

PAME II-2013 Agenda Item 4.8(c)
AMSA Recommendation III(A)
Specially Designated Arctic Marine Areas
IMO's Global Integrated Shipping Information System (GISIS)
Port Reception Facility Database Update for Arctic and Near Arctic Ports

REFERENCES AND RELATED DOCUMENTS

Det Norske Veritas (DNV) Technical Report, 14-07-2006, PAME (II)
06/Annex to Agenda Item 5/Norway/*Port Reception Facilities in the PAME
Region*
Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment (AMSA), PAME 2009
PAME (I) 12/4.6/b/USA/*Specially Designated Arctic Marine Areas and Port
Waste Reception Facilities.*
PAME (II) 12/4.5/c/USA/*Port Waste Reception Facilities.*
PAME (I) 13/4.5/c/ USA/*Adequate Port Reception Facilities and IMO and ISO
Standards*
PAME I-2013 final RoDs

BACKGROUND

AMSA Recommendation III(A) provides, in relevant part:

“That the Arctic states should recognize that improvements in Arctic marine infrastructure are needed to enhance safety and environmental protection in support of sustainable development. Examples of infrastructure where critical improvements are needed include...port services, including reception facilities for ship-generated waste.....”

PAME (II) 13/4.5/b/AMSA II(D) stated that “considerable progress has been made by all Arctic States in reporting and maintaining adequate reception facilities at Arctic and near-Arctic ports and terminals in their respective countries.”

The 2006 DNV report to PAME provided information on the availability of port reception facilities based, in part, on data submitted to the IMO as it was developing the Global Integrated Shipping Information System (GISIS) database¹ module on port reception facilities. Starting in late 2007, the GISIS port reception facilities module became operational on the GISIS database and IMO Member States were encouraged to populate the database with their port information.

In a paper submitted to PAME I-2012, the USA recommended, *inter alia*, that PAME member governments regularly update the GISIS port reception facility database module with information on the availability and adequacy of port waste reception facilities at

¹ The GISIS database can be accessed at www.gisis.imo.org (public users are required to register and select a password).

Arctic and Near Arctic ports.² PAME I-2012 subsequently adopted a ROD stating “PAME encourages the member governments to regularly check and as necessary and appropriate update information on their port waste reception facilities in the Arctic region in IMO’s GISIS database.”

More recently, at PAME I-2013 member governments adopted a ROD “invit[ing] the United States to submit to PAME II-2013 an up to date report of all existing GISIS-reported port waste reception facilities for the Arctic region.”

DISCUSSION

Port Reception Facility Data in the Arctic region:

Table 1 provides a summary of the information on port reception facilities as reported by Arctic States in a survey for the study conducted by DNV in 2006. DNV presented the report to PAME as a DNV Technical Report entitled “Port Reception Facilities in the PAME Region.”

TABLE 1

State	Number of Ports	MARPOL Waste Categories Accepted
Canada	10	I, VI, II
Faroe Is. (DK)	7	I, II, IV, V
Greenland (DK)	5	I
Finland	Note: no port information provided for this report.	
Iceland	10	I, II, IV, V
Norway	4	I, IV, V
Russian Federation	19	I
Sweden	Note: no port information provided for this report.	
USA	10	I, V

² See PAME (1) 12/4.1/a/USA.

Notes for Table 1:

1. Neither Finland nor Sweden responded to the survey with data on their port/port reception facilities.
2. The information was for ports as opposed to actual reception facilities at ports. (See table 2 which includes information on the reception facilities within the ports.
3. Some of the information provided in the 2006 DNV Technical Report was publically available information provided to IMO for its initial survey collected when the GISIS port reception facilities module was being developed. It mainly consisted of MARPOL Annex I data (*e.g.*, Russian Federation).
4. The data for the USA was provided separately to DNV and was taken from the publically accessible reception facility data published by the U.S. Coast Guard under its Certificate of Adequacy program.

Table 2 provides a summary of information taken from the publicly accessible component of IMO's GISIS database for port reception facilities and is current as of 31 August 2013. This publicly accessible information/data on port reception facilities is provided to IMO by each of the Arctic States through their port state maritime authority.

TABLE 2

State	Number of Ports	Number of Facilities	MARPOL Waste Categories Accepted
Canada	22	187	I, II
Faroe Is. (DK)	12	51	I, IV, V
Greenland (DK)		Note: None Reported in GISIS	
Finland	29	151	I, II, IV, V
Iceland	4	17	I, II
Norway	55	286	I, II, IV, V, VI
Russian Federation	48	508	I, II, IV, V, VI
Sweden	57	229	I, II, IV, V
USA	52	163	I, V

Notes for Table 2:

1. The information on ports and port reception facilities for Canada includes all Canadian ports on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts as well as those located in the Canadian Maritimes and the Great Lakes. With the exception of the Great Lakes ports (which, in fact, do ice over in winter), many of these ports could be considered near Arctic and may be likely to be servicing the needs of ships that have or will transit Arctic regions.
2. Ports of the Faroe Islands (DK) may also be considered near Arctic ports. Faroe Island ports are generally ice free year round.

3. The same is true for ports in Iceland.
4. Ports in Finland and Sweden are, of course, all on the Baltic Sea, where winter ice formation is significant.
5. The data for Norway includes all of its ports, many of which (*e.g.*, southwestern Norway) would be considered only near Arctic ports but, like several other countries with near Arctic ports, those ports may be likely to be servicing the needs of ships that have or will transit Arctic regions.
6. The data for Russian Federation, again, includes all of its ports, only a portion of which are considered Arctic or near Arctic. (See comment below regarding identification of Arctic ports.)
7. The data for the USA is for Alaskan ports only. The USA publishes data, per its own MARPOL implementing legislation and provides this same data to IMO for inclusion in GISIS. The USA publicly accessible port reception facility database may be found at <http://cgmix.uscg.mil/default.aspx>.

CONCLUSIONS

1. By comparing Table 1 and Table 2, it is clear that there has been a significant improvement in reporting of port reception facility data/information since the 2006 DNV Technical Report was released. The IMO's GISIS database provides valuable information resource for ship operators to identify availability of port reception facilities around the world, including those located in Arctic and near Arctic regions likely to service ships departing for, returning from, or transiting Arctic regions.
2. All Arctic States are party to MARPOL and most of its Annexes and have an obligation to ensure the provision of port reception facilities. As recommended in IMO Guidance on port reception facilities and previous PAME meeting RODs, all IMO member States should ensure that information on port reception facilities is current, up-to-date and provided to IMO for inclusion in GISIS.
3. At present, there is no simple way to identify Arctic or near Arctic ports within a particular country except by close examination of each entry. As noted, the USA publishes its information and allows for public searching using various criteria, including by individual U.S. state (*e.g.*, Alaska). Unfortunately, this specificity does not transfer when the information is uploaded to IMO's GISIS database.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The USA recommends that:

- Arctic States continue efforts to populate the GISIS database, as recommended in previous PAME submissions, on all Arctic and near Arctic ports and port reception facilities.
- PAME explore ways to identify Arctic ports when data is submitted to IMO for inclusion in the GISIS port reception facility database. This additional level of detail would enhance use of GISIS for Arctic shipping and help contribute to both the provision and use of port reception facilities throughout the Arctic.