

Impact assessment for a possible revision of Directive 2000/59/EC on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues

Background

The objective of [Directive 2000/59/EC](#) is to protect the marine environment from operational pollution by ships, regardless of their flag, by harmonizing relevant international provisions to this end. Moreover, it builds upon the obligations which all the Member States have already accepted under Marpol 73/78 regime by addressing in detail the legal, financial and practical responsibilities between the different players involved in the delivery and handling of residues in EU ports.

Whereas the Directive seemed to have produced positive effects since its entry into force, the Commission services have identified a range of potential shortcomings in the implementation of the Directive, confirming that the current system is not optimum and that not all ship-generated wastes and residues from ships calling at EU ports are actually collected.

The current consultation aims to collect the views of stakeholders in order to ascertain the critical areas for improvements and to collect information and data that are necessary for assessing the impacts (environmental, economic, and social) of the possible measures envisaged.

Structure of the questionnaire

- Part I: Respondent information
- Part II: The current functioning of the EU system of port reception facilities
- Part III: Options for a possible revision of Directive 2000/59/EC
- Part IV: Statistical background – Ships/Ports
- Part V: Final considerations

Important caveat

Please note that this document has been drafted for information and consultation purposes only. It has not been adopted or in any way approved by the European

Commission and should not be regarded as representing the view of the Commission. It does not prejudge, or constitute the announcement of any position on the part of the Commission on the issues covered. The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the information provided, nor does it accept responsibility for any use made thereof.

Practical Information

There is also a possibility to fill out a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet as part of this questionnaire. However, this is not obligatory.

Please [download](#) the spreadsheet here. You will be able to upload it at the end of the questionnaire.

Part I: Introductory

1. In what capacity are you completing this questionnaire?* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- My personal capacity
- Private sector company
- Industry association or NGO
- Local or regional public authority
- National public authority

2. Please indicate if your organisation is registered in the Transparency Register of the Commission
http://europa.eu/transparency-register/index_en.htm

* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- Yes
- No

Please indicate the identification number* (compulsory)

3. Organisation or authority name* (compulsory)

4. Could you please identify your role and interest in the potential revision of the EU Directive 2000/59/EC on port reception facilities?* (compulsory)

5. Country or region in which you are based* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- Belgium
- Bulgaria
- Czech Republic
- Denmark
- Germany
- Estonia
- Ireland
- Greece
- Spain
- France
- Italy
- Cyprus
- Latvia

- Lithuania
- Luxembourg
- Hungary
- Malta
- Netherlands
- Austria
- Poland
- Portugal
- Romania
- Slovenia
- Slovakia
- Finland
- Sweden
- United Kingdom
- Europe – non-EU
- USA
- Canada
- South America
- Asia
- Africa
- Australia

6. Do you reckon distances in kilometres or in nautical miles? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Kilometres
- Nautical miles

7. Indicate the sectors in which you are engaged* (compulsory)
(at least 1 answers)

- National government
- Regional or local government
- Flag State authority
- Port authority
- Harbourmaster
- Terminal operator
- Port state control / Vessel inspection
- Port reception facility operator
- Coast guard
- Pilotage
- Ship management company
- Ship owner
- Ship brokers and agents
- Ship operator
- Ship crew
- Seafarers' trade union/worker's organisation

- Seafarers' manning agency
- Seafarers' educational/training/research organisation
- Entities responsible for health of seafarers or port workers
- Freight forwards/logistic services
- Multimodal transport agent / consultant
- Shippers/receivers
- Classification society
- Trade Association
- NGO
- Maritime law/ insurance
- Other interested in shipping
- Other interested in port facilities

8. Have you made formal representations to the Commission or to other authorities in the last 12 months that you would like to be taken into account in the current consultation? * (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- Yes (please upload a copy of the submission)
- No

9. In part II of this questionnaire, you are invited to provide information and data related to the system of port reception facilities, from the 'port' perspective or from the 'ship' perspective. Please select the sections you would like to fill-in. * (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- Statistical background 'Port'
- Statistical background 'Ship'

Statistical background 'Port & Ship'

None

II. The current functioning of the EU system of port reception facilities

It is important for this consultation to understand how well Directive [2000/59/EC](#) currently functions, and whether stakeholders have experienced any problems with the implementation of this legislation. The respondents are also invited to express their views on the possible underlying causes of the problems and to suggest potential solutions to address the problems.

10. To what extent are you aware of the EC Directive on port reception facilities for ship-generated waste and cargo residues (Directive 2000/59/EC)?* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

Quite familiar

Slightly familiar

Know very little about it

11. How do you assess the overall functioning of Directive 2000/59/EC on port reception facilities for ship-generated wastes and cargo residues? What problems, if any, are there with this legislation? (optional)

12. What are the main reasons why ship-generated waste may sometimes be discharged at sea?

Please mark up to three causes, marking 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, in order of importance – with 1 being the most important.

	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequacies of port reception facilities (PRF) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of an integrated information and monitoring system at EU level <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

High charges for use of PRF <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Some waste can legally be discharged at sea <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fines for illegal discharging of waste at sea are too low <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Likelihood of being detected discharging illegally of waste at sea is too low <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of awareness or training of seafarers <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

Please specify "Other" (optional)

13. What are the main reasons why cargo residues may sometimes be discharged at sea?

Please mark up to three causes, marking 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, in order of importance – with 1 being the most important.

	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequacies of port reception facilities (PRF) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lack of an integrated information and	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<p>monitoring system at EU level</p> <p>optional</p>					
<p>High charges for use of PRF</p> <p>optional</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Some cargo residues can legally be discharged at sea</p> <p>optional</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Fines for illegal discharging of waste at sea are too low</p> <p>optional</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<p>Likelihood of being detected discharging illegally of waste at sea is too low</p> <p>optional</p>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Lack of awareness or training of seafarers optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify "Other" (optional)

14. In general, what is your view on EU port reception facilities? (optional)

(at most 1 answer)

- Port reception facilities are in general inadequate in meeting the needs of ships regularly using them
- Port reception facilities are in general adequate in meeting the needs of ships regularly using them
- Port reception facilities are fully adequate in meeting the needs of the ships regularly using them
- Port reception facilities in general provide good value for money
- Port reception facilities are generally too costly to provide or use
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

15. Where port reception facilities are inadequate, what are the problems? (optional)

- Facilities needed are not provided
- There are problems of segregating different types of waste
- Capacities / discharge rates of facilities are insufficient
- There are long waits before facilities can be used
- Communications with the ports are unnecessarily difficult
- Facilities are unreasonably costly to use
- Other

Please specify "Other"* (compulsory)

16. Where port reception facilities are inadequate, what in your view are the underlying reasons for this?

Rank the importance from 1 (very important) to 5 (little importance) if the underlying reason applies.

	1	2	3	4	5
Legislation is unclear or insufficient <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Legislation is not properly enforced <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The cost recovery systems (fees) are not incentive <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waste Reception and handling plans do not meet the needs of the port users <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is a general lack of transparency on the	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

functioning of PRF (including the fee system) <small>optional</small>					
	<small>Other</small> <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please specify "Other" (optional)

17. In EU ports in general, do the fees charged to ships cover the costs of providing port reception facilities for ship-generated waste? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

What is your opinion on the existing provisions and the way they are implemented in ports across the EU?

(optional)

19. Various fee systems for using port reception facilities are currently implemented in ports across the EU.

In your opinion, what type(s) of system(s) are the most incentive with regard to the discharge of ship wastes in ports?

Conversely, what type(s) of system(s) are the least incentive?

(optional)

20. Do you think that fee systems for using port reception facilities should be harmonised at EU level? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Yes
- No
- Do not know / have no firm opinion
- Other

20b. Add any relevant comment to substantiate your answer. (optional)

21. Pertaining to article 12(3) of the current Directive, an appropriate information and monitoring system should be established to support and achieve the objectives of the Directive.
In your opinion, what are the main features and functionalities that should be incorporated in such a system?

(optional)

22. Waste Reception and Handling (WRH) plans in ports: are you familiar with such plans? * (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- Yes, I am familiar with WRH plans
- No, I am not familiar with WRH plans

23. Have you been involved in the preparation and development of the WRH plan in the port(s) with which you are familiar? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Yes
- No

24. The WRH plan is designed to put in place adequate port reception facilities in order to meet the need of the port users.

For that purpose, the parties involved, and especially the ship operators that use this port regularly, should be consulted.

In the port(s) with which you are familiar with, which of the following statements in your view best describes the consultation process?

* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- Port(s) users were not or hardly consulted
- Port(s) users were consulted orally and rather informally
- Port(s) users were consulted formally, by way of dedicated meetings and/or written contributions
- Other

Please specify "Other"* (compulsory)

25. Pertaining to article 7(2) of the current Directive, ships may be allowed to proceed to the next port of call without delivering the ship-generated waste if there is sufficient dedicated storage capacity, taking into account the waste to be accumulated during the intended voyage until the port of delivery. According to your experience, how is this provision applied in the day-to-day operations of EU ports providing PRF services?

(optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Generally applied
- Sometimes applied
- Rarely applied

- Never applied
- Do not know / have no firm opinion
- Other

25b. Add any relevant comment to substantiate your answer. [\(optional\)](#)

26. Also referring to article 7(2) of the current Directive, do you think that an integrated information and monitoring system at EU level would contribute to implement this provision more systematically? [\(optional\)](#)
[\(at most 1 answer\)](#)

- Yes
- No

26b. Add any relevant comment to substantiate your answer. [\(optional\)](#)



III. Options for a possible revision of Directive 2000/59/EC

The policy options that will be considered following the current review of the Directive are:

- Option 1: Continuation of present policies
- Option 2: Abrogation of the Directive
- Option 3: Better implementation
- Option 4: Legislative reform

Option 1: Continuation of present policies

The first policy option would be to continue with present policies, implemented largely as at present but also incorporating planned and expected changes, such as any revisions to MARPOL annexes. This option would maintain the present legal framework for the EU system of port reception facilities. This option is the base line against which the effects of other options are compared; when we talk about the effect of a new policy we mean the difference it would make to the situation that would have obtained under a continuation of present policies.

27. If present policies are continued, would you expect the overall **adequacy** (in the sense of article 4(2) of the current Directive) of port reception facilities and related services to improve, decline or stay the same over the next five years? (optional)

(at most 1 answer)

- Improve significantly
- Improve slightly
- Stay the same
- Decline slightly
- Decline significantly
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

28. If present policies are continued, would you expect the overall **volume** of ship-generated waste and cargo residues collected in EU port reception facilities to increase, decrease or stay the same over the next five years? (optional)

(at most 1 answer)

- Improve significantly
- Improve slightly
- Stay the same
- Decline slightly
- Decline significantly
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

29. In relation with your answer to the previous question (variation in volume), which types of waste or residues would you expect to be most affected? * (compulsory)

- Oily wastes
- Noxious liquid substances in bulk

- Sewage
- Garbage
- Air pollution treatment residues
- Cargo residues
- Ballast sediments
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

Option 2: Abrogation of the Directive

This option would abrogate (i.e. abolish) Directive 2000/59/EC. All other EU Directives and Regulations would be kept in place, including those related to waste disposal at sea and treatment of waste on land, and Member States would still be subject to MARPOL requirements

30. If the Directive were abrogated, would you expect the overall **adequacy** (in the sense of article 4(2) of the current Directive) of port reception facilities and related services to improve, decline or stay the same over the next five years, relative to Option 1: Continuation of present policies? [\(optional\)](#)
[\(at most 1 answer\)](#)

- Improve significantly
- Improve slightly
- Stay the same
- Decline slightly
- Decline significantly
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

31. If the Directive were to be abrogated, would you expect the overall **volume** of ship-generated

waste and cargo residues collected in EU port reception facilities to increase, decrease or stay the same over the next five years, relative to Option 1: Continuation of present policies? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Improve significantly
- Improve slightly
- Stay the same
- Decline slightly
- Decline significantly
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

32. In relation with your answer to the previous question (variation in volume), which types of wastes or residues would you expect to be most affected? (optional)

- Oily wastes
- Noxious liquid substances in bulk
- Sewage
- Garbage
- Air pollution treatment residues
- Cargo residues
- Ballast sediments
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

33. Would you expect an increase or reduction in the costs to you or your organisation in using or providing PRF over the next five years as a result of the Directive being abrogated, relative to Option 1: Continuation of present policies? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Significant increase in costs

- Limited increase in costs
- No change to costs
- Limited reduction in costs
- Significant reduction in costs
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

Administrative costs are those generated through the provision of information to either public or private parties.

—

34a. Please provide estimates of the initial, **one-off administrative** cost or savings to you or your organisation resulting from abrogation of the Directive (Measured in thousand euro (€000) or equivalent value in national currency)?

(optional)

34b. Please also provide estimates of the **on-going** costs or savings (Measured in thousand euro (€000) or equivalent value in national currency) to you or your organisation resulting from abrogation of the Directive. (optional)

35a. After any initial adjustments were made, how many additional/fewer full time equivalent staff

members would you or your organisation need to employ if the Directive were abrogated (indicate fewer by providing a negative number)? [\(optional\)](#)

35b. And as % of existing staff? [\(optional\)](#)

 %

Option 3: Better implementation

If this option were chosen, the Commission services would prepare an interpretative Communication to port authorities, national governments, ship owners and others involved. This guidance would be supported by other actions (i.a. exchange of best practices). Without changing the legal framework, this option may also include amendments of the current provisions of the Directive (art. 15) in so far as such amendments do not broaden the scope of the Directive.

Full explanation of this option

36. If guidance and limited amendments within the scope of the existing Directive were to be provided on the Directive, would you expect the overall adequacy (in the sense of article 4(2) of the current Directive) of port reception facilities and related services to improve, decline or stay the same over the next five years, relative to Option 1: Continuation of present policies? [\(optional\)](#)
[\(at most 1 answer\)](#)

- Improve significantly
- Improve slightly
- Stay the same
- Decline slightly
- Decline significantly

Do not know / have no firm opinion

37. If guidance and limited amendments within the scope of the existing Directive were to be provided on the Directive, would you expect the overall **volume** of ship-generated waste and cargo residues collected in EU port reception facilities to increase, decrease or stay the same over the next five years, relative to Option 1: Continuation of present policies? [\(optional\)](#)
[\(at most 1 answer\)](#)

Improve significantly

Improve slightly

Stay the same

Decline slightly

Decline significantly

Do not know / have no firm opinion

38. In relation with your answer to the previous question (variation in volume), which **types of waste or residues** would you expect to be most affected? [\(optional\)](#)

Oily wastes

Noxious liquid substances in bulk

Sewage

Garbage

Air pollution treatment residues

Cargo residues

Ballast sediments

Do not know / have no firm opinion

39. Which aspects of the guidance and limited amendments provided would contribute to this overall effect (adequacy and volumes collected through PRF)?

	Positive impact	No impact	Negative impact
Availability of adequate facilities (Art 4) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Operational management in ports (Art 5) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication between ships and ports / notification (Art 6) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delivery obligations, including possibility to proceed without discharging in case of sufficient storage capacity (Art 7 & 10) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Costs and fees (Art 8) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exemptions in	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

case of regular and frequent scheduled voyages (Art 9) optional			
Enforcement (Art 11) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

40. Would you expect an increase or reduction in the costs to you or your organisation in using or providing PRF over the next five years as a result of guidance being provided and limited amendments being made under Option 3, relative to Option 1: Continuation of present policies? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Significant increase in costs
- Limited increase in costs
- No change to costs
- Limited reduction in costs
- Significant reduction in costs
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

41. Which aspects of the guidance would have an effect on the costs and to what extent?

	Significant increase in costs	Small increase in costs	No change in costs	Small reduction in costs	Significant reduction in costs
Availability of adequate facilities (Art 4) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Operational management in ports (Art 5) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication between ships and ports / notification (Art 6) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delivery obligations, including possibility to proceed without discharging in case of sufficient storage capacity (Art 7 & 10) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Costs and fees (Art 8) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exemptions in case of regular and frequent scheduled voyages (Art 9) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enforcement (Art 11) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Administrative costs are those generated through the provision of information to either public or private parties.

—
42a. Please provide estimates of the **initial one-off administrative** cost or savings to you or your organisation that would be incurred if guidance and limited amendments were provided on the Directive as envisaged under option 3 (Measured in thousand euro (€000) or equivalent value in national currency).

(optional)

42b. Please also provide estimates of the **on-going** costs or savings (Measured in thousand euro (€000) or equivalent value in national currency) to you or your organisation that would be incurred if guidance and limited amendments were provided on the Directive as envisaged under option

3. (optional)

43a. How many additional/fewer full time equivalent staff members would you or your organisation

need to employ if guidance were provided on the Directive and limited amendments made as envisaged under option 3 (indicate fewer by providing a negative number)? [\(optional\)](#)

43b. And as % of existing staff? [\(optional\)](#)

44. Are there any other topics on which you think guidance would be useful?
Please explain your answer.

[\(optional\)](#)

Option 4: Legislative reform

If Option 4 were chosen by the Commission, a formal legislative reform of the Directive would be undertaken with the view to update, clarify, reinforce, and modify the requirements as appropriate. All modifications introduced through amendments would be legally binding for the Member States.

[Full explanation of this option](#)

45. If the Directive were to be amended as described in the note attached, would you expect the overall **adequacy** (in the sense of article 4(2) of the current Directive) of port reception facilities and related services to improve, decline or stay the same over the next five years, relative to Option 1:

Continuation of present policies? (optional)

(at most 1 answer)

- Improve significantly
- Improve slightly
- Stay the same
- Decline slightly
- Decline significantly
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

46. If the Directive were to be amended as described in the note attached, would you expect the overall **volume** of ship-generated waste and cargo residues collected in EU port reception facilities to increase, decrease or stay the same over the next five years, relative to Option 1: Continuation of

present policies? (optional)

(at most 1 answer)

- Improve significantly
- Improve slightly
- Stay the same
- Decline slightly
- Decline significantly
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

47. In relation with your answer to the previous question (variation in volume), which **types of waste or residues** would you expect to be most affected? (optional)

- Oily wastes

- Noxious liquid substances in bulk
- Sewage
- Garbage
- Air pollution treatment residues
- Cargo residues
- Ballast sediments
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

48. Which of the amendments made would contribute to this overall effect (adequacy and volumes collected through PRF)?

	Positive impact	No impact	Negative impact
Availability of adequate facilities (Art 4) <small>optional</small>	○	○	○
Operational management in ports (Art 5) <small>optional</small>	○	○	○
Communication between ships and ports / notification (Art 6) <small>optional</small>	○	○	○
Delivery obligations, including possibility	○	○	○

to proceed without discharging in case of sufficient storage capacity (Art 7 & 10) optional			
Costs and fees (Art 8) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exemptions in case of regular and frequent scheduled voyages (Art 9) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enforcement (Art 11) optional	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

49. Would you expect an increase or reduction in the costs to you or your organisation in using or providing PRF over the next five years as a result of a legislative reform made under Option 4, relative to Option 1: Continuation of present policies? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Significant increase in costs
- Limited increase in costs
- No change to costs
- Limited reduction in costs
- Significant reduction in costs
- Do not know / have no firm opinion

50. Which aspects of the legislative reform would have an effect on the costs and to what extent?

	Significant increase in costs	Small increase in costs	No change	Small reduction in costs	Significant reduction in costs
Availability of adequate facilities (Art 4) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Operational management in ports (Art 5) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication between ships and ports / notification (Art 6) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Delivery obligations, including possibility to proceed without discharging in case of	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

sufficient storage capacity (Art 7 & 10) <small>optional</small>					
Costs and fees (Art 8) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Exemptions in case of regular and frequent scheduled voyages (Art 9) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Enforcement (Art 11) <small>optional</small>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Administrative costs are those generated through the provision of information to either public or private parties.

—

51a. Please provide estimates of the **initial one-off administrative** cost or saving to you or your organisation that would be incurred by the legislative reform envisaged under Option 4 (Measured in thousand euro (€000) or equivalent value in national currency).

(optional)

--

51b. Please also provide estimates of the **on-going** costs or savings (Measured in thousand euro (€000) or equivalent value in national currency) to you or your organisation that would be incurred by

the legislative reform envisaged under Option 4. (optional)

52a. How many additional/fewer full time equivalent staff members would you or your organisation need to employ as a result of the legislative reform envisaged under Option 4 (indicate fewer by providing a negative number)? (optional)

52b. And as % of existing staff? (optional)

 %

53. Are there any other topics on which you think a legislative reform would be useful?
Please explain your answer.

(optional)

IV. Statistical background - Ports

54. You are invited to provide information and data about port reception facilities operated in the port that is most familiar to you (to which your answers will refer).

What type of activities may be found in this port?

* (compulsory)

- Commercial cargo port
- Commercial passenger port
- Ro-Ro / Ro-Pax terminals
- Fishing port
- Recreational port
- Oil terminal
- Chemical terminal
- Other

Please specify* (compulsory)

55a. Please provide data for your port for 2010 (or the last year for which you have complete data).
Provide figures for traffic travelling in the inwards direction only:

Vessel traffic - number of ships

(optional)

55b. Please provide data for your port for 2010 (or the last year for which you have complete data).
Provide figures for traffic travelling in the inwards direction only:

Goods - gross weight in tonnes

(optional)

55c. Please provide data for your port for 2010 (or the last year for which you have complete data).
Provide figures for traffic travelling in the inwards direction only:

Units – lane meters (for Ro-Ro)

(optional)

55d. Please provide data for your port for 2010 (or the last year for which you have complete data).
Provide figures for traffic travelling in the inwards direction only:

Number of passengers

(optional)

56a. What facilities are available for receiving different categories of ship waste and cargo residuals from ships calling at this port?

	Fixed	Tanker or barge	Tank truck / portable tank	Other
Oily wastes <small>optional</small>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noxious liquid substances in bulk <small>optional</small>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sewage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

optional				
Garbage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
optional				
Air pollution treatment residues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
optional				
Cargo residues	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
optional				
Ballast sediments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
optional				

56b. What are the specifications of these facilities (Minimum and maximum quantities, maximum discharge rates)? If more than one facility is available for a type of waste, please record the highest specifications.

Answer this question by filling out the table in the spreadsheet.

* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- I filled out the table in the spreadsheet
- I did not fill out the table in the spreadsheet

57. How many ships called at this port in 2010 (or in the last complete year for which you have information)?

Answer this question by filling out the table in the spreadsheet with information relating to the most recent year for which you have records (in case only aggregated figures are available, please fill-in the last row 'Total')

* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- I filled out the table in the spreadsheet
- I did not fill out the table in the spreadsheet

58. What volumes of ship waste and cargo residual were collected in this port last year from each type of ship?

If accurate numbers are not known please give estimates.

Answer this question by filling out the table in the spreadsheet.

* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- I filled out the table in the spreadsheet
- I did not fill out the table in the spreadsheet

IV. Statistical background - Ships

59. What type or types of vessels are found in the fleet with which you are familiar and to which your replies will refer?

If possible, please also indicate the size of the fleet and the average deadweight in the spreadsheet.

* (compulsory)

- Liquid bulk ships (tankers)
- Dry bulk carrier
- Container ships
- Specialised carriers
- Non-specialised general cargo carriers
- Dry cargo barges
- Ro-Ro / Ro-Pax ships

- Passenger vessels - excluding cruise ships
- Cruise ship
- Recreational vessel
- Fishing vessels >24m in length
- Fishing vessels <24m in length
- Vessels for offshore activities
- Tugs
- Miscellaneous vessels (dredgers, research vessels, others)
- Unknown

60. What are typical voyages for each of the types of vessels in the fleet with which you are familiar?
Answer this question by filling out the table in the spreadsheet.

* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- I filled out the table in the spreadsheet
- I did not fill out the table in the spreadsheet

61. What is the average storage capacity for waste on each of the types of vessel in this fleet?
Answer this question by filling out the table in the spreadsheet.

* (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- I filled out the table in the spreadsheet
- I did not fill out the table in the spreadsheet

62. What is the average amount of waste generated per day and per km / nautical mile for each type of ship in the fleet to which you are referring? * (compulsory)
(at most 1 answer)

- I filled out the table in the spreadsheet
- I did not fill out the table in the spreadsheet

63. If you are aware of 'garbage record book' onboard certain ships, could you please indicate if, according to your experience, it has ever been used by port authorities or inspection authorities with regard to enforcement of Directive 2000/59/EC? (optional)
(at most 1 answer)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Conclusions

64. If you have filled out any table in the spreadsheet you can upload it here.
Add any other comments you consider relevant to this consultation in the text box below.

(optional)

65. Please provide your contact details only in case you would like us to contact you for more information. (optional)

Background documents

- * Microsoft Excel spreadsheet as part of the questionnaire: <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/consultations/doc/prf/prf.xls>
- * Background note: <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/consultations/doc/prf/background-note.pdf>
- * Definitions: <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/consultations/doc/prf/definitions.pdf>
- * Option 3 – Better implementation: <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/consultations/doc/prf/option3.pdf>
- * Option 4 – Legislative reform: <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/consultations/doc/prf/option4.pdf>
- * EMSA horizontal report on the implementation of the PRF Directive: <http://ec.europa.eu/transport/maritime/consultations/doc/prf/emsa-report.pdf>
- * Directive 2000/59/EC (consolidated version of 11 December 2008): <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2000L0059:20081211:EN:PDF>