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Submission by four GlobalMET participants of articles for this newsletter is encouraging and much appreciated. Of course we would like more and urge all reading this editorial to think of the need for more to be involved. To assist the development of MET we need to float ideas for discussion and debate. So, how about to drafting and submitting your thoughts for publication?

This is the 24th issue of the electronic version and it is time to review the situation. While comment about these monthly newsletters has been generally favourable, there is need for more, including criticism, so that we have a clearer understanding of what members would like.

What impact are the newsletters having? Do you think we are achieving our objective of providing an interesting, informative monthly publication that facilitates communication and assists development of MET and of GlobalMET? Do let us know what you think.

At this stage there doesn’t appear to be need for a proper survey form, just a brief email to the ExecSec. To assist discussion at the Board of Directors meeting in late October, please let me know what you think of the newsletter in its present form.

But it is not just the newsletter that needs review. What about GlobalMET’s performance in striving to achieve other objectives. We were established:

To promote, develop and support in the spirit of cooperation, the common interests of members in all matters concerning the development and quality of maritime education and training.

While there is regular communication with and between directors and advisors, it is through the agenda papers and the structured discussions at the twice-yearly Board meetings that agenda items receive the consideration needed and decisions are made.

Within the MET sector the number expressing concerns in writing is small. Yet there are many concerns and the overall situation is one in which a considerable amount of the training is ossified, with little consideration given to review and change. The need to introduce modern teaching methodologies, especially distance learning, is widespread and serious, yet the number of MET providers actively involved in such development is comparatively small.

With the Asian Development Bank agreeing to the project ‘Human Resource Development in the Maritime Sector in Asia and the Pacific’ there is now a major opportunity to clearly identify needs and to take the steps to address them. It is essential that we take this opportunity to lead significant MET development. All GlobalMET participants are urged to participate.

Similarly, more are urged to submit articles for this newsletter, raising issues, suggesting steps to take and thereby generating greater interest and more involvement by others who recognise that MET is in serious need of development. The work of the four contributing to this newsletter is very much appreciated. Now, more contributions please!

And more thoughts please about what should be proposed to the ADB with respect to moving MET into the future, either for publication in the newsletter or for consideration by directors and advisors.

Rod Short
Executive Secretary
Ship staff generally do a good job with ship inspection and repairs and the classification societies also try to achieve a good balance between neglect and over recommending, ignoring commercial realities. However, the following points should be noted.

1. Due to short port stay, the renewal of main engine liner rubber rings is suffering. If we try to do this in dry dock, the cost increases and during anchorages we are unable to immobilize the main engine. Proper preheating and diligent cooling water treatment becomes necessary. We can keep ourselves prepared so that as and when we get time on berth, we should efficiently complete it with the help of Master (try to prolong stay on account of lashing etc).

2. On container ships, we hardly go inside the holds to inspect. At times the Electrical Officer goes to check water level alarms and, generally, a cadet or AB only accompanies him.

3. Marpol is the new tiger. We are so afraid of it that the cleaning and inspection of fuel oil settling and service tanks is neglected, as also are the bunker tanks. The classification societies should conduct a study to find out how many FO bunker tanks have not been closely inspected in the last five years. It is not that the owners do not want to do it but the cost of cleaning and gas freeing of tanks tends to lead to avoidance of such work.

4. Inspection of boiler furnaces has suffered. I have not seen a surveyor enter the furnace for a long time. Ultrasonic gauging of furnace plating and the flue tube (the tubular structure between the tubes and the furnace) should be carried out.

5. The hotwell is a neglected structure. This needs greater attention, especially pipe pieces between the valve and the hotwell plate. The bottom plating of the hotwell must be checked for strength. On one ship, this started leaking but luckily we found the gap between bottom plating and deck below quite small, enabling us to fill cement in between.

6. The auxiliary condenser (dump condenser) is not being pressure tested.

7. On bulk carriers, no one is inspecting the holds for structural strength members, the air pipes and sounding pipes hidden behind cover plating. I have not seen senior officers spending some time closely checking the rose boxes.

More items can be easily added to the list but the intention is to invite attention. The officers on board and the surveyors are quite capable and knowledgeable, they only need to improve a bit on diligence. Greater interaction between the surveyors of the administration and the recognized organizations is humbly called for.

He who has never learned to obey cannot be a good commander.

Aristotle
Maritime Operations in Arctic Ocean Region

Future Challenges and Opportunities

By

Jai Acharya
MSc (Maritime studies); B.E. (Hons) EEE; FIE; CEng
Technical Director
STET Maritime Pte Ltd
Singapore

Abstract

Global interest in the Arctic Region has grown in recent years. The Arctic environment is unique and highly sensitive to disturbances. The region is heavily affected by ongoing climate change, technological development and increasing commercial activities. Temperatures have already risen twice as quickly in the Arctic as elsewhere on Earth. Glaciers and sea ice are melting more extensively than in the past. While efforts must be made to slow the rapid changes, plant and animal life will have to adapt to new conditions. Arctic marine areas are vital components in the regulation of global climate and an important source of nutrition, income and cultural identity for Arctic peoples and communities.

As the polar ice caps shrink, the international battle for control of the Arctic Ocean, a body of water surrounded by five countries, and its seabed, is escalating. As the ice withdraws, technological advances are creating opportunities to open maritime transport routes across the Arctic Ocean and exploit the natural resources of the Arctic. These developments must be managed in a responsible and sustainable manner so that they benefit the region and do not lead to undesired side effects.

For the region’s inhabitants, developments in the Arctic are a source of both challenges and opportunities. Climate change affects the cultures of the indigenous peoples and their traditional activities, such as reindeer husbandry, hunting and fishing. At the same time, the world business community’s increasing interest in Arctic areas is creating opportunities for economically more advantageous living conditions.

In 2012 alone, a new minimum for the extent of Arctic sea ice was set in September, eclipsing the dramatic previous new low set only five years before in 2007; the sea surface temperature on the ice margins continued to exceed the long-term average; the Greenland ice sheet experienced melting over some 97% of its expanse in a single day; and massive phytoplankton blooms were measured below the Arctic summer sea ice, an indication that biological production may be lower than originally estimated. The reduction in sea ice extent bears emphasis: the last six years, 2007-2012, have produced the “six lowest sea ice minimum extents since satellite observations began in 1979” (Ref: D. Perovich et al. 2012).

Growing interest in the Arctic marine environment with respect to industrial development, shipping, oil and gas activities, commercial fishing, tourism and other marine activities, has an effect on the marine environment itself. These activities also have potential effects on the livelihoods of local inhabitants and indigenous communities, with both positive and negative consequences. Increased activity brings increased risk of adverse impact, whether through incremental or cumulative pressures from additional pollution loads or from acute accidental events. An extensive framework of international, regional and national instruments, measures and arrangements already applies in Arctic marine areas. The Arctic states are committed to responsible governance for the conservation and sustainable use of the Arctic Marine Environment.

Defining Arctic Shipping

The Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment (AMSA) Team defined ‘Arctic Shipping’ very broadly to include many types of ships and vessels including: icebreakers, container ships, tankers, bulk carriers, cruise ships, fishing vessels, offshore supply vessels, ferries, tug-barge combinations, government survey vessels, salvage ships, and coast guard ships. The reason for this broad definition was that the AMSA Team took a holistic approach to Arctic marine use and wished to include nearly all Arctic surface vessels that might have an impact on the marine environment. Also it was recognized that comprehensive levels of discharges and stack emissions could be estimated from the AMSA database. Most naval ships that are combatants, such as submarines and surface warships, were not included in AMSA although they are well-known operators in the Arctic Ocean. This exclusion is consistent with the Arctic Council’s non-involvement in naval, military and security affairs.

Arctic Marine Operations Involve unique hazards that contribute to overall levels of risk. Examples of Hazards Include:

- Remoteness and high latitudes
- Extreme cold temperatures
- Ice characteristics and conditions (form and age)
- Limited infrastructure (aids to navigation, pollution response capabilities)
- Limited search and rescue capabilities

AMSA Baseline Database and Current Operations

The AMSA Team sent an electronic survey form to the Council’s Senior Arctic Officials requesting ship data in their nation’s Arctic waters during calendar year 2004. Since AMSA’s research phase commenced in summer 2005, it was logical to ask the Arctic states for their most recent Arctic ship data for calendar year 2004. It also requested how each of six Arctic states defined the boundaries of their Arctic waters (only Sweden and Finland have no Arctic waters). In this way, the AMSA team would be able to report on the numbers of ships in each Arctic Large Marine Ecosystem (LME); total emissions and discharges could be derived from such a comprehensive database. The AMSA database should be considered a first-order estimate since this was an initial attempt at a complete survey of all Arctic ships (less naval) for a given year. Using AMSA as a baseline, future surveys expected to be more robust.

Notable Arctic marine activity data from the AMSA include:

- An estimated 6,000 individual ships operated in or near the Arctic during calendar year 2004 (including ships along the North Pacific Great Circle Route through the Aleutian Islands).
- Slightly less than 50% of total were fishing vessels and 20% were bulk carriers.
- High ship concentrations were found off coastal Norway and northwest Russia (Barents, Kara and Pechora seas); along the North Pacific Great Circle Route (off southwest
Alaska); off Greenland’s west coast (cruise ships and support traffic); and around Iceland.

- Evidence of surface ships operating in the central Arctic Ocean (from 1977-2008 there have been 77 icebreaker voyages to the North Pole for science and tourism).
- Year-round operation of commercial Arctic ships between Dudinka on the Yenisey river and Murmansk supporting the industrial complex at Norilsk.
- Seasonal operation of large, non-icegoing bulk carriers to the Red Dog zinc mine in northwest Alaska, and extensive summer

**Arctic Maritime Activities: Key Environmental Issues and Infrastructure Concerns**

In an AMSA scientific review of the environmental impacts of Arctic marine activity, the most significant threat from ships was determined to be the release of oil through accidental or illegal discharge. Other potential impacts of Arctic ships include: ship strikes on marine mammals; the introduction of alien species from ballast water, cargo, and hull fouling; and transfer of organisms from one polar ecosystem to another; black carbon emissions accelerating regional ice melt; anthropogenic noise effects on migratory patterns of species; and the unintended consequences of greenhouse gases, sulfur oxides and nitrogen oxides in the remote Arctic environment. Lengthening of the navigation season and the possibilities for year-round navigation may also have far reaching consequences for Arctic ecosystems. For example, late autumn and early spring Arctic shipping may increase the potential for interaction between ships and migrating (and calving) marine mammals. A major AMSA concern identified is the general lack of marine infrastructure in the Arctic except for areas along the Norwegian coast and coastal regions of northwest Russia. Missing or lacking infrastructure in most Arctic areas include: hydrographic data and marine charts; complete and adequate coverage of communications; environmental monitoring (for weather, sea ice, and icebergs); search and rescue (SAR) capability; environmental response capacity; ship monitoring and tracking; aids to navigation; salvage; and more. AMSA states that the vastness and harshness of the Arctic environment make conduct of marine emergency response more difficult throughout the region. The Arctic Ocean’s hydrographic database for charting is not adequate. In most areas to support current and future Arctic marine activity and the monitoring network of meteorological and oceanographic observations critical to safe navigation is extremely sparse and not adequate to support increases in Arctic marine transportation.

**The Legal Framework**

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) provides the fundamental framework for governance of Arctic marine navigation and overall marine use. UNCLOS sets out the legal framework for the regulation of shipping according to maritime zones of jurisdiction. Significantly for the Arctic Ocean, UNCLOS allows coastal states the right to adopt and enforce non-discriminatory laws and regulations for the prevention, reduction and control of marine pollution in ice-covered waters (UNCLOS Article 234). AMSA indicates that the IMO is the competent and appropriate UN agency for issues related to international shipping including maritime safety, security and environmental protection. The IMO acts as a secretariat for most international conventions and facilitates their global implementation through adoption of codes and regulations that become international rules and standards. All 8 Arctic States are Active and Influential members of the IMO and working together with the global maritime community at IMO. They can attain acceptance of Arctic-specific rules and regulations for improved safety and environmental protection in polar waters.

**Co-Operation Action Required Amongst Arctic States and Relevant UN/Global Statutory Administration Authorities**

- Timely completion of a mandatory IMO Polar Code
- Encourage compliance with the Ballast Water Management and Anti-fouling Systems Convention
- Address preparedness and response for hazardous bulk chemicals
- Enhance cooperation on monitoring and surveillance of Arctic marine traffic and consider for an Agreement to this end. Update surveys of indigenous marine use
- Increase Arctic Council collaboration with IMO (International Maritime Organization), IWC (International Whaling Commission) and NAMMCO (North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission)
- Advance conservation of Arctic marine ecosystems
- Invest in infrastructure for hydrographic surveys and an observing network
- Enhance passenger ship safety in Arctic waters
- Support training requirements for seafarers
- Potential IMO measures for the Arctic including maritime environment (enhanced MARPOL Annex VI), safety and security.

Part II of Jai Acharya’s interesting article will be included in the next Newsletter.
A Game Changer for MET Institutions:
Cloud Computing and Virtual Learning Environments

by
William E. Hamilton @ Iman Fiqrie
Lecturer, Malaysian Maritime Academy

Background
This article picks right up on the compelling game changing technology broached in GlobalMET Newsletter #23 (2013, July). A Game Changer for MET Institutions, and speaks directly to the innovators, leaders and game changers in Maritime Education and Training (MET) Institutions who see the paradigm shift and command change!

Purpose
This article serves to both inform and persuade administrators and institutions thinking about making use of Google Apps for Education (GAFE) for their institution to act now!

The Game Changer
In GlobalMet Newsletter #23, the GlobalMet Executive Secretary noted the IMO’s recognition that as ships become more and more complex, the necessity for new technology in MET classrooms becomes even more paramount; “…there is need... the serious need—for MET providers to ‘keep up with new technology’; there is a huge task ahead for all of us involved in MET” (Short, 2013).

According to Mike Myatt, a Forbes magazine contributor, “At one time or another all great leaders experience something so big and so impactful it literally changes the landscape – it’s what I call a ‘Game Changer’ (Myatt, 2012). He goes on to layout some concepts like relentless pursuit, be original and develop a clear purpose - but, more importantly, he lays out, “6 Steps for Creating a Game Changer,” The 6 steps are that the effort should be simple, meaningful, actionable, relational, transformative and scalable (SMARTS) (Myatt, 2012).

GAFE is that game changer for MET and is designed to take much of the ICT burden away from organizations and give it simply and scalable (SMARTS) (Myatt, 2012).

And lastly, scalable refers to prospects for the future – can the game changer scale or grow as the organization’s future needs changes and grows. Having a platform and apps residing in the cloud with the actual developers means the latest technologies are always available and the organization always “leaning forward” and not several years behind innovation for lack of funds, interest and purchasing decisions. Let it be said, that of nine parameters noted for failure to capitalize on 21st Century Technology Skills, ICT was not in the top three; Participants not having the time, administrative and infrastructure constraints, and policies being the main reasons for failure to implement virtualization.

Digital Skills and 21st Century Skill Game Changing Aids
The article, “The 33 Digital Skills Every 21st Century Teacher Should Have,” suggests the kinds of game changing skills that can be flexed on a platform like GAFE (Kharbach, 2012). A few of these skills are; 3-Use blogs and wikis to create online platforms for students; 8- Create and deliver asynchronous presentations and training sessions; 10- Have knowledge about online security; 12- Create screen capture videos and tutorials; 13- Curate web content for classroom learning; 14- Use and provide students with task management tools to organize work and plan their learning; 15- Use polling software to create a real-time survey in class; 17- Exploit computer games for educational purposes; 18- Use digital assessment tools to create quizzes; 19- Use of collaborative tools for text construction and editing; 29- Use of collaborative tools for text construction and editing; and
33. Use file sharing tools to share docs and files with students online.

Why are these skills important? The aforementioned are innovative and transformative organizational game changing skills to meet the virtualization paradigm shift head-on! It’s being utilized successfully right now in the workplace by millions already!

The article, “What are 21st Century Skills,” gives more insight into what these 21st Century Skills are; creative ways of thinking; ways of working and communicating collaboratively; tools and information literacy for working with information and communication technology; and skills for living in the world that involves—personal and social responsibility (Binkley, 2010).

**Engagement and Interaction**

In order to help achieve these game changing 21st Century Skills in the Google and virtualized education context; practical collaboration, ICT literacy (on digital networks), application and engagement would be required, i.e., a virtual environment in the cloud, mobile devices and m-learning. True competency in this new environment also requires what’s called “digital literacy and citizenship,” or the attainment of knowledge as it relates to this new virtualized environment, social media and mobile devices. The GAFE platform encourages engagement and interaction in the form of effective integrated communications and increased opportunities for collaboration.

**Momentum and Enhancing the Institution’s Position**

GAFE also helps create momentum towards achieving the myriad of metrics an organization must complete in order to make a profit, continue to be a going concern, and address stakeholder’s needs to their fullest potential. It’s important to maximize these opportunities, “get traction” and momentum towards achieving desired goals and metrics. An organization effectively utilizing 21st Century tools and platforms will achieve these metrics with distinction!

**Conclusion**

There will always be resistance when “changing the game”—in this case, probably revolving around the use of social media in the workplace and other issues involving security. Consequently, organizations may not want to make hasty decisions without genuinely exploring all options! Hasty decisions may be cause for organizations to miss out on game changing opportunities in new technologies.

I am reminded of the movie, The Great Gumball Rally, a 1976 movie about a coast to coast automobile race set in the U.S.; in the last scenes, an Italian race car driver races towards the finish line, his partner yells they’re catching up, hurry! The driver’s cool response is instructive—“what’s behind me is not important”! And so, an organization’s time might be better spent leading 21st Century initiatives, new technology and change rather than looking at what’s behind them or following others! However, GAFE can be locked all the way down until it’s virtually useless as a viable 21st Century Technology tool for change—and instead of changing the game, what one will have is a heavy Albatross around the organization’s neck!

**Works Cited**


A recent discussion thread on the business/social media site LinkedIn concerned delegation and trust. By extension, it also raised questions about communication, where developments, instant messaging, social media sites and the rest are well documented. The rate of change is astonishing. It is the ease of communication which may have influenced the locus of decision-making and this short paper asks whether this is an undesired and unexpected consequence of the communication revolution.

Working with seagoing officers of all ranks, I usually hear something jaw-dropping at least once a week; one example is how (some) navigating OOWs now automatically call the master if they see a light while they’re on watch. You might expect this to have been in restricted waters, low visibility or tricky conditions. But alas, we’re talking about routine, deep sea, clear weather and on first sighting.

This lamentable state of affairs is reinforced and so perhaps unwittingly condoned, by some masters, who will attend the bridge and take the con.

Now of course this might be an isolated, one-off, case easily explained as nervous first-trip OOW meets over-zealous master. Alternatively, it may be common practice and just the way things are today. It’s decades since I was on the bridge of a ship in anger so some contemporary evidence would be good.

Accepting the scant evidence above, perhaps we should ask some questions. Do watchkeepers and masters today think the OOW’s action is a positive contribution to safety at sea and commercial success? If so, there’s really no issue and we should stop worrying - although the practice is a far cry from that experienced forty years ago by my generation of seafarers. If, on the other hand, we see a problem with the OOW’s actions, then perhaps we should ask why it is happening? and inquire further.

On quizzing masters about the reported increase in the degree of operational micro-management, they will often point fingers at superintendents. The masters argue that it is they, the supers, who require this level of control. Not to be left out, the superintendents blame the charterers and big shipping companies who (it is alleged) demand a level of four stripe involvement that is clearly inappropriate. Trust? It’s hardly given a mention.

These bizarre behaviours appear to be becoming normalised. Arguably, they are potentially damaging the morale, confidence and even competence of seagoing officers. What’s even scarier is the thought of what junior officers themselves will do when they get promoted if they’ve never had to deal with everyday, routine officer-decisions.

There may be denial (or ignorance) that this is happening and organisations will probably say that their company policies and procedures don’t call for this level of micro-management. Sadly, there are often disconnects between espoused policy and practice.

Middle managers and superintendents work in the moment, sometimes under great stress. They are encouraged to operate a no-risk culture, with dire consequences if they fail, and in this litigious world, the best way of mitigating risk (or so they short-sightedly believe) is to get the Old Man to check the compass bearings.

Why do we find ourselves in this sorry situation? Low freight rates, tight margins, rising costs, reduced manning, suspect certification, lacklustre training, vetting, audits, accountability – all ingredients guaranteed to keep shipowners and managers awake at night. One reaction has been to take more central control. Masters will be on the phone to their supers in seconds whenever they encounter a ‘problem’. CEOs boast of being available 24/7 whenever their masters need them. With such a warm security blanket around them is it any wonder that the masters avail themselves of it?

So, we have the master who went ashore during a USCG inspection because a superintendent was on board and outranked him; a chief engineer who was not prepared to take decisions over a pump repair even though this jeopardised a canal transit; the master who had to seek permission from the DPA to send a man to the doctor.

So what’s all this got to do with the OOW calling the captain? Over the past thirty years we seem to have gradually constructed a dependency culture in which seagoing officers have abrogated responsibility for taking decisions. The locus of much decision-making has shifted. As we have seen, masters and chief engineers are now expected and required to inform their managers when there is even the slightest deviance from the norm.

Senior management (under pressure from their clients) have seized day-to-day control and it simply doesn’t occur to anyone to say ‘deal with it’ – even if they could.

And all this has been made possible by the near-instant communication systems that everyone has at their finger tips. It will get more intense. There is research that shows reactions similar to drug withdrawal when youngsters are separated from their electronic devices. Digital natives, generation Y - and even some oldies! - are ineluctably wedded to their i-gadgets and therefore we simply have to manage this reality more effectively.

In any organisation, juniors will often emulate the behaviours of their seniors. (We once had a college principal who wore Bart Simpson socks. It was remarkable how many managers started wearing various cartoon and other wacky designs...I digress). Juniors look up, observe the behaviours that got the seniors where they are and so mirror them in order to climb the ladder (or greasy pole) of success. To illustrate, look at the behaviours in the boardroom of any company and compare them with the culture within the fleet, or on the shop floor.

So, if junior officers see their seniors reaching for the phone every time they want to swing the boats out it’s almost inevitable that they’ll adopt similar behaviours themselves.

If this hypothesis is accepted then it’s entirely logical, predictable and rational for OOWs to copy their seniors and refuse to take responsibility for things that once were taken for granted. The result is they call the master if they see something.

Hopefully once he or she gets to the bridge they will deal with the situation...but how long before a master calls the super to find out what they should do about that pesky light on a steady bearing, starboard side?

The next monograph will look at some of the things that we might consider doing about this.

© Haughton Maritime Limited 2013
www.haughtonmaritime.com
For references and permission to reproduce,
email info@haughtonmaritime.com
Monstrous Saharan Dust Cloud Puts the Kibosh on Atlantic Hurricanes

Rob Almeida

This week NOAA’s Terra/MODIS satellites detected a massive plume of dust moving off the coast of Africa, born from a storm far inland. This plume, called the Saharan Air Layer (SAL), carries with it a particularly high concentration of dust and dry air that NOAA notes, ‘plays an important role in lessening “cyclogenesis” or the formation of hurricanes.’

According to a 2004 study by Jason P. Dunion from the University of Miami, and Christopher Velden from the University of Wisconsin, the ‘SAL engulfs tropical waves, tropical disturbances, or preexisting tropical cyclones (TCs), its dry air, temperature inversion, and strong vertical wind shear (associated with the midlevel easterly jet) can inhibit their ability to strengthen.

This week, NOAA’s Terra/MODIS satellites detected a massive plume of dust moving off the coast of Africa, born from a storm far inland. This plume, called the Saharan Air Layer (SAL), carries with it a particularly high concentration of dust and dry air that NOAA notes, ‘plays an important role in lessening “cyclogenesis” or the formation of hurricanes.’
The Francisco, manufactured by Australia’s Incat shipyard, is the world’s fastest ship, hitting speeds of 58.1 knots. It will carry up to 1,000 passengers between Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Montevideo, Uruguay. It is also the first ferry using LNG as fuel and generating power in two GE turbines based on converted jet engines.

‘Francisco’: World’s Fastest

Source: Maersk Line

The Shape of Change

The Maersk Triple-E

* subject to change

Designed for lower speeds
A small change in knots cuts fuel consumption and lowers CO2 emissions

* vaccinated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO2 Emission</th>
<th>Speed (knots)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Shape of Change

Comparison between the shape of the Triple-E compared to Emma Maersk

Size and speed

The Triple-E vessels are powered by two super-long stroke engines which drive two 4-bladed propellers, a combination meant for slower operating speeds and greatest possible efficiency

Interior

Extra space created by U-shaped hull. New vessels will have 18% greater capacity (equal to 2,500 containers) than current largest containership Emma Maersk

Source: Maersk Line
Kiani Satu Grounding

In early August Kiani Satu, a 165-meter bulk carrier transporting a cargo of rice from Hong Kong to Ghana, grounded when it encountered engine troubles along the southeastern shore of South Africa. All 19 crew members from the bulk carrier are safe after being airlifted from their stricken vessel.

Study Shows Nature of International Piracy is Changing

The nature of international piracy is undergoing a dramatic change, according to a study recently released by three organizations: the International Maritime Bureau, Oceans Beyond Piracy and Maritime Piracy-Humanitarian Response.

The study shows that in 2012, for the first time in recent history, pirate attacks in the Gulf of Guinea surpassed those in the Gulf of Aden and the Western Indian Ocean.

Policies enacted by the Somali government and an increased presence of international navies off the coast of Somalia have resulted in a striking reduction of pirate attacks of the eastern coast of Africa. The number of such incidents dropped by 80 percent from 2011 to 2012.

However, the news was not all good. Pirate attacks off the coast of western Africa tend to be more violent than those undertaken off the coast of Somalia.

Moreover, while the number of pirate attacks dropped dramatically off the coast of Somalia, the success rate of those launched was substantially higher.

There were other differences as well. Piracy off Africa’s west coast is primarily aimed at capturing cargoes of refined oil, while off Somalia, the impetus is to secure hostages for ransom. The difference in motives means that west African pirates hold their captives for an average of four days; while Somali pirates, who engage in sensitive negotiations with shipping companies and host governments, keep civilian mariners for nearly a year.

Members of the international maritime community are saying that the report will have important implications for the future. For example, “These statistics may also indicate that (Somali) pirates have learned to fire upon and attack only the most vulnerable vessels … vessels that do not carry armed guards” or that don’t take any other antipiracy measures.
First Merchant Ship on Arctic Northeast Route Sails

Sinoship News 09/08/13

"Yong Sheng", a multi-purpose vessel, China’s first merchant ship to head to Europe via the Arctic Northeast sailed from Dalian on 8 August and is scheduled to arrive at Rotterdam on 11 September.

The Arctic routes greatly shorten the shipping distance between China and Europe/North America, reduce fuel consumption and carbon emissions, improve energy efficiency and lower operational costs.