

Shipping
Federation
of Canada



2010



300 St. Sacrement, Suite 326, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Y 1X4
Telephone: 514 849-2325 Fax: 514 849-8774
info@shipfed.ca
www.shipfed.ca

Table of Contents

Board of Directors	3
Chairman's Address	4
President's Report	6
Advocacy	8
Operations	13
Education	15
Members	16
Affiliated Members	17
Standing Committees	18
Companies Represented by Federation Members	19
Tonnage Figures for Major Canadian Ports	20

Board of Directors



CHAIR

Jim Stoneman
Atship Services Ltd.
(Chair, Nova Scotia Committee)



VICE-CHAIR

Brian McDonald
Montship Inc.



HONOURARY TREASURER

Ross Kennedy
Robert Reford



Michael Broad
Shipping Federation of Canada
President



David Cardin
Maersk Canada Inc.



Paul Gourdeau
Fednav Ltd.



Lou Holmes
Holmes Maritime Inc.



Fritz King
Atlantic Container Line



Volker Kluge
Zim Integrated Shipping Services
(Canada) Co. Ltd.



Andre Neuendorff
Protos Shipping Ltd.



Holger Oetjen
Hapag-Lloyd (Canada) Inc.



Allan Philp
Laden Maritime Inc.



Gordon Smith
F.K. Warren Ltd.



Sokat Shaikh
MSC Canada Inc.



Norma Tilley
Canadian Maritime Agency Ltd.
Chair, Newfoundland / Labrador
District Committee



Robert Vandenende
Gresco Ltd.



David Watson
OOCL Canada Inc.
Chair, Ontario District Committee



Bryan Wilson
Lower St. Lawrence Ocean
Agencies Ltd.

Chairman's Address

The Shipping Federation of Canada had a busy and challenging agenda in 2010, as it worked to address members' concerns regarding a somewhat uneven economic recovery, while continuing to fulfill its primary mission as the pre-eminent voice of ships involved in Canada's world trade. In addition to addressing a wide array of marine-related issues from both a policy and an operational perspective, the Federation maintained a consistent focus on its other key activities of advocacy, education and information. It also continued to work collaboratively with other associations on issues of mutual interest and to strengthen its relationships on the international front through its participation in such organizations as the International Maritime Organization's Marine Environment Protection Committee.

The Board of Directors held five regular meetings throughout the year to review the Federation's progress on specific issues and formulate strategic directions for its future areas of endeavour. The Annual Meeting, held on April 8th, was followed by a half-day conference on the economy, which examined the economic downturn in terms of its major contributing factors, the effect of the recession on global transportation (and the marine industry) and what may be in store for the future. The keynote speaker was Graham Slack, Chief Economist at AP Moller Maersk, whose presentation focused on the possibility that the economy is heading towards a "new normal" characterized by more balanced global growth in the future, with the emerging markets of Asia and China becoming the new demand drivers. Mr. Slack's remarks were followed by presentations from Dawn Desjardins, Assistant Chief Economist at RBC Canada (who provided an economic outlook for Canada and the U.S.); Pat Sinnott, Executive Vice-President (Technology & Supply Chain) at Canadian Tire (who provided a shippers' perspective on the economic situation); and John Watt, Managing Director of the Morgan Stanley Infrastructure Fund (who spoke about investing in maritime infrastructure in the current economic context). The event was very well-attended, with 73 people present at the conference, and 123 at the lunch that followed. This is the ninth conference that the Federation has held since 2000, and as always, the event served as an ideal vehicle for bringing together key stakeholders and consolidating the Federation's role as a leader in Canada's international shipping industry.

The Federation's district committees continued to address subjects that are of interest to local members and to bring issues of particular concern to the Board's attention. I am pleased to note that the Nova Scotia District Committee was a member of the organizing committee for the second edition of Nova Scotia Maritime Day, which took place in Halifax under the theme of "The Nova Scotia Maritime Industry: See What We Do and What We Offer." The event provided representatives from the provincial government with an opportunity to attend an industry familiarization session and cocktail reception, and to gain a greater appreciation of the essential role that the maritime industry plays in the Nova Scotia economy and the Atlantic gateway. Meanwhile, the Newfoundland-Labrador District Committee (chaired by Norma Tilley) was extensively involved in discussions on pilotage costs and levels of service in the Placentia Bay region and also assisted in the organization of a training session for local members on the transportation of dangerous goods. For its part, the Ontario District Committee (chaired by David Watson) continued to hold regular monthly meetings to discuss such topics as rail service, CBSA examination procedures, and labour issues.

I am also pleased to report that in May, the Board of Directors passed a resolution to establish a British Columbia District Committee to address marine issues in B.C. ports and waterways that are of interest to members. The committee will operate under terms of reference similar to the Federation's other district committees in Nova Scotia, Newfoundland/Labrador and Ontario. I will undoubtedly have more to report on the work of this newest addition to our district committee structure in next year's report.

The Federation's standing committees continued to do their usual excellent work in 2010, devoting a considerable amount of time and expertise with respect to specific issues affecting the industry. Particularly noteworthy was the work of the Intermodal Committee, which provided substantial input into the Federation's representations with respect to the Vancouver Gateway Infrastructure Fee and the Rail Freight Services Review, as well as that of the Pilotage Committee, which was extensively involved in the discussions surrounding the Great Lakes Pilotage Authority's tariff proposal of May 2010, and cost and service issues in the Atlantic, Laurentian and U.S. Great Lakes regions. The Environment, Customs and Seaway Committees also continued to meet regularly throughout the year, thus ensuring that the Federation's advocacy efforts reflect the real needs of members as well as the operational realities that they face.

I must also take this opportunity to recognize the tremendous contribution to the Federation made by Capt. Ivan Lantz, who retired from his position as Director of Marine Operations at the end of 2010. Capt. Lantz has been an indispensable part of the Federation for the past twenty-two years, providing expertise and leadership on issues ranging from pilotage to electronic navigation to ballast water management to oil spill response. Not only has he been a tireless advocate of marine transportation and its many economic and environmental benefits, but he has also helped mold a new generation of shipping industry professionals through his involvement in the Certificate in Marine Transportation as both an instructor and course developer. On behalf of the entire Board of Directors, I would like to express my gratitude to Capt. Lantz for the expertise he has so willingly provided on all matters related to marine operations and navigation, for the dedication and integrity he has unfailingly exhibited in his work, and for the warmth and good humour with which he has conducted all of his interactions.

Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my fellow Board members for the support and expertise they have provided over the past year, and to express my appreciation to the President and staff of the Federation for their professionalism, dedication and efforts on behalf of the membership.

Jim Stoneman
Chairman

President's Report

2010 began on an optimistic note for some of our members, fuelled by the subsidies that governments around the world had provided to major industries such as banking and auto in order to kick-start their economies. As a result, the markets looked poised to take off with an increase in the movement of iron ore to China at the end of 2009 and of steel into the Great Lakes at the opening of the Seaway in March 2010. Indeed, ports on both the east and west coasts saw a rise in business during the first six months of the year, and container volumes throughout North America increased markedly, indicating that consumers were spending once again. Unfortunately, this early optimism could not be sustained. By mid-year, the dry bulk trades were experiencing another drop in activity, causing the Baltic Dry Index to fall to its lowest level of the year, while retailers in the United States indicated that the "peak season" had peaked early, leading to uncertainty as to whether container volumes would continue to increase at the same pace in the second half of the year. As a result, the early optimism of 2010 cooled off and was replaced by a more cautious approach within the industry.

Despite the ongoing uncertainty that was felt throughout much of 2010, it was business as usual at the Shipping Federation of Canada, as we continued to focus on our four core activities of advocacy, operations, information and education. Indeed, we have made it a priority over the last several years to maintain a strong focus on member satisfaction, with a view to ensuring that the challenging economic climate does not detract from our primary mission of protecting and promoting the interests of the owners, operators and agents of ships engaged in Canada's world trade.

Although 2010 was not a year of major legislative developments, the government did undertake a number of initiatives that may ultimately strengthen Canada's position from a gateways and trade route perspective. A key undertaking in this respect was Transport Canada's Rail Freight Services Review, which finally gained traction in 2010, as the phase 1 information-gathering process wound down and the phase 2 industry consultation process got underway. The Federation's Intermodal Committee was extensively involved in this process, contributing to the development of our brief (and follow-up comments) to the review panel, and participating in two face-to-face meetings with panel members. The focus of all of our comments has been on the need to establish measurable service levels and performance standards for the railways, with the government playing a monitoring role to help ensure compliance. This topic will continue to occupy our agenda in 2011, as we await the public release of the panel's report and work with the railways

to develop a series of metrics that would play a key role in continuously improving supply chain operations. Another legislative initiative that may have a positive result for our industry is the government's decision to engage in interdepartmental discussions on potential changes to the coasting trade regime. The need to upgrade this regime has long been an item on the Federation's agenda, and following consultation and discussion with members, we recently submitted a brief on specific trades and business opportunities that may warrant amendments to the current legislation, and on the overall need to build more flexibility into the *Coasting Trade Act*.

A new issue that found its way onto the Federation's agenda in 2010 was the introduction of a Gateway Infrastructure Fee (GIF) by Port Metro Vancouver. Although the Federation's initial involvement in this issue was based on members' concerns regarding the lack of consultation on the original fee proposal, our attention soon turned to the structure of the fee and the jurisdictional basis for its implementation, as well as the precedent it creates with respect to the potential introduction of similar fees in other regions of Canada. The questions surrounding the Vancouver GIF also highlighted the need for improved communication with stakeholders in Western Canada, as many of our members (particularly those in the liner trades) operate on this country's east and west coasts. Towards that end, the Board of Directors passed a resolution in May to formally establish a British Columbia District Committee, which will operate under terms of reference that are similar to those of our other district committees in Ontario, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland/Labrador.

In a trend that has now become the norm, the number and scope of environmental subjects on our agenda continued to be significant in 2010, and ranged from the implementation of an Emission Control Area (ECA) in North America, to the effort to develop a regime to regulate marine air emissions in Canada's internal waters, to ongoing issues related to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's permit for vessel discharges. Although the most pressing environmental issue facing the industry was arguably the State of New York's proposed ballast water discharge requirements (which prescribe a treatment standard that is significantly more stringent than that of the IMO), recent admissions from both California and Wisconsin that their own upcoming ballast water standards (which are similar to those of New York) are unattainable, leaves us cautiously optimistic that the State of New York will ultimately arrive at the same conclusion.

Other subjects of interest included ongoing delays associated with the Canada Border Service Agency's container examination procedures, the government's remission of the 25 percent duty on imported ships (and our effort to have this apply to ships that are imported not only on a permanent, but also on a temporary, basis), and of course, issues related to the cost and level of pilotage services. I am also pleased to report that as a result of the Federation's interventions, the Great Lakes Pilotage Authority agreed to withdraw its proposed introduction of Class 5 and Class 6 ships into its tariff, which would have had a disproportionate financial impact on the largest ships using the system. We therefore agreed to withdraw the objection that we had already filed with the Canadian Transportation Agency and to forego the public hearing process that was about to get underway.

The Federation continued to move forward with its government relations agenda, meeting regularly with senior officials at Transport Canada, Environment Canada, the Canadian Coast Guard, and other relevant departments throughout the year; organizing the second edition of "Nova Scotia Maritime Day" this past April; and participating in the 2010 edition of Quebec Marine Day this past October. Following the very successful government relations day we held in October 2009, we will likely organize another such event in the second half of 2011.

Internally, 2010 was a transitional year for the Federation, due mainly to the departure of Capt. Ivan Lantz, who retired on December 31 after a twenty-two year career as the Federation's Director of Marine Operations. Although Capt. Lantz's wealth of knowledge and experience, not to mention his vast network of contacts within the industry, will be greatly missed, we are confident that his replacement, Capt. Jean-François Belzile, will do a stellar job of heading our marine operations department. Another noteworthy development was the appointment of Anne Legars as the Federation's first ever Vice-President, effective January 1, 2011. Ms. Legars is a lawyer who joined the Federation as Director of Policy and Government Affairs, and who brings a wealth of legal, governance and strategic expertise to our organization. Finally, our environmental affairs department is being headed on a temporary basis by Lilia Khodjet El Khil, who holds a PhD in maritime law and has a solid background in helping countries implement IMO conventions dealing with ship source pollution. Ms. Khodjet is replacing Caroline Gravel, who took a one-year maternity leave in October 2010.

Our organization's success depends on the input of many people, and I wish to thank all of our members who donate their time to the Federation's various standing, ad-hoc and district committees, as well as the Board of Directors for their support and guidance throughout the past year. Finally, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the Federation's staff, who are every day committed to providing members with a professional and high level of service.

Michael Broad
President

Advocacy

As part of its overall advocacy efforts on behalf of members, the Federation consulted extensively with the government on various marine policy questions, provided direct input into the regulatory and legislative process, and participated in a number of working groups at the regional, national and bi-national levels. Following is a summary of the year's most noteworthy developments and accomplishments in this respect.

POLICY AND LEGISLATION

Rail Services Review

Transport Canada's review of rail freight services, which was launched in April 2008, moved significantly forward in 2010, as industry stakeholders were given the opportunity to provide their input by submitting written briefs to the review panel and meeting with panel members at several locations across Canada. The Federation's Intermodal Committee was extensively involved in this process, convening several times to help develop the Federation's brief (and follow-up comments) to the review panel and meeting with panel members on two occasions. The Federation's formal brief, which was submitted on April 30, 2010, expressed the view that rail service in Canada has systematically failed to meet the needs of users, and that the resulting impact on the supply chain and trade route has been sufficiently serious to warrant government attention. Our brief also identified a number of best practices which should serve as building blocks to bridge the gaps between the needs of shippers and the level of service provided, and recommended that the *Canada Transportation Act* be amended to provide the framework (and necessary leverage) for negotiated levels of service and performance standards, contract default provisions, and monitoring by the federal government. The Federation subsequently had two face-to-face meetings with the review panel to clarify these recommendations and discuss its positions in more detail.

The review panel issued an interim report in October, which recommends a two-phased strategy for addressing rail service issues. In the first phase, railways would continue to work with stakeholders to develop commercial measures aimed at improving rail service, with particular focus on four key principles (service changes, service agreements, dispute resolution and enhanced reporting). In the second phase, which would take place in 2013,

the government would undertake an assessment to determine whether these measures have successfully addressed the major rail service issues identified by stakeholders. If they have not, then the government would implement a series of regulatory fallback provisions based on the same principles as those underlying the commercial approach. Moreover, the legislative drafting and approval process for these fallback provisions would begin immediately after the government's acceptance of the panel's recommendations, with a view to minimizing any time delays in implementing such provisions.

The Federation filed a letter expressing general support for the panel's recommendations in early November, and at the time of writing, was waiting for the panel's final report to the Minister to be released to the public. In the meantime, the Federation is working to organize a brainstorming session with the railways' operational personnel, in an effort to develop a series of metrics for continuously improving supply chain operations. The first such session would be aimed at gaining a better understanding of the mutual operational constraints faced by both railways and marine carriers, and at identifying realistic and achievable improvements.

Vancouver Gateway Infrastructure Fee

In the spring of 2010, the Federation's Board of Directors learned of an initiative by Port Metro Vancouver to implement a new Gateway Infrastructure Fee (GIF) designed to provide investment dollars for a number of rail and road infrastructure improvements in areas such as the Roberts Bank rail corridor and the North and South Shore trade areas. Although the total price tag for these improvements amounted to \$717 million, the GIF was designed to recoup the \$167 million that the port had already invested on the industry's behalf (as part of an overall funding arrangement under which other agencies would provide \$3 million for every \$1 million invested by the industry). However, given that the port made this investment without any prior consultation with the shipping lines calling the port, the proposed new fee was greeted with a great deal of consternation on the part of the industry. This concern was compounded by a high degree of uncertainty regarding the structure of the proposed fee and the party against whom it would be assessed, as well as the legality of the port's right to recover the cost of work being done outside its territory from users who would not benefit from such work.

Following consultation with the Board of Directors and the Intermodal Committee, the Federation filed written comments to Port Metro Vancouver underlining its strong opposition to any fee structure making the shipowner responsible for payment of the fee, as this would force shipping lines to either re-invoice their customers at a considerable additional administrative cost or to absorb the GIF themselves because the fee would be impossible to pass on. Notwithstanding these efforts, the Port of Vancouver issued a notice at the end of October announcing that the vessel owner or charterer would indeed be responsible for paying the fee in the case of laden containers, while the cargo owner would be responsible for payment in the case of non-containerized cargo. Moreover, although the initial dollar value of the fee appeared to be relatively low (i.e. 50 cents per TEU in the South Shore Trade Area and 30 cents per TEU in the Roberts Bank Rail Corridor), the fact that these values were scheduled to double in 2013/2014 raised strong concern as to the level they could potentially reach over the thirty-year duration of the industry's funding commitment.

Although the Federation has recommended that the wording of the GIF be amended so that the fee is borne by the cargo, our discussions with port officials have not yet yielded an agreement in this respect. As a result, we are considering a number of alternative courses of action, including the possibility of launching a legal challenge in Federal Court over the port's right to recover the cost of non-marine infrastructure improvements located outside the port's territory from users who gain no direct benefit from such improvements. Ultimately, however, we remain hopeful that an agreement can be reached without seeking a judgement from the courts.

Coasting Trade Regime

In recent years, the Federation has received a significant number of inquiries from member companies regarding potential projects that they could not undertake due to the regulatory constraints imposed on them by Canada's coasting trade requirements. These inquiries, combined with Transport Canada's recent decision to conduct an internal review of the coasting trade regime, provided the ideal impetus for the Federation to address this issue head on in 2010. Towards that end, the Federation worked with members

to develop a series of recommendations for making the coasting trade regime more responsive to current realities, with a view to addressing the growing gap between the need for shipping services within the Canadian market, and the services that can actually be provided by either domestic ships or foreign ships operating under coasting trade licenses.

The Federation submitted a brief to Transport Canada in January 2011 which recommends that the *Coasting Trade Act* be amended in order to provide room for flexibility and for tailored management of exceptional cases. Based on specific issues raised by members, the brief also identifies a number of activities that could potentially be exempted from the *Coasting Trade Act* so as to better meet the needs of the industries that rely on marine transportation services. Such activities include the repositioning of empty containers between Canadian ports, the trans-shipment of import and export cargo, and the carriage of Canadian cargo between Canadian ports via the Panama Canal. Finally, as regards coasting trade cruise activities, the brief recommends that current immigration and income tax regulations and procedures be amended so they are more streamlined in terms of their application to crew members. Transport Canada's response to our brief is now awaited.

Remission of 25% Duty on Imported Ships

On October 1, the government announced its long-awaited decision on a new duty remission framework, which waives the 25 percent tariff that was previously assessed on imports of all general cargo vessels, tankers and ferries. However, the actual Remission Order that was subsequently published in Part II of the *Canada Gazette* indicated that the remission would apply only to ships that are permanently imported into Canada, and not to those that are imported on a temporary basis. As a result, foreign ships operating under coasting trade licenses would be ineligible to benefit from the removal of the 25% duty. In addition to contacting Finance Canada to express strong disappointment at the exclusion of temporarily imported ships from the remission order, the Federation raised this issue in its brief on the coasting trade regime (see previous item) in the form of a recommendation on the need to align the duty regime for permanently and temporarily imported ships.

Canadian Environmental Bill of Rights

This past fall, the Federation submitted a brief to the House Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development with respect to Bill C-469 (also known as the *Canadian Environmental Bill of Rights*), which is a private member's bill that has the support of all three minority parties. Bill C-469 would make it possible for any Canadian resident (or entity) to file an "environmental protection action" and seek recourse against the Government of Canada in the Federal Court for failing to fulfill its duties as a trustee of the environment; for failing to enforce an environmental law; or for violating the right to a healthy and ecologically balanced environment. The Bill would also allow Canadian residents (or entities) to undertake civil action in provincial superior court against any person who has contravened any Act or regulation, as a result of which significant environmental damage has occurred (or is likely to occur).

The Federation's primary concern with respect to Bill C-469 is that it would enable anyone to challenge existing regulatory standards at any time, and would cease providing protection to operators the moment someone files a civil action claim alleging that the operator's activities have caused or are likely to cause "significant environmental harm" (a very extensive concept). The Federation raised these concerns through both a written brief and verbal testimony to the House Environment Committee, drawing particular attention to the bill's potentially negative effect on the overall concept of regulatory compliance. Bill C-469 is now awaiting second recording in the House of Commons.

Another private member's bill with a potentially significant impact on the shipping industry is Bill C-606, which seeks to amend the *Canada Shipping Act 2001* by establishing a tanker ban in Northern British Columbia and enabling the Governor-in-Council to designate other prohibited areas by order. The Federation is developing a position on this Bill in coordination with other stakeholders, with a view to being ready to express the industry's concerns when Parliament undertakes a study of the legislation later this spring.

ENVIRONMENT

Vessel General Permit

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) program requiring commercial vessels to apply for a Vessel General Permit (VGP) covering 26 categories of operational discharges (including ballast water, grey water and bilge water), which came into effect in February 2009, continued to be high on the Federation's agenda in 2010. A key aspect of the U.S. permit program is that individual states must certify the new standards before they can be applied within their own waters, meaning that states can either impose additional requirements on ships or demand recognition of their own individual permit programs. Many states bordering the U.S. Great Lakes (including New York, Michigan, Wisconsin and Minnesota) have used this provision as an opportunity to develop their own standards governing the management of ships' ballast water, thereby creating a patchwork of federal and state regulations that is often unworkable from an operational perspective. As a result, the Federation devoted a considerable amount of time to informing members of the applicable requirements in each state and ensuring their ability to comply with the relevant regulations.

The Federation also addressed this issue during the course of public consultations on how to improve the next version of the Vessel General Permit, which will come into effect on December 19, 2013 when the current permit expires. Our comments to the EPA underlined the desirability of regulating vessel discharges on a federal rather than a local or regional basis, with a view to avoiding situations in which vessels may not be able to meet all the criteria in the multiple states they transit. Other major points raised in our submission included the need to harmonize the permit's provisions with those of relevant international conventions; the need to ensure that performance-based ballast water standards are reflective of available technology; and the need to simplify requirements related to inspections, monitoring, reporting and recordkeeping.

New York Ballast Water Requirements

Of the various Great Lakes states which used the state certification provisions of the Vessel General Permit as an opportunity to develop their own ballast water discharge requirements, those developed by New York were the most potentially contentious. The New York measures require existing ships to install (by 2012) ballast water treatment systems that perform at a standard which is significantly greater than that prescribed by the IMO Ballast Water Convention, and new ships (those built after January 1, 2012) to install treatment systems that perform at a standard which is at least one-thousand times greater than IMO. Given that there currently exist only a handful of fully-tested systems that are capable of meeting (let alone exceeding) the IMO standard, it is difficult to see how ships could realistically attain the much more stringent New York standard. Meanwhile, the fact that the New York standards also apply to ships navigating through the state's waters on an in-transit basis essentially means that all ships would be banned from entering or exiting the Great Lakes as of January 1, 2012, thereby creating the very real potential for a total blockade of Canadian Great Lakes ports.

Although the shipping industry challenged the reasonableness of the New York requirements from both a technological and a legal perspective, the legal avenue was effectively shut down earlier this year, when the New York Court of Appeals rejected a motion filed by a group of international and domestic shipowners for leave to appeal an earlier State Supreme Court decision upholding those requirements. As a consequence, the only remaining avenue by which to seek relief from the New York standards was through a provision allowing companies to ask the New York Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) for an extension of the January 1, 2012 implementation date, provided they could furnish sufficient justification as to the unavailability of the necessary technology by that date. In order to help member companies navigate through this process, the Federation developed an extension request template, which members were then able to adapt to their particular circumstances. The DEQ received over one-thousand extension requests in total, as a result of which it was only able to begin issuing responses in February 2011.

According to those responses, any company which submitted an extension request will now have until August 1, 2013 to comply with the New York ballast water requirements. Although this has given shipowners some breathing room, there still remains a great deal of uncertainty as to whether these extensions will ultimately be anything more than an interim solution. Indeed, a more reliable source of optimism from the Federation's perspective stems from the fact that both California and Wisconsin recently concluded that their own upcoming ballast water standards (which are similar to those of New York) are unattainable, raising the possibility that New York may ultimately arrive at a similar conclusion.

Wisconsin Ballast Water Requirements

As noted above, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is seeking to modify its ballast water requirements so that ocean going ships would have to treat their ballast water to a level that meets (rather than exceeds) IMO standards and also exchange their ballast water at sea. This proposal stems from the DNR's view that the combination of treatment and flushing represents the best means of protecting Wisconsin's waters based on the state-of-the-art ballast water technologies (and testing methods) that are currently available.

Although this is an encouraging development, a number of environmental groups have argued that the proposed new standard is not sufficiently stringent. As a result, the Federation recently submitted comments to the Wisconsin DNR expressing support for the proposed modification and reiterating the need for a common, achievable ballast water standard that is based on available technology. Federation members have also been encouraged to send their own individual comments in this respect.

Air Emissions

In March 2010, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) adopted the North American Emission Control Area (ECA), under which ships sailing in North American waters are required to comply with a 1.0% fuel content sulphur limit within the entire EEZ (out to 200 miles) and to comply with NO_x (nitrogen oxide) and PM (particulate matter) reduction requirements as of August 1, 2012. In view of the Federation's strong support for the ECA initiative, we subsequently issued a press release (in conjunction with the west coast-based International Ship-Owners Alliance of Canada) applauding the adoption of the North America proposal and congratulating Transport Canada on its leadership with respect to this issue.

Given that the ECA does not cover the internal waters of either Canada or the U.S., it has been incumbent on both countries to develop their own regulations to achieve the ECA reduction standards in such waters. In the U.S., the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a rule this past summer, which stipulates that ships transiting internal U.S. waters (including the Great Lakes) must abide by the same requirements as the ECA (with compliance strategies for attaining SO_x reduction targets including either fuel purchases or abatement technologies such as scrubbers). Progress on this issue is somewhat less advanced in Canada, where Transport Canada is considering three different options for achieving the ECA emission standards in Canada's internal waters. Those options range from mirroring the U.S. approach by extending the current ECA standards to the St. Lawrence and Great Lakes; to introducing fleet averaging for the domestic fleet (which would allow domestic ships to gradually reduce their fuel sulphur content on an annual basis from 2012 to 2020); to implementing a gradual phase-in approach (in which older vessels would have more time to meet emission reduction standards than newer ships).

These options were presented to Federation members during the course of an information meeting with Transport Canada this past November, at which time the Department indicated its preference for the fleet averaging option for domestic vessels, despite the fact that this would create an uneven playing field for foreign flag ships, which would be subject to the more stringent standards required under the North American ECA. In view of the competitive disparities that the fleet averaging option would create (at least in its present form), the Federation will continue to work with members and other stakeholders in order to identify the optimal means of enabling the foreign flag fleet to meet Canada's air emission reduction targets.

Greenhouse Gases

The Federation was a member of the Canadian delegation that attended the IMO's Marine Environment Protection Committee (MEPC) meeting in March 2010, at which a key topic of discussion was the development of GHG reduction measures for shipping. A major unresolved issue related to GHGs revolves around the "common but differentiated responsibility" principle, under which developed Annex I countries identified by the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (which represent about 25 percent of the world merchant fleet) would have different responsibilities in terms of GHG reductions than developing non-Annex 1 countries. The application of such a regime to shipping is potentially contentious because it runs counter to the longstanding IMO principle of regulating the industry on the basis of consistent and uniform standards. Another debate has revolved around the use of market-based instruments to achieve GHG reductions, with some countries favouring the imposition of a levy on bunker purchases, others leaning towards the development of an emission trading scheme, and still others arguing for the implementation of vessel efficiency programs. Although the Energy Efficiency Design Index and the Ship Energy Efficiency Management Plan may become mandatory under Annex VI of the MARPOL Convention, issues related to setting targets for specific ship types and reduction dates still need to be addressed.

In December, the Federation provided comments on a Transport Canada discussion paper regarding the development of technical regulations for GHG emissions from international shipping. Our comments expressed support for the Department's effort to address this issue within the framework provided by the IMO, and to implement regulations that are based on non-prescriptive, performance-based energy efficiency measures for ships. The Federation also noted that the IMO's traditional approach of developing uniform global rules to regulate shipping activity should also apply in the case of GHGs, and that the use of a "common but differentiated responsibilities" approach would be inappropriate for the shipping industry.

Operations

One of the Federation's most important assets is the wide range of operational services it provides, which members view as an essential support to their Canadian operations. 2010 was once again an active year on the operational front, as the Federation worked to facilitate members' regulatory compliance, minimize disruptions to ship operations, and ensure that members receive the necessary levels of service from government agencies and marine service providers. Following is a summary of the year's main activities in the respect.

PILOTAGE

Great Lakes Pilotage Authority (GLPA)

A major item on the Federation's pilotage agenda was the Great Lakes Pilotage Authority's tariff proposal of May 2010, as a result of which tariffs would increase by 1.5 percent overall, with the exception of Churchill and Lake Ontario, where rates would rise by 30 percent and 15 percent respectively. Although the Federation had no objection to this portion of the proposal, it did have serious concerns with the tariff's proposed introduction of two new classes of ships (Class 5 and Class 6) for the Seaway and Great Lakes, which would require the largest ships using the system to pay an additional \$350,000 in fees per year (based on 2008 traffic). Subsequent to the GLPA's decision to cease negotiating with the Pilotage Committee on this issue, the Federation assessed that it had no choice but to file an appeal with the Canadian Transportation Agency (CTA). The appeal, which was submitted at the end of May, argued that the proposed tariff would place a disproportionate cost burden on the largest ships using the system and strongly recommended that the Authority seek to achieve financial self-sufficiency through more reasonable means, such as reducing expenses and more equitably distributing costs among users.

Although the CTA is normally required to issue a decision ninety days after an appeal has been filed, the Agency only issued its response on this particular matter in November 2010 (due to an internal administrative delay), advising of its intention to hold public hearings in January 2011 and requesting extensive additional data from the GLPA. The Federation immediately began preparing its case for presentation at the hearing, but a surprise offer from the GLPA to settle the objection provided an opportunity for a much quicker than anticipated resolution. More specifically, the GLPA

agreed to withdraw the two new classes of ships from its weighted tariff structure for 2011, and to refrain from introducing these classes in future years, as a result of which the Federation agreed to withdraw its objection with the CTA.

This development also affected discussions on the GLPA's most recent tariff proposal for 2011, as its previous proposal for a 3 percent across-the-board increase plus retention of the current 15 percent surcharge will now be revised before it is re-submitted to industry for further discussion.

Laurentian Pilotage Authority (LPA)

In October, the Laurentian Pilotage Authority published a tariff increase proposal of 2.35 percent in each of the next three years (2011, 2012, 2013). The Authority cited a number of factors as justifications for these increases, including the need to invest approximately \$3 million in property repairs at the pilot station at Les Escoumins. Although the Federation expressed some concern over the magnitude of the proposal during the course of consultations with the Authority, it did not believe that an objection was warranted. As a result, the first of these increases came into effect on January 1, 2011. A major item on the LPA's agenda in the coming months will be to prepare for negotiations with the Lower St. Lawrence pilots, whose contract expires at the end of 2011, and the Mid St. Lawrence pilots, whose contract expires in June 2012.

A shared issue on the LPA's agenda was the risk assessment of post-Panamax ships navigating the St. Lawrence River up to Montreal, which is a collaborative initiative involving the Authority, the Canadian Coast Guard and Transport Canada (Marine Safety). In June, the project's managers held an open meeting to unveil and explain their recommendations, which were based on their analysis of simulator test results, key scenarios, and on-board experiences at another port. Although these recommendations focused mainly on passage planning and traffic management for post-Panamax ships navigating the section of the St. Lawrence ship channel between Montreal and Quebec, one statement in the report also acknowledged that the beam of a ship alone is not a suitable criterion for determining whether such ships can safely navigate the ship channel. These recommendations have been submitted to the three project partners, whose responses are expected in 2011.

Atlantic Pilotage Authority (APA)

In October, the Atlantic Pilotage Authority published a tariff proposal for 2011 which sought to increase rates by 5 percent at Halifax, 5 percent at Sydney, 3 percent at Placentia Bay, 2.5 percent at the Strait of Canso, and 2 percent at Saint John. The APA cited a number of factors as justification for these increases, including new accounting standards; user demands to maintain current service levels despite reduced traffic levels; and the need to "provide an acceptable margin of return to offset the financial risk inherent in providing pilotage services." This proposal was met with strong objection by members in Placentia Bay, who raised serious concerns over pilotage service in their area. As a result, the Authority agreed to review its traffic projections for 2011 and ultimately decided to drop the proposed increase for that area. The Authority also implemented administrative measures in Placentia Bay in order to restore pilotage service to the level expected by Federation members. The revised tariff came into effect on January 1, 2011.

The Joint Federation / APA Users Committee, which met in both Halifax and Montreal during the year, continued to serve as a valuable forum for discussing tariff, service and related issues. The committee's key topics of discussion included the optimal management of pilot shortages (particularly in periods of peak demand), the construction of new pilot boats at Halifax and Saint John (where Federation members have been paying a surcharge for the past two years in order to build a cash fund to start the building process), and the APA's 2011 tariff increase proposal.

CUSTOMS

Customs Examinations

A key item on the Federation's customs agenda continued to be the container examination and inspection process, which was addressed primarily through the forum of CBSA's Container Examination Committee (a group comprised of representatives from CBSA and various marine associations, freight forwarders, customs brokers, and facility operators). The committee's primary focus in 2010 was on mapping the process by which marine import containers are examined, with a view to identifying specific problem areas and/or bottlenecks and developing possible solutions. Towards that end, the committee gathered detailed data on the examination of some 3,200 containers at Vancouver, Prince Rupert,

Brampton, Montreal and Halifax over two three-month periods. This exercise, and the regional consultations that ensued, identified two issues – the need to test for fumigants and the length of time involved in carrying out an actual examination - as the major factors contributing to delays in the examination process. The committee subsequently developed a number of recommendations for expediting this process, including the development of a national standard governing the examination of marine containers, the implementation of new procedures for dealing with problem containers that have not ventilated after five days, and the need to achieve a median container examination time of 7.5 days.

E-Manifest Program

Throughout the year, CBSA continued with its planned phase-in of the E-Manifest program, in which all stakeholders in the trade chain (from importers to carriers to freight forwarders) will be required to provide the Agency with electronic pre-arrival information within prescribed timeframes, with an overall aim of creating a more streamlined border clearance process. The main focus in 2010 was on the provision of Importer Advance Data (IAD) prior to vessel loading, particularly as this relates to cross-border truckers, importers and freight forwarders. As far as the marine mode is concerned, CBSA continued to implement the reporting of bayplan information, which is presently being tested with three container carriers. The Agency is also working on a "single window" project that will enable marine carriers to submit their A6 declaration, crew and passenger list, and ship's stores declaration electronically, and to process marine carrier information required by other government departments through a central reporting point. The single window project is expected to come to fruition sometime in 2013 or 2014.

U.S. Loaded "FROB" Cargo

The reporting of U.S. loaded FROB (freight remaining on board) cargo came into effect on January 1, 2011, with a three-month implementation period ending on April 1, 2011. Under the program, US loaded FROB information is to be supplied to CBSA twenty-four hours before the vessel arrives at the first Canadian port or upon departure from a U.S. port if the voyage to the first Canadian port is in less than twenty-four hours. Although the Federation has encouraged all marine carriers to provide US FROB information to CBSA, the Agency has indicated that it will not apply monetary penalties against carriers who cannot comply with the regulations within the prescribed implementation timeframes.

Education

The Federation continued to offer a number of training courses and programs in 2010, with an overall view to ensuring that marine industry stakeholders have access to information and expertise on relevant aspects of the shipping business that is delivered by individuals with current and firsthand knowledge of the industry. The cornerstone of our efforts in this respect continued to be the Certificate in Marine Transportation, which is a university-level program composed of five marine courses focusing on key aspects of the commercial shipping industry (Introduction to Shipping, Vessel Husbandry & Port Operations, Commercial & Contractual Aspects of Shipping, Customs & Documentation and Practical Chartering). All five courses are developed and delivered by professionals working within the industry, thereby ensuring that the course content accurately reflects the current (and evolving) realities of the shipping business. The program is delivered in partnership with Concordia University's Centre for Continuing Education, with all five courses available either on-site or via the Internet.

Although each of the courses associated with the certificate program is updated on a regular basis, 2010 was marked by an extensive revision of the customs and documentation course, which was undertaken in close collaboration with the Federation's in-house customs expert. The updated course was introduced during the autumn 2010 semester, and focuses on the key CBSA processes that apply to marine carriers, including ACI, inward and outward reporting, inspection and interdiction procedures, CBSA activities on behalf of other government departments, and customs requirements that are specific to cruise ship operators. Given the high level of interest generated by this topic, the Federation is now developing a condensed, day-long version of the most relevant aspects of the course material, for delivery to employees of member companies who wish to enhance their practical understanding of basic customs requirements and procedures. The course is expected to be ready for delivery in the spring of 2011.

Meanwhile, the current cycle of the Certificate in Marine Transportation will end this spring when another ten to fifteen students are slated to receive their certificates. This will bring the total number of students graduating from the program to over ninety (a figure which does not include the many students who have completed individual courses without pursuing the full certificate option). The Federation is now establishing a Training Committee composed of members, course instructors and former students, which will explore options for the program's future direction as we prepare to launch a new cycle of courses in September 2011.

The Federation also continued to offer its one-day training seminar on the *International Maritime Dangerous Goods (IMDG) Code* and its applicability to commercial marine operations, which is designed to ensure that employees of member companies meet Transport Canada's IMDG training requirements. After delivering two courses in Montreal in late 2009, the Federation took the course on the road in 2010, delivering two days of instruction in Placentia Bay (in May), one day of instruction in Quebec (in June) and two days of instruction in Halifax (in November). The course schedule for 2011 will likely include Montreal and Toronto, as well as the possibility of customized sessions at the request of individual member companies.

Finally, the Federation offered another edition of the Mariner's Workshop, which serves as a key forum for exploring industry needs, opportunities and developments in the field of electronic navigation, with an overall view of enhancing the safety and efficiency of marine navigation in both Canada and worldwide. The most recent edition of this workshop, which was organized in collaboration with the Port of Montreal, the Canadian Hydrographic Service, the Canadian Coast Guard, Transport Canada and the University of New Hampshire, was held in February 2011, and attracted close to eighty participants from Canada, the U.S. and overseas.

Members

Admiral Marine Inc.
Aegean Maritime Inc.
Anglo-Eastern Ship Management Ltd.
APL (Canada) Ltd.
Atlantic Container Line
Atship Services Ltd.
Bay Shipping Inc.
Canada Steamship Lines - A Division of The CSL Group Inc.
Canadian Maritime Agency Ltd.
Celtic Maritime
China Ocean Shipping Co. (COSCO)
China Shipping (Canada) Agency Co. Ltd.
CMA-CGM (Canada) Inc.
CMC-Currie Maritime Corporation
Colley Motorships Ltd.
Cross Marine Inc.
Echo Freight Inc.
Evergreen America Corporation
F.K. Warren Ltd.
Fednav Ltd.
Fundy Shipping Ltd.
Furncan Marine Ltd.
Gibson Canadian Global Agency Inc.
Goodfellow Shipping Agency Ltd.
Gresco Ltée
H.E. Kane Agencies Ltd.
Hampton Ship Agency
Hanjin Shipping
Hapag-Lloyd (Canada) Inc.
Holmes Maritime Inc.
Inchcape Shipping Services
K Line Canada Ltd.
K D Marine Inc.
Laden Maritime Inc.
Lakehead Shipping Co. Ltd.
Lower St. Lawrence Ocean Agencies Ltd.
Maersk Canada Inc.
Mathers Logistics Ltd.
MCA Marine & Cargo Agencies Ltd.
McAsphalt Industries Ltd.
McKeil Marine Limited
McLean Kennedy Inc.
Montreal Marine Services Inc.
Montship Inc.
MSC Canada Inc.
Navitrans Shipping Agencies Inc.
Nirint Canada Inc.
Norton Lilly International
North Atlantic Refining Ltd.
NYK Line (Canada) Inc.
Ocean Remorquage Montreal Inc.
OceanCrest Transport Inc.
Oceanic Tankers Agency Ltd.
OOCL (Canada) Inc.
Poros Shipping Agencies Inc.
Project Transport & Trading Ltd.
Protos Shipping Limited
Ramsey Greig & Co. Limited
Rio Tinto
Robert Reford
Scandia Shipping (Canada) Inc.
SMK Tanker Agency Inc.
Sorel Maritime Agencies Inc.
Svitzer Canada Ltd.
Tormar Inc.
Trillium Shipbrokers Ltd.
Wagenborg Shipping North America Inc.
Wallenius Wilhelmsen Logistics Americas LLC
Yang Ming Shipping (Canada) Ltd.
Zim Integrated Shipping Services (Canada) Co. Ltd.

Affiliated Members

Atlantic Pilotage Authority
Atlantic Towing Ltd.
Belledune Port Authority
BIMCO
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP
Canadian Marine Pilots Association
Canadian Sailings
Can-Med Maritime Inc.
Cerescorp Inc.
CFT Corporation
Eastern Canada Response Corporation Ltd.
Germanischer Lloyd
Great Lakes Pilotage Authority
Halterm Limited
Hamilton Port Authority
Halifax Port Authority
IBI Group
Innovation Maritime
Institut maritime du Québec
Marine Press of Canada
Montreal Gateway Terminals Partnership
Montreal Port Authority
Newfoundland Transshipment Ltd.
Quebec Port Authority
Saint John Port Authority
Seamont Brokerage & Transport Ltd.
Seanautic Marine Inc.
Sept-Iles Port Authority
St. John's Port Authority
Stelvio Inc.
Toronto Port Authority
Trac-World Freight Services Inc.
Urgence Marine Inc.
U.S. Great Lakes Shipping Association
Wilhelmsen Ship Services
Worldscale Association (London) Ltd.

Standing Committees

Pilotage Committee

Ross Baldwin, McLean Kennedy Inc.
Robert Calvé, Lower St. Lawrence Ocean Agencies Ltd.
Andrew Digby, Robert Reford
Andrew Dzielak, Montreal Marine Services Inc.
David Grieve, Fednav Ltd. (Chair)
Jennifer Holmes, Holmes Maritime Inc.
Stan Kwiaton, MSC Canada Inc.
Michael O'Morchoe, OOCL (Canada) Inc.
Donald Poirier, Hapag-Lloyd (Canada) Inc.
Jason Skorski, Inchcape Shipping Services
Norma Tilley, Canadian Maritime Agency Ltd.
Robert Vandenende, Gresco Ltd.
Jean-François Belzile, Shipping Federation of Canada

Environment Committee

Jai Alimchandani, Maersk Inc.
Denis Blondeau, SMK Tanker Agency Inc.
Ron Brushett, V Ships Inc.
Henrik Carle, Atlantic Container Line
Donny Coelho, Robert Reford
Marc Gagnon, Fednav Ltd.
Lou Holmes, Holmes Maritime Inc.
Lee Kindberg, Maersk Inc.
Fritz King, Atlantic Container Line
Bob Moore, Atlantic Container Line
Michael Omorchoe, OOCL (Canada) Inc.
Donald Poirier, Hapag-Lloyd (Canada) Inc.
Beth Quitadamo, CSL International
Philippe Roderbourg, Fednav Ltd.
Barbara Seifert, V Ships Inc.
Jim Stoneman, Atship Services Inc.
Aiden Wadman, Canadian Maritime Agency Ltd.
David Watson, OOCL (Canada) Inc.
Chris Williams, CSL International
Caroline Gravel, Shipping Federation of Canada (Chair)
Lilia Khodjet El Khil (Interim Chair)

Seaway Committee

Andrew Digby, Robert Reford
Anthony Dobesch, Colley Motorships Ltd.
Elias Mitrikas, Navitrans Shipping Agencies Inc.
Robert Muir, Gresco Ltd.
Philippe Roderbourg, Fednav Ltd.
Jean-François Belzile, Shipping Federation of Canada

Customs Committee

Lisa Brown, Protos Shipping Ltd. (Chair)
Brad Carter, China Shipping Agency (Canada) Co. Ltd.
Frank Caucci, Zim Integrated Shipping Services (Canada) Co. Ltd.
Doug Davison, Montship Inc.
Ralph de Boyrie, American President Lines Ltd.
Mohammed El Mzouri, MSC Canada Inc.
Linda Hall, Atlantic Container Line
Jennifer Holmes, Holmes Maritime Inc.
Steven Holt, Fednav Ltd.
Stan Kwiaton, MSC Canada Inc.
Denis Le Goff, Hapag-Lloyd Canada Inc.
Joseph Lee, China Shipping Agency (Canada) Co. Ltd.
Juliet McKenzie, American President Lines Ltd.
Heather Morrison
Andrew Nation, Robert Reford
William Nguyen, MSC Canada Inc.
Michael O'Morchoe, OOCL (Canada) Inc.
Michel O'Neil, Project Transport & Trading Ltd.
Steven Paillant, Montship Inc.
Ping Pan, Maersk Canada Inc.
Monique Patenaude, Yang Ming Shipping (USA) Ltd.
Richard Pereira, CMA-CGM (USA) Inc.
Sokat Shaikh, MSC Canada Inc.
Norm Tam, MSC Canada Inc.
Robert Tiseo, MSC Canada Inc.
Kirk Tyler, Montship Inc.
Mike Young, OOCL (Canada) Inc.
James Moram, Shipping Federation of Canada

Intermodal Committee

Alex Carvajal, APL (Canada)
David Cardin, Maersk Canada Inc.
Brad Carter, China Ocean Shipping Co.
Doug Davison, Montship Inc.
Peter Hinge, CMA-CGM (Canada)
Jordan Kajfasz, Maersk Canada Inc.
Fritz King, Atlantic Container Line
Volker Kluge, Zim Integrated Shipping Services (Canada) Co. Ltd.
Owen Kwong (China Ocean Shipping Inc.)
Brian McDonald, Montship Inc.
Henry Munz, K Line Canada Ltd.
Andre Neuendorff, Protos Shipping Ltd.
Michael Schaffler, Maersk Canada Inc.
Sokat Shaikh, MSC Canada Inc.
Luciano Stefanelli, CMA-CGM (Canada)
Holger Oetjen, Hapag-Lloyd (Canada) Inc.
F. Vanduy, Hanjin Shipping
David Watson, OOCL Canada Inc.

Companies Represented by Federation Members

A/S Bulk Handling
 Abitibi Bowater
 AC Oersskeff's Effr A/S
 Acromas Shipping Ltd.
 Agrico Canada Inc.
 Aimcor
 Alcoa Steamship Co.
 Alianca Lines, Inc.
 American Iron and Metal Company Inc.
 American President Line
 Ameropa USA
 Arcelor Mittal
 Atlantic Container Lines
 Atlantic Minerals Limited
 Atlantic RORO Carriers
 Barya Shipping & Trading Inc.
 BBC Chartering & Logistic GmbH
 Beluga Chartering GmbH
 Bermuda Container Line
 BHP Billiton
 BP Shipping
 Brochart KB
 C O S C O
 Cam Paris
 Canada Malting Co. Ltd.
 Canada States Africa Line
 Canarctic Shipping
 Canformav Inc
 Carnival Cruise Line
 Celebrity Cruises
 Celtic Shipping USA
 CertainTeed
 China Shipping
 Citadel Shipping AB
 CMA CGM
 Coeclerici
 Combilift
 Comets
 CORUS
 COSCO Shipping Hong Kong
 Crystal Cruise Line
 CSAV Chilean Line
 CSSA
 Cunard Line
 Cyprus New York State Marine Highway Transportation Co.
 Dalmore Corporation USA
 Daphne Shipping Odessa
 David J. Joseph
 Delmas
 Dowa Line
 ED & F Man Shipping Ltd.
 Eitzen Bulk and Chemical
 EMR European Metal Recycling
 Evergreen
 EXXONMOBIL
 Fair Wind (Europe) SA
 Falconbridge Nickel Mines
 Federation of Japan Tuna
 Fednav International
 Fisser & v. Doornum
 Flinter Ship management Limited
 Fred Olsen Cruises
 GAC
 Gavilon Group
 Gearbulk
 Global Trading
 Gorthon Lines
 GPS Manila
 Great Lakes Feeder Lines
 Great White Fleet
 Greece Marlow Navigation
 Hamburg Shyvers Savoy London
 Hamburg Sud
 Hanjin
 Hapag Lloyd
 Harren and Partners
 Hartmann Group
 Heidenreich Marine
 Herning Shipping a.s.
 HMM
 Hoegh Autoliners
 Holcim
 Holland America Line
 Horizon Lines Inc.
 Ibex Maritime Ltd.
 Innovative Municipal Products
 Internaut Group
 Intersee Schiifahrts GmbH+Co. KG
 J. Poulsen Shipping
 J.K. Commodities Ltd.
 Jacob Scorpio Tanker Pool
 Jo Tankers
 Johan G. Olsen
 Johnson & Dever Inc.
 Jumbo Navigation
 K Line
 Kent Lines
 Korea Lines
 Kronos
 LBH Shipping Canada Inc.
 Lindblad Expeditions
 Lockwood Marine Inc.
 Louis Dreyfus Group
 Lydia Mar Shipping Co. S.A.
 Maersk Line
 Marlow Navigation
 Mar-Ocean Brokers Inc.
 Mediterranean Shipping Co. Ltd.
 Melfi Lines
 MidShip Marine Group
 Mitsui OSK Bulkers
 MOL (Mitsui O.S.K. Lines)
 MST Mineralien Schifffahrt und Transport GmbH
 National Shipping Corporation of Saudi Arabia
 Navarone SA
 Navios Handybulk
 Neptune Orient Line
 Neste
 Netherlands Industrial Maritime Carriers USA
 New York Nordana Project & Chartering Denmark
 Newco Ferrous
 Nirint Shipping B.V.
 Noble Resources Srl, Ravenna
 Nordana Line
 Norfalco
 Norwegian Cruise Line
 NS United Shipping
 NYK Bulkship New York
 NYK Line
 Oceania Cruises
 OMS Shipping
 Onego Shipping
 OOCL
 P & O Cruises
 Pacific Basin
 Parakou Shipping Ltd.
 Paramout Enterprises International
 Peter Cremer Canada Ltd.
 Peter Dohle Schifffahrts-KG Hamburg
 Phoenix Bulk Carriers
 Polsteam
 Prestige Cruises
 Princess Cruises
 Pro Line Limited & Co. GmbH
 Regent Seven Seas
 ResidenSea-The World
 Rio Tinto Alcan
 RollDock B.V.
 Royal Caribbean Cruise Line
 SA Cargo Logistics LLC USA
 Safmarine Container Lines NV
 Saga Shipping
 Sanko Steamships
 Scanscot Shipping Services (Deutschland)
 Sea Sea Shipping
 Sea Star Line
 Seabourn Cruises
 Seastar Chartering Ltd.
 Seaway S. A. M.
 Shyvers Savoy London UK
 Silversea
 Sims Hugo New Global Trading
 Sinochem Shipping co. Ltd.
 SMT Shipmanagement
 Spliethoff
 Springfield Shipping Co. Panama SA
 ST Shipping
 Star Shipping
 Statoil
 STC
 Stolt Nielsen
 STX Panocean (America) Inc.
 Swire Shipping
 Sylvite Sales
 TBS Shipping Services Inc.
 Teck Cominco Metals Ltd.
 Texas American Shipping USA
 Toko
 Tokyo Greenpeace International
 Traffigra
 Transammonia Inc.
 Transatlantic AB
 Tube City IMS
 Turkey Cape Reefers
 Ultramar
 Unicargo Transportges MBH
 Urbal Paris
 USL U.S. Lines
 UTC Chartering USA
 V. Ships, Leisure
 Van Ommeren Clipper
 Vertom Scheepvaart - & Handelmaatschappij B.V.
 Viterra Inc.
 Volkswagen Logistics GmbH & CO. OHG
 Voyages of Discovery
 Wagenborg
 Waterfront Shipping Company Ltd.
 WEC Lines
 Xstrata
 Xtrata
 Yang Ming Marine Transport Inc.
 Yara
 Zim Integrated Shipping Services Inc.

Tonnage Figures for Major Canadian Ports (metric tonnes)

MONTREAL	2010	2009	2008
Containers (TEU)	1,331,351	1,247,690	1,473,914
Liquid Bulk	8,151,136	7,773,149	8,005,416
Dry Bulk	5,584,939	5,316,457	6,624,357
Containerized	12,033,434	11,265,868	13,321,147
Non-Containerized	150,158	168,690	215,630
TOTAL	25,919,667	24,524,164	28,166,550
QUEBEC	2010	2009	2008
Liquid Bulk	13,124,966	13,422,642	14,376,877
Dry Bulk	11,246,319	8,588,568	12,768,812
Non-Containerized	75,863	71,225	84,212
TOTAL	24,447,148	22,082,435	27,229,901
TROIS-RIVIERES	2010	2009	2008
Liquid Bulk	335,000	292,000	418,000
Dry Bulk	1,172,000	1,076,000	1,271,000
Grain	1,100,000	1,079,000	608,000
Breakbulk	188,000	126,000	222,000
TOTAL	2,795,000	2,573,000	2,519,000
HALIFAX	2010	2009	2008
Containers (TEU)	435,461	344,811	387,347
Bulk Cargo	5,612,957	6,523,019	6,629,308
Breakbulk	146,115	110,120	171,323
Containerized	3,493,392	2,776,846	3,197,776
Non-Containerized	264,779	264,779	264,779
TOTAL	9,517,243	9,646,413	10,281,811
ST. JOHN'S	2010	2009	2008
Liquid Bulk	716,798	684,579	680,721
Dry Bulk	68,080	63,830	93,001
Containerized	509,980	485,978	481,306
Non-Containerized	260,431	238,421	240,775
TOTAL	1,555,289	1,472,808	1,495,803
SAINT JOHN	2010	2009	2008
Containers(TEU)	46,303	44,382	49,240
Liquid Bulk	289,000	260,000	241,520
Dry Bulk	1,083,000	402,000	872,052
Containerized	278,000	265,000	304,942
Non-Containerized	140,000	187,000	168,979
TOTAL	1,790,000	1,114,000	1,587,493

Tonnage Figures for Major Canadian Ports (metric tonnes)

VANCOUVER	2010	2009	2008
Containers(TEU)	2,492,107	2,135,813	2,492,107
Bulk Cargo	80,268,352	67,672,486	73,080,000
Breakbulk	16,800,139	14,550,913	20,560,000
Containerized	20,928,784	19,280,000	20,460,000
Non-Containerized	381,609	387,230	460,000
TOTAL	118,378,884	101,890,629	114,561,990
PRINCE RUPERT	2010	2009	2008
Containers(TEU)	343,366	265,258	181,890
Bulk Cargo	12,943,333	9,521,073	8,777,963
Containerized	3,433,662	2,652,598	1,818,900
TOTAL	16,376,995	12,173,671	10,596,863
THUNDER BAY	2010	2009	2008
Bulk	6,692,438	7,093,433	7,792,718
Liquid Bulk	158,953	178,913	212,083
General Cargo	10,986	13,553	65,818
TOTAL	6,862,377	7,285,899	8,070,619
HAMILTON	2010	2009	2008
Breakbulk	271,042	180,686	599,023
Dry Bulk	10,630,531	7,711,753	9,827,566
Liquid Bulk	571,258	465,684	702,102
TOTAL	11,472,831	8,358,123	11,128,691
CHURCHILL	2010	2009	2008
Wheat	603,352	529,000	424,388
Dry Cargo	55,596	15,100	29,200
TOTAL	658,948	544,100	453,588
ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY	2010	2009	2008
Grain	9,207,000	8,125,000	7,592,000
Iron Ore	9,742,000	6,853,000	11,932,000
Coal	3,707,000	2,886,000	3,636,000
Other Bulk	12,280,000	11,647,000	15,694,000
General Cargo	1,550,000	926,000	1,914,000
TOTAL	36,486,000	30,437,000	40,789,000

