports in July 2006 as compared with July 2005.

Table 3: Liner companies providing services to the country's ports

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	change 2006/2005
1	Netherlands	118	126	131	-6.3%
2	Belgium	113	119	123	-5.0%
3	United Kingdom	108	117	133	-7.7%
4	Germany	103	110	114	-6.4%
5	France	97	100	105	-3.0%
6	United States	91	101	77	-9.9%
7	Singapore	89	95	98	-6.3%
8	China	84	87	96	-3.4%
9	Spain	83	88	91	-5.7%
10	Italy	79	82	87	-3.7%

In July 2004, 33 countries received services from 4 or fewer companies only. By July 2006, this number had increased to 43 countries. Most of these countries are developing countries, and many are small island developing States (SIDS), for which dependence on a small number of shipping companies may imply a danger of a monopolistic or oligopolistic market structure.

(4) Liner services

Usually, shipping lines provide more than one regular service. Still, when liner companies consolidate, they may also combine and restructure their services, leading to a reduction in the number of services in a majority of countries.

Table 4: Liner services from the country's ports

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	change 2006/2005
1	China	943	957	863	-1.5%
2	Hong Kong (China)	743	738	738	0.7%
3	Singapore	689	687	669	0.3%
4	United States	594	621	623	-4.3%
5	Rep. of Korea	531	567	569	-6.3%
6	Japan	496	540	539	-8.1%

[4] See also UNCTAD Transport Newsletter No. 24, second quarter 2004. http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/websdtetlb20042_en.pdf

7	United Kingdom	469	503	538	-6.8%
8	Germany	461	474	472	-2.7%
9	Netherlands	454	498	506	-8.8%
10	Malaysia	445	436	431	2.1%

Note: Includes some double counting if services are being sold under different names.

(5) Average vessel sizes

As vessel sizes of new buildings of container ships increase, so does the average vessel size. 114 countries (i.e. 70 per cent of the total) received vessels of a larger average size in 2006 than in 2004, 2 countries recorded no change, and 46 countries experienced a decrease. A large majority of the countries that are served by the smallest ships are SIDS. The countries receiving the largest ships are those located on the main East–West shipping routes (table 5).

Table 5: Average vessel sizes

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	change 2006/2005
1	Saudi Arabia	3 616	3 097	2 882	16.7%
2	China	3 501	3 281	3 199	6.7%
3	Hong Kong (China)	3 499	3 350	3 216	4.5%
4	Taiwan Prov. of China	3 354	3 147	3 115	6.6%
5	Egypt	3 347	2 846	2 542	17.6%
6	Germany	3 276	2 855	2 778	14.7%
7	Canada	3 211	3 074	3 022	4.5%
8	Oman	3 199	3 595	3 215	-11.0%
9	Panama	3 111	2 855	2 895	9.0%
10	United Kingdom	3 087	2 672	2 520	15.5%

(6) Maximum vessel sizes

In July 2006, 11 countries were served by vessels of 9,200 TEU capacity and above. The largest container ships were all deployed on the Europe–Asia route. As the new, larger, vessels are deployed on the main East–West routes, this also has implications for other countries as medium sized ships are redeployed. Ninety-four countries received larger ships in 2006 than in 2004, meaning that most of them most likely had to invest in dredging and infrastructure so as to accommodate these larger vessels.

Table 6: Maximum vessel sizes

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	change 2006/2005
1	Belgium	9 449	8 468	8 076	11.6%
1	China	9 449	9 200	8 238	2.7%
1	Egypt	9 449	8 073	6 978	17.0%
1	Germany	9 449	8 750	8 076	8.0%
1	Hong Kong (China)	9 449	9 200	8 238	2.7%
1	Netherlands	9 449	8 750	8 076	8.0%
1	Singapore	9 449	8 750	8 063	8.0%
1	United Kingdom	9 449	8 750	8 076	8.0%
10	France	9 200	9 200	6 978	0.0%
10	Rep. of Korea	9 200	8 189	6 978	12.3%
10	Spain	9 200	8 189	6 742	12.3%

The new LSCI 2006

If we combine available information on fleet assignment, liner services, and vessel and fleet sizes, it is possible to generate an overall "Liner Shipping Connectivity Index" (LSCI) (table 7). In order to allow a comparison over time, the maximum value of the LSCI is set to be equal to 100 in 2004.

Table 7: Liner Shipping Connectivity Index LSCI for 2004, 2005 and 2006

(Maximum index 2004 = 100)

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	Change 2006-05
1	China	113.1	108.3	100.0	4.8
2	Hong Kong (China)	99.3	96.8	94.4	2.5
3	Singapore	86.1	83.9	81.9	2.2
4	United States	85.8	87.6	83.3	-1.8
5	United Kingdom	81.5	79.6	81.7	1.9
6	Netherlands	81.0	80.0	78.8	1.0
7	Germany	80.7	78.4	76.6	2.3
8	Belgium	76.1	74.2	73.2	2.0
9	Rep. of Korea	71.9	73.0	68.7	-1.1
10	Malaysia	69.2	65.0	62.8	4.2
11	France	67.8	70.0	67.3	-2.2
12	Taiwan Prov. of China	65.6	63.7	59.6	1.9
13	Japan	64.5	66.7	69.1	-2.2
14	Spain	62.3	58.2	54.4	4.1
15	Italy	58.1	62.2	58.1	-4.1
16	Egypt	50.0	49.2	42.9	0.8
17	United Arab Emirates	46.7	39.2	38.1	7.5
18	India	42.9	36.9	34.1	6.0
19	Saudi Arabia	40.7	36.2	35.8	4.4
20	Sri Lanka	37.3	33.4	34.7	4.0
21	Canada	36.3	39.8	39.7	-3.5
22	Thailand	33.9	31.9	31.0	2.0
23	Brazil	31.6	31.5	25.8	0.1
24	Greece	31.3	29.1	30.2	2.2
25	Malta	30.3	25.7	27.5	4.6
26	Mexico	29.8	25.5	25.3	4.3
27	Sweden	28.2	26.6	14.8	1.6
28	Panama	27.6	29.1	32.1	-1.5
29	Turkey	27.1	27.1	25.6	0.0
30	Australia	27.0	28.0	26.6	-1.1
31	South Africa	26.2	25.8	23.1	0.4

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	Change 2006-05
32	Indonesia	25.8	28.8	25.9	-3.0
33	Argentina	25.6	25.0	20.1	0.6
34	Lebanon	25.6	12.5	10.6	13.0
35	Denmark	25.4	24.2	11.6	1.1
36	Portugal	23.5	16.8	17.5	6.7
37	Jamaica	23.0	22.0	21.3	1.0
38	Pakistan	21.8	21.5	20.2	0.3
39	New Zealand	20.7	20.6	20.9	0.1
40	Colombia	20.5	19.2	18.6	1.3
41	Israel	20.4	20.1	20.4	0.4
42	Oman	20.3	23.6	23.3	-3.4
43	Venezuela	18.6	19.9	18.2	-1.3
44	Guatemala	18.1	13.9	12.3	4.3
45	Romania	17.6	15.4	12.0	2.2
46	Cyprus	17.4	18.5	14.4	-1.1
47	Iran (Islamic Rep. of)	17.4	14.2	13.7	3.1
48	Uruguay	16.8	16.6	16.4	0.2
49	Philippines	16.5	15.9	15.4	0.6
50	Peru	16.3	15.0	14.8	1.4
51	Bahamas	16.2	15.7	17.5	0.5
52	Chile	16.1	15.5	15.5	0.6
53	Dominican Republic	15.2	14.0	12.4	1.2
54	Viet Nam	15.1	14.3	12.9	0.8
55	Costa Rica	15.1	11.1	12.6	4.0
56	Ukraine	14.9	10.8	11.2	4.1
57	Puerto Rico	14.7	15.2	14.8	-0.6
58	Ecuador	14.2	12.9	11.8	1.3
59	Ghana	13.8	12.6	12.5	1.2
60	Nigeria	13.0	12.8	12.8	0.2
61	Côte d'Ivoire	13.0	14.5	14.4	-1.5
62	Jordan	13.0	13.4	11.0	-0.4

Rank 2006	Country or territory	2006	2005	2004	Change 2006-05
63	Russian Federation	12.8	12.7	11.9	0.1
64	Mauritius	11.5	12.3	13.1	-0.7
65	Cameroon	11.4	10.6	10.5	0.8
66	Syrian Arab Republic	11.3	11.8	8.5	-0.6
67	Senegal	11.2	10.1	10.1	1.2
68	Trinidad and Tobago	11.2	10.6	13.2	0.6
69	Togo	11.1	10.6	10.2	0.5
70	Slovenia	11.0	13.9	13.9	-2.9
71	Benin	11.0	10.2	10.1	0.8
72	Croatia	10.5	12.2	8.6	-1.7
73	Guam	9.6	10.5	10.5	-1.0
74	Angola	9.5	10.5	9.7	-1.0
75	Yemen	9.4	10.2	19.2	-0.8
76	Kenya	9.3	9.0	8.6	0.3
77	Congo	9.1	9.1	8.3	0.0
78	New Caledonia	9.0	10.3	9.8	-1.3
79	French Polynesia	8.9	11.1	10.5	-2.2
80	Gabon	8.7	8.8	8.8	0.0
81	Unit. Rep. of Tanzania	8.7	8.6	8.1	0.1
82	Guinea	8.7	6.9	6.1	1.8
83	Algeria	8.7	9.7	10.0	-1.0
84	Finland	8.6	10.2	9.4	-1.6
85	Morocco	8.5	8.7	9.4	-0.1
86	Namibia	8.5	6.6	6.3	1.9
87	Madagascar	8.3	6.8	6.9	1.5
88	Honduras	8.3	8.6	9.1	-0.3
89	Ireland	8.2	9.7	8.8	-1.5
90	El Salvador	8.1	7.3	6.3	0.8
91	Nicaragua	8.1	5.2	4.8	2.8
92	Netherlands Antilles	7.8	8.2	8.2	-0.4
93	Aruba	7.5	7.5	7.4	0.0
94	Poland	7.5	7.5	7.3	0.0
95	Djibouti	7.4	7.6	6.8	-0.2
96	Norway	7.3	8.3	9.2	-1.0
97	Fiji	7.2	8.3	8.3	-1.1
98	Tunisia	7.0	7.6	8.8	-0.6
99	Mozambique	6.7	6.7	6.6	0.0
100	Cuba	6.4	6.5	6.8	-0.1
101	Paraguay	6.3	0.5	0.5	5.8
102	Mauritania	6.2	6.0	5.4	0.3
103	Estonia	5.8	6.5	7.1	-0.8
104	Sudan	5.7	6.2	6.9	-0.5
105	Lithuania	5.7	5.9	5.2	-0.2
106	Saint Kitts and Nevis	5.6	5.3	5.5	0.3
107	Comoros	5.4	5.8	6.1	-0.5
108	Barbados	5.3	5.8	5.5	-0.4
109	Bangladesh	5.3	5.1	5.2	0.2
110	Seychelles	5.3	4.9	4.9	0.3
111	Sierra Leone	5.1	6.5	5.8	-1.4
112	Latvia	5.1	5.8	6.4	-0.7
113	Samoa	5.1	5.3	5.4	-0.2
114	Guinea-Bissau	5.0	5.2	2.1	-0.2
115	American Samoa	4.9	5.3	5.2	-0.4
116	Gambia	4.8	6.1	4.9	-1.3
117	Iceland	4.7	4.9	4.7	-0.1
118	Libyan Arab Jam.	4.7	5.2	5.3	-0.5
119	Papua New Guinea	4.7	6.4	7.0	-1.7
120	Guyana	4.6	4.4	4.5	0.2
121	Liberia	4.5	6.0	5.3	-1.4
122	Bulgaria	4.5	5.6	6.2	-1.1
123	Tonga	4.4	4.8	3.8	-0.3
124	Bahrain	4.4	4.3	5.4	0.1
125	Faeroe Islands	4.4	4.4	4.2	0.0
126	Vanuatu	4.4	4.5	3.9	-0.1
127	Kuwait	4.1	6.8	5.9	-2.6
128	Iraq	4.1	1.6	1.4	2.4
129	Solomon Islands	4.0	4.3	3.6	-0.3
130	Qatar	3.9	4.2	2.6	-0.3
131	Maldives	3.9	4.1	4.2	-0.2
132	Suriname	3.9	4.2	4.8	-0.3
133	Equatorial Guinea	3.8	3.9	4.0	-0.1
134	Saint Lucia	3.4	3.7	3.7	-0.3
135	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	3.4	3.6	3.6	-0.2
136	Grenada	3.4	2.5	2.3	0.8
137	Brunei	3.3	3.5	3.9	-0.2
138	Marshall Islands	3.3	3.7	3.5	-0.4
139	Virgin Islands (US)	3.2	3.0	1.8	0.2
140	Switzerland	3.2	3.4	3.5	-0.2
141	Kiribati	3.1	3.3	3.1	-0.2
142	Serbia	3.0	2.9	2.9	0.0
143	Georgia	2.9	3.8	3.5	-0.9
144	Cambodia	2.9	3.3	3.9	-0.3
145	Haiti	2.9	3.4	4.9	-0.5
146	Cape Verde	2.8	2.3	1.9	0.5
147	Dem. Rep. of Congo	2.7	3.0	3.0	-0.4
148	Belize	2.6	2.6	2.2	0.0
149	Myanmar	2.5	2.5	3.1	0.1
150	Antigua and Barbuda	2.4	2.6	2.3	-0.1
151	Somalia	2.4	1.3	3.1	1.1
152	Dominica	2.3	2.5	2.3	-0.2
153	Greenland	2.3	2.3	2.3	0.0
154	Eritrea	2.2	1.6	3.4	0.7
155	Micronesia (Fed. Sts.)	1.9	2.9	2.8	-0.9
156	Palau	1.9	1.0	1.0	0.8
157	North. Mariana Islands	1.8	2.2	2.2	-0.3
158	Cayman Islands	1.8	2.2	1.9	-0.4
159	Sao Tome and Principe	1.6	1.3	0.9	0.3
160	Bermuda	1.6	1.6	1.5	0.0
161	Czech Republic	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0
162	Albania	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.0

Note: The indexes for 2004, 2005 and 2006 presented above are a simplified version of the LSCI initially presented in UNCTAD's Transport Newsletters for the years 2004 and 2005. For the sake of clarity and long-term consistency, we recalculated the index to include only the

five original components, i.e. the number of ships, TEUs, number of companies, number of services and maximum vessel size.[5]

Some of the countries with the lowest LSCI rankings either do not necessarily depend on national ports, but rather trade via land transport with other countries in the region or are quasi-landlocked and mostly trade through neighbouring countries' ports (e.g. Albania, Czech Republic, Switzerland and Georgia).

Most of the least-connected countries are also developing countries, and a majority of them are small island developing States. Whereas 75 per cent of the top 20 best-connected countries recorded an improved LSCI between 2006 and 2004, only 30 per cent of the 20 least-connected countries were able to improve their status during the same period. Nine of the 20 least-connected countries actually had a lower LSCI in 2006 as compared with 2004, hence the "connectivity gap" between the best- and the least-connected countries is increasing.

Jan Hoffmann, Trade Logistics Branch, SITE, UNCTAD, jan.hoffmann@unctad.org.

GFP featured topic: Regional partnerships

With the interlinking of international supply chains, reducing the overall cost of transport across multiple countries has become essential. Regional partnerships in trade facilitation play an increasing role in reducing the "economic distance" of countries to markets – the impact of overall transport costs and their components such as infrastructure, transit arrangements and compliance cost of border procedures. Regional trade and transport facilitation (TTF) partnerships reflect the multidisciplinary nature of TTF by their diversity. They support the sharing of good practices, the identification of TTF bottlenecks that extend beyond a single country, the formulation of proposals that require parallel undertakings in several countries, and the implementation of selected measures, with proper monitoring and benchmarking. These partnerships play a major role in regularly raising awareness of TTF benefits and the need to follow up on actions agreed upon.

Regional TTF partnerships can include a variety of players: private- and public-sector representatives, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), multilateral donors or a mixture of those. For example, in South-East Europe, the TTFSE[6] Regional Steering Committee includes high-level government representatives, while SECIPRO[7] offers a regional forum for trade facilitation committees (PRO committees), including business and government representatives. In Central Asia, Eastern Europe and the Caucasus, the TRACECA[8] programme offers a comprehensive structure with an Intergovernmental Commission, National Secretary and Trade Facilitation working groups meeting on a regular basis. Purely business organizations are

[5] The per capita indicators (ships/capita and TEUs/per capita) that had been included in the 2004 and 2005 index are no longer included because the adjustment for population sizes was considered somewhat arbitrary; furthermore, it was found that available data for population sizes of several countries and territories could not be updated annually. The two coefficients of original indicators (TEUs/ship and ships/company) were excluded owing to methodological concerns regarding the calculation of an index if components are included more than once and in different forms. The new, simplified, index is easier to calculate and allows for a clearer interpretation: it is the unweighted average of five components, namely ships, TEUs, companies, services, and maximum vessel size. Each one of the five components is indexed to assume a maximum value of 100 in 2004. As a second step, the average of the five indexed components is again indexed so that its maximum value for 2004 is 100.

[6] http://www.seerecon.org/ttfse

[7] http://www.secipro.net/

[8] http://www.traceca-org.org/

mainly sector specific, such as the European organizations of freight forwarders CLECAT[9] and customs agents CONFIAD[10].

Facilitating trade and transport across a region may have variable objectives, depending on the degree of economic integration and political cooperation. Heterogeneous regions need a special approach focusing on facilitation of single modes of transport, or other relatively homogeneous facilitation measures (e.g. industry-specific efforts, focusing on border-crossing performance, etc.). Regions where a preferential or free trade agreement, a customs or monetary union, exists tend to need more holistic and all-inclusive measures such as regional TTF programmes and cooperation with other regions (see, for example, the Vientiane Declaration,[11] art. 19 ff.).

For further information contact Kremena Gocheva, trade facilitation expert and consultant with the World Bank, kremena@gochev.net or visit the GFP topic at www.gfptt.org/topics/Regional.

New tonnage system to measure shipbuilding activities

The OECD's Council Working Party on Shipbuilding (WP6) has accepted the proposal made by shipbuilder associations for the new, formula-based compensated gross ton system (cgt) to replace the former system based on coefficient that it endorsed in 1994. Users of cgt in their statistical collections and analyses are encouraged to commence utilizing the new cgt system from 1 January 2007, which has been adopted by WP6 as the formal commencement date.

http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/59/49/37655301.pdf

Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006 (SAFE Port Act)

The "Security and Accountability for Every Port Act of 2006" (H.R.4954),[12] or the "SAFE Port Act" for short, was enacted into law by the President of the United States on 13 October 2006. It became Public Law No: 109-347.[13] The US Congress completed action on the bill on 30 September 2006.

The SAFE Port Act is one of the most important acts adopted in the United States in the field of maritime and supply chain security since the Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) of 2002.[14] It amends this earlier legislation in many respects, setting forth a number of additional standards and requirements designed to increase the security of US seaports, including internal security plans, systems, programmes, grants, port operations, and domestic detection, imaging and scanning. It also deals with issues related to the security of the international supply chain, including providing the legal basis for existing programmes such as the "Container Security Initiative" (CSI) and the "Customs–Trade Partnership Against Terrorism" (C-TPAT), and encourages cooperation with foreign governments and international organizations with a view

[9] http://www.clecat.org/
[10] http://www.confiad.org/
[11] http://www.aseansec.org/676.htm
[12] For the latest text of the Act, see: House Report 109-711, SAFE Port Act (H.R. 4954), at the US Government Printing Office (GPO) website (www.gpoaccess.gov) or at the Library of Congress website (http://thomas.loc.gov).
[13] Please note that as of 20 December 2006, the text of Public Law No: 109-347 is not yet available from the GPO website (www.gpoaccess.gov).
[14] For the text of the MTSA of 2002 (Public Law 107-295 of 25 November 2002), see the GPO website (www.gpoaccess.gov). For an overview of this Act, see also UNCTAD report *Container Security: Major Initiatives and Related International Developments*, UNCTAD/SDTE/TLB/2004/1, of 26 February 2004, available on the UNCTAD website (www.unctad.org).

to promoting international security standards for containers in the supply chain and facilitating the efficient flow of international trade. Provisions in the Act are, in most instances, accompanied by implementation deadlines, requirements for the initiation of pilot programmes, as well as reporting requirements to appropriate congressional committees.

The provisions of the SAFE Port Act are organized under eight "Titles"**:** Title I – Security of United States Seaports; Title II – Security of the International Supply Chain; Title III – Administration, Title IV – Agency Resources and Oversight; Title V – Domestic Nuclear Detection Office; Title VI – Commercial Mobile Service Alerts for Emergencies; Title VII – Other Matters; and Title VIII – Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement.

Main aspects of the "SAFE Port Act"

(a) With respect to the security of domestic seaports, port operations and domestic detection, imaging and scanning, the SAFE Port Act, inter alia:

- Requires the *22 largest ports*, which handle 98 per cent of all cargo coming into the United States, *to scan all containers through the use of radiation detectors* by the end of 2007. To the extent practicable, next-generation radiation detection technology will be deployed. The Secretary of DHS is required to develop a *strategy* for the deployment of radiation detection capabilities, which is to be fully implemented within three years of the enactment of the SAFE Port Act. Not later than the end of 2008, the Secretary of the DHS will *expand the strategy* to provide for the deployment of radiation capabilities *at all other US ports of entry*.
- Provides for the development and implementation of a *plan to conduct random searches of containers* in addition to any targeted or preshipment inspection of such containers required by law or regulation or conducted under any other programme.
- Provides for the establishment of an Intermodal Rail Radiation Detection Test Centre.
- Requires the implementation of a *threat assessment screening*, including *name-based checks* against terrorist watch lists and *immigration status checks* for all *port truck drivers* with access to secure areas of a port, who have a commercial driver's licence but do not have a current and valid hazardous materials endorsement.
- Provides for the establishment of a programme based on a *Transportation Workers Security Card (TWIC)*, which will go into effect gradually, and for all US ports, not later than 1 January 2009. A pilot programme would be conducted to test the business processes, technology, and operational impacts of the deployment of transportation security card readers. This pilot programme will be implemented at not fewer than five distinct geographical locations, to include vessels and facilities in a variety of environmental settings. The Act prohibits the issuance of TWIC to persons convicted for certain felonies.
- Requires *US citizenship* for qualified individuals with full authority to implement security actions for a facility. This requirement may be waived if it is determined that the individual has gone through background checks and is not on any terrorist watch lists.
- Subject to availability of funding, requires the US Government to *verify the effectiveness of facility security plans* periodically, but not less that two times per year, at least one of which must be an inspection of the facility conducted without notice to the facility.
- Provides for the issuance of regulations to establish a voluntary *long-range automated vessel tracking system.*
- Requires the establishment of *interagency operational centres for port security* at all high-priority ports not later than three years after the date of the enactment of the SAFE

Port Act, in order to improve the coordination of the ports and various federal agencies and other entities that would be affected by a transportation security incident.

- Requires the establishment of a *Port Security Training Programme* and a *Port Security Exercise Programme* to help prepare for and prevent acts of terrorism as well as recover from such acts.

(b) With respect to the *security of the international supply chain*, the SAFE Port Act inter alia:

- Requires the development, implementation and update, as appropriate, of *a strategic plan to enhance the security of the international supply chain.* In furtherance of this plan, the Act encourages the consideration of proposed or established standards and practices of foreign governments and international organizations, including IMO, WCO, ILO and ISO, as appropriate, to establish standards and best practices for the security of containers moving through the international supply chain. Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of the SAFE Port Act, a report will be submitted to the United States Congress containing the required strategic plan, and another one containing an update of such plan, not later than three years after the first submission.
- Establishes additional standards for the *Automated Targeting System (ATS)* requiring the provision of additional information with regard to cargo destined for importation into the United States of America.
- With regard to *container security standards and procedures,* provides for the initiation of a rulemaking procedure to establish minimum standards and procedures for securing containers in transit to the United States.
- The Secretary of DHS is encouraged to *promote and establish international cargo security standards* for the security of containers moving through the international supply chain with foreign Governments and international organizations, including IMO, ISO, ILO and WCO.
- Formally establishes the *Container Security Initiative (CSI),* to identify and examine or search maritime containers that pose a security risk before loading such containers in a foreign port for shipment to the United States, either directly or through a foreign port. The Secretary of DHS may designate foreign seaports to participate in the CSI after he has assessed the costs, benefits, and other associated factors; enter into negotiations with the Government of each foreign nation in which a seaport is designated under the CSI in order to ensure full compliance with the requirements under the CSI. The SAFE Port Act authorizes the *appropriation of funds* to the United States CBP to carry out the provisions of the CSI programme: US$ 144 million for 2008, US$ 146 million for 2009 and US$ 153.3 million for 2010.
- Contains provisions relating to *international cooperation and coordination*, including a clause suggesting the provision of technical assistance, equipment and training to facilitate the implementation of supply chain security measures at ports designated under the Container Security Initiative.
- Provides the legal basis for the establishment of a voluntary programme between Government and the private sector (known as the "*Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism" or "C-TPAT")* to strengthen and improve the overall security of the international supply chain and US border security, and to facilitate the movement of secure cargo through the international supply chain, by providing benefits to participants meeting or exceeding the programme requirements. There are three tiers of benefits known as "green lane" benefits. The Secretary of DHS will review the minimum security requirements of C-TPAT at least once every year and update such requirements as necessary. *Eligible entities* for participation in the C-TPAT programme include US

importers, as well as customs brokers, forwarders, air, sea, land carriers, contract logistics providers, and other entities in the international supply chain and intermodal transportation system. The Act provides for *consequences for lack of compliance* with the requirements of the law of the security measures and supply chain practices of C-TPAT participants, in which case they may be denied benefits otherwise available, in whole or in part.

- Requires the Secretary of DHS to develop a plan to implement a *one-year voluntary pilot programme* to test and assess the feasibility, costs and benefits of using *third-party entities to conduct validation* of C-TPAT participants.
- Authorizes *funding* for the C-TPAT programme, including US$ 65 million for 2008, US$ 72 million for 2009, and US$ 75.6 million for 2010.
- Requires the designation of *three foreign seaports* through which containers pass or are transhipped to the US for the establishment of *pilot integrated scanning systems* that couple non-intrusive imaging equipment and radiation detection equipment. Three distinct ports with unique features and differing levels of trade volume shall be considered. Full-scale implementation of the pilot systems at these ports shall be achieved not later than one year after the date of the enactment of the SAFE Port Act.
- As regards *screening of cargo containers and scanning of high-risk containers*, the Secretary of DHS shall ensure that 100 per cent of all cargo containers originating outside the U.S. and unloaded at a US seaport undergo screening to identify high-risk containers. He shall also ensure that 100 per cent of containers that have been identified as high-risk are screened or searched before such containers leave a US seaport facility. As regards full-scale implementation, the Secretary of DHS shall ensure that integrated scanning systems are fully deployed to scan, using non-intrusive imaging equipment and radiation detection equipment, all containers entering the United States before such containers arrive in the US as soon as possible, but not before he determines that certain requirements have been met by the integrated scanning system.
- Provides for the conduct of a *one-year pilot programme* to assess the risk posed by and *improve the security of empty containers* at US seaports to ensure the safe and secure delivery of cargo and to prevent potential acts of terrorism involving such containers. The pilot programme will include the use of visual searches of empty containers at US seaports.

(c) With respect to *customs procedures and commitments*, the SAFE Port Act, inter alia:

- Provides that the Secretary of DHS, the US Trade Representative and other appropriate Federal officials *will work through appropriate international organizations*, including WCO, WTO, IMO and APEC, to align, to the extent practicable, customs procedures, standards, requirements and commitments in order to facilitate the efficient flow of international trade.
- An electronic trade data interchange system, to be known as "*International Trade Data System" (ITDS)*, will be implemented in order to eliminate redundant information requirements, efficiently regulate the flow of commerce and effectively enforce laws and regulations relating to international trade, by establishing a single portal system, operated by the US CBP.

Regina Asariotis, Chief, Policy and Legislation Section, SITE, UNCTAD, regina.asariotis@unctad.org, and Anila Premti, Policy and Legislation Section, SITE, UNCTAD, anila.premti@unctad.org.

Direct liner shipping services between countries

There are 13,041 "pairs" between the 162 coastal countries and economies that receive liner shipping services.[15] On the basis of data from Containerisation International On-line (c-i on-line), UNCTAD has gathered information on pairs of countries that rely on direct liner shipping services – that is, where regular direct container shipping services are provided by at least one liner company.

In July 2006, 2,214 (17 per cent) of the 13,041 routes were serviced by direct shipping connections. Containerized trade on the remaining 10,827 routes required at least one transhipment. For those 2,214 routes with direct services, the following indicators of "connectivity" were computed:

- The average number of companies providing direct services per route was 5.6. The maximum number was 82, on the route between the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.
- The average number of ships deployed per route was 28. The maximum number was 1,028 on the route between China and Hong Kong (China).
- The average TEUs deployed per route was 82,429. The maximum was 3,839,910 TEUs, also on the route between China and Hong Kong (China).

We are in the process of further analysing the data with a view to generating indicators of "connectivity" between all pairs of countries, incorporating maritime and land distances, land connectivity, and also shipping services involving one or more transhipments. Research on transport costs and on the geography of trade confirms that transport connectivity is an important determinant of both. Quantifying and producing indicators for transport connectivity between pairs of countries can thus help to better analyse trade flows and their costs.

Birgit Viohl, Trade Logistics Branch, SITE, UNCTAD, birgit.viohl@unctad.org, and Jan Hoffmann, Trade Logistics Branch, SITE, UNCTAD, jan.hoffmann@unctad.org.

New contracting parties to international conventions adopted under the auspices of UNCTAD

Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, 6 April 1974

Entry into force: 6 October 1983; Contracting States: 81

Montenegro – 23 October 2006 (d)

For more information on the latest status of this and other conventions, please visit: www.unctad.org/ttl/legal

Publications and proceedings

The time factor in liner shipping services

Managing the time factor is an important issue in contemporary liner service design. Increased port congestion and infrastructure constraints are some of the reasons preventing shipping lines from delivering impeccable liner services to their customers. Waiting times and delays put pressure on schedule reliability and may lead to logistics costs to the customer. This paper assesses the tradeoffs linked to the time factor in liner service schedules from the perspective of

[15] See above the article on the Liner Shipping Connectivity Index. The number of "pairs" of countries is ((162 x 162) – 162) /2 = 13041. Information on the top 25 routes was included in the previous issue of the UNCTAD Transport Newsletter.

a shipping line. Port congestion is identified as the main source of schedule unreliability. Policymakers need to be aware that port congestion and port productivity are important incentives for shipping lines to secure capacity in key ports in their service schedules.

Maritime Economics and Logistics, 2006, 8. Paper by Theo Notteboom. The paper is available free on-line via http://mel.iame.info

Panama Canal expansion

The implications of the planned expansion of the Panama Canal for international trade were discussed at a workshop that took place at the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) in Chile on 27 November 2006. The event was jointly organized by ECLAC and the Port Committee of the Organization of American States (CIP/OAS). Discussants included chambers of shipping, shippers and ports, as well as ECLAC and the Panama Canal Authority. Presentations were made in Spanish.

Files of the presentations are available free online via http://www.eclac.cl/drni/

Ports are more than piers

Seaports are much more than just places for the loading and discharging of vessels. The global marketplace has a deep impact on port competition and on the functioning of seaports. The logistics environment leaves port managers with the question of how to respond effectively to market dynamics. At the same time, however, seaports need to be embedded in their local multi-stakeholders' environment. The book, edited by Theo Notteboom, contains 18 contributions that address current challenges to ports. Areas include port policy, strategy and planning, port-related knowledge clusters, port–hinterland relationships and seaport terminals.

428 pages. Publisher: De Lloyd. www.itmma.ua.ac.be.

Devolution, port governance and port performance

The relationship between ports and Governments has changed profoundly over the past quarter of a century. Many Governments have sought to extricate themselves from the business of port operations, and in many cases, the provision of port services has devolved to local governments, communities or private management and administration. As such, devolution implies a change in governance models, this trend raises questions about consequent performance. This book, edited by Mary R. Brooks and Kevin Cullinane, examines the changed port management environment, focusing on government policies such as devolution, regulatory reform and newly imposed governance models, all of which have exerted a significant influence on the nature of this changed environment.

696 pages. Publisher: Elsevier. http://www.elsevier.com/locate/isbn/0762311975

Asian Container Ports

The container port industry in Asia represents a dynamic aspect of the international transport and logistics scene. This book, by Kevin Cullinane and Dong-Wook Song, applies an overarching theme of 'Development, Competition and Co-operation' to a wide range of individual container ports in Asia. Major trends are identified and concrete examples provide new insights into the nature of relationships between the main ports in the region. The book provides new analysis that contributes to theoretical and conceptual debates on the nature of port competition. More generally, it will aid understanding of port development strategies within the context of Asian trade and economic growth.

264 pages, publisher: Palgrave. http://www.palgrave.com/newsearch/Catalogue.aspx?is=0230001955

Agenda

UNCTAD and GFP events

31 Jan-1 Feb 2007: UNCTAD regional workshop on trade facilitation negotiations. Hanoi

6–7 Feb 2007: UNCTAD national trade facilitation workshop. Tegucigalpa

19–23 Feb 2007: UNCTAD Commission on Enterprise, Business Facilitation and Development. Geneva

23 Feb 2007: UNCTAD Round Table on Trade Facilitation in landlocked countries. Geneva

13 Mar 2007: GFP meeting. Brussels

20–21 Mar 2007: UNCTAD/ALADI regional workshop on trade facilitation. Montevideo

Other events on trade and transport facilitation

30–31 Jan 2007: Third Global Congress on Combating Counterfeiting and Piracy. Geneva

1–2 Feb 2007: 33rd Session of the UN/CEFACT International Trade Procedures Working Group (TBG15), Geneva

2 Feb 2007: Motorways of the Sea Conference. Kirkwall, Orkney Islands

26–30 Mar 2007: IMO FAL Committee Meeting. London

17–21 Apr 2007: Globalization and Freight Transportation in a Containerized World. San Francisco

25–27 Apr 2007: WCO IT Conference and Exhibition. Veracruz, Mexico

3–6 Jun 2007: International Port Training Conference. Rotterdam

14–15 Jun 2007: 4th IRU Euro–Asian Road Transport Conference, Warsaw

4–6 Jul 2007: IAME annual conference. Athens

20–21 Sep 2007: International Symposium on Maritime Safety, Security and Environmental Protection. Athens

For further details on most of these events and continuous updates please visit www.gfptt.org/Entities/EventList.aspx?list=all