Network Session Report

Global impacts on shipping

Conveners: Sarah Bailey (Canada), Silvana Birchenough (UK)

The Network Session began with a presentation by the co-Conveners, introducing ICES Expert Groups in general (what an Expert Group is and how to join) and followed by a review of the Terms of Reference for the new Working Group on Shipping Impacts in the Marine Environment (WGSHIP). The participants then divided themselves into three break-out groups to propose ideas/responses to the three questions listed below:

1. What are potential sources of global shipping traffic data in general, and for the Arctic in particular?

The participants identified multiple sources of AIS (automated information system) data on ship movements, including Lloyd's Register, Global Fishing Watch and direct requests to industry. The participants suggested that the ICES Data Group may also be able to assist with the location of data. Participants asked whether there would be adequate coverage of shipping movements mid-ocean, and suggested a need for the validation of data by comparing or combining datasets.

2. Which shipping-related stressors are of most concern? Invasive species, underwater noise, ship strikes, pollutants, etc.?

The participants listed noise, effects on mammals, and the development of port facilities as being primary shipping impacts of concern. There was a discussion on whether the direction of the WG should be prioritized based on the relative risk of shipping as the source of a particular impact vs. other sources of the same impact (i.e. to focus on impacts where shipping is a main contributor).

3. What management or science advice is most urgently needed for the impacts of shipping on marine ecosystems?

The participants listed noise, impacts of alternative fuels and nuclear power, metals in scrubber wash water, trade-offs between speed vs. emissions, and social economics as topics needing management advice. It was suggested that the WG should work with the International Maritime Organization to identify additional needs. The group questioned the relative importance of topics that may have small probability of occurrence but large consequence. The group also suggested that priorities may differ regionally.

The 21 participants generated many useful ideas for WGSHIP to take into consideration as it develops an initial work plan in the coming months, and multiple people in the network session indicated an interest to join WGSHIP. Multiple participants have since contacted the WGSHIP Chair with intent to participate in the working group activities.