InPlain

Structures of Port Connectivity, Competition, and Shipping Networks in Europe

Qing Liu

Introduction

transport carries 80% of the global A container port's centrality (sometimes also named as connectivity) level based on graph theory (Freeman (1979), Opsahl et al. (2010)) is an important measure for a port's strategic location within the container transport system, and an indicator of its ability to attract cargo traffic and shipping service. In our recently published study (Liu et al., 2022), we focused on 29 major European container ports that have direct liner services with China and evaluate their centrality based on their connections with China and connections within the intra-European networks. For that purpose, we collected 323 intra-European liner services with 241 European ports and 27 liner services between Greater China and Europe with 29 European ports and 12 Chinese ports in 2019.

Index measures

Based on previous research, we proposed centrality indices should essentially measure a container port's strategic position from three dimensions:

- how many ports are directly connected with it (degree centrality)
- how closely/quickly it is connected with other ports in the network (closeness centrality)
- how inevitable its position is within the network (betweenness centrality)

Also, we design our indices to be service based, so that the commonly accepted critical factors for a port's connectivity level are considered, including the number of services, service capacity, service frequency, number of connected ports through direct services, and connection time. Therefore, service-based degree centrality for a port is defined as the number of nodes that it can reach directly within the service network without transfer. Service-based closeness centrality is measured as the total shortest transit time a particular port connects with all other ports within the network via liner services weighted by the connection capacity. The shortest path tree was calculated for each port using the Floyd Warshall algorithm (Floyd, 1962) to obtain the quickest transit time between each port pair. Finally, service-based betweenness centrality is measured as how often a particular port is located within the liner services in the network, weighted by the service capacity.

Key Findings

For each of the 29 ports, the three indices were calculated separately for the intra-Europe network (IEN) and China-connection network (CCN). The

two networks show different patterns for the port centrality measures (Figures 1 and 2).

The three largest European ports (the 'first-tier' ports)

The largest three European container ports are the most "centrally" positioned for CCN network (a transoceanic network) with both connection speed, connection capacity, and number of direct connections. In the IEN network, the largest ports have slower connections in comparison to their smaller peers, but they compensate for this shortcoming with higher connection volumes. Within the largest ports, the major port function (transshipment vs. hinterland) and relationship with China influence centrality scores. For example, Hamburg always ranked after Rotterdam and before Antwerp in the CCN, despite its throughput being smaller than that of Antwerp. Hamburg port has almost one-third of its throughput from/to China (Hamburg Port Authority, 2012) clearly indicates that its strong relationship with China has led to relatively higher rankings than its peers (i.e., Antwerp). As in the IEN, Hamburg as a major gateway (vs. a transfer hub) for direct inland markets has low ranking especially low in betweenness and degree, and even lower when capacity was considered, suggesting that it did not connect intensively with other European ports and was often not included in intra-European services.

Piraeus

However, the most interesting finding is the high and clearly outlined scores of the port of Piraeus. Although Piraeus had the fourth largest throughput value among European ports in 2019, handled only a bit more than half of the throughputs of Hamburg and much fewer than Rotterdam and Antwerp. Despite its much smaller handling capacity and cargo throughput than the first-tier ports), Piraeus had a position almost as "central" as them in the service network with China. It had the quickest direct connection with China, both with and without capacity considered. In the IEN network, Piraeus outperformed all the other major and secondary ports with or without capacity considerations. For example, its betweenness ranked the highest with or without capacity, meaning that it is the most frequently included in existing services in the network. However, in comparison, its degree and betweenness measures in CCN are relatively weak, or should be considered as 'normal', ranking below the first-tier ports just as expected. Especially, its betweenness is ranked fourth with or without capacity measures, indicating that compared to the first-tier ports, it is less frequently included in existing services connecting China with Europe.

Substantial Chinese influences?

It is noted that the port of Piraeus is the only major port entirely managed by a Chinese state-owned company in Europe since 2016, namely COSCO. COSCO's subsidiaries are the sole terminal operators at the port of Piraeus is probably a key reason for its strong connection with China, and consistent with the perception that it has been selected by COSCO as its strategic gateway port in Europe. In addition to improvement of terminal facilities thanks to the substantial investments by the China-led Belt and Road Initiatives (BRI), liner companies' direct ship calls and network structure changes are critical factors for its growth but have not yet been thoroughly investigated. However, such impacts are not comprehensive. Although Piraeus achieved strong closeness centrality in the CCN, we found that its betweenness centrality and degree centrality are considered 'normal', as not as

strong as the largest ports within the region. This indicates that the nature of the inter-continental shipping network largely remained intact, where the 'hub' status of the intercontinental Europe-China shipping network remained in the hands of the major ports along the Hamburg-Le Havre range.

Hence, to conclude, we argue that China's influence, led by the BRI programs on port investments in Europe, has played significant roles in the development of port capacity and competitiveness, but not comprehensively enough to cause fundamental shifts in the established China-Europe maritime transport system yet.

Remark

The detailed results of this study can be found in: Liu, Q., Yang, Y., Ke, L., and Ng, A.K.Y., 2022. Structures of port connectivity , competition , and shipping networks in Europe. Journal of Transport Geography 102, 103360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103360

References

Dijkstra, E.W., 1959. A note on two problems in connexion with graphs. Numerische Mathematik 1, 269–271.

Floyd, R.W., 1962. Algorithm 97: Shortest Path. Communications of the ACM 5, 345.

Freeman, L.C., 1979. Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. Social Networks 1, 215–239. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-8733(78)90021-7

Hamburg Port Authority, 2012. Hamburg is staying on Course - The Port Development Plan to 2025. Hamburg Port Authority, Hamburg.

Liu, Q., Yang, Y., Ke, L., and Ng, A.K.Y., 2022. Structures of port connectivity , competition , and shipping networks in Europe. Journal of Transport Geography 102, 103360. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103360

Opsahl, T., Agneessens, F., and Skvoretz, J., 2010. Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths. Social Networks 32, 245–251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socnet.2010.03.006

InPlain

Figure 1. China Connection Index Cc vs Cd ($\alpha = 0$). (b): China Connection Index Cb vs Cd ($\alpha = 0$). (c): China Connection Index Cb vs Cc ($\alpha = 0$).



Figure 2. Intra-Europe Connection Index Cc vs Cd (α = 0). (b): Intra-Europe Connection Index Cb vs Cd (α = 0). (c): Intra-Europe Connection Index Cb vs Cc (α = 0).



InPlain

Qing Liu
Qing.liu@uni-hamburg.de

Dr. Qing Liu is an Assistant Professor and the director of the Maritime Economics Research Center at the University of Hamburg, Germany. She has earlier studied and worked with Rahall Transportation Institute and Upper Great Plains Transportation Institute in the US. Her main research interest is global logistics and maritime economics.