

Transport system specification - Case A

Deliverable D8.2 – Version Final – 2022-06-30



Advanced, Efficient and Green Intermodal Systems

<http://aegis.autonomous-ship.org/>



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under Grant Agreement N° 859992.



Document information

Title	D8.2 Specification of the transport system – Case A
Classification	Confidential (after approval)

Editors and main contributors	Company
Kay Fjørtoft (KF)	SO
Odd Erik Mørkrid (OEM)	SO
Håvard Nordahl (HN)	SO
Kenneth Johanson (KJ)	NCL
Magnus Bakke (MB)	NCL
Terje Meisler (TM)	TRH
Terje Krogstad (TK)	GC
Nelson F. Coelho (NFC)	AAU
Mathias Klinger (MK)	ISE

Rev.	Who	Date	Comment
0.1	KF	2022-05-16	First draft ready for review by ISE
0.2	OEM	2022-06-09	Revised and detailed
0.3	OEM/KF	2022-06-23	Ready for final review
0.4	MK	2022-06-29	Reviewed by ISE (MK)
Final	OEM	2022-06-30	Final revision to be submitted to EC

© 2020 AEGIS CONSORTIUM

This publication has been provided by members of the AEGIS consortium and is intended as input to the discussions on and development of new automated and autonomous waterborne transport systems. The content of the publication has been reviewed by the AEGIS participants but does not necessarily represent the views held or expressed by any individual member of the AEGIS consortium.

While the information contained in the document is believed to be accurate, AEGIS participants make no warranty of any kind with regard to this material including, but not limited to the implied warranties of merchantability and fitness for a particular purpose. None of AEGIS participants, their officers, employees, or agents shall be responsible, liable in negligence, or otherwise howsoever in respect of any inaccuracy or omission herein. Without derogating from the generality of the foregoing neither of AEGIS participants, their officers, employees or agents shall be liable for any direct, indirect, or consequential loss or damage caused by or arising from any information advice or inaccuracy or omission herein.

The material in this publication can be reproduced provided that a proper reference is made to the title of this publication and to the AEGIS project (<http://aegis.autonomous-ship.org/>).



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	5
Definitions and abbreviations	7
1 Introduction.....	8
1.1 Objective.....	8
1.2 Background.....	8
1.3 Connecting use case A with WPs and deliverables	10
1.4 The AEGIS concept – Case A - the new transport system (to-be)	10
1.5 How to specify the transport system	11
1.6 Autonomy in use case A	12
1.7 Structure of the report	13
2 Vessel specification	14
2.1 Mother vessel(s)	14
2.2 Daughter vessel(s)	15
2.3 Alternative daughter vessel concept.....	19
3 Terminal specification	21
3.1 Introduction.....	21
3.2 Terminal specification parameters.....	21
3.3 Large ports/terminals.....	22
3.3.1 Port of Rotterdam	22
3.3.2 Port of Moerdijk	23
3.4 Medium ports.....	23
3.4.1 Hitra Kysthavn (Sandstad)	23
3.4.2 Port of Orkanger	25
3.4.3 Port of Trondheim	29
3.4.4 Port of Skogn	29
3.4.5 Port of Holla.....	30
3.5 Small terminals in use case A2 (milk route, push barge).....	31
4 Cargo handling equipment specification.....	32
4.1 Cranes.....	32
4.2 Mooring.....	33
4.3 AGVs	34
4.3.1 Transport of containers to/from the terminal	34



4.3.2	Container handling at the terminal	35
4.3.3	AGV carried on-board the vessel.....	35
4.3.4	Electric reachstackers key parameters.....	36
5	ICT systems' requirements from use case A.....	37
5.1	Introduction.....	37
5.1.1	EDI messages	38
5.1.2	Points of contact.....	38
5.1.3	Discovery	38
5.1.4	Customs clearance.....	39
5.2	Planning and operational systems.....	39
5.3	Port Management System - Planning a Port Call.....	40
5.3.1	Berth and mooring plans	40
5.3.2	Planned Time of Arrival and Estimated Time of Arrival	40
5.4	Terminal Operating System - Discharge and Load Operations	40
5.4.1	Supporting discharge / loading operations	40
5.4.2	Yard planning and geometric state	41
6	Regulatory hindrances: a preliminary overview.....	42
6.1	Introduction.....	42
6.2	Regulatory hindrances for vessel	42
6.2.1	Regulatory hindrances for energy sources.....	42
6.3	Regulatory hindrances regarding access to port terminals.....	42
6.3.1	Regulatory hindrances for goods carried	43
6.4	Policy support.....	43
7	KPIs and analysis of the use case scenario(s)	44
7.1	Introduction.....	44
7.2	Economic KPIs.....	44
7.3	Environmental KPIs.....	45
7.4	Social KPIs	45
8	Relevant use case scenarios	47
8.1	As-is situation for use case A scenarios.....	47
8.2	High level use case description	47
8.3	Detailed description of use case A1: Daughter(s)	52
8.3.1	Hitra Kysthavn – Orkanger - Skogn – Trondheim (including Holla)	52
8.3.2	Potential daughter transports: Steinkjer – Hitra Kysthavn (milk route)	57



8.4	Detailed description of use case A2: Mother	58
9	Summary and recommendations	60
9.1	Recommendations for further work in use case A.....	62
	References.....	63
Annex A.	Distances in Trondheimsfjorden.....	64
Annex B.	Autonomy levels.....	65









Executive Summary

This report specifies a transport system for use case A, based on a combination of mother and daughter (feeder) vessels to enable a more flexible and cost-efficient waterborne transport solution for fjords and smaller ports. Hitra Kysthavn, which is located at the main fairway along the Norwegian coast, has been assigned as the hub terminal in the transport system. NCL's existing container vessels sailing between Port of Rotterdam and the Norwegian coast are passing there today on their journey north/south. The three major building blocks of the transport system (mother and daughter vessels and terminals) have been further specified in this report.

Important parts of a transport system specification include route information, sailing frequency, estimated cargo volumes, distances and sailing time, as-is situation, relevant vessel requirements, terminal requirements such as cargo equipment and charging infrastructure, involved ICT systems and last but not least, regulatory hindrances with specific focus on transshipment.

The table below shows in brief the focus areas in the use case A transport system.

	Customer -> terminal (NO)	Domestic transport	Terminal (NO)	Short-Sea, international transport	Terminal (EU)	Hinterland
	 Orkanger, Trondheim, Skogn	 Daughter transport	 Kysthavna - Hitra	 Mother transport	 Rotterdam	 Hinterland transport
Cargo volume	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red
Containers	Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red
AGVs	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red	Red
Cranes	Green	Green	Green	Green	Red	Red
Ship concepts	Yellow	Green	Yellow	Red	Red	Red
Terminal concepts	Green	Yellow	Green	Red	Red	Red
ICT systems	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Red
KPIs	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Yellow	Red
Regulatory hindrances	Green	Green	Green	Green	Yellow	Red
Autonomy levels	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Red	Red

The colour *green* is defined as focus area, for instance cargo volume in the regional ports in the Trondheimsfjorden will be highly relevant as input to the "daughter vessel" specification. The colour *yellow* is defined as less relevant (but still touched upon), while the colour *red* is an area considered outside of the scope of use case A.

An example is that the "green colour" for "Cargo volume" describes that the focus in use case A is the goods from Norway on its way to Rotterdam. The cargo volume in Rotterdam and hinterland out of Rotterdam is considered less important for the case study performed. Furthermore, it says that the



focus is on container transport, and use of AGVs is most important when talking about the daughter vessel operation in Norwegian ports. One example is whether the AGVs can lift/move the containers between the vessel and the terminal or operate in the terminal area such that the vessel cranes can load them onto a vessel. The AGVs and (vessel) cranes must be able to lift all types of containers (20, 40 and 45 feet). The "red colour" for cranes on Rotterdam indicates that use case A will not do a detailed specification of cranes to be used in a big port such as Rotterdam. The focus within use case A is therefore the daughter vessel(s) operating in a specific region and the transshipment of goods from a small port, via a daughter vessel, to a transshipment terminal, then loaded onto a mother vessel sailing to a bigger port such as Rotterdam.

This report recognises the dilemma related to investments in the transport system, and specifically related to mooring and cargo handling systems. Autonomous mooring solutions and cranes are expensive, and it is not realistic that such investments are done at the small ports in the fjord, with limited cargo volume. However, to make the transport system flexible, the daughter vessel(s) should be able to call on these ports as well. The report concludes that the daughter vessel must be equipped with its own cargo handling capabilities and preferably also with an on board autonomous mooring solution. Two different cargo handling equipment solutions have been proposed:

1. Deck crane on the vessel, fully autonomous
2. Autonomous AGV (reachstacker), brought on board the vessel, to be driven on shore to do the cargo handling operations. This is most relevant when looking at the flexibility of calling on the small ports with no cargo handling equipment.

The AGVs are suggested to also do the terminal operations at the smaller ports, enabling moving of containers from the vessel to quayside and further onto a storage area or directly onto a truck.

A use case A transport system has been proposed as follows:

- Ports as part of a regular schedule: Hitra Kysthavn, Orkanger, Trondheim, Skogn and Holla
- Ports to be called on demand: Steinkjer, Follafooss and Verdal
- Total cargo handling time (loading + discharging), based on 15 containers/hour: 90 hours
- Total sailing distance and time (at 12 knots): 469 nm in 39 hours
- One (100 TEUs) or two (each 60 TEUs) daughter vessel(s), sailing at 12 or eight and five knots
- The daughter vessels will be equipped with either a crane or a reachstacker
- Batteries as energy source for daughter vessels, either based on conventional charging at the terminals, or containerized and swappable. The latter implies implementation of charging stations at specific terminals in the transport system.

The specified transport system is subject to cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and Logistics Analysis tool will be used to assess the overall logistics system. Further detailing and validation of the transport system will be documented in deliverable *D8.4 Detailing and validation of use case A*, which work will be based on the results of the CBA and simulations from the Logistics Analysis tool.