

A) Project delays - North Europe

Project	Planned maximum capacity (million teu p.a.)	Original proposed start date	Status as of 2005	Earliest start date for operations	Delay experienced (years)	Estimated additional capacity which could have been available in 2005 if project not delayed/refused (million teu p.a.)	Estimated total cost of approval process (million Euro) *	Estimated project construction & equipment costs (million Euro)	Main cause of delay to project
France									
Le Havre Port 2000	4.2	2003	Under construction	2006	3	0.7	25.0	550	Internal politics within the port
Belgium									
Deurganckdok	7.2	2001	Under construction	2005	4	4.0	100.0	1100	Environmental objections and legal technicalities and objections
Netherlands									
Rotterdam Euromax	2.4	2004	Regulatory and other hurdles appear to have been overcome	2008	4	1.2	25.0	225	EC investigation into market share implications
Rotterdam Maasvlakte II	6.0	2002	Funding gained	2012	10	2.0	150.0	1000+	Political wrangling over funding
Westerschelde	3.0	2003	Refused but attempts being made to resurrect on a smaller scale	Unknown, possibly never	At least 5	1.0	50.0	400	Environmental objections, political wrangling and court cases
Germany									
Wilhelmshaven/JadeWeser	4.1	2006	Operator being selected	2010	4	0	25.0	800	Political wrangling
Cuxhaven	2.0	2006	Dead	n/a	n/a	0.0	5.0	400	Political wrangling
UK									
Dibden Bay	2.1	2000	Dead	n/a	n/a	2.1	98.6	876	Public inquiry and subsequent government consideration of findings
London Gateway	3.5	2006	Awaiting decision	2008	2	0	36.5	876	Public inquiry and subsequent government consideration of findings
Bathside Bay	1.7	2004	Awaiting decision	2008	4	0.4	20.0	438	Public inquiry and subsequent government consideration of findings
Felixstowe South	1.6	2006	Awaiting decision	2007	1	0	5.0	365	Public inquiry and subsequent government consideration of findings
Hull (Quay 2000/2005) **	0.6	2000	Nearing approval	2007	7	0.6	10.0	51	Public inquiry and subsequent government consideration of findings
TOTALS	37.8					11.4	540.1		

* For all parties involved

** Facility not specifically aimed at deep sea market although will have deep water.

Note: Includes some estimates

KEY COMMENTS/CONCLUSIONS

1. Not all projects have suffered delays, but those that have (see above) have generally seen significant delays
2. Delays have been experienced in each of the main countries in the North Continent, plus the UK
3. For those projects still alive, the average delay is around 2 to 3 years
4. Without the delays, deep sea capacity in N. Europe in 2005 could potentially be over 11 million teu more than it is expected to actually be (i.e. 30% more)
5. The estimated cost of the approval process, inquiries, legal work etc in relation to the above projects is in excess of half a billion Euros. This would pay for a terminal the size of Bathside Bay.

B) North European deep sea terminals - Estimated utilisation in 2004

Million teu

Port	Capacity	Throughput	Utilisation	Notes
Le Havre	2.4	2.2	89.6%	Port 2000 expansion project is now under construction, first berths operational in 2006
Dunkirk	0.5	0.2	40.0%	Good maritime access is offset by additional inland transport costs and limited barge infrastructure.
Zeebrugge	0.9	0.5	50.0%	Good maritime access is offset by additional inland transport costs and limited barge infrastructure.
Antwerp	6.0	5.6	92.9%	First berths at Deurganckdok will open in late 2005
Rotterdam	7.2	6.7	92.5%	Hanno-Uniport facilities are upriver beyond ECT Home terminal and so less attractive to carriers with large ships
Amsterdam	1.0	0.0	0.0%	Ceres terminal awaits first customer - Grand Alliance rumoured
Bremerhaven	3.8	3.6	95.5%	
Hamburg	7.3	6.8	93.2%	
Southampton	1.5	1.4	99.3%	Investment to optimise capacity towards a maximum of 2 million teu p.a. is ongoing
Thamesport	0.7	0.6	78.6%	
Felixstowe	3.5	2.7	77.1%	Loss of MSC transshipment traffic has provided temporary breathing space, as has opening of final extension to Trinity termin
TOTAL	34.8	30.2	86.8%	

Note: Figures exclude estimates of RoRo container, multi-purpose and short sea container capacity and volume at each port

KEY COMMENTS/CONCLUSIONS

1. It is clear that certain ports are very highly utilised whilst others are under-utilised/empty
2. Hence even in a market where capacity is under pressure, certain ports remain less attractive
3. An average utilisation across the market in excess of 85% offers very little scope to deal with peaks
4. Plus it means that there is little or no opportunity to switch ports (especially the most attractive ones), thereby limiting competition

1al. Deepest berths remain in short supply though.

C) Supply-demand balance - Confirmed capacity expansion projects only

<i>Million teu</i>	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Notes
Le Havre	2.4	2.4	3.2	3.8	3.8	4.5	4.5	Includes first 6 berths of Port 2000
Dunkirk	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	Extra capacity due to additional cranes on order
Zeebrugge	0.9	0.9	1.4	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	Additional capacity is from APM Terminals' planned re-development of Flanders Container Terminal
Antwerp	6.0	6.7	8.7	10.3	10.5	11.1	11.7	Includes P&O Ports and PSA-HNN's Deurganckdok facilities, and expansion of MSC's terminal in the Delwaide Dock. Excludes Saefthingedok as unconfirmed and likely to be after 2010 anyway
Rotterdam	7.2	8.3	9.2	9.2	10.9	10.9	10.9	Includes maximisation of ECT Delta capacity plus Euromax from 2008 onwards, but excludes Maasvlakte II
Amsterdam	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Bremerhaven	3.8	4.2	4.4	4.7	5.2	5.7	6.2	Includes CT IV
Hamburg	7.3	8.3	9.0	9.8	10.2	10.7	11.3	Includes expansion/optimisation of Eurogate, Burchardkai and Tollerort terminals
Southampton	1.5	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	Optimisation of SCT
Thamesport	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	
Felixstowe	3.5	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	Not including Felixstowe South development
TOTAL DEEP SEA TERMINAL CAPACITY	34.8	38.5	43.9	47.9	50.7	53.0	54.7	
TOTAL DEEP SEA TERMINAL DEMAND	30.2	33.4	36.8	40.1	43.2	46.2	48.8	
Growth		10.6%	10.1%	9.0%	7.9%	6.8%	5.7%	
Utilisation	86.8%	86.7%	83.8%	83.7%	85.4%	87.2%	89.2%	

KEY COMMENTS/CONCLUSIONS

1. Assuming that the new capacity detailed above is brought on stream with any further delays, market utilisation levels will remain in excess of 80% until 2010
2. Low utilisation at Amsterdam, Zeebrugge and Dunkirk may well continue meaning that utilisation levels at other ports will be above the market average
3. Market utilisation levels in excess of 80% result in limited scope for major carriers to switch ports
4. During 2004, pressure on capacity was evident in the marketplace at peak periods, even though average utilisation across the year was "only" 87%

D) Capacity - Unconfirmed projects

<i>Million teu</i>	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Notes
Wilhelmshaven (JadeWeser)							0.5	Ultimate planned capacity is over 4 m teu p.a.
Hamburg*						0.5	1.0	Ultimate potential capacity in excess of 1 m teu p.a.
Westerschelde							0.9	
London Gateway					0.5	1.5	1.5	Ultimate planned capacity is 3.5 m teu p.a.
Bathside Bay					0.9	0.9	0.9	Ultimate planned capacity is 1.7 m teu p.a.
Felixstowe South				0.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	
TOTAL UNCONFIRMED CAPACITY	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	2.9	4.4	6.3	

* Special Port Expansion Project/Steinwerder terminal

Note: Second phase of Port 2000 at Le Havre assumed to be after 2010

Theoretical utilisation including all unconfirmed projects

2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
86.8%	86.7%	83.8%	82.8%	80.8%	80.6%	80.0%

KEY COMMENTS/CONCLUSIONS

1. If all currently unconfirmed projects went ahead to their full extent and assumed timings, market utilisation would remain relatively high but over-capacity could result in certain places (e.g.UK)
2. However, even in these locations, capacity would only be brought on stream in response to market demand so in reality, over-capacity is unlikely