



HAL
open science

Port migration patterns in the global seaport system since the 1950s

César Ducruet, Theo E. Notteboom, Brian Slack

► To cite this version:

César Ducruet, Theo E. Notteboom, Brian Slack. Port migration patterns in the global seaport system since the 1950s. César Ducruet; Theo E. Notteboom. Port Systems in Global Competition. Spatial-Economic Perspectives on the Co-Development of Seaports, Routledge, pp.122-146, 2023, 9781003316657. <10.4324/9781003316657-9>. <halshs-04588346>

HAL Id: halshs-04588346

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-04588346v1>

Submitted on 26 May 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

Port migration patterns in the global seaport system since the 1950s

César Ducruet¹, Theo Notteboom², and Brian Slack³

This is the draft version of the book chapter published in: Ducruet C., Notteboom T.E. (2023) (Eds.), *Port Systems in Global Competition. Spatial-Economic Perspectives on the Co-Development of Seaports*. London & New York: Routledge Studies in Transport Analysis, pp. 122-146.

Abstract

Port migration can be defined as the shift of port infrastructure and/or maritime traffic from one location to one or multiple other locations within a given period of time. Such migration processes can involve new port or new terminal development near existing facilities (e.g. a new port area being developed on a greenfield site away from an existing older port area) or at medium and longer distance. In a number of cases, port migration can change the physical and spatial features of the port, e.g. a river port can become an estuary or coastal port, in case of downstream development. Modern ports typically developed away from the obsolete facilities near the urban core to less-urban locations with ample space, and a better nautical accessibility, as exemplified in the 'Anyport' model of James Bird. In this chapter, we undertake an overview of port migration throughout the world from two perspectives, qualitative and quantitative. The qualitative perspective discusses existing models, drivers and impediments of port migration, supported by concrete cases from around the world. The quantitative approach measures port migration patterns using urban population and vessel traffic data of about 4,000 places from the 1950s to the present. We analyze the changing share of "outer" versus "inner" traffic by cargo and location type, world region, and urban area, concluding with a typology of port migration trajectories throughout the world.

Keywords: port cities; port migration; port development; shipping networks; spatio-temporal evolution; world trade patterns

Introduction

Port migration can be defined as the shift of port infrastructure and/or maritime traffic from one location to one or multiple other locations within a given period of time. The discussion on port migration is embedded in research on port and port system development, a key theme in the port geography literature (Ng et al., 2014). Modern ports typically developed away from the obsolete facilities near the urban core to less-urban locations with ample space, and a better nautical accessibility, as exemplified in the 'Anyport' model of James Bird (1963, 1971) and the port life cycle

¹ French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS), UMR 7235 Economix, France. Contact author: cesar.ducruet@economix.fr

² Antwerp University & University of Ghent, Belgium.

³ Concordia University, Canada.

of Jacques Charlier (1994). As remarked by Jackson (1983), the major cause for the decline of ports across history had been technical or physical, i.e. the congestion of channel entrances by sediments due to insufficient dredging. Transport and other economic actors were thus constantly in search of alternative locations to ship their goods and keep trade going on. In addition, growth in international trade and maritime transport since the end of WW2 and the co-dependent technological developments in ships and cargo handling forced ports to undergo significant transformations. One facet of the transformations is site expansion, either by accretion or relocation, or a combination of both.

Port migration processes have an impact on cargo concentration patterns in port systems. Barke (1986) pointed to processes of cargo de-concentration in port systems resulting from port activities leaving the urban core for less congested suburban or peripheral port sites. Hayuth (1981) introduced a trend towards de-concentration in port systems as a result of the so-called 'challenge of the periphery', a concept which was empirically tested by Slack and Wang (2002) for Asia and Notteboom (2005) for Europe, and the former insisting more on shipping lines' strategies than on physical factors. Port migration is recognized in the extant literature as an important structural factor influencing port and port system development. Still, the measurement of the extent of port migration processes is underdeveloped, while also a comprehensive and structured discussion on port migration factors is lacking.

This chapter attempts to contribute to filling these two research gaps by focusing on two goals. The first objective is to consider the forces that are shaping port migration, based upon a review of the literature. This exercise will demonstrate that site locations are shaped by seemingly contradictory forces. Some forces incite development on new sites to exploit factors such as land availability and access to deeper water. Others reinforce the attractiveness of urban locations that ensure better access to local and hinterland markets. The literature review provides a discussion of the different forces and examples of their impacts.

The second goal is to provide a global quantitative assessment of port migration. Three large data sets are compiled: the first dataset includes ports of all types since the 1950s based on vessel calls, the second covers ports of all types including vessel tonnage since the late 1970s, and the third dataset consists of container ports only, also using vessel tonnage. Based on the location of each port or terminal, sites were apportioned between inner and outer locations for measuring respective traffic volume and share. In addition, the use of urban population data along with the migration shift results allows an analysis of the relationships between demographic changes and port migration. The chapter also compiles a basic typology of port migration. Migration profiles of representative ports in each class are selected to describe the actual patterns of migration and to describe the most important and most specific shifts.

The chapter is structured as follows. The next section provides a more in-depth discussion on the port migration concept by considering both spatial and governance-related dimensions. A holistic view on the forces that foster or limit port migration comes next, based on concrete examples but also existing models of port system evolution and port-city evolution. It provides classic and specific examples of port migration through space and time all over the world. The fourth section is quantitative in nature as it tries to find certain rules by which discontinuous urban port migration is more advanced in certain

places and not in others. In conclusion, we discuss the difficulty to match perfectly quantitative and qualitative approaches, although they remain complementary, and identify future research avenues.

A spatial and governance-related typology of port migration

The possible outcomes of port migration can be illustrated by container terminal developments in world ports (**Figure 6.1**) involving *downstream*, *lateral* or *downstream/offshore* terminal development which can be continuous or discontinuous. Such processes involve various forms of migration, relocation and transformation. It can involve new port or new terminal development near existing facilities (*continuous*, e.g. a new port area being developed on a greenfield site adjacent to an existing older port area) or at medium or longer distances (*discontinuous*). In case of *relocation*, the older obsolete port areas are either abandoned and given a new function in the context of waterfront redevelopment schemes (Hoyle, 1989) or might undergo a rehabilitation/conversion phase in view of taking up other port logistics functions focused on specific market segments. In a number of cases, port migration can change the physical and spatial features of the port, e.g. a river port can become an estuary or coastal port, in case of downstream development. The port migration pattern is very dependent on the nautical and geographical characteristics of the port's location. For example, upstream river ports typically develop downstream to new terminal locations along the river or in dock systems connected to the river or estuary, at coastal or even offshore locations.

[Insert Figure 6.1 about here]

The governance arrangements associated with port migration and relocation can differ greatly (**Figure 6.2**). The port authorities of the new port areas or terminals can be the same or different from existing or abandoned terminals, or, in some cases, a new governance structure might be set in place by combining the existing port authority with other administrative entities. On the operational side, new terminals might be operated by incumbent terminal operators who are/were active in the older facilities, or, alternatively, by newcomers.

[Insert Figure 6.2 about here]

Drivers of and impediments to port migration

This review of port migration factors is largely inspired by the respective works of Notteboom (2016) and later Merk (2018) who analyzed the specific role of container ship size on port migration and relocation processes. Extant literature primarily points to forces promoting port migration. It provides fewer clues on the processes that might favor a further development of ports in urban locations. Therefore, in this section we also discuss forces that help to explain why urban seaports can still have a significant role to play in port systems. We divided this section in two main parts: spatial and technological; economic and operational.

Spatial and technological factors

Nautical accessibility and scale increases in vessel size

The need for deep water access to accommodate ever larger vessels is one of the prime reasons for port migration. Scale increases in vessel size force ports to look for deep-water locations, typically in an estuary or along a coastline, bay or deep-water inlet. Not only draft conditions are important. A rise in beam and length of vessels requires more maneuvering room, wider turning circles near terminals and wider port access channels, particularly when considering that two-way traffic on navigational channels is the norm. While also many coastal and estuarine ports are challenged to dredge and widen access channels, investments in the nautical accessibility of upstream seaports located along rivers typically require larger budgets and come with more complex issues revolving around river morphology and ecology, flood protection and the disposal of (contaminated) dredged material.

When elaborating on the link between vessel size and port migration, it is important to consider that vessel size increases across the spectrum of shipping are not uniform. Liquid bulk underwent a very significant increase in scale economies in the 1970s with the emergence of Ultra-Large Crude Carriers (ULCCs), a time when container vessels were below Panamax capacities. In a short space of time the ULCCs disappeared because of changed market conditions, but before they did precipitate the establishment of new oil terminal facilities. Dry bulk vessel size growth was slower, first plateauing at the scale of Very Large Crude Carriers (VLCCs) only to grow in the 2010s to Chinamax as a result of Chinese demand for iron ore. Throughout this evolution of scale of bulk vessels there remain important sub-markets such as the grain trade, where smaller handymax vessels are still pre-eminent. This diversity of scales is present also in the container trades, despite the recent upscaling to 24,000 TEU ships. The lesson is that scale economies produce different effects in different markets and on different ports and hence on demand for land in ports.

Still, not all ports are moving downstream. Baltimore is a prime example of an upstream urban port trying to regain an important status by combining nautical accessibility (i.e. 50 feet channel and berths), terminal productivity, and strategic inland location. For instance, Baltimore ranks number one among US ports for container berth productivity according to Journal of Commerce (2015), while its central location in the Washington/Baltimore market of some 6.8 million people makes it the closest Atlantic port to major Midwestern production and consumption centers. Another example is London Gateway, which opened in 2013. Global terminal operator DP World tries to lure customers using the marketing slogan “Ship closer. Save money”, thereby referring to the slightly better proximity to the main markets in the UK compared to rival coastal ports Felixstowe and Southampton. In Taiwan, the expansion of New Taipei Port was decided by the central government to limit trucking flows between the capital city and Kaohsiung, 400km southbound, for environmental reasons (El Hosni, 2017).

Diseconomies of scale and land availability issues at established ports

These concerns are echoed in Bird (1971). In the 1950s and 1960s, the fast rise of the chemical industry (for example in view of producing plastics) led many ports in Europe to migrate to locations with ample space for the development of vast Maritime Industrial Development Areas (Vigarié, 1981). In more recent times, discussions also revolved around finding enough space to create new large-scale logistics

zones in the framework of port-centric logistics (Mangan et al., 2008; Monios and Wilmsmeier, 2012) and free trade and economic development zones (Tiefenbrun, 2012). In the 1950s and 1960s some large ports in NW-Europe witnessed a massive (downstream) development triggered by the demand of fast-growing petrochemical and chemical companies to have access to large maritime sites for the development of industrial complexes. Examples include Antifer near Le Havre but also Rotterdam and Antwerp. Rotterdam would never have been able to become such a large container port if the Botlek and Europoort industrial port areas would not have been developed prior to containerization, as these developments opened the path to the development of Maasvlakte 1 in the early 1970s and Maasvlakte 2 in the 2010s. Both Maasvlakte 1 and 2 are giant landmasses reclaimed from the sea making Rotterdam de facto a coastal container port despite its initial development along a river. Rotterdam's container volume (14 million TEU in 2018) is almost entirely handled on the container terminals at Maasvlakte I and II. Thus, there is a clear path dependency in port migration processes. In Antwerp and Rotterdam, a first wave of port migration for industrial purposes opened windows of opportunity for a second wave focusing mainly on containers.

The above examples demonstrate that port migration processes in response to diseconomies of scale, land availability issues or nautical issues can lead to path dependency and a certain spatial 'lock-in' in future port development. Path dependence implies that ports evolve by building on previous phases and 'memory effects'. Past decisions on port migration might thus stimulate or prevent new waves of port migration. Without the port authorities being aware of it, the port migration that took place paved the way for these ports to position themselves as early adopters of containerization in the late 1960s early 1970s. Path dependent development patterns of port systems can go back many centuries, and therefore lie the foundation for more recent port migration processes or the lack thereof.

US East Coast ports as well have long histories of development. Ports were the major lifeline for trade and settlers with Great Britain during the colonial period, and even after US independence ports were gateways for US exports of raw materials and imports of European manufactured goods. By the late 19th century they began to serve as focal points of industrialization, a trend that became even more important through much of the Twentieth with the establishment of new industries such as chemicals and oil refining. By the late 1950s the container revolution began on the US East Coast and continued its expansion until the present day. The fact that the region has such a long history of commercial shipping explains in part the apparent stability of port development indicated later in this study. Changes that are reshaping port development in some other markets have already taken place here. It parallels comparable results for some of the ports in North West Europe which too has a long heritage of port-industrial activity.

Vancouver represents an almost 'text book' example of port migration. In the early 1970s two container terminals were developed from converted sites adjacent to the city's downtown on Burrard Inlet. Although both Centerm and Vanterm terminals possess rail connectivity and provide deepwater accessibility, their sites are constrained by close urban proximity, which limits any physical expansion. In addition, much of the adjacent shoreline is occupied by other bulk cargo terminals which accounted for much of the port's overall business. Indeed, it was the absence of suitable sites on Burrard Inlet that led to the construction of an entirely new coal export terminal 35km from Vancouver at Roberts Bank (a case of *discontinuous lateral migration* or DLM, see **Figure 6.1**). It is located at the end of a long causeway extending out from the mainland into deep water. By the 1990's site constraints at the container terminals led to the decision to expand Roberts Bank and add a new container facility,

Deltaport. The new terminal was opened in 1997 and has been expanded since. As with Rotterdam, port migration was initiated out by a bulk trade. One difference with Rotterdam is that Centerm and Vanterm remain very active inner-city container terminals.

Urban density and hierarchies

The urban fabric and networks can exert forces towards port migration. In an urban setting, strong tensions between port development and urban/city development can result in a move away from urban locations. The matrix on port-city relations as presented by Ducruet and Lee (2006) provides a framework to assess the risk of incurring increasing tensions between city and port. Wiegman and Louw (2011) present a model that adds to the Anyport-model of Bird by referring to zones where conflicts between the existing land use as a port and proposed city land uses takes place. Such city-port tensions can eventually result in port migration, with rare examples of waterfront redevelopment for new port uses (Charlier, 1992). In their network analysis of world's cities connected by shipping flows, Ducruet et al. (2018) observed that the declining relationship between vessel traffic and urban population occurred most frequently in the context of upstream ports and port cities. Despite demonstrating that larger cities keep dominating the global shipping network today, it was acknowledged that maritime hub ports such as Rotterdam and Singapore, which are not very large cities, have maintained their dominance. In Asia, port migration emerged in the 1980s and 1990s, such as in Singapore with the reclamation of industrial islands Tuas and Jurong, Japan, and in the 2000s, in major Chinese industrial ports such as Shanghai and Ningbo-Zhoushan, etc. Singapore is a key example with the development of the large-scale Tuas container terminal project (Yap and Lam, 2013) and the decommissioning of three terminals close to the city center to make room for urban expansion on prime land. The Tuas development at present corresponds to a *discontinuous outward migration* or DOM (see **Figure 6.1**), but will gradually evolve towards a *discontinuous outward relocation* or DOR by 2040 when all city terminals and the Pasir Panjang terminal complex will have been closed. A similar process is taking place in Busan where Busan New Port, located some 25km west of Busan city, is expected to handle all container traffic in the future as existing terminals at the urban Busan North Port will gradually be closed.

Dynamics in shipping networks and urban hierarchies do not necessarily result in port migration and a decline of urban ports. As per the centrality concept proposed by Fleming and Hayuth (1994), market players typically value some of the supply chain related characteristics of urban ports, such as a closer proximity and better connectivity to inland markets, high cluster and scale effects in cargo generation, and savings in environmental costs of land transport. Cities and ports remain tied by labor market and infrastructure issues, local politics and policy concerns, and a variety of synergies (Hall and Jacobs, 2012). The competitiveness of a seaport is not only determined by its location and the available port infrastructure and superstructure. It is also increasingly being determined by the port's effective integration in these supply chains and logistics pathways (Robinson, 2002; Mangan et al., 2008). From a generalized transport cost approach (also incorporating transit times and service quality elements), urban ports can thus be competitive in a supply chain perspective. The cases of upstream seaports Antwerp and Hamburg are a good illustration. Despite challenges in terms of nautical accessibility, land availability, congestion and the environment, both ports have been able to remain competitive vis-à-vis existing (e.g. Rotterdam) and new (e.g. Wilhelmshaven) container ports in more coastal locations.

They have managed to do so by developing strong adaptive capacities to deal with nautical and other challenges, by developing strong supply chain integration strategies linked to the existing logistics cluster, by focusing on a high maritime and land connectivity and by nurturing preferential attachment processes at the level of the market players (Notteboom, 2016).

In fact, the imperatives of modern global supply chains can weaken the push for port/terminal migration to less-urban locations. However, the link between port migration and the characteristics of supply chains largely depends on cargo types for which port migration makes more or less sense, certainly when smaller ships are being used and availability of (dock) labor is key to competing in such a cargo segment. In other words, port migration forces might be different depending on the cargo segment under consideration. Port migration forces might be particularly strong for deep-sea container trades and major liquid bulk activities. Also, in some containerized commodity supply chains, such as tobacco and coffee, there are very strong forces towards centralization of flows in only few ports. Such elevated levels of cargo centralization might result in a demand for large terminals and warehousing facilities. This could trigger port migration. Other activities, such as shortsea operations, might benefit from a more decentralized approach with many ports and smaller terminal facilities being served. Other segments in shipping might prefer more urban locations. While this chapter does not focus on passenger traffic, it is worthwhile mentioning that many cruise terminals have been developed near urban centers, often on old port sites. There is pressure from the cruise industry to establish terminals closer to the old city centers, rather than in some derelict facilities miles from anywhere.

Economic and operational factors

Maritime networks

The need for locations that offer a better 'intermediacy' in shipping networks (Fleming and Hayuth, 1994) can lead to port migration away from urban centers, to estuarine and coastal locations, or even offshore. In the container market, the growing sea-sea transshipment market has led to the emergence of almost pure transshipment hubs (Rodrigue and Notteboom, 2010) with a range of common characteristics in terms of an easy nautical access, a close proximity to main shipping lanes (i.e. low diversion distance from the trunk routes), short vessel turnaround times, and specific ownership structures dominated by carriers or international terminal operators (see e.g. Lirn et al., 2004; Baird, 2006). Strategic passageways in the global shipping network such as the Straits of Gibraltar, the Suez Canal, the Panama Canal and the Malacca Straits act as magnets on the development of transshipment hubs (Ashar, 2002; De Monie, 1997). However, literature demonstrates that the position of container transshipment hubs in shipping networks is more vulnerable than the positions of gateway ports or ports with a mixed cargo base (Robinson, 2008; Ducruet and Notteboom, 2012; Wilmsmeier and Notteboom, 2011) and that the container throughput volatility in transshipment ports is statistically significantly higher than in other ports (Notteboom et al., 2019). In other words, maritime networks are dynamic in nature and the position of intermediate hubs in these networks can be subject to a (sudden) change upwards or downwards. The dynamics in these networks and the relationships with port migration are under-researched.

However, not all port systems around the world feature a presence of significant transshipment activity. One major difference of US ports with the rest of the world is the absence of transshipment. The amount of coastal container trade in the US is negligible because of the high cost of domestic shipping, the result of restrictive domestic shipping regulations (i.e. the Jones Act) that insist on US-built, manned and operated vessels (Slattery et al., 2014). US container ports are therefore focused on landward connections. North American ports thus developed other options to keep their activity going on despite the absence of transshipment, such as short sea shipping operation between Newfoundland and Montreal, environmental innovation in Vancouver and LA/Long Beach (Hall et al., 2013) triggered by the pressures on environmental performance as exerted by leader firms, local communities and organizations, and governments.

As observed by Ducruet (2013), container flows are the most overlapped with other maritime flows such as bulks etc. Containerization made it possible for such heavy industrial complexes to adopt a new function, i.e. the aforementioned intermediacy through hub functions which largely focus on sea-sea transshipment activities also exist in other markets such as the liquid bulk market (e.g. crude oil terminals in the northern part of the UK that transship North Sea oil) or the automotive market. For instance, the Belgian coastal port of Zeebrugge handled 2.8 new vehicles in 2018 of which a significant part related to sea-sea transshipment activities between north and south Europe and between the British Isles and mainland Europe.

Cost differentials and environmental restrictions

The availability and cost of production factors capital, labor and land play a role in port location decisions. High factor costs at more urban locations can drive port developers and market players to look for new less-urban locations. However, there might be a shortage of workers in these more remote locations and commuting times for urban dwellers might be too high. In his seminal paper on port-city separation, Hoyle (1989) used the case of Fos-sur-Mer as an outport of Marseilles. This can be solved by stimulating the further development of existing villages to attract (young) families and port workers or by creating new towns/cities near the new port areas. However, in the case of containers, Slack and Gouvernal (2016) concluded that transshipment ports barely create local value-added activities, such as logistics, or entice urban growth. Other authors insisted on the fact that depending on the pattern of the urban system, (new) ports may not give rise to cities due to the “shadow effect” of existing urban centers on the port location, which remains bound to transshipment between the sea and the core market (Fujita and Mori, 1996).

Like elsewhere but perhaps under a stricter regulatory environment, national and European regulations, such as the EU Bird and Habitat Directive and the EU Water Directive, combined with an increased stakeholder involvement in the decision-making process, seriously limit the possibility to develop greenfield port projects in ecologically sensitive areas.

Development in the coastal zone requires an approval process that is lengthy and costly. Port development has become particularly difficult because of local opposition that is able to intervene in the evaluation process. A good example is the failure of the Dibden Bay port expansion project in Southampton in 2004, due to strong local protest. Even in case some development can take place, the decision process can easily take 5 to 10 years and initial plans often undergo major changes throughout

the entire process to meet demands of the regulators and stakeholders (environmental groups, community groups, etc.). For instance, the Port 2000 expansion project in Le Havre, imagined in the 1990s, was inaugurated in 2006. Thus, every greenfield development plan goes hand in hand with lengthy and complex processes without any guarantee of being successful in the end. This knowledge increasingly pushes port developers to consider optimizing and extending existing port areas through intra-port renovation/conversion projects, co-location and co-siting, thereby limiting the pressure for port migration.

However, ports located in urban areas also face specific environmental issues. This can trigger a search for other terminal locations. Given the proximity of urban cores and the associated local communities, issues of noise, air quality, energy consumption, waste management and dredging are typically scrutinized much more than in remote offshore or coastal port sites. Yet, Hall and Jacobs (2012) show that the proximity to urban areas provides urban ports with both dynamic tangible and less tangible advantages which cannot be found in non-urban environments, e.g. superior infrastructure, knowledge, innovation and decision-making capacities. While congestion and environmental challenges negatively affect more urban ports, they can be a major source of innovative power with positive impacts on competitiveness.

Institutional and governance factors

Administrative borders

Institutional and governance factors and the interplay among stakeholders often have a large impact on port migration decisions. A good example is the role of administrative borders in 'limiting' port migration processes in space. Port migration might not go far in case this would imply that the port needs to be developed across borders to other provinces or countries. Several examples underline that port migration typically is spatially constrained to the own territorial borders (county, province, state, country). Physical (country/state) borders also often lead to 'mental' borders at the level of public entities, market players and other stakeholders involved in port development processes.

The development of the Antwerp port is another good example of how borders can affect port migration patterns. Until the 1970s, Antwerp saw a strong downstream development on the right bank of the river Scheldt to the north away from the urban core. Rural sparsely populated areas were turned into dock systems connected to the river by sea locks. However, a large part of the navigable section of the river Scheldt flows through the southern part of the Netherlands before reaching the North Sea. This meant that a further downstream development of the port (as portrayed in Bird's Anyport model) would have implied crossing the Belgian/Dutch border. Therefore, further port development processes shifted to the left bank of the river in the 1970s. Even at present, the main port expansion projects are all focused on the left bank area, e.g. the Deurganckdock (opened in 2005) and the planned Saeftinghedock, making the left bank almost as important as the right bank in cargo volume terms.

Market players often capitalize on the existence of borders and the associated rivalry among nations and regions. For example, in the early 2000s, the container terminal operator APM Terminals benefited from the rivalry between Singapore and Malaysia to push for the development of a large new port in Tanjung Pelepas in Malaysia (just across the border with Singapore) after sister company Maersk Line

was denied the development of a dedicated terminal in Singapore. Such a “duality” is common to numerous Asian port systems, as seen with Hong Kong, Busan, and Shanghai, where new port facilities were created outside the original territory, thereby exacerbating tensions with the neighboring provinces about local benefits (Frémont and Ducruet, 2005; Wang and Chen, 2010; Wang and Ducruet, 2012). In the case of Shanghai, the new Yangshan port opened in 2005 fell under the jurisdiction of Zhejiang province, allowing it to levy taxes and to plan the development of a new city on Yangshan Island for attracting business, culture, leisure, tourism, and housing activities.

Collective action and the role of politics

On the other side of the coin, power, politics and collective action by the port community have a role to play in port development and migration (Notteboom, 2016). Some actors or stakeholders will use their power and sense for joint action in order to constrain or enable the development of an urban seaport. Jacobs (2007) and Jacobs and Notteboom (2011) demonstrated how strategic or collective action can affect the development path of ports. Also, politics can play a major role. For instance, Ng and Pallis (2007) noted that variations of political traditions and culture could result in the embeddedness of strategies within the institutional frameworks concerned. This governance setting leads to some local rationality in terms of assessing port development opportunities and the port’s economic impact. As a result, terminal expansion in other neighboring ports is often not supported with the argument that a lack of investments in (nautical) accessibility and terminals of the proper port will lead to a vicious cycle towards decline of the port and a decrease of its effects on the (local) economy. Hamburg in Germany provides a good example. The early 2000s brought a discussion in Germany on the development of a new deep-water port in the northern part of the country. A proposed project in Cuxhaven at the mouth of the Elbe River was shelved. In the end, Wilhelmshaven was chosen as the best location. The Jade Weser Port terminal opened in 2012 with an initial capacity of 2.7 million TEUs. The city and the port of Hamburg have never been strong supporters of the development of the new port as they believe that the port of Hamburg has a much stronger market proposition than any newcomer, but also partly because Wilhelmshaven is located in another German state (Bundesland Niedersachsen) and therefore not under the jurisdiction of the city state of Hamburg (Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg).

Port ownership structure and (regional) port integration

The institutional arrangements at the level of port and terminal ownership can play a role in port development and migration. Even though the ports operate as public entities there exist large numbers of privately owned and operated facilities. Typically, these are terminals that serve an industrial function that is located alongside, receiving coal for a thermal power station, or receiving crude oil and shipping out refined products. The activity is controlled by the corporation with no public input. They tend to be fixed in their use for long periods of time, and thus contribute to the spatial stability of port infrastructure. In contrast publicly-owned sites may undergo periodic reappraisal and may be leased to other users for a different function.

Governance issues are paramount also for many US ports with the role of private terminals (Fawcett, 2007). US ports are under State jurisdiction, like most East Coast States, unlike the West Coast where port jurisdiction has been devolved to municipalities. The absence of transshipment (cf. the Jones Act) makes that all US container ports are gateway ports focusing on import/export flows. This undoubtedly shapes port areas and location decisions in terms of port extension. At the same time, over the last 60 years, the US has developed an increasingly restrictive set of regulations relating to coastal zone management. The time and cost considerations have resulted in very limited greenfield port development in the US, where conversion of existing sites has been a very common approach to new facility provision (Hirshman et al., 1999).

Finally, port system development in China, and associated processes of port migration and outer development have been and still are heavily affected by institutional arrangements and governance issues, given the strong role of government and state-owned enterprises in economic life in China. Cullinane and Wang (2007) and Notteboom and Yang (2017) examined the distinctive phases in port governance reform in China. The strong growth of the economy meant that port capacity was developed on a massive scale, thereby enhancing outer development and large-scale port migration in established and new ports. In more recent years, the central government's policy encourages port co-operation and integration schemes at the regional/provincial level to fight overcapacity, duplication of facilities and excessive competition among regional ports. Wang et al. (2015) analyzed the nature of port integration in China, including associated temporal pathways, spatial patterns and dynamics. Huo et al. (2018) concluded that China's domestic port cooperation has resulted in the formation of provincial port groups (such as Zhejiang Port Group) through investment holding or acquisition and strategic alliance. Next to the envisaged synergies and advantages of such port integration schemes, we expect that this trend will also affect the regional cargo distribution patterns among ports and investment decisions on new port expansions. More specifically, regional port integration brings port development discussions from the local to the regional/provincial level, thereby opening more possibilities for increased specialization of ports and the further development of hub facilities, particularly in outer locations. Such a specialization might be needed to prepare the regional port system for increased inter-regional port competition and strongly reduced levels of intra-regional competition.

A world geography of urban port migration

Defining and measuring port migration from an urban perspective

Given the range of drivers shaping port migration described previously, it remains challenging to attempt a quantitative assessment on a global scale. After many attempts it was decided to adopt an urban perspective. Thus, the remainder of the chapter focuses on *urban port migration* which we measure by analyzing traffic performed at terminals and ports outside a port city and which bear another name than the (principal) port of this city. This implies that we primarily focus on *discontinuous* spatial patterns of port migration and relocation (see earlier **Figure 6.1**) whereby initial port development took place within an urbanized area (i.e. *inner port activity*), and the external developments are found outside, in a range of maximum 50 kilometers (i.e. *outer port activity*).

Thus, our approach does not cover all cases of port migration as depicted in **Figure 6.1**, depending on local conditions and specificities. For instance, Maasvlakte 2 in Rotterdam is at about 45km from the urban area, but since it is still *continuous* spatial development of the port of Rotterdam and part of the Rotterdam metropolitan area, it is seen as “Rotterdam” and so as an inner development. The same applies to Antwerp, of which the most northern part of the port is located on the right bank of the river Scheldt some 15km from the urban area, but still on the territory of the city of Antwerp and part of the *continuous* port area of Antwerp which stretches from the city borders to the Belgian-Dutch border. The left bank, where the massive Deurganckdock is located is even closer to the city of Antwerp, but although it is located on the territory of another city/municipality/province and administered by the same port authority, it is also considered as inner port activity. Contrarily, Antifer oil terminal is about 25km from Le Havre, but since it is not located in the urban area of Le Havre, has a different name and is a clear case of *discontinuous* port development, it is classified as an outer port activity.

In other words, port migration in our chapter always involves a port development which is spatially/physically disconnected from the existing port area and not just a continuous expansion of an existing port. In some cases, the definition of outer port activity had been difficult, such as in the case of London Gateway, Thamesport, and Felixstowe being considered outer ports given their location outside the urban area. In the same vein, Wilhelmshaven is considered, like Bremerhaven, an outer port of Bremen, just like Zeebrugge in Belgium is considered as an outer port of Brugge. In Asia, Tanjung Pelepas is one of the (inner) ports of Johor Bahru urban area.

Our methodological approach is thus a specific and partial view of port migration, due to the limits of quantitative possibilities. First, measuring port migration would require micro-level data such as vessel traffic or tonnage figures per terminal, which, unfortunately, does not exist⁴. We thus opted for a more “macro-level” perspective with the city, or urban area, as the unit of analysis. Dealing with the urban dimension of port migration was inspired by numerous works about gateway cities (Burghardt, 1970; Bird, 1973) and settlement patterns (Vance, 1970; Brocard, 1988) in the post-colonial and post-industrial world, backed by a countless literature about port-city relationships (see Ng et al., 2014 for a review). The urban area is larger than the municipality as it includes adjacent localities, based on a more functional or morphological definition of the city. Yet, in many cases there has been a somewhat haphazard relocation of “satellite” terminals (Slack, 1999), an inland shift of port activities through port regionalization (Notteboom and Rodrigue, 2005), and planning policies more or less in favor of port-city separation or reconnection (Hall and Clark, 2010).

One urban area may host one or more ports. Each port was treated case by case manually looking at the map, considering physical distance, elevation, road network connectivity, urban morphology, and regional urban network patterns. We consulted numerous websites giving more detailed information on trucking flows for instance and historical elements to check for dubious cases. Traffic was measured using *Lloyd's List Intelligence* (LLI) data, the world's leading maritime insurance company, over different time scales. Three datasets were selected for the sake of comparing different periods, traffic types, and units: (1) vessel tonnage 1977-2016 for containerships, corresponding to vessel capacity in

⁴ Sources such as Containerisation International Yearbooks and Lloyd's Ports of the World do contain terminal-level information but mainly a physical description and barely no traffic data.

deadweight tons (DWTs); (2) vessel tonnage 1977-2008 for all ships in deadweight tons; and (3) number of vessel calls 1950-2010 (i.e. without taking into account ship size). The latter dataset is extended back to the year 1880 in certain analyses for the sake of historical depth. For multivariate analyses such as principal components analysis and hierarchical clustering, vessel traffic volume per city was averaged every 5 years to keep the maximum number of places, as some of them did not handle cargo every year; also to eliminate the “noise” caused by fluctuations within yearly time-series. We then calculated the relative amount (%) of inner versus outer port traffic for each urban area and traffic type.

London provides a fertile ground to test our methodology (**Figure 6.3**). It is known to have undergone drastic port migration: outer traffic grew from about 9% in 1960 to nearly 70% in the 2010s based on vessel calls. We included in this calculation Thames River terminals and distant seaports like Felixstowe, although its hinterland coverage goes beyond London and Southeast UK. The fast rise of outport traffic since the 1970s in particular also relates to the redevelopment of London Docklands into a new CBD. The bottom part of the figure (b) is a comparison of containerships and all ships based on tonnage, both showing a similar evolution. Yet, we observe a revival of inner container port traffic in the last year, probably due to Dubai Ports World (DPW)’s investment near London through the London Gateway project. Similar reinvestments were observed in other large cities such as Taipei, Jakarta, Osaka, and Tokyo. When studying these cases, El Hosni (2017) showed that those examples of a “return of the port into the city” can be driven by multiple forces, of which competition between terminal operators, market accessibility, and environmental imperatives.

[Insert Figure 6.3 about here]

Main trends

We first calculated the correlation between traffic volume and demographic size⁵ (**Figure 6.4**). Inner port traffic was significantly correlated with city size in the early period. From the 1920s already, such a correlation started to decline, way before containerization. Thus, port migration was not caused, but reinforced, by the container revolution. The latter prolonged, often at the same sites, previous phases of port development towards deep-sea, as exemplified in the aforementioned Anyport model. Earlier than the latter model, Pounds (1947) identified a pattern of downstream (outport) emergence in Northwest Europe, which he explained by combined factors such as the silting of estuaries and the increasing size of vessels, among others.

[Insert Figure 6.4 about here]

In terms of cargo types (**Figure 6.5**), liquid and solid bulk traffic are the most external to urban areas. It confirms the trend of early deep-sea migration of facilities handling raw materials, to cope with increasing ship size, growing trade, and to realize economies of scale. Interestingly, semi-finished

⁵ Our population database is the outcome of the merger and harmonization of four different world urban population databases (see Ducruet et al., 2018 for more information): Populstat (1880-2005), World Gazetteer (2010), Citypopulation.de (1980-2015), and Geopolis (1950-1990).

goods (general cargo) and containers follow the same migration trend over the period, albeit at lower levels. These two traffic types remain dominantly “inner”, as cities and high-density regions are magnets for finished, higher-valued goods, notably for imports (Ducruet et al., 2015; Rodrigue and Notteboom, 2020). Early observers of port system evolution noted that local market size was a crucial element in the development of large load centers, notably in North America (see Hayuth, 1981). In Asia, a “consolidation” model of port-city evolution was proposed to depict the emergence of so-called global hub port cities, which maintain a close association of port and urban functions (Lee et al., 2008).

[Insert Figure 6.5 about here]

Another important facet to be discussed is the regionalism of port migration, based on **Figure 6.6**. The average share of outport traffic reveals a coevolution of world regions, all of them experiencing an increase of outport traffic share. The level, pace, and take-off of this trend varies across regions, however. North America and Africa have remained at low values along the period, with a slight increase for North America after 1980, and a stagnation of Africa around 25%. East Asia and Europe share comparable values and experienced a similar trend, namely a slow increase over the period from about 25% to 35-40%. The last three regions witnessed a remarkably fast increase since the start of the period, with Oceania shifting from less than 3% in 1950 to more than 40% in 2010, and Latin America from 10% to 45%. The most impressive evolution is the one of West Asia, from 25% already in 1950 to nearly 60% in 2010. Eliot (2003) underlined the recurrent port-city separation process in South Asia, where several colonial port cities developed large outports in proximity to the original urban core: Karachi-Port Qasim, Mumbai-Nhava Sheva, Calcutta-Haldia, but also Dubai-Jebel Ali. Port migration in the world is thus regionally differentiated, but the same process occurs in different regions.

[Insert Figure 6.6 about here]

Lastly, **Figure 6.7** serves to corroborate the fact that outport traffic share is clearly higher for upstream port cities which are, on average, the most technically constrained in their access to rapidly changing maritime networks. Along many rivers, deltas, and estuaries, traffic shifted from upstream to downstream / coastal locations. In the figure, downstream urban areas witness the lowest share of outport traffic, while “pure” coastal locations (i.e., without river access) remained in an intermediary position. An increasing trend takes off from the mid-1960s onwards, confirming the shift to deep-sea locations for upstream sites in particular. Technological and economic changes also affected numerous urban areas situated at the mouth of rivers, forcing port facilities to migrate further away, such as on the opposite bank or on an island (on offshore hub development, see Notteboom and Rodrigue, 2005).

[Insert Figure 6.7 about here]

A lot can be said about the particularities of port cities in terms of morphology and its influence on – and adaptation to – changing technical and economic circumstances, which would extend beyond the ambition of this chapter. The great diversity of port city morphologies and their effects on port and urban expansion was reviewed by Zaremba (1962). His work can guide further analyses on the role of morphology in the development of port cities. **Figure 6.8** summarizes his work, including exemplary types that recall famous examples like Genoa (type 2), Le Havre (type 5), and Shanghai (type 8) for instance. Another important contribution is the (textual) model of port development proposed by Airriess (1991), applied to the “third world” and to Belawan (Indonesia) in particular. He depicted how

global and national forces modified local port development, through four principal stages since the mid-19th century.

[Insert Figure 6.8 about here]

A global typology of urban port migration trajectories

We then propose a typology of urban areas depending on their type of port migration trajectory (e.g. stability, decline, growth). First, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was applied to the evolution of outport traffic share by urban area. Second, a hierarchical clustering analysis was performed on the main factor loadings with eigenvalue > 1. Should it be for vessel calls (1950-2010) or container traffic (1977-2016), three migration trajectories were found: (a) initially low and rapid increase; (b) initially high and relatively stable; and (c) generally low and slight increase.

We map the results per city to observe how clusters are geographically distributed (**Figure 6.9**). This is based on the hypothesis that local evolutions may be regionalized, although each port city remains relatively unique, and world regions may embrace very different trajectories. For vessel calls (upper figure), most cities handling a large traffic amount experienced limited migration (c). Among the exceptions are Houston, Marseilles, Odessa, as well as several British and Japanese port cities – together with Calcutta and Sydney to a lower extent. These cases of large ports experiencing migration are well-known cases of port-city separation dynamics, like Marseilles being emblematic of port-city separation in the seminal work of Hoyle (1989). Fast port migration (a) across the British Isles is a good confirmation of the Anyport model (Bird, 1963).

For container traffic (bottom figure), results do not show any particular regionalism, but a number of local evolutions. High and stable outport traffic (b) apply to several upstream port cities (Bordeaux, Nantes, London, Bremen, Guangzhou). Fast port migration (a) applies to urban areas comprising hub development (Tangier, Valletta, Dubai) or welcoming new container ports nearby (Fortaleza, Recife, Mumbai, Bangkok, Qingdao). The vast majority of urban areas experienced a slow and limited migration (c), reaching on average a maximum of 20% outport container traffic.

[Insert Figure 6.9 about here]

Conclusion

This chapter demonstrates that there is no simple and unambiguous answer to the questions concerning the dominant tendency shaping port migration. Earlier empirical evidence is derived from a small number of cases, the results of which tended to be contradictory, thereby justifying the particular arguments of each proponent. By undertaking a quantitative analysis of a global set of ports it was hoped that greater clarity would be possible. The results reveal that migration of port activities away from an urban context has taken place in all regions of the world, but varied in terms of level and pace, cargo type, and location. Nevertheless, from two different angles (vessel calls 1950-2010 and container traffic 1977-2016), three main categories of migration trajectories could be found. Part of the reason for the absence of a regionalism of port migration is that each port city remains relatively

unique regarding its combination of evolutionary factors. It is suggested also that the methodology in defining inner and outer traffic could be refined by a more rigorous classification based on field work.

A large number of factors drive port migration and relocation processes. While we demonstrated their relevance in this study, we do not suggest any prioritization. This engenders uncertainty as to how all the drivers are to be applied to question of port migration. It is evident, however there are important interdependencies between the main drivers that we summarize as spatial/physical economic/governance. For example, environmental legislation may set the conditions for port expansion that may shape future port functions and traffic. In turn the present effects of the three main drivers are shaped by the history and stage of life cycle of the port. The results of the quantitative analysis indicate a certain coevolution in the patterns of urban port migration, as the average share of outport traffic increased regularly should it be about cargo types, world regions, and location types. The classified trajectories help us to underline the existence of different “generations” of port migration, but those are not bound to a specific region of the world, or at most are found in specific terrains, like estuaries.

Further research shall consider tonnage instead of vessel calls to provide amore realistic analysis of long-term trends, as ship capacity is more suitable to measure bulk shipments. But it will inflate container traffic because vessels are engaged in multiport itineraries so the same size vessel making multiple calls will count the same. In addition, data should be updated to investigate port migration up to present day. In terms of methodology, there is a need to question how to characterize outer ports and measure their traffic. Here, a city-region approach was adopted in order to obtain a broad spatial perspective on *discontinuous* forms of port migration and relocation away from urban areas. It led to questions about the definition of specific sites as ‘outer’ in particular. Moreover, our urban approach and the lack of precision of the traffic data both confirmed and infirmed established cases where port migration was known to have happened but could not be properly measured and then compared. One inherent risk to our method is to mix outports, new ports, and rival ports in the same category, namely to consider migration and competition as one single phenomenon. One way forward is to better categorize locations in a harmonious way, so as to better bridge qualitative and quantitative, field observation and macro-level testing. In this vein, a more constraining approach focused on the patterns of terminal locations under the same governing body (see also the matrix presented in **Figure 6.2**) could provide some more nuanced results.

References

- Airriess C.A. (1991) Global economy and port morphology in Belawan, Indonesia. *Geographical Review*, 81: 183-196.
- Baird A.J. (1996) Containerisation and the decline of the upstream urban port in Europe. *Maritime Policy and Management*, 23: 145-156.
- Barke M. (1986) *Transport and Trade. Conceptual Frameworks in Geography*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.
- Bird J. (1963) *The Major Seaports of the United Kingdom*. London: Hutchinson.

- Bird J. (1971) *Seaports and Seaport Terminals*. London: Hutchinson.
- Bird J. (1973) Of central places, cities and seaports. *Geography*, 58: 105-118.
- Brocard M. (1988) Les relations fonctionnelles entre le port et la ville. Paper presented at the 1st International Conference Cities and Ports, Le Havre, France.
- Burghardt A.F. (1970) A hypothesis about gateway cities. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 61(2): 269-285.
- Charlier J. (1992) The regeneration of old port areas for new port uses. In: Hoyle B.S., Pinder D.A. (Eds.), *European Port Cities in Transition*. London: Belhaven Press, pp. 137-154.
- Charlier J. (1994) Anvers et le syndrome des docklands. Working Paper, Le Havre: International Association Cities and Ports.
- Cullinane K.P.B., Wang T.F. (2007) Port governance in China. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 17: 331-356.
- De Monie G. (1997) The global economy, very large containerships and the funding of mega hubs. Proceedings of the Cargo Systems Port Financing Conference, London, June 27.
- Ducruet C. (2013) Network diversity and maritime flows. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 30: 77-88.
- Ducruet C., Cuyala S., El Hosni A. (2018) Maritime networks as systems of cities: the long-term interdependencies between global shipping flows and urban development (1890-2010). *Journal of Transport Geography*, 66: 340-355.
- Ducruet C., Itoh H., Joly O. (2015) Ports and the local embedding of commodity flows. *Papers in Regional Science*, 94(3): 607-627.
- Ducruet C., Lee S.W. (2006) Frontline soldiers of globalisation: Port-city evolution and regional competition. *Geojournal*, 67(2): 107-122.
- El Hosni A. (2017) *Le Retour du Port dans la Ville*. Sarrebruck: Editions Universitaires Européennes.
- Eliot E. (2003) Chorotype de la métropole portuaire d'Asie du Sud. *Mappemonde*, 69(1): 7-10.
- Frémont A., Ducruet C. (2005) The emergence of a mega-port: from the global to the local, the case of Busan. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96(4): 421-432.
- Fujita M., Mori T. (1996) The role of ports in the making of major cities: self-agglomeration and hub-effect. *Journal of Development Economics*, 49(1): 93-120.
- Guerrero D., Rodrigue J.P. (2014) The waves of containerization: shifts in global maritime transportation. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 35: 151-164.
- Hall P.V., Clark A. (2010) Maritime ports and the politics of reconnection. In: Desfor G., Laidley J., Stevens Q., Schubert D. (Eds.), *Transforming Urban Waterfronts: Fixity and Flow*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 17-53.
- Hall P.V., Jacobs W. (2012) Why are maritime ports (still) urban, and why should policy-makers care? *Maritime Policy and Management*, 39(2): 189-206.
- Hall P.V., O'Brien T., Woudsma C. (2013) Environmental innovation and the role of stakeholder collaboration in West Coast port gateways. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 42(1): 87-96.

- Hayuth Y. (1981) Containerization and the load center concept. *Economic Geography*, 57(2): 160-176.
- Hoyle B.S. (1989) The port-city interface: Trends, problems and examples. *Geoforum*, 20(4): 429-435.
- Huo W., Zhang W., Chen P.S.L. (2018) Recent development of Chinese port cooperation strategies. *Research in Transportation Business and Management*, 26: 67-75.
- Jackson G. (1983) *The History and Archaeology of Ports*. Littlehampton Book Services Ltd
- Jacobs W. (2007b) Port competition between Los Angeles and Long Beach: An institutional analysis. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 98(3): 360-372.
- Jacobs W., Notteboom T.E. (2011) An evolutionary perspective on regional port systems: the role of windows of opportunity in shaping seaport competition. *Environment and Planning A*, 43(7): 1674-1692.
- Lee S.W., Song D.W., Ducruet C. (2008) A tale of Asia's world ports: The spatial evolution in global hub port cities. *Geoforum*, 39(1): 372-385.
- Lirn T.C., Thanopoulou H.A., Beynon M.J., Beresford A.K.C. (2004) An application of AHP on transshipment port selection: a global perspective. *Maritime Economics & Logistics*, 6(1): 70-91.
- Mangan J., Lalwani C., Fynes B. (2008) Port-centric logistics. *International Journal of Logistics Management*, 19(1): 29-41.
- Merk O. (2018) *Container Ship Size and Port Relocation*. Discussion Paper no. 169, International Transport Forum, Paris: OECD.
- Merk O., Ducruet C., Dubarle P., Haezendonck E., Dooms M. (2011) *The Competitiveness of Global Port-Cities: The Case of the Seine Axis (Le Havre, Rouen, Paris, Caen) - France*. OECD Regional Development Working Papers, no. 2011/7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kg58xppgc0n-en>
- Monios J., Wilmsmeier G. (2012) Port-centric logistics, dry ports and offshore logistics hubs: strategies to overcome double peripherality? *Maritime Policy and Management*, 39(2): 207-226.
- Ng A.K.Y., Ducruet C., Jacobs W., Monios J., Notteboom T.E., Rodrigue J.P., Slack B., Tam K.C., Wilmsmeier G. (2014) Port geography at the crossroads with human geography: between flows and spaces. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 41: 84-96.
- Ng A.K.Y., Pallis A.A. (2010) Port governance reforms in diversified institutional frameworks: generic solutions, implementation asymmetries. *Environment and Planning A*, 42(7): 2147-2167.
- Notteboom T.E., Rodrigue J.P. (2005) Port regionalization: Towards a new phase in port development. *Maritime Policy and Management*, 32(3): 297-313.
- Notteboom T.E. (2005) The peripheral port challenge in container port systems. In: Leggate H., Mcconville J., Morvillo A. (Eds.), *International Maritime Transport: Perspectives*, Routledge, pp. 173-188.
- Notteboom T.E. (2016) The adaptive capacity of container ports in an era of mega vessels: The case of upstream seaports Antwerp and Hamburg. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 54: 295-309.
- Notteboom T.E., Rodrigue J.P., Hall P.V. (2019) The drivers, impediments and outcomes of container ports migration and relocation: Analysis of a global sample of ports. Paper presented at the IAME 2019 conference, International Association of Maritime Economists, Athens, June.

- Notteboom T.E., Yang Z. (2017) Port governance in China since 2004: Institutional layering and the growing impact of broader policies. *Research in Transportation Business and Management*, 22: 184-200.
- Pounds N.J.G. (1947) Port and outport in North-West Europe. *The Geographical Journal*, 109(4-6): 216-228.
- Robinson R. (2002) Ports as elements in value-driven chain systems: the new paradigm. *Maritime Policy and Management*, 29(3): 241-255.
- Rodrigue J.P., Notteboom T.E. (2020) The containerization of commodities. *The Geography of Transport Systems*, <https://transportgeography.org/contents/applications/containerization-commodities/>
- Slack B. (1999) Satellite terminals: a local solution to hub congestion? *Journal of Transport Geography*, 7: 241-246.
- Slack B., Gouvernal E. (2016) Container transshipment and logistics in the context of urban economic development. *Growth and Change*, 47(3): 406-415.
- Slack B., Wang J.J. (2002) The challenge of peripheral ports: an Asian perspective. *GeoJournal*, 56(2): 159-166.
- Tiefenbrun S. (2012) *Tax Free Trade Zones of the World and in the United States*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vance J.E. (1970) *The Merchant's World. The Geography of Wholesaling*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Vigarié A. (1981) Maritime industrial development areas: Structural evolution and implications for regional development. In: Hoyle B.S., Pinder D.A. (Eds.), *Cityport Industrialization and Regional Development*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Wang C., Ducruet C. (2012) New port development and global city making: emergence of the Shanghai-Yangshan multilayered gateway hub. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 25: 58-69.
- Wang C., Ducruet C., Wang, W. (2015) Port integration in China: Temporal pathways, spatial patterns and dynamics. *Chinese Geographical Science*, 25(5): 612-628.
- Wang J.J., Chen M. (2010) From a hub port city to a global supply chain management center: a case study of Hong Kong. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 18(1):104-115.
- Wiegmans B., Louw E. (2011) Changing port-city relations at Amsterdam: A new phase at the interface? *Journal of Transport Geography*, 19(4): 575-583.
- Yap W.Y., Lam J.S.L. (2013) 80 million-TEU container port? Sustainability issues in port and coastal development. *Ocean and Coastal Management*, 71: 13-25.
- Zaremba P. (1962) Les principes du développement des villes portuaires. Paper presented at the conference of the Geographical Institute of Paris University, Académie Polonaise des Sciences, Fascicule No. 32, May 2nd.




Figure 6.1 Spatial processes of port migration and relocation of container terminals

Source: own compilation adapted from Notteboom, Rodrigue and Hall (2019)

		Port authority (managing body of the port)	
		Different for existing and new terminal(s)	Same for existing and new terminal(s)
Terminal operator(s)	All are different for existing and new terminal(s)	<p><i>Example:</i></p> <p>London Gateway, UK (DDM)</p>	<p><i>Example:</i></p> <p>Busan New Port, South Korea (DLM now; DLR in future)</p>
	All or some are the same for existing and new terminal(s)	<p><i>Example:</i></p> <p>JadeWeserPort, Wilhelmshaven, Germany (DDM)</p>	<p><i>Examples:</i></p> <p>Tuas Port, Singapore (DOM now; DOR in future)</p> <p>Yangshan, Shanghai, China (DOM)</p> <p>Deurganckdock, Antwerp, Belgium (CDM)</p>

Figure 6.2 Governance settings of port migration and relocation of container terminals

Source: own compilation

Note: see Figure 6.1 for abbreviations




Figure 6.3 London's inner and outer vessel traffic evolution

Source: own elaboration based on Lloyd's List data




Figure 6.4 Correlation between urban population and vessel traffic by type, 1880-2010

Source: own elaboration based on Lloyd's List and urban data




Figure 6.5. Outer traffic share by main cargo type, 1977-2008

Source: own elaboration based on Lloyd's List data




Figure 6.6 Outer traffic share by world region, 1950-2010

Source: own elaboration based on Lloyd's List data




Figure 6.7 Outer traffic share by location type, 1950-2008

Source: own elaboration based on Lloyd's List data




Figure 6.8 Morphologies of port cities

Source: adapted from Zaremba (1962)




Figure 6.8 (continued)





Figure 6.9 Typology of outer port traffic trajectories

Source: own elaboration based on Lloyd's List data, RStudio and TULIP software