FAERE

French Association
of Environmental and Resource Economists

Working papers

How can ports act to reduce underwater noise from shipping? Identifying effective management frameworks

Laura Recuero Virto - Hervé Dumez - Carlos Romero - Denis Bailly

WP 2021.13

Suggested citation:

L. Recuero Virto, H. Dumez, C. Romero, D. Bailly (2021). How can ports act to reduce underwater noise from shipping? Identifying effective management frameworks.
FAERE Working Paper, 2021.13.

ISSN number: **2274-5556**

www.faere.fr

"How can ports act to reduce underwater noise from shipping? Identifying effective management frameworks"

Laura Recuero Virto
Centre for the Law and Economics of the Sea (UMR M101 AMURE)
European Institute for Marine Studies, Rue Dumont d'Urville 29280 Plouzané, France
Interdisciplinary Institute for Innovation (UMR 9217 i3), École Polytechnique
Bâtiment Ensta, 828, Boulevard des Maréchaux, 91762 Palaiseau Cedex, France
laura.recuerovirto@univ-brest.fr

Hervé Dumez
Interdisciplinary Institute for Innovation (UMR 9217 i3)
École Polytechnique
Bâtiment Ensta, 828, Boulevard des Maréchaux, 91762 Palaiseau Cedex, France
herve.dumez@polytechnique.edu

Carlos Romero
ETS Ingenieros de Montes, Forestales y del Medio Natural
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid
Ciudad Universitaria s/n 28040 Madrid, Spain
carlos.romero@upm.es
&
Denis Bailly
Centre for the Law and Economics of the Sea (UMR M101 AMURE)
European Institute for Marine Studies
Rue Dumont d'Urville, 29280 Plouzané, France
denis.bailly@univ-brest.fr

Abstract

Through a survey and interviews with representative stakeholders, this paper aims to find mechanisms to align commercial interests with underwater noise reductions from commercial shipping. While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, port actions could support a reduction in underwater noise emissions from commercial shipping through changes in hull, propeller and engine design, and through operational measures associated with reduced speed, change of route and travel in convoy. Though the impact of underwater noise emissions on marine fauna is increasingly shown to be serious and wide-spread, there is uncertainty in the mechanisms, the contexts, and the levels which should lead to action, requiring precautionary management. Vessels owners are already dealing with significant investment and operating costs to comply with fuel, ballast water, NOx and CO2 requirements. To be successful, underwater noise programs must align with these factors.

Ports could propose actions such as discounted port fees and reduced ship waiting times at ports, both depending on underwater noise performance. Cooperation between ports to scale up actions through environmental indexes and classification societies' notations, and integration with other ports' actions could help support this. However, few vessels know their underwater noise baseline as there are very few hydrophone stations, and measurement methodologies are not standardized. Costs increase and availability decreases dramatically if the vessel buyer wants to improve the noise profile. Local demands regarding airborne noise close to airports boosted global pressure on the aviation industry to adopt existing quieting technology. This experience of the aviation noise control could inform the underwater noise process. Since 2017, the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority has been implementing a voluntary vessel slowdown trial for commercial vessels in key known foraging areas for southern resident killer whales, which are locally considered an emblematic species.

JEL-codes: Q53, Q56, Q58, Q25.
Key-words: Noise, ocean, pollution, shipping

1. Why focus on underwater noise from shipping?

The sounds in the ocean may come from natural sources, such as breaking waves, rain, earthquakes, ice and marine life. Sound in the ocean is referred to as underwater 'noise' only when it has the potential to cause negative impacts on marine life. Humans can add underwater noise to the marine environment. Anthropogenic underwater noise can have a series of adverse effects on marine biodiversity and ecosystems, ranging from masking effects whereby noise interferes with biologically important signals to behavioral disturbance, tissue damage and death (OSPAR, 2009a; CBD, 2012; NOAA, 2016, Weilgart 2018).[1] Such noise is generated by an increasingly large number and variety of anthropogenic activities in the marine environment. It is classified under two broad categories (EC, 2010; TSG UW Noise, 2013; OSPAR, 2014). Underwater impulsive or acute noise typically comes from seismic research surveys and oil and gas exploration, pile driving for offshore oil and gas platforms and wind farms, active sonar for naval, commercial, fishing and research operations, controlled explosions for naval operations and harbor deepening, and acoustic mitigation devices (Rijkswaterstaat, 2015).[2] Underwater ambient or chronic noise is usually generated by shipping, energy installations and construction, i.e. dredging for shipping lanes, sand mining, and laying pipes and cables (HELCOM, 2016a).

Underwater impulsive noise is generally characterized by relatively short-term and spatially more limited high intensity acoustic energy linked to a single activity (NOAA, 2016). This type of noise does not always result in easily detectable behavioral or physical changes. Seismic pulses can be detected at hundreds and thousands of kilometers (Nieukirk *et al.,* 2004). At these distances, seismic pulses become part of the background noise because reflections from seafloor and seabed, and ground transmission transform pulses in nearly continuous sound. High intensity noise from naval sonar and seismic surveys has been correlated with mortality events of marine mammals, often involving atypical mass strandings of beaked whales (Azzellino *et al.,* 2011). In particular, there have been over 40 mass strandings of Cuvier's beaked whales related with naval exercises (Z*iphius cavirostris)* since the 1960s worldwide (Hildebrand 2005; Weilgart, 2007). Seismic surveys have coincided also with mass strandings in several cases but no necropsies have been performed to investigate cause-effects relationships.[3]

Underwater ambient noise, on the other hand, is associated with continuous and lower intensity energy across large areas and is due to multiple activities (OSPAR, 2009b; NOAA, 2016). It may lead to chronic effects extending over several thousand kilometers within the frequency ranges used by marine animals for reproduction, detection of predators and prey, navigation and group cohesion (Stojanovic and Beaujean, 2013; Buscaino *et al.*, 2016). For instance, low frequency tones from a single large vessel can be heard as far away as 139 kilometers (Ross, 1976). Even if both underwater impulsive and ambient noise may result in a decrease in survival, the bulk of research on the impacts of anthropogenic underwater noise on marine animals has focused on impulsive noise. However, there

[1] According to the Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic, also known as the OSPAR Convention, when the sound has the potential to cause negative impacts on marine life it is considered to be "noise".

[2] Acoustic mitigation devices, which are typically used to deter marine mammals from industrial activities, generate noise (Brumm, 2013; Barker and Lepper, 2013).

[3] Several mass strandings of ziphiids took place during seismic surveys (Castellote and Llorents, 2013). Also, a pantropical striped dolphin with aberrant behavior was observed to sink motionless near a ship performing a seismic survey (Gray and Van Waerebeek, 2011). The dolphin entered into this apparently akinetic state after a period of intense swimming keeping its head out of the water, the latter interpreted as an intent to avoid acoustic exposure.

have been several studies on the effects of shipping noise on marine fauna, observing stress, behavioral changes and potential effects on foraging efficiency (Aguilar de Soto *et al.*, 2006; Dyndo *et al.*, 2015; Wisniewska *et al.*, 2018). These studies show how shipping noise can effect marine fauna, even if the effects of chronic anthropogenic changes in ambient noise have been traditionally more difficult to detect (NOAA, 2016).

Shipping noise is the dominant anthropogenic contribution to underwater ambient noise (Edmonds *et al.*, 2016; OSPAR, 2009a). It is also the most widespread and persistent source of underwater noise at the global scale (Merchant, 2019). Underwater ambient noise increased by about 3.3 dB per decade between 1950 and 2007 in some areas, doubling every 10 years, primarily attributed to the increase in the number and size of commercial ships (Frisk, 2012). Underwater ambient noise due to commercial shipping is set to continue to rise in the coming years, particularly in and around shipping lanes and in the Northern hemisphere (Hatch *et al.*, 2008). As at January 2017, there were 93,161 commercial ships worldwide (UNCTAD, 2017). They increased 2.7 fold between 1980 and 2017 in terms of weight-carrying capacity, the growth being over fivefold in the merchant fleets of developing countries which account for 76% of the world fleet (UNCTAD, 2018).[4] The largest commercial ships measure between 300 and 400 meters, independently of their type, with larger sizes usually reflecting higher cost savings (OECD/ITF, 2015). For instance, total container ship costs per container have been reduced by one third with the doubling of the size of vessels in the last decade. By contrast, the global fishing fleet is mainly composed of small vessels measuring fewer than 12 meters in length and about a third is not motorized (UN, 2010).[5] Industrial fishing vessels are relatively stable in number and gross tonnage (FAO, 2008).[6] There are about 2.1 million active motorized vessels under 12 meters worldwide, 320,000 between 12 and 24 meters and 50,913 over 24 meters, the largest ranging from 100 to 150 meters (Kroodsma *et al*., 2018).

The effect of ocean traffic on the underwater ambient noise level depends, among other factors, on the local sound propagation characteristics, the shipping speed, the shipping load and level of maintenance, the number of ships and the distance from the ship (Recuero Lopez, 1995; Lurton, 2010; Bassett *et al.*, 2010; IMO, 2014; Bureau Veritas, DNV GL, 2015; Berkowitz and Dumez, 2017). Underwater noise from shipping can come from propeller cavitation, machinery noise and hydrodynamic noise, i.e. the motion of the vessel through the water (U.S. Office of Naval Research, 1998). According to the 'Ships oriented innovative solutions to reduce noise and vibrations' (SILENV) project, the machinery and propellers are the main contributors to underwater noise in the European fleet (Beltran Palomo *et al.*, 2014). More precisely, machinery noise is dominant at low shipping speeds and low frequencies, particularly at speeds of up to 27 km/h (14.6 knots); otherwise, propeller noise is predominant (Curtis, 1951). In general terms, underwater noise ranges from 150 dB re 1µPa at 1m for small fishing vessels to 195 dB re 1µPa at 1m for oil tankers (Bassett *et al.*, 2010).[7] These levels are comparable to those emitted by biological sources, mainly marine mammals but also fish and invertebrates such as shrimp (Cato, 2001; Kuperman, 2013). However, there is good reason

[4] In terms of vessel types, bulk carriers accounted for 43% of the total commercial fleet in weight-carrying capacity in 2017, followed by oil tankers (29%), container ships (13%), other types of vessels including cruise ships (11%) and general cargo ships (4%) (UNCTAD, 2018).

[5] Overall, there were approximately 4.3 million fishing vessels worldwide in 2014, about three quarters of them in Asia (FAO, 2016).

[6] While some Asian countries such as Cambodia, Indonesia, Vietnam, Malaysia and Sri Lanka have recently increased their fishing fleet, others such as China, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the European Union, Iceland and Norway have decreased the number of vessels to deal with overcapacity (FAO, 2012a).

[7] The reference level used for underwater sound is 1µPa at 1m to relate acoustic energy levels to a standard pressure and distance.

to assume that marine life is better adapted to natural sources of sound, which they have experienced for eons, compared to recent, human-made ones. Especially for long-lived species, such as whales, and in cases of rapidly increasing background noise levels, animals are highly unlikely to be able to genetically adapt at a pace similar to that of habitat change (Rabin and Greene, 2002).

Underwater noise from ships is strongly contingent on the type of vessel, particularly on propeller cavitation (MAPAMA, 2012). Underwater noise from large commercial ships of over 100 meters is concentrated in low frequency ranges between 5 to 500 Hz, and can attain up to 220 dB re 1µPa at 1m (Sadaf *et al.,* 2015). Commercial vessels are the dominant source of underwater noise in this low frequency band (Joint Working Group on Vessel Strikes and Acoustic Impacts, 2012). This noise is often present near large ports and along shipping lanes, and can propagate over very long distances due to its low frequencies (Jasny, 2014).[8] Noise levels produced by medium-size ships in the range of 50 to 100 meters, such as modern freighters or fast-ferries, can be found in higher frequencies, of up to about 600 Hz - 2 kHz with the potential to interfere with the vocalizations of many species of odontocete cetaceans (Evans, 2003). Such ships produce noise levels in the range of 165 to 180 re 1µPa at 1m which contribute to marine ambient noise to varying degrees depending on their age and level of maintenance (OSPAR, 2009a). Small and medium boats and recreational vessels of fewer than 50 meters generate noise at higher frequencies, above 1 kHz, due to higher propeller rotation speeds (Abdulla and Linden, 2008). They may produce noise levels of the order of 160 to 175 dB re 1 µPa at 1m, and hence in some coastal areas the level of underwater noise can be high (Tejedor *et al.,* 2012).

Underwater acoustic energy is fundamental for marine animals since underwater communication typically depends on it. Indeed, optic, magnetic and electric modes are not well adapted to transmission in this environment (Recuero Lopez, 1995). A large number of marine animals rely on acoustic energy for communication and sensing (CBD, 2012; Radford *et al.,* 2012). These range from marine mammals and some fish which primarily detect acoustic pressure through their auditory system, to other fish and invertebrates which mainly detect particle motion, i.e. vibrations associated with acoustic energy, through sensory organs such as external sensory hairs and internal statocysts (Brumm, 2013; Nedelec, 2016). For instance, low-frequency sounds (15-30 Hz) of blue and fin whales can be detected from 400 to 1,600 kilometers away, an illustration of their ability to communicate across long distances (Sirovic et al., 2007). Odontocetes produce a series of fast clicks and the return echoes, as energy bounces off distant objects, provide information about their surroundings (Berta and Sumich, 1999). Settlement-stage invertebrates such as corals and crustaceans use reef noise as a cue for orientation (Simpson *et al.,* 2004; Montgomery *et al.,* 2006; Mann *et al.,* 2007; Vermeij *et al.,* 2010).

Depending on the acoustic intensity and the frequency, the effects of underwater noise on marine animals can be detectable in the hearing zone, can induce behavioral changes, can mask biologically important information, can cause hearing damage including temporary and permanent threshold shifts as well as other physical injuries or even death (Van der Graaf *et al.,* 2012). On a broader scale, the long-term consequences of anthropogenic underwater noise on marine animals at the level of the population as a whole are still largely unknown, both when considering this stressor alone and when accounting for cumulative impacts (CBD, 2012; NOAA, 2016; IMO, 2018a). To date, most research has explored the impacts of anthropogenic underwater noise on marine mammals, mainly cetaceans whose auditory sensitivity ranges from 7 Hz to 180 kHz (Southall *et al.,* 2007; CBD, 2012). There is

[8] Underwater noise from ships has a broadband contribution at medium to high frequencies and narrowband peaks at low frequencies (Traverso *et al.,* 2016). Noise from nearby shipping may be present therefore in a wide spectrum of frequencies, but only the lower frequencies below about 200 Hz attain a certain distance since high frequencies are attenuated in deep water (Jasny, 2014).

evidence that underwater noise leads to physical effects in a wide range of marine fauna from invertebrates to marine mammals, including hearing loss, decompression sickness and strandings (Aguilar de Soto and Kight, 2016; UN, 2018). Behavioral responses may include avoidance of a region with underwater noise, and may vary depending on several factors such as the nutritional, reproductive or migratory conditions (Richardson *et al.*, 1997; Bejder *et al.*, 2009). There is also evidence that cetaceans change the frequency, source level, redundancy or timing of their signals in the presence of anthropogenic underwater noise (CBD, 2012), with unknown impacts to them.

There is less but growing evidence on the impact of anthropogenic underwater noise on fish, turtles and invertebrates. The majority of fish detect acoustic energy from below 50 Hz to 500-1000 Hz, with most communication signals in the range of 100 Hz to 1 kHz (CBD, 2012). There are some species however, that detect sounds over 100 kHz (Popper and Hastings, 2009). Marine turtles are sensitive to low frequency acoustic energy in the range of 100 to 1 kHz with the greatest sensitivity between 200 and 400 Hz (Southwood *et al.*, 2008). Some recent evidence suggests that underwater noise can lead to physical, behavioral and masking effects in fish (Weilgart 2018). Evidence of the impacts on turtles is quite limited (CBD, 2012; Rijkswaterstaat, 2015; IMO, 2015; NOAA, 2016).[9] There is still a paucity of studies on invertebrates (Williams *et al.*, 2015). Very roughly 66 species of fish and 36 species of invertebrates have shown documented impacts from underwater noise pollution, however (Weilgart, 2018). Crustaceans are sensitive to acoustic energy of less than 1 kHz and detect up to 3 kHz, and cephalopods between <20 and 1,500 Hz (Packard *et al.*, 1990; Lovell *et al.*, 2005; Hu *et al.*, 2009; Jézéquel *et al.*, 2018). Anthropogenic noise may cause physical damage to invertebrates, including cephalopods (André *et al.*, 2011; Solé *et al*., 2013; Aguilar del Soto *et al.*, 2013 ; André *et al.*, 2016; Solé *et al.*, 2016 ; NOAA, 2016 ; Solé *et al.*, 2017, 2018, 2019). There is also evidence of behavioral and masking effects in crustaceans (Lagardère, 1982; Simpson *et al.*, 2011). The scientific understanding of the impacts of underwater noise from shipping on marine animals is limited (OSPAR, 2009a; CBD, 2012; IMO, 2018a). There is mainly evidence of the masking effects of underwater noise from shipping on marine mammals (IMO, 2018a). In fact, an overlap exists between the frequency ranges of noise from commercial vessels and the sounds used by many cetacean species (Clark *et al*., 2009). Underwater noise from commercial shipping can mask communications or foraging signals of baleen whales, belugas, bottlenose dolphins, short-finned pilot whales, killer whales and Cuvier's beaked whales (Aguilar Soto, 2006; CBD, 2012). Large commercial vessels can, for instance, hinder the ability of endangered whales to communicate within sanctuary waters (Hatch *et al.,* 2008).

There is also evidence that recreational and ice-breaker vessels negatively impact communication with conspecifics for marine mammals (CBD, 2012). Ice-breakers can also cause temporary hearing threshold shifts in beluga whales (Erbe and Farmer, 2000). Underwater noise from vessels has also been associated with short and long-term behavioral impacts in marine mammals, including habitat abandonment, disruption of foraging activity, and suppression or alteration of vocalization (Richardson *et al.,* 1995; Weilgart, 2007; Joint Working Group on Vessel Strikes and Acoustic Impacts, 2012; Blair et *al.*, 2016; Marley et *al.*, 2017; Bittencourt *et al.*, 2017). This type of noise can lead to chronic stress which can affect the health of the populations resulting in changes in fertility, mortality and growth rates (Wright *et al.*, 2009; IMO, 2018a).

[9] There are no studies on the effects of anthropogenic noise on elasmobranchs, namely, sharks, skates and rays whose hearing bandwidth is estimated to be in the range of 20 Hz to 1 kHz (Casper and Mann, 2009). Only studies involving air-gun arrays have been completed so far for turtles, providing some evidence of short-term physical and behavioral effects to underwater noise (CBD, 2012; NOAA, 2016).

To a lesser extent, there is also evidence of the impact of underwater noise from shipping on the communication and the behavior of fish, including stress responses and survival rates (Scholik and Yan, 2002; Wysocki et al., 2006; Sara *et al.,* 2007; Vasconcelos et al., 2007; Graham and Cooke, 2008; Standley *et al.,* 2011; Holles et al., 2013; Kaplan and Mooney, 2015; Sprague *et al.*, 2016; Celi *et al.,* 2016; Standley *et al.,* 2017; Ferrari *et al.,* 2018; McCormick *et al.,* 2018). Underwater noise from shipping is likely to affect marine invertebrates because of their sensitivity to low frequencies (CBD, 2012). There is some evidence of an impact on stress and behavior in crustaceans (Wale *et al.,* 2013; Filiciotto *et al.,* 2016).

Even though underwater noise from shipping is a topic which has aroused growing interest at the international level in recent years, it is subject to scientific uncertainties, especially regarding species-contingent thresholds. This does not mean that no action should be taken. Targets can be set based on the views of the relevant stakeholders that represent different views of society as a whole: port authorities and administrations, the shipping sector, the fisheries sector, analysts (academics and environmental consulting firms), and the biodiversity conservation community. This paper provides data-based guidance on the characteristics of a management framework conducive to reducing underwater noise from commercial shipping, the dominant source of underwater noise.

Through a survey on a representative sample of stakeholders and qualitative interviews with key actors, this paper aims to find mechanisms that will align commercial investment returns with environmental impact reductions. The analysis is based on the goal programing approach which identifies compromise solutions. It may be useful for politically sensitive situations or situations where stakeholders have highly divergent preferences. The results can be used to develop high-priority pilot programs for the commercial shipping sector. While the paper focuses on the shipping industry, the methodology can be replicated and applied to other maritime sectors, including renewable marine energies and oil and gas.

The remaining sections of this paper are organized as follows. In the second section, progress on actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping is described. In the third section, the methodology to explore the management frameworks to reduce underwater noise from shipping is presented in detail. In the fourth section, the results are shared. The fifth and last section puts forward some policy implications. The appendix contains complementary information about actions to abate underwater noise from shipping, and about the methodology used in this paper.

2. What progress has there been on actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping?

Underwater noise from shipping is a topic for which there has been a growing interest at the international level in recent years. In 2018, for instance, the focus topic of the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea was anthropogenic noise which includes shipping (UN, 2018). More generally, an increasing number of international institutions acknowledge the contribution of shipping to underwater noise (Table A1.1 in the appendix). Underwater noise from shipping, however, remains unregulated at the international level despite its transboundary nature (McCarthy, 2004; CBD, 2012; Dolman and Jasny, 2015).

There are nevertheless some initiatives on underwater noise at the level of international institutions (Table A1.2 in the appendix). Most international initiatives focus on the development of noise mapping for shipping, for instance, through the definition of indicators (EC, 2012; EC, 2017; HELCOM, 2016a). The Marine Strategy Framework Directive requires Member States of the European Union to evaluate and monitor the Good Environmental Status of ambient underwater noise (EC, 2010; Berkowitz and Dumez, 2017). There are, in turn, some guidelines for monitoring ambient noise under the Directive's pressure indicator 11.2, which are applied regionally (OSPAR, 2014; HELCOM, 2018a), as well as monitoring sub-programmes (HELCOM, 2018b).[10] Moreover, the International Whaling Commission (IWC) recommends an approach for identifying the noisiest ships, quantifying their contribution to overall ocean noise and assigning a priority to replacing/modifying those ships that contribute disproportionately to ocean noise (IWC, 2017a; 2017b).

There are also a relatively large number of international institutions that focus on options to mitigate underwater noise from shipping. Most options proposed build on the voluntary guidelines of the United Nations agency specialized in setting global standards for international shipping, the International Maritime Organization (IMO). In particular, the IMO issued voluntary Guidelines in 2014 for quieting underwater noise radiated from commercial ships (IMO, 2014). Except for fishing research vessels, there are no underwater noise requirements in contract specifications in Europe. The absence of contractual requirements is one of the main causes of the unavailability of underwater radiated noise data (Beltran Palomo *et al.*, 2012). It also explains why it is not possible to make an assessment of the environmental impact of the European fleet (Beltran Palomo, 2014).

Technology to reduce underwater ship noise from machinery and propellers is already available (Berkowitz and Dumez, 2017), however not all factors and combinations are understood. Other factors such as cost/benefit ratios, fuel efficiency and technical viability should be also considered (Beltran Palomo *et al.*, 2012). Overall, there is no one-size-fits-all solution to underwater noise from vessels (Berkowitz and Dumez, 2017). Mitigation options on vessels should preferably be applied during the design phase (Beltran Palomo, 2014; Berkowitz and Dumez, 2017). Some noise reduction methods incorporated in the design phase also increase efficiency (Jasny, 2014). In the design phase, a 3-5 dB underwater noise reduction could be achieved at about 1% of the total cost of the vessel (Berkowitz and Dumez, 2017). Some experts consider that retrofitting to improve the current environmental impact of old vessels is not technically and economically feasible on a broad scale (Beltran Palomo, 2014). Moreover, there is insufficient information for wide-ranging cost-benefit analyses (Rijkswaterstaat, 2015). Imposing regulatory limits on the noisiest vessels could be the most effective solution and would result in design improvements on future vessels and more appropriate maintenance and operational parameters for existing ones (Bureau Veritas, DNV GL, 2015). This process might be done more quickly by publishing lists of the noisiest vessels and recognizing the best ones.

Given the difficulty in applying design measures, operational measures can provide a short-term solution to tackling underwater noise from shipping. Such operational measures can involve limiting or optimizing speed, traffic regulation, zoning and the creation of marine protected areas (Bureau Veritas, DNV GL, 2015). However, for certain vessels, namely large research vessels and coastal tankers, the propeller can generate high noise levels at low ship speeds. And by traveling at a lower speed, the vessel will remain for a longer time in the area concerned. The best solutions need to be found by exploring ship traffic scenarios using appropriate propagation models which should be verified by measurements.

The progress made by international institutions on the impact of underwater noise from shipping on marine fauna is much more limited. Since there is very little information available on the effects of the increased ambient noise level on marine biodiversity and ecosystems, it is yet not possible to give concrete advice on how to interpret the results of the measurements (OSPAR, 2014). Indeed, in order to link a pressure indicator on underwater noise to a good environmental status, there is a need to establish thresholds which are consistent with the status indicators for biodiversity (HELCOM,

[10] There is on-going work in HELCOM on the development of an HELCOM Action Plan on Underwater Noise, preferably by 2021, following the commitment of the HELCOM Ministerial Declaration 2018 (paragraph 39).

2016a). Species-contingent limits should integrate behavioral and masking effects (IWC, 2014, IWC, 2015). Such limits should ideally also take into account the chronic and cumulative impacts of noise-generating and non-noise-generating activities that exert pressure over biodiversity and ecosystems (HELCOM, 2018c). Some preliminary analyses and tools for chronic and cumulative multi-sector noise exposure levels are available for marine mammals (Wright, 2009; Wright *et al.*, 2009; Dolman and Jasny, 2015).

The harmonization and the improvement of measuring procedures, as well as an agreement on the thresholds between analysts and the marine industry are key (TSG UW Noise, 2013; Bahtiarian, 2014; Bureau Veritas, DNV GL, 2015; appendix A1.4). ICES No.209 limits for fishing research vessels, for instance, are too permissive according to some scientists. Conversely, they are considered as excessive by shipbuilders (Beltran Palomo *et al.*, 2012). Moreover, there is no clear evidence that the investment in noise abatement in research vessels associated with ICES recommendations has reduced fish avoidance reactions (De Robertis and Handegard, 2013).

Some countries have developed monitoring programs on underwater noise from shipping, as well as studies (Table A1.3 in the appendix). Moreover, there are a limited number of countries where regulations are already in place or are planned. In the United States, the Greater Farallones and Cordell Bank sanctuaries have experimented with voluntary speed reductions for vessels to protect whales from strikes and acoustic impacts (Joint Working Group on Vessel Strikes and Acoustic Impacts, 2012). In Germany and in Sweden, noise generating activities are excluded from certain areas, for instance, by moving shipping lanes (HELCOM, 2017b). In Sweden, there are also design and onboard machinery measures aimed at mitigating the noise from ship traffic on a voluntary basis. These measures should improve fuel efficiency and maintenance (HELCOM, 2017a). In Malta, noise and light emissions from navigation and other sea-based recreational activities are regulated in two special marine areas (EU, 2018). In Australia, there are speed limitations in caution zones for cetaceans (Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy Ministry, 2000).

The most important actions on underwater noise from shipping have taken place in Canada. In 2014, the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority is working with stakeholders through the Enhancing Cetacean Habitat and Observation (ECHO) Program (IMO, 2018b). It is monitoring noise from shipping and sounds from marine mammal vocalizations (Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, 2018). To our knowledge, it is the first port with a permanent noise monitoring system (Bahtiarian, 2017). Since 2017, the port authority has also been implementing a voluntary vessel slowdown trial for commercial vessels in important known foraging areas for southern resident killer whales. BC Ferries, in support of its commitment to the ECHO Program, carried out a study that showed that reduced speed increases the noise made by some ferries in their fleet and thus should be applied only to avoid collisions with marine mammals for those particular models, whereas speed reductions are effective for other ferry models (IMO, 2018b). Ferries, however, are an exception in this regard. For most ships, a reduction in speed reduces underwater radiated noise (MacGillivray *et al*, 2018), greenhouse gas emissions, operational costs, and collisions risk with marine mammals (Leaper, 2019).

The Vancouver Fraser Port Authority and the Prince Rupert Port Authority have offered incentives to ships using quieting technology or with quiet notations since 2017, making Canada the first country to provide such incentives. Their programs include Bureau Veritas, DNV-GL, Lloyd's Register, ABS and RINA quiet vessel notations (qualifying them for a 47-50% discount in harbor dues). Vessels with cavitation reduction or wake flow improvement technologies, including Becker Mewis ducts, MMG Energy Savings Cap, Nakashima ECO-Cap, Nakashima Ultimate Rudder, Propeller Boss Caps Fin (PBCF), Schneekluth duct and Wärtsilä EnergoProFin are eligible for a 10% (Prince Rupert Port Authority) or 23% (Vancouver Fraser Port Authority) discount in harbour dues (Vancouver Fraser

Port Authority, 2018, 2020; Port of Prince Rupert, 2019, appendix A1.5). In 2019, both ports added the Green Marine performance indicator that integrates new criteria for underwater noise. The green certification society, Green Marine, has included two indicators on underwater noise from ships and port activities in its North American environmental certification program. Their goal is to reduce the impact of this noise on marine mammals (Jasny, 2014).

3. The methodology.

3.1. The scope of the project.

A steering committee was set up in 2018 to provide guidance on the analysis reported in this paper on underwater noise from shipping (Appendix 2). The members of the steering committee are key experts or major players in the field of underwater noise. There are 36 members from the following social groups: port authorities and administrations (port authorities, global and regional institutions and national administrations), the shipping sector (ship owners and industry, shipyards including engineering consulting firms, ship classification societies and marine-life-watching sea cruises), the fisheries sector (fisheries including small-scale and indigenous fishing communities), analysts (academics and environmental consulting firms) and the biodiversity conservation community (institutions specializing in marine mammals and non-governmental organizations). The social groups were selected to include all relevant stakeholders in the decision-making process regarding underwater noise from shipping. The initial assignment of each stakeholder to a social group was sometimes modified to account for requests from members to properly reflect common interests within the same group. 24 members of the steering committee are from Europe, 11 members from North America and one member from South Africa.

The first round of discussions with the members of the steering committee took place between July and September 2018. The project initially aimed to analyze the relationship between underwater noise from shipping and the economic performance of socioeconomic activities impacted by this noise, in a local area to be selected (UN, 2018). However, none of the members of the steering committee reported any impact of underwater noise on the performance of activities associated with the ocean which included large cruise lines, recreational boating, water sports and fishing. This was the case even for tourist hotspots near very busy shipping lanes. In some cases, the members stated that underwater noise from shipping may have an impact on the economic performance of some activities such as water sports or fishing but that disentangling the effect of this pressure from the impact of other pressures including the noise generated by the activities themselves is not possible. Moreover, the impact of underwater noise is not perceived as being among the strongest pressures. The absence of a baseline on underwater noise from shipping was identified as an important obstacle to gaining a good understanding of the impact of this pressure. These barriers to getting baselines for locations, vessels or fleets are due to the absence of standard methods and locations to measure vessel sounds. Moreover, while there are quiet vessel notations, applying these to a large percentage of global vessels would be a very costly endeavor.

It was decided then that the project should focus on underwater noise from shipping at the global scale. The IMO has already issued guidance on ship-quieting measures to address adverse impacts on marine life, but these are non-mandatory recommendations (IMO, 2014). Moreover, IMO’s mandatory recommendations in the past concerning onboard noise on ships have taken several decades to be approved by Member States and some experts consider they are not sufficiently effective (high emission thresholds), even though this noise directly affects humans. Most recently, a new work output has been put forward to the Marine Environmental Protection Committee of the IMO by Canada, and co-sponsors Australia and the United States, to review the 2014 Guidelines and determine next steps. In order to develop short-term management actions on underwater noise from shipping it was decided to work at the scale of ports. Ports have an important role in supporting the shipping sector to successfully manage the transition to clean shipping, including reducing underwater noise. In particular, the actions ports take to reduce underwater noise can play an important supporting role in driving behavioral change.

3.2. The design of the survey.

The survey explores the role of ports in influencing the reduction of underwater noise from shipping. The objective of the survey was to find the best compromise solutions which will act on underwater noise from shipping and integrate the needs of the target audience, namely, port authorities, the maritime affairs administration, the shipping sector, the fisheries sector, analysts and the biodiversity conservation community. The target audience for the survey was selected with the support of and information provided by the members of the steering committee. The first version of the survey was tested in a case study of the port of Le Havre (Recuero Virto *et al.,* 2019). A mission to Le Havre took place in the second week of November 2018. Representatives from the most relevant social groups were interviewed and were requested to complete the survey. Some experts were also contacted afterwards by telephone. Given this test at Le Havre and the feedback provided by the members of the steering committee between November 16 and December 7, the first version of the survey was significantly modified (Appendix 3).[11]

The first conclusion that can be drawn from the survey is that underwater noise solutions will depend on the particular port's characteristics and local fauna.[12] Indeed, survey responses can be relatively diverse due to the wide variation in port configurations, navigation channels, impacted marine resources, port schedules and other features. This fact was taken into account to consolidate all the survey responses into one cohesive set of conclusions. For example, a deepwater port that has a number of access options, for example, several shipping channels with the necessary drafts to accommodate vessels calling in on that port, would be well placed to support a rerouting measure. Conversely, a port with limited navigation channels would probably choose other options to reduce underwater noise. In addition, the relative density of shipping in a given port results in different approaches. For instance, a port with low traffic density has a smaller impact on receivers than a port with high traffic density.

The survey is composed of three main questions. In the first two questions, the survey covers two perspectives (Tables 3.1 and 3.2). The first perspective is an individual ship as a point source and its impact on near and medium range receivers. The second perspective is shipping as a whole and its contribution to ambient noise levels at the port, regional and ocean basin levels. The first question in the survey proposes a set of options that ports could support to reduce underwater noise from shipping (AQUO consortium, 2014; Vakili, 2018; Merchant, 2019; Vard Marine Inc., 2019). Technical solutions not included in Table 3.1 may be very specific, may have an important drawback or have not been sufficiently tested.[13] Respondents are required to provide a score between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value.

[11] The survey was significantly modified in terms of its format (shortened and simplified) and its content (clarified).

[12] For EU ports it is worth emphasizing the usefulness of NATURA2000 database that enables to get the species of interest in a defined area.

[13] These technical solutions include changes in propellers (water jets, forward skew propellers in ducts, contracted and loaded tip propellers), propulsion types (pod propulsion), reductions in turns per knot, the

Table 3.1. Question 1: While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following options should port actions preferably seek to support to reduce underwater noise from shipping?

Options with global impacts on underwater noise
Design: Hull, propeller, engine (when the measures increase energy efficiency and reduce underwater noise and air emissions)
Design: Type of fuel (liquefied natural gas, methanol, fuel cells, battery hybrid) (to reduce underwater noise and air emissions; not all solutions are mature)
Design: Larger vessels (to reduce underwater noise and air emissions)
Operational: Ship maintenance (hull, propeller) (to increase energy efficiency and to reduce underwater noise and air emissions)
Operational: Ships operate at design load conditions (to increase energy efficiency and reduce underwater noise and air emissions) (optimum trim and ballast conditions for a certain speed)
Options with local impacts on underwater noise
Operational: Ships at reduced speed, change of route, travel in convoy (can reduce underwater noise; can increase shipping costs) (usually limited to a small geographical area, their applicability depending on the port's characteristics)
Operational: Ships use onshore power supply facilities at ports (to reduce underwater noise and air emissions)

Concerning design measures, while structural solutions (structural damping, increasing hull thickness, using lightweight materials like fiber reinforced plastic) should be added at the shipbuilding stage, they can sometimes be expensive. Other solutions associated with the propeller and the hull (EnergoProFin – Wärtsilä, high skew propellers, Schneekluth ducts, Becker Mewis ducts, ECO-Cap – Nakashima, propeller boss cap fins, decoupling of hull coating) can be implemented during dry dockings and can have relatively short payback times. Design options to reduce machinery noise in existing vessels include the use of elastic mountings, considered to be a cost-efficient solution, and the inclusion of an active insulation, which is very effective but too expensive for commercial shipping. Larger ships mean fewer total transits, and more cargo carried at smaller increases in engine size. Both of these factors should help reduce underwater noise from shipping. The use of fuel cells can reduce radiated noise, but they are more expensive than ordinary fuel and require new propulsion systems (Tronstad *et al.,* 2017). Noise requirements could be aligned with transport capacity. This would enable heavier vessels to be noisier as is the case in the aircraft industry. In turn, it would provide incentives to use fewer and larger vessels (Merchant, 2019).

Regarding operational measures, propeller and hull maintenance solutions (propeller repair or maintenance, hull cleaning) can be implemented during docking periods and result in modest reductions in noise emissions with costs dependent on the size of the propeller and hull. The optimal condition of trim and ballast optimizes fuel consumption and may also reduce noise propagation. Indeed, vessels are designed to operate at specific speed and load conditions. Traffic control solutions (speed reduction, travel in convoy, regulated areas) may reduce underwater noise emissions but increase traveling time and hence have an impact on time efficiency. An optimal trade-off between intensity and the length of exposure may be reached at a speed of about 8 knots (McKenna *et al.*, 2013). For large container vessels this speed would be unsafe under some wind and wave conditions.

---

optimization of hull design, acoustic enclosure, wake conditioning devices (nozzles, Grothues spoilers), double hulls, Nautronix signal acoustic digital spread and Sonardyne signal Wideband.

Also, reducing speed to this level in large areas would require the addition of more vessels to provide the same service, which could counteract the benefits. Moreover, although ports have a certain jurisdictional power within their territorial waters, it is usually limited to a very small geographical area. Hence, when ports ask ships coming into port to slowdown, or reroute, the geographical area affected is very small with the exception of some ports that play an important leadership role beyond their territorial waters such as the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority. This port is coordinating many projects outside its boundaries in collaboration with many stakeholders. The use of onshore power facilities at ports reduces underwater noise locally but requires a significant investment by ports and ship owners and is reliant on the local electricity market to be implemented successfully.

For each option proposed in this question, the synergies between underwater noise reductions, energy efficiency increases and air emission reductions are described (Gassmann et al., 2017; Vakili, 2018; OCDE/ITF, 2018a). It is important to emphasize that increasing efficiency does not necessarily result in a reduction in underwater noise emissions. In general, this is the case for energy efficiency, but typically not for other forms of efficiency such as the utilization of capacity (number of ships needed), time efficiency (delays and degradation of product quality over time), cost efficiency (the balance between operational costs, investments and revenues). The survey focuses on energy efficiency because it is perceived as a major issue for the shipping sector given the significance of fuel consumption on operational costs. It also focuses on air emissions since ports are concerned about this type of pollution due to local pressure.

The second question in the survey proposes a set of actions that ports should preferably take to reduce underwater noise from shipping. Respondents are required to provide a score between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value. Many of the actions in Table 3.2 are inspired by the actions made available to ports to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (OECD/ITF, 2018b). These emissions have impacts at the global scale, like underwater noise emissions, in contrast to other air emissions that are mainly of a local concern such as sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides and particulate matter. Environmental port fees for energy efficiency were applied by 28 of the world's major ports as measured by tonnage or container volume in 2018. Environmental port fees have been used as an incentive for speed reductions in four ports (12 knots at a distance of 20 to 40 nautical miles from the port): Los Angeles, Long Beach, New York-New Jersey and San Diego. They have also been used to support the use of low-carbon fuels/energy, in particular liquefied natural gas, to support the reduction of air emissions in six ports: Antwerp, Bremerhaven, Gothenburg, Hamburg, Rotterdam, Singapore and the Panama Canal Authority. Some ports and countries also provide financial incentives for ships that use onshore power facilities to reduce local air emissions: Port of Vancouver (discounts on port fees), Stockholm (subsidy) and Sweden (tax exemption).

Table 3.2 Question 2: While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following actions should ports preferably take to reduce underwater noise from shipping?

Actions with global impacts on underwater noise
Port fees charged according to underwater noise performance (rebates for ships with better performance or differentiated fees according to performance)
Priority in the allocation of berth slots for ships generating less underwater noise
Actions with local impacts on underwater noise
Underwater noise criteria in selecting port service providers (terminal operators, towage operators, dredgers)

Reduction in ship waiting time at ports through collaboration along the entire logistical maritime chain
(mooring, berthing, anchoring, cargo handling; possibly leading to mutual benefits, for instance, through the reduction in the waiting time compensation paid by ports)

Proper port and barrier design, onshore energy facilities
(relocation of noisiest activities, physical barriers against noise propagation, containers on rubber insulation, onshore power supply, electric charging systems, bunkering facilities for alternative fuels, etc.)

Underwater noise mitigation equipment to protect local fauna
(devices to displace marine fauna such as acoustic deterrents or to act as a barrier against noise such as air bubble curtains)

Most of these environmental port fees are based on one or more indexes relating to the environmental performance of the ship, particularly energy efficiency and air emissions. Most port fee rebates range from 5% to 20%, although some ports offer a 50% discount.[14] Some ports offer a fixed amount that is regularly revised upwards to increase the incentives for ships to adopt the suggested changes. Rebates remain marginal with respect to total operating costs. Incentives are economically meaningful for ships to adopt changes only once a large number of ports join a specific initiative. As such, coordination between ports in setting priorities, as well as the harmonization of indexes and their widespread use by ports will favor the adoption of the requested changes by the shipping sector. While higher degrees of differentiation in port fees between "green" and "dirty" ships could probably drive more change, ports typically only offer discounts to higher performance ships. This means the costs are paid for only by ports and therefore there is no leakage effect associated with port competition. This is not consistent however, with the polluter-pays principle since lower performance ships are not penalized.

Greener ships have priority in the allocation of berth slots through the Environmental Premium Program in Panama that has been in place since 2017. This type of action is uncommon. Similarly, ports are only beginning to focus on reducing waiting and turn-around time at ports. Ship waiting and turn-around time impacts the operational costs of ships associated with speed slowdown but also emissions. However, minimizing this time requires the engagement of port authorities and terminal operators and they do not necessarily have the incentives to set up such programs. In terms of green procurement, many European ports use environmental criteria to award concessions to terminal operators. Environmental criteria are rarely taken into account in licenses or contracts with towage or dredging companies. Furthermore, some researchers argue that onshore power could reduce underwater noise impacts on marine species, but also the spread of invasive species among vessels in ports (Weilgart 2018). However, an appropriate port design may involve significant costs for the port and has only a very local impact on underwater noise emissions (Merk, 2013). The use of devices to displace marine fauna such as acoustic deterrents or to act as a barrier against noise such as air bubble curtains should be used only in the local presence of species that can be potentially impacted by underwater noise emissions from shipping. Acoustic deterrents are problematic in that they add yet more noise and often do not just displace the species of interest, but a broader number of species.

The third question in the survey proposes nine management options (q=9) that can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping. Best practices in past marine spatial planning experiments have been explored to analyze their degree of effectiveness and efficiency in addressing coordination problems between stakeholders in coastal and marine areas, and to find out to what extent they can apply to underwater acoustic pollution from shipping. The characteristics that are associated with successful marine spatial planning programs are related to the degree of decentralization, the

[14] The Port of Long Beach CA offers a 100% rebate for vessels that use shore power while at berth and slow to less than 12 knots inside 40 nautical miles both inbound and outbound.

level of flexibility, the definition of temporal and spatial scales, the degree of political support, financial sustainability, the weighting given to key priorities, integration with respect to existing frameworks, stakeholder participation, data gathering and the development of ex-ante and ex-post (local) cost-benefit analyses (Jay, 2017). Following exchanges with the members of the steering committee, the final set of management options proposed in the survey to support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping can be found in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3. Question 3: Using the comparison scale, which of the following options can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping?

Designation	Options
O_1	Raising awareness (among port staff and the general public; through training, ports' corporate social responsibility reports)
O_2	Actions of a voluntary nature
O_3	Focus on key priorities (noisiest ships, biodiversity hotspots)
O_4	Integration with other actions (other actions on air emissions and energy efficiency; for example, by making underwater noise a key green indicator)
O_5	Different actions applied to green and dirty ships (not only positive actions for green ships)
O_6	Broad stakeholder participation
O_7	Cooperation between ports to scale up actions (greater harmonization of green actions and indicators; joint request for action by the IMO)
O_8	Political and/or social demand
O_9	Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)

The answers to question 3 are used as input to feed a group decision making model valid for the aggregation of the individual preferences to obtanin group preferences. In order to achieve that purpose a methodology developed for searching for compromise consensus was straightforwardly applied (González-Pachón and Romero, 1999, Linares and Romero, 2002). this time of methodology is based upon the well-known decision-making approach known as goal programming belonging to the multiple criteria decision making (MCDM) paradigm (Ignizio, 1985; Romero, 1991). Using this methodology, respondents are required to compare two options at a time (appendix 3). To simplify matters ,and in order to avoid a huge and un-manageable number of questions, instead of requesting respondents to compare all options with one another to obtain a full matrix ($q \cdot q$), respondents are required to compare options O_1 - O_8 with respect to option O_9 (effectiveness assessment).

In question 3, respondents first have to indicate which of the two options they prefer. Then, they indicate the importance of one option over another according to the comparison scale in Table 3.4. Once each respondent has made$q$-1comparisons, the full matrix can be derived assuming perfect consistency in the answers that respondents would have given had they compared all options with one another. Given the relative importance of option i over option h, a_{ih}, under perfect consistency $a_{ih} \cdot a_{hi} = 1 \; \forall \, i, j$and $a_{ih} = a_{is} \cdot a_{sh} \forall \, i, h, s$. The weights for the criteria are determined for each of the matrices with preference values using the eigenvalue technique (Nordström *et al.*, 2012). Under this methodology, the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue is found for each pairwise comparison. For each individual response, m weights are obtained, i.e. one weight per criterion under a $q \cdot 1$ matrix (Saaty 1997, 1980).

Table 3.4. Comparison scale for question 3.

Explanation of the comparison scale	Numeric values to enter
If option O_i and O_k are EQUALLY important	1
If option O_i is MODERATELY more important than option O_k	3
If option O_i is STRONGLY more important than option O_k	5
If option O_i is VERY STRONGLY more important than option O_k	7
If option O_i is EXTREMELY more important than option O_k	9

Note: O_i and O_k represent the different options in Table 3.3. where i=1,…,q and k=1,…, q with k≠i and m=9.

There are two parts to this MCDM methodology. First, for each social group, the individual member weights associated with each criterion are aggregated to achieve the social group's preference for each criterion. Second, the solutions obtained for each social group are then aggregated to achieve the preferences of society as a whole on each criterion. In the first part of the analysis, aggregation of the answers of each social group's members can be performed using a median weight. Indeed, the members of the same social group are supposed to have similar social perceptions. In the second part of the analysis, the aggregation method should take into account the fact that the social groups' preferences for each criterion may reflect a wide range of social perceptions. In this context, the following extended goal programming model is proposed for the aggregation of the social groups' preferences (Romero, 2001; Linares and Romero, 2002):

Achievement function:
$\text{Min } (1-\lambda)D+\lambda\sum_{i=1}^{q}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(\bar{n}_{ij}+\bar{p}_{ij})$
[1]
such that

Goals:
$\sum_{i=1}^{q}(\bar{n}_{i1}+\bar{p}_{i1}) - D\leq 0$
[1.1]
...
$\sum_{i=1}^{q}(\bar{n}_{im}+\bar{p}_{im}) - D\leq 0$

$W_i^s+\bar{n}_{ij}-\bar{p}_{ij} = W_i^j,\ i\in\{1,...,q\},\ j\in\{1,...,m\}$
[1.2]
$\bar{n}\geq 0, \bar{p}\geq 0, \lambda\in[0,1]$

Accounting rows:
$\sum_{i=1}^{q}(\bar{n}_{i1}+\bar{p}_{i1}) - D_1=0$
[1.3]
…
$\sum_{i=1}^{q}(\bar{n}_{im}+\bar{p}_{im}) - D_m=0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{q}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(\bar{n}_{ij}+\bar{p}_{ij}) - Z = 0$ [1.4]

where i={1,...,q} are the criteria with q=9, j={1,...,m} are the social groups with m=6, $\bar{n}_{ij}$ and $\bar{p}_{ij}$ are the negative and positive deviation auxiliary variables measuring the difference between the consensus value for the ith criterion and the value attributed to the ith criterion by the jth social group, λ is the control parameter, D represents the disagreement of the social group with the preferences that are most different from the consensus obtained, $D_1, \dots, D_m$ represent the disagreement of each group with respect to the consensus obtained, W_i^j is the preference weight attached to the ith criterion by the jth social group, W_i^s is the preference weight attached to the ith criterion by society and $Z = \sum_{i=1}^{m} D_i$.

The achievement function [1] is used to derive the final weights W_i^s attached to each criterion by society from the intermediate weights W_i^j attached to each criterion by each social group. For λ=0, the achievement function is Min D subject to [1.1]-[1.4], where the model finds a consensus for society that minimizes the disagreement of the most displaced social group, the minority consensus. For λ=1, the achievement function is Min $\sum_{i=1}^{q}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(\bar{n}_{ij}+\bar{p}_{ij})$ subject to [1.2], where the model instead finds a consensus for society that maximizes the average agreement, the majority consensus. For the intermediate values of λ, the model derives compromise solutions between the minority and the majority consensus. Note that the consensus weight attached to $\lambda=1$ is statistically defined by the median weight (see, for instance, Cook and Seiford, 1978).

4. The survey results.

The data from 38 respondents were collected between March and June 2019. The respondents worked in institutions located in 15 countries in the European Union and in North America. There were a larger number of respondents from the United States (6), France (6), Canada (4), Sweden (4), the Netherlands (3) and Denmark (3) than from the remainder of the countries (table A4.1 in the appendix). The number of social groups is designated by m, where m=5. Indeed, there were eight respondents from port authorities, four respondents from maritime affairs administrations, 10 from the shipping sector, 12 from the academic or environmental consulting sector, and four from non-governmental institutions (Table A4.2 in the appendix). The eight respondents from ports came from six countries and they all worked for ports that are considered large in terms of container and/or cargo volume. There were no respondents from the fisheries sector. This is consistent with the preliminary findings which showed that the fisheries sector considered underwater noise to be a minor problem among other sectoral concerns. The final set of social groups that were part of the analysis can be found in Table 4.1. Even though the survey requested the submission of individual views, respondents often sent in one grouped response per institution.

Table 4.1. Social groups.

Designation	Social groups	Stakeholders
D_1	Port authorities	Port authorities
D_2	Maritime affairs administration	Maritime affairs administration
D_3	The shipping sector	Ship owners and industry, shipyards including engineering consulting firms and ship classification societies and marine-life-watching sea cruises.
D_4	Analysts	Academics and environmental consulting firms.
D_5	The biodiversity conservation community	Institutions specializing in marine mammals and non-governmental organizations.

In Tables 4.2 and 4.3, the mean values of the answers of each group of respondents to questions 1 and 2 in the survey are presented. Concerning question 1, “while acknowledging the wide variations in ports’ specificities, which of the following options should port actions preferably seek to support to reduce underwater noise from shipping?”, at the aggregate level (last column in Table 4.2) there are two options that are preferred. Firstly, respondents preferred changes in the design of the hull, the propeller or the engine with an 8.4 score out of 10. A respondent from the shipping sector argued that incentives for energy-efficient low-noise propulsion systems should be developed. Secondly, respondents preferred operational measures associated with reduced speed, change of route and travel in convoy with a 7.9 score out of 10. At the aggregate level, ship maintenance was the third option preferred by respondents with a 6.9 score out of 10. A respondent from the shipping sector wondered who would assess ship maintenance and how. Respondents gave the lowest score to changes in design to produce larger ships with a 5.5 score out of 10. A respondent noted that larger vessels are not a possible option in marine areas such as the Baltic Sea. Respondents had a slight preference for options with local impacts on underwater noise (7.2) compared to global impacts on underwater noise (6.6). Respondents gave an overall score of 6.7 out of 10 to the options proposed with global and local impacts on underwater noise.

Table 4.2. While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following options should port actions preferably seek to support to reduce underwater noise from shipping? (mean values, question 1).

	Port authority	Maritime affairs administration	Shipping sector	Analysts	Biodiversity conservation community	All groups
Design: Hull, propeller, engine	6.5	9.0	8.7	9.0	8.8	8.4
Design: Type of fuel	7.0	7.3	5.3	5.5	5.3	6.1
Design: Larger vessels	5.4	6.0	5.6	5.3	5.3	5.5
Operational: Ship maintenance	6.1	7.3	6.9	7.1	7.3	6.9
Operational: Ships operate at design load conditions	4.9	6.0	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.0
OPTIONS WITH GLOBAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	6.0	7.1	6.6	6.6	6.6	6.6
Operational: Reduced speed, change of route, travel in convoy	5.6	8.5	8.5	7.8	9.0	7.9
Operational: Ships use onshore power supply facilities at ports	4.9	7.0	7.5	7.4	5.7	6.5
OPTIONS WITH LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	5.3	7.8	8.0	7.6	7.3	7.2
OPTIONS WITH GLOBAL AND LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	5.8	7.3	7.0	6.9	6.8	6.7

Note: Respondents were requested to enter a number between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value.

Two key differences show up when analyzing responses from each interest group to question 1. Firstly, respondents from port authorities gave much lower scores to the options proposed in Table 4.2 than the respondents from the other interest groups (column 2 compared to the other columns in Table 4.2). This is particularly the case for changes in the design of the hull, the propeller and the engine (6.5 in column 2 compared to 8.7-9.0 in columns 3-6), and for operational options associated with reduced speed, change of route and travel in convoy (5.6 in column 2 compared to 7.8-9.0 in columns 3-6). In addition, there is a large variance in the scores attributed by ports compared to the other interest groups (standard deviation of 2.6 compared to 1.3-1.8 in Table A4.3 in the appendix). Some respondents from ports noted that the polluters are moving ships, so ship owners, crew and cargo owners should be the first actors to be addressed to put in place mitigation measures. Ports can assist with underwater noise but on a voluntary basis. There is the danger that mandatory obligations could be put in place for ports which would be unacceptable, according to some respondents from ports. A respondent from the shipping sector argued that the design and maintenance of ships are the responsibility of ship owners. The key aspects for the port authority is the assessment of underwater radiated noise from ships entering the port and a comparison with criteria, whatever the means deployed by the ship owner.

Respondents from port authorities gave the lowest score to ships using onshore power supply facilities at ports and to having ships operating at design load conditions with a 4.9 score out of 10 in both cases. A respondent noted that shore power is a very costly solution that is unlikely to reduce the impact of underwater noise on marine species. The economic viability of this option depends on the local energy market. In some cases, the available onshore power supply is not used by ships because of high local energy prices. The benefits of shore power should not just consider energy prices, but rather the energy source shore-side. If a port's energy supply is through coal power plants, the overall environmental impact may be less from running on cleaner diesel. A respondent from the shipping sector wondered whether there is any evidence that the use of onshore power supply at ports has an impact on marine species. [A respondent from the shipping sector also argued that in the case of ensuring that ships operate at design load conditions, there is a need to understand how these mechanisms would be defined, measured and inspected at the port. The relationship between fuel consumption and noise propagation regarding operation under design load conditions requires further study to ensure adequate design.

The other key difference when analyzing responses from each interest group to question 1 is that respondents from all groups, with the exception of those from port authorities, gave very similar scores across all options (columns 3-6 in Table 4.2). There are only two exceptions. Respondents from the maritime affairs administration gave a high score to design options associated with alternative fuels (as did respondents from ports authorities) compared to respondents from the shipping sector, analysts and non-governmental organizations (7.0-7.3 in column 3 compared to 5.3-5.5 in columns 2, 4-6). Moreover, analysts gave a lower score to operational options associated with lower speed, change of route and travel in convoy compared to the maritime affairs administration, the shipping sector and non-governmental organizations (7.8 in column 5 compared to 8.5-9.0 in columns 2-4, 6). Some respondents from the analyst sector argued that the impact of travel in convoy on underwater noise needs further investigation. There is a trade-off between the time that sensitive species are exposed to sound (which would be reduced by vessels in convoys) and the level at which they are exposed (which could be increased by convoys). A respondent from the shipping sector noted that the science for speed optimization regarding underwater noise for different vessel types is not yet clearly defined or understood. Moreover, not all ports have flexibility in entry routes to the port, or influence on offshore routes.

In Table 4.3, the mean values of the answers given by each group of respondents to question 2 of the survey, "while acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following actions should ports preferably take to reduce underwater noise from shipping?", are presented. At the aggregate level (last column in Table 4.3) there are two preferred options. Firstly, respondents preferred port fees charged according to underwater noise performance with a score of 7.6 out of 10.[15] A respondent from the maritime affairs administration argued that if any change is to take place to reduce underwater noise from shipping at ports, it must be driven by financial incentives to compensate the associated shipping investments. Secondly, respondents preferred a reduction in ship waiting time at ports through collaboration along the entire logistical maritime chain with a score of 7.3 out of 10. A respondent from a maritime affairs administration stated that fees based on an acoustic "footprint" need further examination as local acoustic measurements may vary widely depending on the environment and local acoustics. Moreover, measuring acoustic footprints requires significant investments, which so far have been paid for by the public sector. Therefore, at this stage these kinds of fees should be based only on the values given by the classification societies and thus remain simple and cost-effective. In fact, ideally, ships should be able to see whether they are eligible for a port fee reduction based on the vessel's specifications.

[15] A State could adopt regulations that require, as a condition of port entry, that vessels be in compliance with its national acoustic regulations whenever those vessels are in its territorial waters. This strategy could prove problematic for much of the world since vessels can trade with another port State (Firestone and Jarvis, 2007).

A port environment is not the easiest environment in which to make an inventory of acoustic profiles. Apart from anthropogenic noise sources, the shallowness of the area and the presence of hard structures may cause a permanent noise level through reflection and reverberation on the bottom and structures that is absent further offshore. Some studies exist as to how monitoring programs might be designed (IMO, 2015). A respondent from a non-governmental organization argued that a reduction in ship waiting time is quite important because it allows the ship to slow steam throughout its passage. Other actions such as giving priority to ships generating less underwater noise in the allocation of berth slots, ensuring proper port and barrier design, having onshore energy facilities and using underwater noise criteria when selecting port service providers, received relatively lower scores (6.7, 6.6 and 6.2 out of 10, respectively).

Table 4.3. While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following actions should ports preferably take to reduce underwater noise from shipping? (mean values, question 2).

	Port authority	Maritime affairs administration	Shipping sector	Analysts	Biodiversity conservation community	All groups
Port fees charged according to underwater noise performance	5.6	7.0	8.4	7.8	9.0	7.6
Priority in the allocation of berth slots for ships generating less underwater noise	5.0	7.3	6.9	5.3	8.5	6.7
ACTIONS WITH GLOBAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	5.3	7.1	7.7	6.8	8.8	7.1
Underwater noise criteria in selecting port service providers	4.4	6.5	5.9	6.2	8.3	6.2
Reduction in ship waiting time at ports through collaboration along the entire logistical maritime chain	6.0	8.8	6.7	7.0	8.3	7.3
Proper port and barrier design, onshore energy facilities	5.1	8.3	7.4	6.4	5.7	6.6
Underwater noise mitigation equipment to protect local fauna	3.9	5.0	5.1	5.9	2.7	4.5
ACTIONS WITH LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	4.8	7.2	6.3	6.4	6.2	6.2
ACTIONS WITH GLOBAL AND LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	5.0	7.1	6.7	6.5	7.1	6.5

Note: Respondents were requested to enter a number between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value.

At the aggregate level, the lowest score for question 2 was attributed to the use of underwater noise mitigation equipment to protect local fauna (4.5 out of 10). According to a respondent from a maritime affairs administration, actions with local mitigating impact on underwater noise using physical barriers are feasible solutions and could possibly be expanded outside of the port. Acoustic deterrent devices, however, are not a good solution to address shipping noise. These devices are used near impulsive and possibly lethal noise sources, but even here, their effectiveness can be questioned. For instance, they can lead to interrupted diving patterns in marine mammals. Shipping generates continuous noise and local intermittent noise, which is sub-lethal. The introduction of acoustic deterrent devices would only worsen the situation by adding yet another continuous/intermittent noise source to a noisy environment.

A respondent from the shipping sector argued that the science of and technologies related to underwater noise mitigation equipment to protect local fauna are not known/proved, and may have mixed consequences for various marine species. A respondent from a non-governmental organization was of the opinion that they are not in favor of acoustic deterrents because they can have negative effects on marine fauna. However, they support air bubble curtains that can be quite effective at reducing noise levels. Another respondent from a maritime affairs administration agreed with the use of bubble curtains and other noise reduction technology but disagreed with the use of deterrents as they simply add noise and there is little/no research to prove that marine fauna such as whales will behave as planned. At the aggregate level, respondents had a preference for actions with global impacts on underwater noise (7.1) compared to local impacts on underwater noise (6.2). Respondents gave an overall score of 6.5 out of 10 to the actions proposed with global and local impacts on underwater noise.

There are two key differences when analyzing responses from each interest group to question 2. Firstly, as in question 1, respondents from port authorities almost systematically gave much lower scores to the options proposed in Table 4.3 than the respondents from the other interest groups (column 2 compared to the other columns in Table 4.3). This is particularly the case for the use of port fees charged according to underwater noise performance (5.6 in column 2 compared to 7.0-9.0 in columns 3-6). In addition, as in question 1, there is a large variance in the scores attributed by ports (and by analysts) compared to the other interest groups (standard deviation of 2.3-2.4 compared to 1.3-1.9 in Table A4.4 in the appendix). Secondly, there are systematic and significant differences between the scores of respondents from the analytical sector and the scores of respondents from non-governmental organizations, probably reflecting the absence of sufficient scientific evidence on the impact of the proposed actions on underwater noise.

In order to analyze the data in question 3 of the survey, "using the Saaty comparison scale, which of the following options can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping?", we proceed in four steps. In the first step of the analysis, a $q \cdot q$ matrix is derived for each respondent through the pairwise comparison procedure described in the previous section. There are 33 responses to question 3 that could be exploited: port authorities (5), maritime affairs administrations (3), the shipping sector (10), analysts (11) and the biodiversity conservation community (4). In the second step of the analysis, weights for criteria are determined for each of the 33 matrices with preference values given using the eigenvalue technique. As a result, for each of the 33 individual responses, nine weights are obtained corresponding to the nine criteria under a $9 \cdot 1$ matrix.

In the third part of the analysis, the data are aggregated per group of respondents. The model [1] was applied to the individual responses from each group. Five extended programing models were solved, one per group of respondents. Table A4.4 in the appendix shows, for instance, the formulation of the extended goal programing model for the group of non-governmental organizations, and Table A4.5 in the appendix shows the results of the associated estimation. The results in Table A4.5 show a first consensus by maximizing the average agreement which corresponds to the median value from a statistical point of view, and a second consensus by minimizing the disagreement of the most displaced individual. In Table A4.5, both consensuses are relatively similar which is quite common when aggregating data from individuals belonging to the same social group, with two exceptions: the focus on key priorities (O_3) and cooperation between ports to scale up actions (O_7). In these two cases, a majority consensus is appropriate for respondents from the same group of respondents. As a result, the individual data in each group are aggregated through the median value which corresponds to the maximization of the average agreement. It should be noted that all the computations are undertaken by solving linear programing models with sparse matrices, which makes the existence of alternative optimal solutions very likely. Because of this, in some cases the consensus weight for the maximum average agreement is not given by the median (table 4.4) but for instance by the average (table 4.5). In fact, in these cases both statistical parameters give the same optimum value.

In Table 4.4, the median values of the answers of each group of respondents to question 3 in the survey, "using the Saaty comparison scale, which of the following options can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping?", are presented. Two criteria received the highest scores from the different groups of respondents: cooperation between ports to scale up actions and integration with other actions. Each group of respondents attributed a very low score (lower or equal to 10) to three of the proposed criteria: raising awareness, actions of a voluntary nature and effectiveness. The score given to the "broad stakeholder participation" criterion was particularly low for maritime affairs administration, 9%, whereas the other groups attributed scores of between 11% and 18%. In particular, ports and analysts attributed a score of 18% to these criteria. The biodiversity conservation community attributed a score of 15% to political and/or social demand, whereas the scores for this criterion were below 10% for ports, maritime affairs administrations and the shipping sector.

Table 4.4. Using the Saaty comparison scale, which of the following options can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping? (median values in percentage, question 3).

	Port authority	Maritime affairs administration	Shipping sector	Analysts	Biodiversity conservation community
Raising awareness	3	2	3	10	4
Actions of a voluntary nature	9	2	2	2	3
Focus on key priorities	11	16	14	11	18
Integration with other actions	15	30	19	15	17
Different actions applied to green and dirty ships	12	8	12	11	12
Broad stakeholder participation	18	9	15	18	11
Cooperation between ports to scale up actions	20	19	18	15	15
Political and/or social demand	7	8	9	12	15
Effectiveness	6	7	9	7	7

Note: Respondents were requested to enter a number between one and nine, where one means that the option is as important as the other options and nine implies the option is extremely more important than the other options. The Table reports the group median for the individual weights of preferences (in percentage).

In the second step of the analysis of question 3 in the survey, "using the Saaty comparison scale, which of the following options can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping?", the data corresponding to each group are aggregated. Table 4.5 shows the formulation of the associated extended goal programing model, and Table 4.6 shows the results of the estimation. The second row in Table 4.6 corresponds to the solution that maximizes the average agreement, the third row corresponds to the solution that minimizes the disagreement of the most displaced group, and the fourth line corresponds to a compromise solution. It is possible to obtain a larger number of compromise solutions, but given the proximity between the solution that maximizes the average agreement and the solution that minimizes the disagreement of the most displaced group, it is not necessary.

Table 4.5. Determination of the social preferences using the extended goal programing model (question 3).

Achievement function

$$\text{Min } (1\text{-}\lambda)D+\lambda\sum_{i=1}^{9}\sum_{j=1}^{5}(\bar{n}_{ij}+\bar{p}_{ij})$$

subject to:

Goals

$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i1}+\bar{p}_{i1}) - D\leq 0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i2}+\bar{p}_{i2}) - D\leq 0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i3}+\bar{p}_{i3}) - D\leq 0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i4}+\bar{p}_{i4}) - D\leq 0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i5}+\bar{p}_{i5}) - D\leq 0$

$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{11}-\bar{p}_{11} = 0.03$
$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{12}-\bar{p}_{12} = 0.02$
$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{13}-\bar{p}_{13} = 0.03$
$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{14}-\bar{p}_{14} = 0.10$
$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{15}-\bar{p}_{15} = 0.04$

$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{21}-\bar{p}_{21} = 0.09$
$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{22}-\bar{p}_{22} = 0.02$
$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{23}-\bar{p}_{23} = 0.02$
$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{24}-\bar{p}_{24} = 0.02$
$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{25}-\bar{p}_{25} = 0.03$

$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{31}-\bar{p}_{31} = 0.11$
$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{32}-\bar{p}_{32} = 0.16$
$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{33}-\bar{p}_{33} = 0.14$
$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{34}-\bar{p}_{34} = 0.11$
$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{35}-\bar{p}_{35} = 0.18$

$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{41}-\bar{p}_{41} = 0.15$
$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{42}-\bar{p}_{42} = 0.30$
$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{43}-\bar{p}_{43} = 0.19$
$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{44}-\bar{p}_{44} = 0.15$
$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{45}-\bar{p}_{45} = 0.17$

$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{51}-\bar{p}_{51} = 0.12$
$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{52}-\bar{p}_{52} = 0.08$
$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{53}-\bar{p}_{53} = 0.12$
$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{54}-\bar{p}_{54} = 0.11$
$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{55}-\bar{p}_{55} = 0.12$

$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{61}-\bar{p}_{61} = 0.18$
$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{62}-\bar{p}_{62} = 0.09$
$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{63}-\bar{p}_{63} = 0.15$
$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{64}-\bar{p}_{64} = 0.18$
$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{65}-\bar{p}_{65} = 0.15$

$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{71}-\bar{p}_{71} = 0.20$
$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{72}-\bar{p}_{72} = 0.19$
$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{73}-\bar{p}_{73} = 0.18$
$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{74}-\bar{p}_{74} = 0.15$
$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{75}-\bar{p}_{75} = 0.15$

$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{81}-\bar{p}_{81} = 0.07$
$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{82}-\bar{p}_{82} = 0.08$
$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{83}-\bar{p}_{83} = 0.09$
$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{84}-\bar{p}_{84} = 0.12$
$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{85}-\bar{p}_{85} = 0.15$

$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{91}-\bar{p}_{91} = 0.06$
$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{92}-\bar{p}_{92} = 0.07$
$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{93}-\bar{p}_{93} = 0.09$
$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{94}-\bar{p}_{94} = 0.07$
$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{95}-\bar{p}_{95} = 0.07$

Accounting rows

$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i1}+\bar{p}_{i1}) - D_1=0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i2}+\bar{p}_{i2}) - D_2=0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i3}+\bar{p}_{i3}) - D_3=0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i4}+\bar{p}_{i4}) - D_4=0$
$\sum_{i=1}^{9}(\bar{n}_{i5}+\bar{p}_{i5}) - D_5=0$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{9}\sum_{j=1}^{5}(\bar{n}_{ij}+\bar{p}_{ij}) - Z = 0$$

Note: See section 3.2 for the definition of these variables.

Table 4.6. Social weights used with the extended goal programing model (question 3).

Z	D	D_1	D_2	D_3	D_4	D_5	W_1^s	W_2^s	W_3^s	W_4^s	W_5^s	W_6^s	W_7^s	W_8^s	W_9^s
Majority consensus (λ=1)															
0.93	0.28	0.20	0.28	0.04	0.22	0.19	3	2	14	17	12	15	18	9	7
Minority consensus (λ=0)															
0.99	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.10	0.24	0.17	3	2	14	17	11	12	17	8	7
Compromise solution (λ=0.5)															
0.97	0.24	0.22	0.24	0.08	0.24	0.19	3	2	14	17	11	13	18	8	7

Note: This Table shows the results of the MDCM model in Table 4.5. Z is the sum of D_1-D_5, D measures the maximum of the values D_1-D_5, D_1-D_5 represent the disagreement of each group as listed in Table 4.1 with respect to the consensus that is obtained, and W_1^s-W_9^s are the reference weights (in percentage) attached by society to each criteria as listed in Table 3.3.

The results are very robust as they are similar across rows 2-4 in Table 4.6. In the second row in Table 4.6, the most displaced group are the maritime affairs administrations (with a 0.28 score for D_2) and the sum of the disagreements across all groups has a score of 0.93 for Z. In the third row in Table 4.6, when minimizing the disagreement of the most displaced group, the groups have less dispersed disagreement values with respect to the consensus (with values between 0.10 and 0.24 for D_1-D_5), but the sum of the disagreements across all groups has a higher score than when maximizing the average agreement (with a score of 0.99 for Z). In the fourth row in Table 4.6, the compromise solution enables a lower score to be obtained for the maximum disagreement of the maritime affairs administrations than when maximizing the average agreement (with a score of 0.24 for D_2 and D), while achieving a lower value for the sum of the disagreements across all groups compared to the solution minimizing the disagreement of the most displaced group (with a score of 0.97 for Z). The remainder of the paper will refer to the compromise solution results.

At the aggregated level, the highest scores for question 3 were attributed to cooperation between ports to scale up actions (W_7^s with a score of 18%) and to integration with other actions (W_4^s with a score of 17%). Two options were also attributed relatively high scores: the focus on key priorities and broad stakeholder participation (W_3^s and W_6^s with scores of 14% and 13%, respectively). The "different actions applied to green and dirty ships" option had a score of 11%. A respondent from the analyst sector stated that any actions must be integrated with other shipping issues, especially energy efficiency. A respondent from the shipping sector stated that an issue as broad as underwater noise from shipping needs to have the engagement of all stakeholders from the earliest stage for progress to be made. Pilot cases are of prime importance to start from a successful example in a harmonized and agreed way.

According to one respondent, the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority ECHO Program's key findings highlight the role of consultation of stakeholders. The most relevant lessons learned about participation are the following: building knowledge and trust takes time, challenging conversations are healthy and help map a better path forward for all, and early and frequent face-to-face interaction with multi-interests raises engagement levels and is key to identifying gaps and developing research questions. Another respondent from the analyst sector stated that an international legally binding instrument is required to reduce underwater noise pollution from commercial vessels. However, to reach this point, the (technical and procedural) barriers must be lifted and (scientific) gaps must be rectified to attain a certain satisfaction level among key stakeholders.

The largest difference between the solution that maximizes the average agreement and the solution that minimizes the disagreement of the most displaced group is associated with the "broad stakeholder participation" option (with scores between 13% and 15%). Otherwise, the W_1^s-W_9^s scores are similar across the different groups. Therefore, changing the assumption in our estimation that each group has the same social influence should not have a significant impact on the final results. Moreover, the lowest scores are attributed to raising awareness and actions of a voluntary nature (W_1^s and W_2^s with scores of 3% and 2%, respectively). Political and/or social demands and effectiveness are also attributed very low scores (8% and 7%, respectively).

According to one respondent, among the Vancouver Fraser Port Authority ECHO Program's key findings are the following topics: technical working groups are essential for formulating work plans, robust data and multiple account evaluation are essential for informed, evidence-based decision-making and finding the best solutions requires tests, trials and adaptive management. A respondent from the shipping sector stated that noise monitoring, reporting and verification should be the top priority in terms of the next steps to better inform future decisions. Another representative from the shipping sector argued that a monitoring, reporting and verification scheme for underwater noise is too cumbersome and implies too many costs for ship owners. This type of scheme is already in place for carbon dioxide emissions from fuel consumption.

A respondent from the maritime affairs administration argued that an assessment in itself is not helpful. The precautionary principle must be used as data are collected and progress is made. That being said, many ports are already so noisy that any sensitive fauna must have already moved or must have been destroyed. Another respondent from the maritime affairs administration stated that pressure from the public on underwater noise from shipping is unlikely, as the link between consumer choice and the way goods are transported is too diffuse. A respondent from the shipping sector stated that political and social demands will definitely help ports prioritize decisions with regard to investments to reduce their environmental footprint. However, underwater noise is not currently one of their main priorities as opposed to air emissions, for example.

Finally, respondents made some general comments. A respondent from the analyst sector stated that there is a need for more science before regulating. The survey may suggest that there is an assumption of harm being caused to marine fauna although as yet there is no scientific proof associated with impact of the underwater noise from shipping in ports. Another respondent from the analyst sector stated that most can be accomplished by focusing on making the noisiest vessels quieter, reducing ship speed where necessary, putting in place actions that reduce (air) emissions and noise at the same time, making sure there is a level playing field so that ships within one class (tankers, container ships, etc.) are treated the same, and standardizing noise measurement. A respondent from the shipping sector argued that noise occurs both above and below the water. The respondent wondered what the actions to measure, control and minimize impacts of noise levels above water in ports were. Another respondent from the shipping sector stated that it is important that any local or IMO programs avoid any unfortunate experience in implementing the Ballast Water Management Convention. According to a third respondent from the shipping sector, some regulations (limiting underwater noise) might be introduced for new vessels or ships sailing in particular areas while port authorities should provide economic incentives to ships that are quieter.

5. Discussion

This paper provides data-based guidance on the characteristics of management frameworks conducive to reducing underwater noise from commercial shipping, the dominant source of underwater noise. The analysis is made through a survey of a representative sample of stakeholders from 15 countries in the European Union and in North America. Respondents were from port authorities, maritime affairs administrations, the shipping sector, the academic or environmental consulting sector and non-governmental institutions. The eight respondents from ports were from six countries, all working for ports that are considered large in terms of their container and/or cargo volume.

While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, according to the results of the survey there are two options that port actions should preferably seek to support to reduce underwater noise from shipping. Firstly, respondents preferred changes in the design of the hull, the propeller or the engine. Secondly, respondents preferred operational options associated with reduced speed, change of route and travel in convoy. Moreover, there are two actions that ports should preferably take to reduce underwater noise from shipping. Firstly, respondents preferred port fees charged according to underwater noise performance. Secondly, respondents preferred a reduction in ship waiting times at ports through collaboration along the entire logistical maritime chain.

The respondents from port authorities gave much lower scores to all of the options and actions proposed to support the reduction of underwater noise from shipping than the respondents from the other interest groups. This is particularly the case for changes to the design of the hull, the propeller and the engine, and for operational options associated with reduced speed, change of route and travel in convoy. This is also the case for the use of port fees charged according to underwater noise performance. In addition, there is a large variance in the scores attributed by ports compared to the other interest groups. By contrast, the results on the management options that can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping are similar for the different interest groups. According to the survey, cooperation between ports to scale up actions and integration with other actions were the preferred actions. Two other options were also attributed relatively high scores: the focus on key priorities and broad stakeholder participation.

In order to complement these results from the survey, between November 2018 and August 2019 a series of interviews was held with some major European and North American ports: Port of Antwerp, Bremen Port, Hamburg Port, Port of Le Havre, Port of Rotterdam, Prince Rupert Port Authority and Vancouver Fraser Port Authority. Underwater noise is a concern for ports when there are marine mammals nearby, particularly when they are endangered and emblematic, and current or forecasted shipping traffic is high. According to noise modeling and scientific thresholds, the 2018 voluntary slowdown in the Haro Strait reduced underwater noise in nearby habitats, improving foraging conditions for endangered southern resident killer whales (Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, 2019). According to observed data, an increase in underwater noise level is correlated to an increased probability that whales will stop or not start foraging.

Ports are typically concerned with local air pollution, particularly large ports near urban populations. In particular, port and governmental air quality programs typically focus on criteria pollutants with known health impacts, including Sox, NOx and PM (fine particles). Underwater noise is rarely a local concern, however. The results from the Port of Le Havre interviews showcase this common context. Most ports suffer from a wide range of types of local pollution where it is difficult to uncover causal effects. There is little or no knowledge of the impacts of underwater noise on local fauna, there are often no critically endangered marine mammals near ports and the local human population (and hence the port) is primarily concerned with air and water quality, and often depends economically on the port's activities.

Moreover, global pollutants (that is, pollutants with effects at the global scale such as greenhouse gas emissions) are not a major issue for ports. Ports do take into account, however, the synergies between actions on air pollution with local effects from sulfur oxide and nitrogen oxide emissions and their impact on pollution with global effects from greenhouse gas emissions. Given this framework, a solution based on a good understanding of how underwater noise is addressed through different energy efficiency, air quality or water quality measures can result in priority being given to those solutions that are also beneficial for underwater noise. The solutions implemented by ports can be then scaled up, through the development of environmental indexes and classification societies' notations. The scaling-up across a large number of major ports is a necessary condition for the shipping industry to have the incentive to invest in the required solutions, and hence to influence shipyards to change specifications. Overall, a good understanding of the effectiveness of the measures taken to reduce underwater noise is key to tackling this issue, as acknowledged by the European Commission. This type of proposals are comings at a time where vessels owners are already dealing with significant investment requirements and operating costs for the 2020 fuel, ballast water treatment systems, Tier 2 and 3 NOx for new ships, and the upcoming IMO and corporate low/zero CO2 requirements. To be successful, underwater noise programs must align with these factors.

Six Northwest European ports, namely Hamburg, Bremen, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Amsterdam and Le Havre, decided to develop a simple methodology to create an indicator that ship owners could easily provide and that would enable to classify them. As a result, the Environmental Ship Index (ESI) was established in 2011 as an international program developed through the International Association of Ports and Harbors. By 2019, 57 ports were using the indicator which currently covers air emissions (sulfur oxides, nitrogen oxides and carbon dioxide). Given this participation rate from ports, some preliminary evidence suggests that the shipping industry has the incentive to make investments for cost and energy efficiency and for low greenhouse gas operations.. While the inclusion of underwater noise is not currently under discussion, airborne noise may be introduced as a new component of the indicator. In this latter case, synergies between airborne and underwater noise could be explored and exploited.

In fact, underwater noise has not been included in the most widely used indexes, i.e. the ESI (5,500 ships, 47 ports), the Green Award (835 ships, 33 ports), the Clean Shipping Index (CSI) (2,300 ships, 5 ports) and the RightShip (76,000 ships, 2 ports) (OECD/ITF, 2018b).[16] As an exception, Green Marine has included performance indicators on underwater noise for vessels and ports in its index since 2017 (Green Marine, 2019). These performance indicators aim to reduce the underwater noise made by vessels in order to reduce impacts on marine mammals. Actions include, among other features, incorporating vessel quieting technologies in retrofits or new constructions, and working with ports to estimate vessel noise levels for at least one in three vessels in their fleet.

Design and operational options can be used to reduce noise levels and also to improve energy efficiency. The degree of efficiency is very important for the shipping industry because of the significance of fuel consumption on operational costs. If ships of a similar type and size are compared,

[16] CSI merged with Clean Cargo Working Group and the CSI website data is no longer updated or audited. Rightship is a commercial organization that has a mix in terms of information quality. Vessels may be rated based on published information only, or "verified" by the ship owner by submitting sea trial data, etc.

the noisiest ships are likely to be among those which are less efficient (Leaper *et al.*, 2014). Moreover, there is evidence that half of the total power radiated by modern vessels comes from 15% of the fleet (Viers *et al.,* 2017). However, the relationship between energy efficiency and underwater noise emissions needs to be analyzed for each technology (Vakili, 2018).[17]

The relationships between energy efficiency and underwater noise should be clearly identified. In turn, the following indicators on energy efficiency could be used to reduce underwater noise emissions: the Energy Efficiency Design Index (EEDI) (IMO, 2009), the Ship Energy Efficiency Management Plan (SEEMP) (IMO, 2012) and the Existing Vessel Design Index (EVDI) (Rightship, 2013). The EEDI relates to design options and applies to vessels of 400 gross tonnage and above built after January 1, 2013. The EVDI is a similar indicator that applies to existing vessels. The SEEMP deals with operational options that improve the vessel's efficiency through better management and implementation of best practices (Lloyds Register, 2011).

In addition, measures exist to reduce carbon dioxide emissions that can also contribute to reducing underwater noise emissions. In particular, design options linked to the propeller and the hull, to the type of fuel, to the size of vessels and operational options associated with ship maintenance (hull, propeller), operating at design load conditions, and the use of onshore power supply facilities at ports, can reduce carbon dioxide and underwater noise emissions (OECD/ITF, 2018a; Vakili, 2018). Nowadays, carbon dioxide emissions are only taken into account marginally by the Green Award(OECD/ITF, 2018b).

Speed can be reduced to decrease a vessel's greenhouse gas and potentially its underwater noise emissions. It can also be reduced for safety, local environmental factors (particulate matter and sulfur emissions) and sailing conditions (waves) close to the port (OECD/ITF, 2018b). However, costs increase when the speed falls below the energy efficiency-speed levels for which the vessel was designed. A number of ports have set regulations or incentive programs to reduce vessel speed: Los Angeles and Long Beach since 2001, San Diego since 2009, New York-New Jersey since 2010 and Vancouver (First Narrows) since 2019 (trial in 2018). These initiatives mainly aim to reduce local air pollution (Los Angeles, Long Beach, New York-New Jersey) and address safety issues under heavy traffic conditions (Vancouver). Some offer financial incentives through fee rebates (Los Angeles, Long Beach, New York-New Jersey), while others provide public acknowledgement (San Diego). In Vancouver, the speed reduction in First Narrows is now compulsory after a voluntary trial in 2018. This compulsory slowdown is in addition to the voluntary slowdown implemented by the ECHO program in Vancouver since 2017 with the specific goal of reducing underwater noise emissions. As already mentioned, a reduction in speed can decrease underwater noise emissions under certain conditions (Merchant, 2019). In particular, an optimal trade-off between duration (longer time within an area) and intensity may be achieved at about 8 knots (McKenna *et al.,* 2013). This speed is unsafe at many sea and wind conditions, however.

The use of onshore energy facilities at ports can be beneficial in terms of greenhouse gas emissions and also help reduce underwater noise (OECD/ITF, 2018a). Financial incentives have been proposed by several ports or countries: Vancouver (port discount fee), Stockholm (subsidy) and Sweden (tax

[17] A propeller designed for maximum efficiency will likely not be the quietest one. However, improvements in propeller design can be made that are more efficient as well as quieter, especially when the propeller is optimized to the hull. Design options related to the machinery and the hull exist that can improve efficiency and reduce underwater noise emissions. In addition, operational options such as slow steaming, just-in-time, hull and propeller cleaning and maintenance, which are recommended to increase efficiency, can also reduce underwater noise emissions.

exemption) (OECD/ITF, 2018b).

A series of ports is engaging in actions on airborne noise from shipping. These actions have been introduced because airborne noise is a local concern that impacts the population living near ports. These actions can be may have an impact on lowering underwater noise emissions. They can be used to establish some principles or, more broadly, a framework to address underwater noise emissions directly. To date, the results of the NoMEPorts initiative on noise management in European ports and the NEPTUNES project could be used to draw up some principles on airborne noise emissions that could be integrated in the ESI index (NoMEPorts, 2008; NEPTUNES, 2019).[18][19] In particular, the port of Le Havre has participated with 17 other ports in the NEPTUNES project which seeks to reduce airborne noise from vessels. This project has developed guidelines for noise labeling of a vessel based on its noise performance.[20]

In order to achieve a long-term solution to the impact of underwater noise emissions from commercial vessels on marine fauna, the Member States of the IMO could create a legally binding international commitment. Canada has submitted a work output proposal to the Marine Environmental Protection Committee of the IMO to review the *2014 Guidelines* and identify next steps. For example, next steps could include amending the annex to MARPOL 1973/78 (Nowacek et al., 2015).[21] In the short term, given the significant uncertainties in determining the biological impacts of underwater noise emissions from shipping at individual and population levels, management should be based on the precautionary approach (CBD, 2012). Determining the effective level of precaution is a significant obstacle in applying this approach however (McCarthy, 2004). Moreover, ports are particularly concerned about the level of investments that local underwater noise actions could require, particularly acoustic monitoring equipment.[22]

In addition, there is no clear evidence that the past investment in noise abatement in research vessels associated with ICES recommendations has reduced fish avoidance reactions (De Robertis and Handegard, 2013). The development of scientific maps on underwater noise vulnerability per port would be useful both for ports and for ship owners. Individual ports' decisions will depend on the local presence of fauna. The experience gained from aviation noise control could also provide some guidance in terms of the lessons learned, the process, incentive building, monitoring tools and criteria, among other factors. There are indeed differences but also important similarities between aviation noise and shipping noise emissions and local demands regarding airborne noise close to airports have boosted the global pressure on the aviation industry to adopt existing quieting technology.[23][24]

---

[18] The partner ports in the NoMEPorts initiative were Amsterdam, Civitaveccia, Copenhagen/Malmo, Hamburg, Livorno and Valencia. Observer ports were Bremen, Gothenburg, Oslo, Rotterdam and Tenerife.

[19] The NEPTUNES project was launched by eleven ports in north-west Europe, Australia and Canada: Amsterdam, Cork, Copenhagen, Malmo, Gothenburg, Hamburg, Koper, New South Wales, Rotterdam, Stockholm, Turku and Vancouver.

[20] The Barge Terminal Tilburg in the Netherlands and the Intermodal Terminal WienCont in Vienna in Austria are also putting in place actions to reduce airborne noise, due to their close proximity to residential areas and the volume of their activities.

[21] Note that MARPOL typically phases in new regulations, either by the new building date or by the date of the next out of water survey. The first of these options would mean a 20-30 year turnover for the fleet after the full IMO approval, and the second would take 5-7 years after the years to finalize the IMO requirements.

[22] Ports and vessel owners are all concerned about how to obtain reliable, verifiable underwater noise measurements, and from what entities and at what costs. Should this, for example, be available from shipyards and out-of-water maintenance facilities, and become part of the sea trials process? The variations from location to location might be too significant.

[23] Some information on air noise from the airline industry in the EU context is available at the following link:

References

Abdulla, A., Linden, O. (eds.), 2008. Maritime traffic effects on biodiversity in the Mediterranean Sea: Review of impacts, priority areas and mitigation measures. Malaga, Spain: IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation.

Aguilar de Soto, N., Johnson, N., Madsen, P. T., Tyack, P. L., Bocconcelli, A., Borsani, J. F., 2006. Does intense ship noise disrupt foraging in deep-diving Cuvier’s beaked whales (Ziphius cavirostris)? Marine Mammal Science 22: 690–699.

Aguilar de Soto, N., Delorme, N., Atkins, J., et al., 2013. Anthropogenic noise causes body malformations and delays development in marine larvae. Scientific Reports, 3, 2831.

André, M., Solé, M., Lenoir, M., Durfort, M., Quero, C., Mas, A. et al., 2011. Low-frequency sounds induce acoustic trauma in cephalopods. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 9(9): 489–493.

André, M., Kaifu, K., Solé, M., van der Schaar, M. Akamatsu, T. et al., 2016. Contribution to the understanding of particle motion perception in marine invertebrates. In: The Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life II. Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology, Popper, A. N. and Hawkins, A. (eds) 47-55. Springer New York.

AQUO consortium, 2014. Comprehensive listing of possible improvement solutions and mitigation measures. D5.1 package.

AQUO-SONIC, 2015. AQUO-SONIC common guidelines. Guidelines for Regulation on UW Noise from Commercial Shipping. Revision: 4.3 Date: 30 November 2015.

ACCOBAMS, 2004. Resolution 2.16. Assessment and Impact Assessment of Man-Made Noise. ACCOBAMS-MOP2/2004/Res.2.16.

ACCOBAMS, 2007a. Resolution 3.10. Guidelines to Address the Impact of Anthropogenic Noise on Marine Mammals in the ACCOBAMS Area. ACCOBAMS-MOP3/2007/Res.3.10.

ACCOBAMS, 2007b. Report of the Third Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the ACCOBAMS Agreement.

ACCOBAMS, 2010. ACCOBAMS Resolution 4.17. Guidelines to address the impact of anthropogenic noise on cetaceans in the ACCOBAMS area. ACCOBAMS-MOP4/2010/Res.4.17.

Aguilar de Soto, N. and Kight, C., 2016. Physiological effects of noise on aquatic animals. In: Stressors in the Marine Environment, Solan, M. and Whiteley, N. M. (eds). Oxford University Press 2016.

Arctic Council, 2009. Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009 Report. April 2009, second print.

https://www.aef.org.uk/issues/aircraft-noise/.

[24] The regulation at the IMO concerning asbestos also progressed following pressure at the global scale.

Arctic Council, 2013. Status on Implementation of the AMSA 2009 Report Recommendations. May 2013.

Arctic Council, 2019. Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment meeting on the 4-7 February 2019 in Malmo (Sweden). The Arctic Council Working Group on the Protection of the Marine Environment.

ASCOBANS, 2003. Resolution 5. "Effects of Noise and of Vessels. Fourth Meeting of Parties.

ASCOBANS, 2006. "Adverse Effects of Sound, Vessels and other Forms of Disturbance on Small Cetaceans". Resolution No. 4 adopted by the 5th Meeting of Parties 2006 to the ASCOBANS.

Azzellino, A. et al., 2011. Risk mapping for sensitive species to underwater anthropogenic sound emissions: Model development and validation in two Mediterranean areas. Marine Pollution Bulletin 63, 56–70.

Bahtiarian, M., 2017. Ship Generated Underwater Noise: Actions & Technologies to Achieve Greater Stewardship. GreenTech conference, 1st July 2017.

Barker, P.R., Lepper, P.A., 2013. Detection and impact assessment of impulsive underwater noise. Acoustics 2013, East Midlands Conference Centre, Nottingham, UK, May 13th 2013. Proceedings of the Institute of Acoustics 35 (1) 8pp.

Bassett, C., Thomson, J., Polagye, B., 2010. Characteristics of underwater ambient noise at a proposed tidal energy site in Puget Sound. In: Proceedings of the Oceans 2010 Conference, September 23–25, Seattle WA.

Bejder, L., Samuels, A., Whitehead, H., Finn, H. Allen, S. 2009. Impact assessment research use and misuse of habituation, sensitisation and tolerance in describing wildlife responses to anthropogenic stimuli. Marine Ecology Progress Series 395: 177-185

Beltran Palomo, P., Diaz, J.I. and Salinas, R., 2012. Achievement of the new underwater radiated noise requirements by the Spanish shipbuilding industry. The FRV "Ramon Margalef". Proceedings of the 11th European Conference on Underwater Acoustics.

Beltran Palomo, P., 2014. The most recent noise and vibration assessment of the European fleet, within the framework of the "SILENV Project". *Ship Science & Technology* - Vol. 7 - n.° 14 - (43-66) January 2014 - Cartagena (Colombia).

Berkowitz, H. and Dumez, H. (eds), 2017. Racket in the oceans: why underwater noise matters, how to measure and how to manage it. Paris: Observatory for Responsible Innovation / Palaiseau (France): i3-CRG (CNRS – École polytechnique).

Berta, A. and Sumich, J.L., 1999. Marine mammals: Evolutionary biology. San Diego: Academic Press.

BIAS, 2016. Layperson's report. BIAS LIFE11 ENV/SE/841.

Bittencourt, L., Lima, I. M. S., Andrade, L. G., Carvalho, R. R., Bisi, T. L., Lailson-Brito, J., Azevedo, A. F., 2017. Underwater noise in an impacted environment can affect Guiana dolphin communication. Marine Pollution Bulletin 114(2): 1130-1134.

Blair, H. B., Merchant, N. D., Friedlaender, A. S., Wiley, D. N., Parks, S. E., 2016. Evidence for ship noise impacts on humpback whale foraging behaviour. Biological Letters 12(8).

Brumm, H. (eds.), 2013. Animal communication and noise. Vol 2, Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

Bureau Veritas, DNV GL, 2015. Guidelines for regulation on underwater noise from commercial shipping. AQUO, SONIC. Revision 4.3.

Buscaino et al., 2016. Temporal patterns in the soundscape of the shallow waters of a Mediterranean marine protected area. Scientific Reports 6: 34230.

Casper, B.M., Mann, D.A., 2009. Field hearing measurements of the Atlantic sharpnose sharkRhizoprionodon terraenovae. Journal of Fish Biology 75(10): 2768–2776.

Castellote, M. and Llorents, C., 2013. Review of the effects of offshore seismic surveys in cetaceans: are mass strandings a possibility? Proceedings of the 3rd Conference on the Effects of Noise on Aquatic Life, Budapest.

Cato, D.H., 2001. Doug Cato Notes. Marine Mammals Comparison of Natural Ambient Noise with Traffic Noise, Woods Hole, MA, June.

CBD, 2012. Scientific synthesis on the impacts of underwater noise on marine and coastal biodiversity and habitats. Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSSTA), 16th meeting, UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/16/INF/12. Montreal: Convention on Biological Diversity.

CBD, 2014. Progress Report on Addressing Impacts of Underwater Noise and Marine Debris on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity. Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. Eighteenth meeting, Montreal, 23-28 June 2014, Items 4.2 and 4.3 of the provisional agenda, UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/18/5.

CBD, 2016. Compilation of submissions and further information on underwater noise mitigation measures. Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. Twentieth meeting, Montreal, Canada, 25-29 April 2016, Item 4.3 of the provisional agenda, UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/10.

Celi, M., Filiciotto, F., Maricchiolo, G. et al., 2016. Vessel noise pollution as a human threat to fish: assessment of the stress response in gilthead sea bream (Sparus aurata, Linnaeus 1758). Fish Physiological Biochemistry 42: 631.

Clark, C. W., Ellison, W. T., Southall, B. L., Hatch, L., Van Parijs, S. M., Frankel, A., Ponirakis, D., 2009. Acoustic masking in marine ecosystems: intuitions, analysis, and implication. Marine Ecology Progress Series 395: 201-222.

CMS, 2008. Adverse anthropogenic marine/ocean noise impacts on cetaceans and other biota. UNEP/CMS/Resolution 9.19.

CMS, 2011. CMS Further Steps to Abate Underwater Noise Pollution for the Protection of Cetaceans and Other Migratory Species. UNEP/CMS/Resolution 10.24.

CMS, 2017a. Family Guidelines on Environmental Impact Assessment for Marine Noise generating Activities. Appendix to Resolution Adverse Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Cetaceans and Other Migratory Species, UNEP/CMS COP12.

CMS, 2017b. Adverse Impacts of Anthropogenic Noise on Cetaceans and Other Migratory Species. UNEP/CMS/Resolution 12.14.

Commonwealth of Australia, 2017. Recovery Plan for Marine Turtles in Australia, Australian government.

Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy, 2000. Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Regulations 2000. Statutory Rules No. 181, 2000 made under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. Australian government.

Cook, W. D., Seiford, L. M., 1978. Priority rankings and consensus formation. Management Science 24: 1721-1732.

Curtis, W.F., 1951. Interim Report - Self-noise of QHB transducers in 120-inch retractable domes aboard CVL-type ships. DTMB Report C-484, Dec. 1951.

Dekeling, R.P.A., Tasker, M.L., Van der Graaf, A.J., Ainslie, M.A, Andersson, M.H., André, M., Borsani, J.F., Brensing, K., Castellote, M., Cronin, D., Dalen, J., Folegot, T., Leaper, R., Pajala, J., Redman, P., Robinson, S.P., Sigray, P., Sutton, G., Thomsen, F., Werner, S., Wittekind, D., Young, J.V., 2014. Monitoring Guidance for Underwater Noise in European Seas, Part I: Executive Summary, JRC Scientific and Policy Report EUR 26557 EN, Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.

De Robertis, A. Handegard, N. O., 2013. Fish avoidance of research vessels and the efficacy of noise-reduced vessels: a review, ICES Journal of Marine Science 70 (1), 34-45.

DFO, 2018. Review of the Effectiveness of Recovery Measures for Southern Resident Killer Whales. Fisheries and Ocean Canada.

Dolman, S.J., Jasny, M., 2015. Evolution of marine noise pollution management, Aquatic Mammals 41(4): 357-374.

Dooling, R. J., Leek, M. R., Popper, A. N., 2015. Effects of noise on fishes: what we can learn from humans and birds. Integrative zoology 10(1) 29–37.

Dyndo, M., Wiśniewska, D., Rojano-Doñate, L. *et al.*, 2015. Harbour porpoises react to low levels of high frequency vessel noise. Sci Rep 5, 11083. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep11083

EC, 2008. Directive 2008/56/EC of the European Council and of the Council. Brussels, EU.

EC, 2010. Commission decision of 1 September 2010 on criteria and methodological standards on good environmental status of marine waters. Official Journal of the European Union 2010/477/EU. Brussels: European Commission. Brussels, EU.

EC, 2012. The SILENV Project: Ship Innovative soLutions to rEduce Noise and Vibrations. EU 7FP.

EC, 2017. Commission Decision 2017/8482. Brussels, EU.

EC, 2018. Full texts of contribution from FAO to the report of the Secretary-General on the topic of focus of the nineteenth meeting of the United Nations Open-Ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea. Brussels, EU.

Edmonds, N.J., Firmin, C.F., Goldsmith, D., Faulkner, R.C., Wood, D.T., 2016. A review of crustacean sensitivity to high amplitude underwater noise: Data needs for effective risk assessment in relation to UK commercial species. Marine Pollution Bulletin, vol. 108, issues 1-2.

Erbe, C. and D. M. Farmer. 2000. Zones of impact around icebreakers affecting beluga whales in the Beaufort Sea. Journal Acoustical Society of America 108: 1332-1340.

Evans, P. 2003. Shipping as a possible source of disturbance to cetaceans in the ASCOBANS region. ASCOBANS Document MOP4/Doc. 17(S) Rev.1.

FAO, 2008. The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2018. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.

FAO, 2012a. The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2016. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.

FAO, 2012b. Technical Guidelines for Responsible Fisheries. No. 13. Rome, FAO.

FAO, 2016. The state of world fisheries and aquaculture 2016. Contributing to food security and nutrition for all. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization.

Ferrari, M.C.O., McCormick, M.I., Meekan, M.G., Simpson, S.D., Nedelec, S.L., Chivers, D.P., 2018. School is out on noisy reefs: the effect of boat noise on predator learning and survival of juvenile coral reef fishes. Proceedings of the Royal Society B 284.

Filiciotto, F., Vazzana, M., Celi, M., Maccarrone, V., Ceraulo, M., Buffa, G., Arizza, V., de Vincenzi, G., Grammauta, R., Mazzola, S., and Buscaino, G., 2016. Underwater noise from boats: Measurement of its influence on the behaviour and biochemistry of the common prawn (Palaemon serratus, Pennant 1777). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 478, 24-33.

Frisk, G., 2012. Noiseonomics: The relationship between ambient noise levels in the sea and global economic trends. Scientific reports 2: 437.

Gassmann, M., Kindberg, L.B., Wiggins, S.M., Hildebrand, J.A., 2017. Underwater noise comparison of pre- and post-retrofitted MAERSK G-class container vessels. Scripps Institution of Oceanography, MPL-TM 616.

GFNMS & CBNMS, 2015. UPDATE for GFNMS & CBNMS Advisory Councils on Sanctuary Actions in Response to SAC Report: Vessel Strikes and Acoustic Impacts to Whales. Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuary.

van der Graaf, A.J., Ainslie, M.A., André, M., Brensing, K., Dalen, J., Dekelin, R.P.A., Robinson, S., Tasker, M.L., Thomsen, F. and Werner, S. 2012. European Marine Strategy Framework Directive-Good environmental status (MSFD GES): Report of the technical subgroup on underwater noise and other forms of energy. Brussels: European Commission.

Graham, A.L., Cooke, S.J., 2008. The effects of noise disturbance from various recreational boating activities common to inland waters on the cardiac physiology of a freshwater fish, the largemouth bass (Micropterus salmoides). Aquatic Conservation Marine Freshwater Ecosystems 18: 1315–1324.

Gray, H. and Van Waerebeek, K., 2011. Postural instability and akinesia in a pantropical spotted dolphin, Stenella attenuata, in proximity to operating airguns of a geophysical seismic vessel. Journal for Nature Conservation, 19: 363–367.

Green Marine, 2019. Green Marine Environmental Program. Performance Indicators for Ship owners. Quebec, Canada.

Hatch, L., Clark, C., Merrick, R., Van Parijs, S., Ponirakis, D., Schwehr, K., Thompson, M. and Wiley, D., 2008. Characterizing the relative contributions of large vessels to total ocean noise fields: a case study using the Gerry E. Studds Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary. Environmental Management 42, 735-752.

HELCOM, 2013. HELCOM Copenhagen ministerial declaration. Helsinki, Finland.

HELCOM, 2016a. Endorsement of HELCOM pre-core indicator on ‘Continuous low frequency anthropogenic sound’. Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission Working Group on the State of the Environment and Nature Conservation Tallinn, Estonia, 7-11 November, 2016.

HELCOM, 2016b. Regional Baltic Underwater Noise Roadmap 2015-2017. Adopted by HELCOM 37-2016. Helsinki, Finland.

HELCOM, 2017a. THEME 4: Noise WP 4.1 Deliverable 5: Compilation of internationally available mitigation measures and Baltic Sea country specific information. Final report 14 February 2017 with minor revisions 9 August 2017.

HELCOM, 2017b. BalticBOOST Appendix 1, THEME 4: Noise WP 4.1 Deliverable 5: Compilation of internationally available mitigation measures and Baltic Sea country specific information. Final report 14 February 2017 with minor revisions 9 August 2017.

HELCOM, 2017c. Measuring progress for the same targets in the Baltic Sea. Helsinki: HELCOM.

HELCOM, 2018a. Monitoring guidelines for continuous noise. Helsinki, Finland.

HELCOM, 2018b. Monitoring sub-programme on continuous noise. Helsinki, Finland.

HELCOM, 2018c. Thematic assessment of cumulative impacts on the Baltic Sea 2011-2016. Helsinki, Finland.

HELCOM, 2019. Noise Sensitivity of Animals in the Baltic Sea Environment. Proceedings N° 167.

Hildebrand, J.A., 2005. Impacts of anthropogenic sound. *Marine mammal research: conservation beyond crisis*, pp.101-124.

Holles, S., Simpson, S.D., Radford, A.N., Berten, L. and Lecchini, D., 2013. Boat noise disrupts orientation behaviour in a coral reef fish. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser*. 485, 295-300.

ICES, 1995. Underwater noise of research vessels. Review and recommendations. ICES Cooperative Research Report 209.

Ignizio, J.P., 1985. Multiobjective mathematical programming via the MULTIPLEX model and algorithm. European Journal of Operational Research 22:338.

IMO, 2007. Shipping noise on marine mammals. Submitted by the United States. Marine Environmental Protection Committee. MEPC 57/INF.4. 57th session. Agenda item 19. International Maritime Organization, London, UK.

IMO, 2014. Guidelines for the reduction of underwater noise from commercial shipping to address adverse impacts on marine life. MEPC.1/Circ.8337 April 2014. International Maritime Organization, London, UK.

IMO, 2015. New information on impact of underwater noise from ships on fish and invertebrates. Submitted by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Marine Environment Protection Committee, 68th session, agenda item 20, MEPC 68/INF.26, 6 March 2015. International Maritime Organization, London, UK.

IMO, 2018a. Further information related to impacts of underwater noise on marine life. Submitted by International Whaling Commission. Marine Environment Protevtion Committee, 72nd session, agenda item 16, MEPC 72/INF.9, 19 January 2018. International Maritime Organization, London, UK.

IMO, 2018b. Reducing underwater noise utilizing ship design and operational measures submitted by Canada. Marine Environment Protection Committee, 72/2 session. International Maritime Organization, London, UK.

ITTC, 2014. Underwater Noise from Ships, Full Scale Measurements. Recommended Procedures and Guidelines. Document 7.5-04-04-01.

IUCN, 2004. Resolution 3.068 concerning undersea noise pollution. World Conservation Congress at its 3rd Session in Bangkok, Thailand, 17-25 November 2004.

IWC, 1998. Resolution for the Funding of Work on Environmental Concerns. IWC Resolution 1998-6.

IWC, 2009. Report of the Scientific Committee. Appendix K. Report of the Standing Working Group on Environmental Concerns. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management (Suppl.) 11: 266-302.

IWC, 2011. Report of the Scientific Committee (IWC, 2011). Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 12 (Suppl.), 1–75.

IWC, 2014. Report of the Scientific Committee. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management 16

(Suppl.), 1–87. 2015.

IWC, 2015. Report of the Scientific Committee. Appendix K. Report of the Standing Working Group on Environmental Concerns. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management (Suppl.) 11: 266-302.

IWC, 2017a. IWC Scientific Committee Recommendations on Noise. SC66b meeting, June 2016, Bled, Slovenia.

IWC, 2017b. Report of the Workshop on Acoustic Masking and Whale Population Dynamics, 4-5 June 2016, Bled, Slovenia. Journal of Cetacean Research and Management (Suppl.) 18: 617-627.

Jay, S., 2017. Marine Spatial Planning. Assessing net benefits and improving effectiveness. Issue paper, Green Growth and Sustainable Development Forum 2017, the 21 & 22 November, Paris.

Jasny, M., 2014. Reducing noise from commercial ships: Current efforts and ways forward. New York: Natural Resources Defense Council.

Jézéquel, Y., Bonnel, J., Coston-Guarini, J., Guarini, J.-M. and Chauvaud, L., 2018. Sound characterization of the European lobster Homarus gammarus (L.) in tanks. Aquatic Biology 27 13-23. 10.3354/ab00692.

Joint Working Group on Vessel Strikes and Acoustic Impacts, 2012. Vessel Strikes and Acoustic Impacts. Report of a Joint Working Group of Gulf of the Farallones and Cordell Bank National Marine Sanctuaries Advisory Councils. San Francisco, CA.

Kaplan, M.B. and Mooney, T.A., 2015. Ambient noise and temporal patterns of boat activity in the US Virgin Islands National Park. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 98 (1-2): 221-228.

Kroodsma, D.A., Mayorga, J., Hochberg, T., Miller, N.A., Boerder, K., Ferretti, F., Wilson, A., Bergman, B., White, T.D., Block, B.A., Woods, P., Sullivan, B., Costello, C. and Worm, B., 2018. Tracking the global footprint of fisheries. Nature 359: 6378.

Kuperman, W.A., 2013. Ocean noise and signal processing. San Diego: Scripps Institution of Oceanography.

Lagardère, J.P., 1982. Effects of noise on growth and reproduction of crangon in rearing tanks. Marine Biology 71: 177- 186.

Leaper, R.C., 2019. The role of slower vessel speeds in reducing greenhouse gas emissions, underwater noise and collision risk to whales. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *6*, p.505.

Leaper, R., Renilson, M., Ryan, C., 2014. Reducing underwater noise from large commercial ships: Current status and future directions. Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology 9(1).

Linares, P., Romero, C., 2002. Aggregation of preferences in an environmental economics context: a goal-programming approach, Omega 30(2) 89-95.

Lloyds Register, 2011. Implementing a ship energy efficiency management plan (SEEMP): Guidance for shipowners and operators. Lloyds Register, London UK.

Lurton, X., 2010. An introduction to underwater acoustics. Principles and applications. Berlin: Springer.

Macgillivray, A. and Li, Z., 2018. Reductions in underwater radiated noise from shipping during the 2017 Haro Strait vessel slowdown trial. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 144: 1731-1731. 10.1121/1.5067678.

Mann, D.A., Casper, B.M., Boyle, K.S. Tricas, T.C., 2007. On the attraction of larval fishes to reef sounds. Marine Ecology Progress Series 338: 307–310.

MAPAMA, 2012. Estrategia marina. Demarcacion marina canaria. Evaluacion inicial. Parte II : Analisis de presiones e impactos. Madrid : Ministerio de Agriculture, Pesca, Alimentacion y Medio Ambiente.

Marley, S. A., Salgado Kent, C. P., Erbe, C., Parnum, I. M., 2017. Effects of vessel traffic and underwater noise on the movement, behaviour and vocalisations of bottlenose dolphins in an urbanised estuary. Scientific Reports 7(1): 13437.

McCarthy, E. 2004. International regulation of underwater sound: Establishing rules and standards to address ocean noise pollution. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McCormick, M.I., Allan, B.J.M., Harding, H., Simpson, S.D., 2018. Boat noise impacts risk assessment in a coral reef fish but effects depend on engine type. Scientific Reports.

McKenna, M. F., Wiggins, S. M., Hildebrand, J. A., 2013. Relationship between container ship underwater noise levels and ship design, operational and oceanographic conditions. Scientific Reports 3, 1760.

Merchant, N. D., 2019. Underwater noise abatement: Economic factors and policy options. Environmental Science & Policy 92.

Merk, O., 2013. The Competitiveness of Global Port-Cities: Synthesis Report. OECD Regional Development Working Papers, n° 2013/13, OCDE editions, Paris.

Montgomery, J.C., Jeffs, A., Simpson, S.D., Meekan, M.G., Tindle, C., 2006. Sound as an orientation clue for the pelagic larvae of reef fish and crustaceans. Advances in Marine Biology 51: 143–196.

Nedelec, S.L. et al., 2016. Particle motion: the missing link in underwater acoustic ecology. Methods in Ecology and Evolution, vol. 7, issue 7.

NEPTUNES, 2019. Best practice guide version 1.0. Mitigation of noise from ships at berth. Noise Exploration Program To Understand Noise Emitted by Seagoing ships.

Nieukirk, S.L., Stafford, K.M., Mellinger, D.K., Dziak, R.P. and Fox, C.G., 2004. Low-frequency whale and seismic airgun sounds recorded from the mid-Atlantic Ocean. J. Acoust. Soc. Am., 115(4): 1832–184.

NOAA, 2016. Ocean noise strategy roadmap. Maryland: U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

NoMEPorts, 2008. Good Practice Guide on Port Area Noise Mapping and Management NoMEPorts. Noise Management in European Ports.

Nordström, E. M., Öhman, K., Eriksson, L. O., 2012. Approaches for aggregating preferences in participatory forest planning - An experimental study. The Open Forest Science Journal 5: 23-32.

Nowacek, D., Christopher, C., Mann, D., Miller, P., Rosenbaum, H., Golden, J., Jasny, M., Kraska, J., Southall, B., 2015. Marine seismic surveys and ocean noise: Time for coordinated and prudent planning. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment. 13. 378-386.

OECD/ITF, 2015. The impact of mega-ships. International Transport Forum Policy Series no. 10. OECD/ITF editions, Paris.

OCDE/ITF, 2018a. Decarbonising maritime transport. OECD/ITF editions, Paris.

OCDE/ITF, 2018b. Reducing shipping GHG emissions: Lessons from port-based initiatives. OECD/ITF publishing, Paris.

OSPAR, 2009a. Overview of the impacts of anthropogenic underwater sound in the marine environment. London: The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic.

OSPAR, 2009b. Assessment of the environment impact of underwater noise. London: The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic Commission.

OSPAR, 2009c. Assessment of impacts of shipping. London: The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic Commission.

OSPAR, 2014. Monitoring guidance for underwater noise in European seas. London: The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic Commission.

OSPAR, 2015. Ambient Noise Monitoring Strategy. London: The Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic Commission.

Paillet, J., 2012. Coûts liés à l'introduction d'énergie dans le milieu et à des modifications du régime hydrologique. Evaluation initiale, La Directive Cadre Stratégie pour le Milieu Marin (DCSMM).

Port of Prince Rupert, 2019. Port of Prince Rupert Green Wave Programme. Port of Prince Rupert, Canada.

Rabin, L.A. and Greene, C.M., 2002. Changes in acoustic communication systems in human-altered environments. *J. Comp. Psychol.* 116: 137–141. doi:10.1037/0735-7036.116.2.137. PMID:12083606.

Radford, C.A., Montgomery, J.C, Caiger, P., Higgs, D.M., 2012. Pressure and particle motion detection thresholds in fish: a re-examination of salient auditory cues in teleosts. Journal of Experimental Biology 215 (19): 3429-3435.

Recuero Lopez, M., 1995. Ingenieria acustica. Madrid: Paraninfo (eds.).

Recuero Virto, L., Dumez, H., Galichon, P., Muntoni, M., De Courtois, F., 2019. Noise in the ocean. What can we learn from Le Havre case study? OCEAN University Initiative Policy Brief, Issue 3. Univ Brest, France.

Richardson, W.J., Würsig, B., 1997. Influences of man-made noise and other human actions on cetacean behaviour. Marine and Freshwater Behavior and Physiology 29: 183-209 330.

Rightship, 2013. Calculating and comparing CO2 emissions from the global maritime fleet. http://site.rightship.com.

Rijkswaterstaat, 2015. Underwater noise. Social costs benefit analysis. Amersfoort: Haskoningdhv Nederland S.V.

Rodriguez, A.M., Mullor, R.S., Palomo, P.B., Baudin, E., Lamaison, V., 2015. New European underwater noise measurement standard developed in the AQUO project. OCEANS 2015 - Genova, 1-6.

Romero, C., 1991. Handbook of critical issues in goal programming. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Romero, C., 2001. Extended Lexicographic Goal Programming: A Unifying Approach. Omega, The International Journal of Management Science, 29: 63-71.

Ross, D. 1976. Mechanics of underwater noise. New York: Pergamon Press.

Saaty, T. L., 1977. A scaling method for priorities in hierarchical structures. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*, 15: 234-281.

Saaty, T.L., 1980. The Analytic Hierarchy Process: Planning, Priority Setting, and Resource Allocation. McGraw-Hill, New York.

Sadaf, S. Yashaswini, P., Halagur, S., Khan, F., Rangaswamy, S., 2015. A literature survey on ambient noise analysis for underwater acoustic signals. International Journal of Computer Engineering and Sciences, Vol. 1, Issue 7.

Sara, G., Dean, J.M., D'Amato, D., Buscaino, G., Oliveri, A., Genovese, S., Ferro, S., Buffa, G., Lo Martire, M. and Mazzola, S., 2007. Effect of boat noise on the behaviour of bluefin tuna Thunnus thynnus in the Mediterranean Sea. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* 331, 243-253.

Scholik, A.R., and Yan, H.Y., 2002. Effects of boat engine noise on the auditory sensitivity of the fathead minnow. Pimephales promelas. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*. 63: 203-209.

Sirovic, A., Hildebrand, J.A., Wiggins, S.M., 2007. Blue and fin whale call source levels and propagation range in the Southern Ocean. The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 122(2) 1208-15.

Simpson, S.D., Meekan, M.G., McCauley, R.D., Jeffs, A., 2004. Attraction of settlement-stage coral reefs fishes to ambient reef noise. Marine Ecology Progress Series 276: 263–268.

Simpson, S.D., Radford, A.N., Tickle, E.J., Meekan, M.G., Jeffs, A.G., 2011. Adaptive avoidance of reef noise. PLoS ONE 6(2).

Solé, M., Lenoir, M., Durfort, M., López-Bejar, M., Lombarte, A. et al., 2013a. Does exposure to noise from human activities compromise sensory information from cephalopod statocysts? Deep Sea Res II. 95, 160–181. doi: 10.1016/j.dsr2.2012.10.006.

Solé, M., Lenoir, M., Durfort, M., López-Bejar, M., Lombarte, A. et al., 2013b. Ultrastructural Damage of Loligo vulgaris and Illex coindetii statocysts after Low Frequency Sound Exposure. PLoS ONE. 8(10): e78825. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0078825.

Solé, M., Lenoir, M., Fortuño, J. M., Durfort, M., van der Schaar, M. and André, M., 2016. Evidence of Cnidarians sensitivity to sound after exposure to low frequency noise underwater sources. Sci Rep 6, 37979 doi: 10.1038/srep37979.

Solé, M., Sigray, P., Lenoir, M., van der Schaar, M., Lalander, E. and André, M., 2017. Offshore exposure experiments on cuttlefish indicate received sound pressure and particle motion levels associated with acoustic trauma. Sci Rep. 7, 45899. doi: 10.1038/srep45899.

Solé, M., Lenoir, M., Fortuño, J-M., van der Schaar, M. and André, M., 2018. A critical period of susceptibility to sound in the sensory cells of cephalopod hatchlings. Biology Open 7 (10). bio033860 doi: 10.1242/bio.033860.

Solé, M., Monge, M., André, M. and Quero, C., 2019. A proteomic analysis of the statocyst endolymph in common cuttlefish (Sepia officinalis): an assessment of acoustic trauma after exposure to sound. Sci Rep. 9, 9340. doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-45646-6.

Southall, B.L., Bowles, A.E., Ellison, W.T., Finneran, J.J., Gentry, R.L., Greene Jr., C.R., Kastak, D., Ketten, D.K., Miller, J.H., Nachtigall, P.E., Richardson, W.J., Thomas, J.A., Tyack, P.L., 2007. Marine mammal noise exposure criteria: initial scientific recommendations. Aquatic Mammals 33 (4): 412–522.

Southwood, A., Fritsches, K., Brill, R., Swimmer, Y., 2008. Sound, chemical and light detection in sea turtles and pelagic fishes: sensory-based approaches to bycatch reduction in longline fisheries. Endangered Species Ressources 5: 225-238

Sprague, M.W., Krahforst, C.K. and Luczkovich, J.J., 2016. Noise propagation from vessel channels into nearby fish nesting sites in very shallow water. *Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics* 27(1).

Stanley, J.A., Radford, C.A. and Jeffs, A.G., 2011. Behavioural response thresholds in New Zealand crab megalopae to ambient underwater sound. *PLoS One* 6, e28572.

Stanley, J. A., Van Parijs, S. M., Hatch, L. T., 2017. Underwater sound from vessel traffic reduces the effective communication range in Atlantic cod and haddock. Scientific Reports 7(1): 14633.

Stojanovic, M., Beaujean, P.P., 2013. Acoustic communication. In: Handbook on Ocean Engineering, Manhar R. Dhanak, Nikolaos I. Xiros (eds.): Springer International.

Tejedor, A., Sagarminaga, R. and Zorzo, P., 2012. Mitigación de los impactos del trafico marítimo en aguas españolas. Proyecto LIFE INDEMARES.

Traverso et al., 2016. Statistical analysis of ships noise records. 23rd International Congress on Sound & Vibration, Athens, 10-14 July 2016.

TSG UW Noise, 2013. Monitoring guidance for underwater noise in European Seas - Monitoring guidance specifications. 2nd Report. s.l.: Technical Subgroup on Underwater Noise (TSG Noise).

Tronstad, T., Åstrand, H.H., Haugom, G.P. and Langfeldt, L., 2017. Study on the use of fuel cells in shipping. European Maritime Safety Agency.

U.S. Office of Naval Research, 1998. Background noise. In: A Summary of underwater acoustic data. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Naval Research.

UN, 2010. Resumed review conference on the agreement relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks (24-28 May). New York: United Nations.

UN, 2018. Report of the Secretary-General on the topic of focus of the nineteenth meeting of the United Nations Open-ended Informal Consultative Process on Oceans and the Law of the Sea. Seventy-third session of the United Nation General Assembly.

UNCTAD, 2017. Review of maritime transport 2017. Geneva: United Nation Conference on Trade and Development.

UNCTAD, 2018. UNCTADstat. Geneva: United Nation Conference on Trade and Development.

UNEP/MAP, 2012. State of the Mediterranean Marine and Coastal Environment report.

Vakili, S., 2018. Under-water noise pollution sources, mitigation measures in commercial vessels: the trade-off analysis in the case of study for trans mountain project, Port of Vancouver, Canada. World Maritime University Dissertations 670.

Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, 2018. Enhancing Cetacean Habitat and Observation (ECHO) Program. 2018 Annual Report. Vancouver, Canada. https://www.portvancouver.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/2019-06-05-Annual-Report-ECHO-Program-2018.pdf

Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, 2020. Reference sheet EcoAction Program 2020. Vancouver, Canada. https://www.portvancouver.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2020-01-15-Reference-sheet-EcoAction-Program-2020.pdf

Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, 2019. Enhancing Cetacean Habitat and Observation Program (ECHO) 2018 voluntary slowdown in Haro Strait. Summary findings. Vancouver, Canada.

Vard Marine Inc., 2019. Ship underwater radiated noise. Report 368-000-0, rev 4, prepared for Innovation Centre of Transport Canada.

Vasconcelos, R. O., Amorim, M. C. P., Ladich, F., 2007. Effects of ship noise on the detectability of communication signals in the Lusitanian toadfish. Journal of Experimental Biology 210: 2104-2112.

Vermeij, M.J.A., Marhaver, K.L., Huijbers, C.M., Nagelkerken, I. and Simpson, S.D., 2010. Coral larvae move toward reef sounds. PLoS ONE 5(5): e10660.

Veirs, S., Veirs, V., Williams, R., *et al.*, 2017. A key to quieter seas: Half of ship noise comes from

15% of the fleet. Authorea.

Wale, M.A., Simpson, S.D., Radford, A.N., 2013. Size-dependent physiological responses of shore crabs to single and repeated playback of ship noise. Biological Letters 9.

Weilgart, L.S., 2007. The need for precaution in the regulation and management of undersea noise. Journal of International Wildife Law & Policy 10: 247-253.

Weilgart, L. 2018. The impact of ocean noise pollution on fish and invertebrates. Report for OceanCare, Switzerland. 34 pp.
https://www.oceancare.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/OceanNoise_FishInvertebrates_May2018.pdf

Wisniewska, D.M., Johnson, M., Teilmann, J., Siebert, U., Galatius, A., Dietz, R. and Madsen P.T., 2018. High rates of vessel noise disrupt foraging in wild harbour porpoises (Phocoena phocoena). Proc. R. Soc. B 285: 20172314. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.2314.

Wright, A.J. (ed.), 2009. Report of the workshop on assessing the cumulative impacts of underwater noise with other anthropogenic stressors on marine mammals: From ideas to action. Monterey, California, USA, 26th-29th August, 2009. Okeanos - Foundation for the Sea, Auf der Marienhöhe 15, D-64297 Darmstadt.

Wright, J.W., Deak, T., Parsons, E.C.M., 2009. Concerns Related to Chronic Stress in Marine Mammals. IWC SC/61/E16, 7 pp.

Wysocki, L.E. *et al*., 2006. Ship noise and cortisol secretion in European freshwater fishes. Biological Conservation 128: 501–508.

Appendix 1. Actions concerning underwater noise from shipping.

Table A1.1. International institutions acknowledging the contribution of shipping to underwater noise.

International institution	References
ACCOBAMS	ACCOBAMS (2004; 2007a).
Arctic Council	Arctic Council (2009; 2013).
ASCOBANS	ASCOBANS (2003; 2006).
CMS	CMS (2008; 2011; 2017b).
FAO	FAO (2012b).
HELCOM	HELCOM (2013).
IMO	IMO (2007).
IUCN	IUCN (2004).
IWC	IWC (1998; 2011; 2017b).
OSPAR	OSPAR (2009b; 2009c).
UNEP/MAP	UNEP/MAP (2012).
UN	UN (2018).

Source: Authors' elaboration (alphabetical order).

Table A1.2. International institutions proposing actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping.

International institution, references	Noise mapping of shipping	Impact of underwater noise from shipping on marine fauna	Options for mitigating underwater noise from shipping
ACCOBAMS (2007b).			X
ACCOBAMS (2010).			X (brief)
ACCOBAMS, forthcoming.			X
Arctic Council (2009).			X
Arctic Council (2019).	X		
CBD (2014).	X	X	
CMS (2017a).			X
EC (2008).	X (work plan)		
EC (2012).	X (green label)		
EC in AQUO-SONIC (2015).			X
EC in BIAS (2016).	X		
EC (2017).	X (definition of indicators)		
EC, forthcoming.		X (thresholds for indicators)	
HELCOM (2016b).	X	X	X (work plan)
HELCOM (2016a).	X (definition of indicator)		
HELCOM (2017a; 2017b).			X (survey)
HELCOM (2017c) .	X (sound map for the Baltic region)		
HELCOM (2018a).	X		
HELCOM (2018b).	X	X (cumulative pressures and impacts)	
HELCOM (2019).		X	
ICES (1995).		X (fishery research vessels)	
IMO (2005).			X (PSSAs)
IMO (2014).	X		X (rerouting; voluntary guidelines)
IMO, forthcoming.			X (Member States experience sharing)
IWC (2009).		X (reduction noise targets)	
IWC (2014; 2015).		X (stress and masking)	
IWC (2015).			X (IMO voluntary guidelines)
IWC (2017a; 2017b).	X (noisiest ships)		
OSPAR at Dekeling *et al.* (2014).	X		
OSPAR (2015).	X		
OSPAR, forthcoming.			X
UNEP/MAP (2012).	X	X (indicators)	

Source: Authors’ elaboration (alphabetical order).

Table A1.3. Countries engaged in regulating underwater noise from shipping.

Country	Regulations already in place (1) or planned (2), only monitoring programs or studies are reported (3)	References
Australia	1	Commonwealth Department of the Environment and Energy Ministry (2000), CBD (2016), Commonwealth of Australia (2017).
Canada	1	Bahtiarian (2017), Vancouver Fraser Port Authority (2018), DFO (2018).
Estonia	3	EC (2018).
Finland	3	CBD (2016), EC (2018).
France	3	CBD (2016), EC (2018).
Germany	1	HELCOM (2017a; 2017b).
Latvia	3	CBD (2016).
Lithuania	2	HELCOM (2017b), EC (2018).
Malta	1	EC (2018).
The Netherlands	3	UN (2018).
Poland	3	UN (2018).
Russia	3	HELCOM (2017b).
Sweden	1	HELCOM (2017b), UN (2018).
United States	1	GFNMS & CBNMS (2005), Joint Working Group on Vessel Strikes and Acoustic Impacts, 2012, CBD (2016), Gassmann *et al.* (2017).

Source: Authors' elaboration (alphabetical order).

Table A1.4. Underwater noise measurement standards relevant for shipping.

Institution and date	Content
NATO, 1995.	Standardization agreement No.1136 (STANAG), “Standards for use when measuring and reporting radiated noise characteristics of surface ships, submarines, helicopters, etc. in relation to sonar detection and torpedo risk”, May 29.
ANSI-ASA, 2009.	Quantities and procedures for description and measurement of underwater sound from ships - Part 1: General requirements. ANSI-ASA S12.64-2009/Part1.
DNV, 2010.	Part 6, chapter 24 - Silent class notation. Rules for classification of ships. s.l.: DNV, 2010.
TNO, 2011.	“Standard for measurement and monitoring of underwater noise, Part 1: physical quantities and their units”, TNO-DV 2011 C235.
ISO, 2012.	“Acoustics-Quantities and procedures for description and measurement of underwater sound from ships, Part 1: General requirements for measurements in deep water”, ISO/PAS 17208-1: 2012(E).
ISO, 2013.	“Ships and marine technology- Protecting marine ecosystem from underwater radiated noise- Measurement and reporting of Underwater sound radiated from merchant ships”, ISO/CD 16554.012.
ISO, 2014.	"Ships and marine technology - Measurement and reporting of underwater sound radiated from merchant ships - Survey measurement in deep-water", ISO 16554.3.
AQUO, 2014.	European Collaborative Project, deliverable D3.1, European URN Standard Measurement Method, April 2014.
ITTC, 2014.	Underwater Noise from Ships, Full Scale Measurements. Recommended Procedures and Guidelines.
ISO, 2016.	"Acoustics – Quantities and procedures for description and measurement of underwater sound from ships – Part 1: General requirements", ISO/DPAS 17208-1.
Lloyd's Register Group Limited, 2018.	Additional Design and Construction Procedure for the Determination of a Vessel’s Underwater Radiated Noise. ShipRight. Design and Construction. Additional Design Procedures.
ISO, 2019.	“Underwater acoustics - Quantities and procedures for description and measurement of underwater sound from ships -- Part 2: Determination of source levels from deep water measurements”, ISO/FDIS 17208-2. Under development.

Source: Authors’ elaboration based on ITTC (2014) and Rodriguez *et al*. (2015) (chronological order).

Table A1.5. Underwater noise notation for shipping.

Institution and date	Designation
ICES, 1995.	"Underwater Noise of Research Vessels Review and Recommendations".
DNV GL, 2010.	DNV GL Silent class notation (part of "Rules for classification of ships, new buildings").
Bureau Veritas, 2014.	Rule Note NR614 DT R00E – Underwater Radiated Noise (URN).
RINA, 2014.	RINA Dolphin.
ABS, 2018.	Guide for classification notation. Underwater noise. July 2018. American Bureau of Shipping.
Lloyd's Register, 2018.	Underwater notation on underwater radiated noise.

Source: Authors' elaboration (chronological order).

Appendix 2. The steering committee.

The steering committee was initially conceived to include maritime transport users as well as other ocean users (leisure activities and fisheries). These stakeholders were contacted and discussions took place on their views about underwater noise. These stakeholders were considered particularly relevant given the importance of including the socioeconomic impacts of underwater noise (UN, 2018). Major transport users have chosen to engage with the Clean Cargo Working Group and/or the Clean Shipping Index/Network. The Clean Cargo Working Group, which brings together shippers, shipping lines and freight forwarders to work towards more sustainable shipping, recently undertook an assessment of sustainability issues in the maritime transport industry to steer the organization's strategy for the coming years. While the topic of underwater noise pollution featured in the assessment, it was not included in the prioritized list of issues that the working group will work on in the near future. Likewise, underwater noise is an emerging topic that arouses interest, but it is not a core issue for the Clean Shipping Index/Network. As active members of these groups, transport users usually choose to focus their engagement on the most highly prioritized issues in the industry to ensure maximum impact. Transport users were therefore not included as members of the steering committee of the project.

Regarding leisure activities, representatives from large cruise lines, recreational boating and water sports were contacted. None of these representatives shared concerns about the impacts of underwater noise on the performance of their activity. These stakeholders noted that their own activities usually generate more noise locally (near users) than shipping lines. There was no reported (potential or proven) impact of underwater noise from shipping on the economic performance of their activities. Due to the lack of involvement of these stakeholders in this issue, ultimately they were not included as members of the steering committee. As an exception, marine-life-watching sea cruises are members of the steering committee. These stakeholders are concerned about the potential impact of shipping on their activities, particularly in areas where large ports are developing and hence traffic is steadily rising. However, in the discussions, no clear pattern was reported between the rising levels of shipping traffic and the distribution of marine mammals at the local level.

Concerning the fisheries sector, representatives from this social group were included as members of the steering committee. No impact of underwater noise on fishing performance was reported by the experts consulted. There are a large number of pressures and a strict regulatory framework in the fishing sector. As such, underwater noise is not perceived as a major issue in the sector. In the discussions, there was no reported impact on fishing performance even close to shipping lane hotspots (the Straits of Gibraltar, Canary Islands). Neither is there any reported trend between increased shipping traffic and fishing performance (the Straits of Gibraltar). This social group showed greater interest in underwater noise compared to the representatives of the leisure groups previously described, namely large cruise lines, recreational boating and water sports.

The role of the members of the steering committee was the following. Each member of the steering committee was required to provide input three times during the project to validate: (i) the scope and the methodology of the project, and the key actors to interview before designing the survey; (ii) the survey content; and (iii) the final output of the data processing exercise and the associated policy recommendations. The steering committee members could also provide advice and guidance throughout the development of the different phases of the project. Each meeting or exchange was flexible and was held by teleconference, telephone or email.

Members of the project steering committee

Port authorities and administrations

Port authorities

Carrie Brown, Director, Environmental programs, Vancouver Fraser Port Authority, Canada.
Pascal Galichon, Directeur du développement durable et du pilotage, Grand Port Maritime du Havre, France.
Kirsti Tarnanen-Sariola, Deputy director, Finnish Port Association, Finland.

Global and regional institutions

(Observer: Andrew Birchenough, Technical officer, Office for London Convention/Protocol & Ocean Affairs, Marine Environment Division, International Maritime Organization, United Kingdom.)
Maud Casier, National expert on secondment, Directorate-General for Environment, European Commission, Belgium.
(Observer: Marta Ruiz, Associate Professional Secretary, Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (HELCOM), Finland.)

National administrations

Leila Hatch, Co-leader, Ocean Noise Strategy, the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), United States.
Nathan Merchant, Lead scientist, Noise & Bioacoustics Team, Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS), United Kingdom.
Michelle Sanders, Director, Clean Water Policy, Transport Canada, Canada.

The shipping sector

Ship owners and industry

Anais Guerin, Responsable Environnement et Foncier, CAN – Groupe Roullier, France.
Lee Kindberg, Director, Environment & Sustainability, Maersk Line North America, United States.
Kathy Metcalf, President and CEO, Chamber of Shipping of America, United States.
Caroline Roux, Coordinatrice environnement, CMA-CGM, France.

Shipyards including engineering consulting firms and ship classification societies

Publio Beltran, Director General, TSI, Spain.
Caroline Fonti, Naval architect, CMA-CGM, France.
François Frey, President, Esprit de VELOX, France.
Alfonso Moreno, Expert, TSI, Spain.
Eric Baudin, Head of the Test & Measurements Section, Bureau Veritas, France.
Veronique Nolet, Program Manager, Green Marine, Canada.

Marine life watching sea cruises

Jake Keeton, Manager, Raggy Charters, South Africa.
Sophie Lewis, Responsible whale watching partner project manager, World Cetacean Alliance, United Kingdom.

The fisheries sector

Fisheries including small-scale and indigenous fishing communities

Ignacio Belmonte Rincón, President, ARESTRECHO (Asociación Armadores del Estrecho), Spain.

Andrés Cisneros-Montemayor, Program manager / Research associate, Nippon Foundation, Nereus Program, Fisheries Economics Research Unit, The University of British Columbia, Canada.
Ricardo Federizon, Senior fisheries management coordinator, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization, Canada.

Analysts

Academics

Natacha Aguilar de Soto, Director, Cetacean research, Grupo de Investigación en Biodiversidad, Ecología Marina y Conservación, La Laguna University, Spain.
Michel André, Director, Laboratory of Applied Bioacoustics, Polytechnic University of Cataluña, Spain.
Cedric Gervaise, Senior scientist, Chorus chair, France.

Environmental consulting firms

Thomas Folegot, President and CEO, Quiet Oceans, France.
Michele Halvorsen, Manager, Ocean Sound & Marine Life Services, United States.
Alessio Maglio,Cchargé d'études en environnement marin, Sinay, France.
John V. Young, Consultant, DHI Environment and Water, United States.

The biodiversity conservation community

Institutions specializing in marine mammals

Florence Descrois-Comanducci, Executive secretary, the Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans in the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and contiguous Atlantic area (ACCOBAMS), Monaco.

Non-governmental organizations

Cato C. ten Hallers-Tjabbes, Marine scientist, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) representative for underwater acoustic pollution, the Netherlands.
Michael Jasny, director, Marine Mammal Protection, Natural Resources Defense Council, United States.
Rickard Lindström, Director, Clean Shipping Index, Sweden.
Sigrid Lüber, The European Coalition for Silent Oceans, Oceancare, President, Switzerland.

Appendix 3. Survey.

Please submit your ***individual view*** *and not that of the country or institution you represent.*
Personal information will not be disclosed.
Note that underwater noise solutions will depend on the particular port's characteristics and local fauna.

- In which country is the institution you work for located? …………………………………………
- With which group do you identify yourself **predominantly** (select one category only)? *Please mark with an X.*

Port authorities	
Maritime affairs administration	
Shipping sector (ship owners, industry, classification societies, engineering firms)	
Fisheries sector	
Analysts (academics, environmental consulting firms)	
Biodiversity conservation community	
Other (please specify:…………………………………………………………..….)	

- **Question 1.** While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following options should port actions **preferably** seek to support to reduce underwater noise from shipping? *Please enter a number between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value. Please enter NA for not applicable/do not know.*

OPTIONS WITH GLOBAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	**Value (1 to 10 or NA)**
Design: Hull, propeller, engine (when the measures increase energy efficiency and reduce underwater noise and air emissions)	
Design: Type of fuel (LNG, methanol, fuel cells, battery hybrid) (to reduce underwater noise and air emissions; not all solutions are mature)	
Design: Larger vessels (to reduce underwater noise and air emissions)	
Operational: Ship maintenance (hull, propeller) (to increase energy efficiency and to reduce underwater noise and air emissions)	
Operational: Ships operate at design load conditions (to increase energy efficiency and reduce underwater noise and air emissions) (optimum trim and ballast conditions for a certain speed)	
OPTIONS WITH LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	**Value (1 to 10 or NA)**
Operational: Ships at reduced speed, change of route, travel in convoy (can reduce underwater noise; can increase shipping costs) (usually limited to a small geographical area, their applicability depending on the port's characteristics)	
Operational: Ships use onshore power supply facilities at ports (to reduce underwater noise and air emissions)	

- **Question 2.** While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following actions should ports **preferably** take to reduce underwater noise from shipping? *Please enter a number between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value. Please enter NA for not applicable/do not know.*

ACTIONS WITH GLOBAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	**Value**

	(1 to 10 or NA)
Port fees charged according to underwater noise performance (rebates for ships with better performance or differentiated fees according to performance)	
Priority in the allocation of berth slots for ships generating less underwater noise	
ACTIONS **WITH LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE**	**Value** **(1 to 10 or NA)**
Underwater noise criteria in selecting port service providers (terminal operators, towage operators, dredgers)	
Reduction in ship waiting time at ports through collaboration along the entire logistical maritime chain (mooring, berthing, anchoring, cargo handling; possibly leading to mutual benefits, for instance, through the reduction in the waiting time compensation paid by ports)	
Proper port and barrier design, onshore energy facilities (relocation of noisiest activities, physical barriers against noise propagation, containers on rubber insulation, onshore power supply, electric charging systems, bunkering facilities for alternative fuels, etc.)	
Underwater noise mitigation equipment to protect local fauna (devices to displace marine fauna such as acoustic deterrents or to act as a barrier against noise such as air bubble curtains)	

Question 3: Explanations to complete the Table on the next page

Your answers to question 3 will be used to develop analyses to prioritize decision-making alternatives involving multiple social groups and multiple goals (see Linares and Romero, 2002). In particular, the comparison scale is used to express the importance of one alternative over another:

Explanation of the comparison scale	Numeric values to enter
If option A and B are EQUALLY important	1
If option A is MODERATELY more important than option B	3
If option A is STRONGLY more important than option B	5
If option A is VERY STRONGLY more important than option B	7
If option A is EXTREMELY more important than option B	9

Example of use of the comparison scale

Given alternatives A and B in the Table below, you can assess their relative importance:

- In the first row of the Table below, if you think that option A "Effectiveness assessment" is STRONGLY more important than option B "Raising awareness", then enter "A" in the *Preference* column (you indicate that you prefer A over B), and 5 in the *Intensity* Column (you indicate that you have a strong preference for A over B).
- In the second row of the Table below, if you think that option B "Actions of a voluntary nature" is EXTREMELY more important than option A "Effectiveness assessment", then enter "B" in the *Preference* column (you indicate that you prefer B over A), and 9 in the Intensity Column (you indicate that you have an extremely strong preference for B over A).
- In the third row of the Table below, if you think that option A "Focus on key priorities" and option B "Actions of a voluntary nature" are EQUALLY important, then enter "A" or "B" in the *Preference* column, and 1 in the *Intensity* Column (you indicate that you have the same preference for A and B).

Comparison of options Option A	 Option B	Preference	Intensity
Effectiveness assessment	Raising awareness	A	5
Effectiveness assessment	Actions of a voluntary nature	B	9
Effectiveness assessment	Focus on key priorities	A	1

- **Question 3.** Using the comparison scale, which of the following options can help support port actions to reduce underwater noise from shipping?

Please enter A or B in the Preference column.
Then, enter the intensity of your preference in the Intensity column by using the scale 1 to 9 (Equal=1 Moderate= 3 Strong= 5 Very strong= 7 Extremely= 9).

Comparison of options Option A	 Option B	Preference	Intensity
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Raising awareness** (among port staff and the general public; through training, ports' corporate social responsibility reports)		
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Actions of a voluntary nature**		
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Focus on key priorities** (noisiest ships, biodiversity hotspots)		
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Integration with other actions** (other actions on air emissions and energy efficiency; for example, by making underwater noise a key green indicator)		
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Different actions applied to green and dirty ships** (not only positive actions for green ships)		
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Broad stakeholder participation**		
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Cooperation between ports to scale up actions** (greater harmonization of green actions and indicators; joint request for action by the International Maritime Organization)		
Effectiveness assessment (through monitoring, reporting, verification)	**Political and/or social demand**		

- Do you want to share any comments?..
....
....
....
....
....
- This survey is anonymous. If you wish to receive its results, please provide an email address:
....

Appendix 4. Other results of the survey.

Table A4.1. In which country is the institution you work for located?

Country	Number of respondents
Belgium	2
Canada	4
Denmark	3
Estonia	1
Finland	1
France	6
Germany	2
Italy	2
Lithuania	1
Norway	1
Portugal	1
Spain	1
Sweden	4
The Netherlands	3
United States	6

Table A4.2. With which group do you identify yourself predominantly?

Stakeholders	Number of respondents
Port authorities	8
Maritime affairs administration	4
Shipping sector (ship owners, industry, classification societies, engineering firms)	10
Fisheries sector	0
Analysts (academics, environmental consulting firms)	12
Biodiversity conservation community	4
Other (please specify:……………………………………………………….)	0

Note: The respondent could only select one stakeholder category.

Table A4.3. While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following options should port actions preferably seek to support to reduce underwater noise from shipping? (standard deviation values, question 1).

	Port authority	Maritime affairs administration	Shipping sector	Analysts	Biodiversity conservation community	All groups
Design: Hull, propeller, engine	3.7	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.7
Design: Type of fuel	1.1	1.4	1.8	2.2	1.8	1.7
Design: Larger vessels	3.1	2.7	2.4	2.1	1.3	2.3
Operational: Ship maintenance	2.9	0.4	1.0	1.4	1.8	1.5
Operational: Ships operate at design load conditions	2.7	2.5	1.7	2.1	1.6	2.1
OPTIONS WITH GLOBAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	2.7	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.5	1.8
Operational: Reduced speed, change of route, travel in convoy	2.9	1.0	1.6	1.8	1.0	1.7
Operational: Ships use onshore power supply facilities at ports	19	2.0	2.2	1.7	0.9	1.7
OPTIONS WITH LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	2.4	1.6	1.9	1.8	0.9	1.7
OPTIONS WITH GLOBAL AND LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	2.6	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.3	1.8

Note: This Table reports standard deviation values. Respondents were requested to enter a number between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value.

Table A4.4. While acknowledging the wide variations in ports' specificities, which of the following actions should ports preferably take to reduce underwater noise from shipping? (standard deviation values, question 2).

	Port authority	Maritime affairs administration	Shipping sector	Analysts	Biodiversity conservation community	All groups
Port fees charged according to underwater noise performance	2.4	2.0	1.4	1.7	1.0	1.7
Priority in the allocation of berth slots for ships generating less underwater noise	2.0	2.3	1.7	3.2	1.5	2.1
ACTIONS WITH GLOBAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	2.2	2.1	1.6	2.5	1.3	1.9
Underwater noise criteria in selecting port service providers	2.9	1.0	1.7	2.8	0.8	1.8
Reduction in ship waiting time at ports through collaboration along the entire logistical maritime chain	1.8	0.9	1.6	2.5	1.3	1.6
Proper port and barrier design, onshore energy facilities	2.4	1.6	2.1	1.8	1.8	2.0
Underwater noise mitigation equipment to protect local fauna	2.1	2.0	3.0	1.8	1.6	2.0
ACTIONS WITH LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	2.3	1.4	2.1	2.3	1.3	1.9
ACTIONS WITH GLOBAL AND LOCAL IMPACTS ON UNDERWATER NOISE	2.4	1.6	1.9	2.3	1.3	1.7

Note: This Table reports mean values. Respondents were requested to enter a number between 1 and 10, where 1 means a very low value and 10 a very high value.

A4.5. Determination of the social preferences by the extended goal programing model: Non-governmental organizations.

Achievement function

$$\text{Min } (1-\lambda)D+\lambda \sum_{i=1}^{9}\sum_{j=1}^{4} (\bar{n}_{ij}+\bar{p}_{ij})$$

Subject to:

Goals

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i1}+\bar{p}_{i1}) - D \leq 0$

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i2}+\bar{p}_{i2}) - D \leq 0$

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i3}+\bar{p}_{i3}) - D \leq 0$

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i4}+\bar{p}_{i4}) - D \leq 0$

$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{11}-\bar{p}_{11} = x_1^{12}$

$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{12}-\bar{p}_{12} = x_1^{22}$

$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{13}-\bar{p}_{13} = x_1^{32}$

$W_1^s+\bar{n}_{14}-\bar{p}_{14} = x_1^{42}$

$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{21}-\bar{p}_{21} = x_2^{12}$

$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{22}-\bar{p}_{22} = x_2^{22}$

$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{23}-\bar{p}_{23} = x_2^{32}$

$W_2^s+\bar{n}_{24}-\bar{p}_{24} = x_2^{42}$

$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{31}-\bar{p}_{31} = x_3^{12}$

$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{32}-\bar{p}_{32} = x_3^{22}$

$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{33}-\bar{p}_{33} = x_3^{32}$

$W_3^s+\bar{n}_{34}-\bar{p}_{34} = x_3^{42}$

$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{41}-\bar{p}_{41} = x_4^{12}$

$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{42}-\bar{p}_{42} = x_4^{22}$

$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{43}-\bar{p}_{43} = x_4^{32}$

$W_4^s+\bar{n}_{44}-\bar{p}_{44} = x_4^{42}$

$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{51}-\bar{p}_{51} = x_5^{12}$

$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{52}-\bar{p}_{52} = x_5^{22}$

$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{53}-\bar{p}_{53} = x_5^{32}$

$W_5^s+\bar{n}_{54}-\bar{p}_{54} = x_5^{42}$

$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{61}-\bar{p}_{61} = x_6^{12}$

$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{62}-\bar{p}_{62} = x_6^{22}$

$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{63}-\bar{p}_{63} = x_6^{32}$

$W_6^s+\bar{n}_{64}-\bar{p}_{64} = x_6^{42}$

$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{71}-\bar{p}_{71} = x_7^{12}$

$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{72}-\bar{p}_{72} = x_7^{22}$

$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{73}-\bar{p}_{73} = x_7^{32}$

$W_7^s+\bar{n}_{74}-\bar{p}_{74} = x_7^{42}$

$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{81}-\bar{p}_{81} = x_8^{12}$

$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{82}-\bar{p}_{82} = x_8^{22}$

$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{83}-\bar{p}_{83} = x_8^{32}$

$W_8^s+\bar{n}_{84}-\bar{p}_{84} = x_8^{42}$

$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{91}-\bar{p}_{91} = x_9^{12}$

$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{92}-\bar{p}_{92} = x_9^{22}$

$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{93}-\bar{p}_{93} = x_9^{32}$

$W_9^s+\bar{n}_{94}-\bar{p}_{94} = x_9^{42}$

Accounting rows

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i1}+\bar{p}_{i1}) - D_1=0$

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i2}+\bar{p}_{i2}) - D_2=0$

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i3}+\bar{p}_{i3}) - D_3=0$

$\sum_{i=1}^{9} (\bar{n}_{i4}+\bar{p}_{i4}) - D_4=0$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{9}\sum_{j=1}^{4} (\bar{n}_{ij}+\bar{p}_{ij}) - Z = 0$$

Note: See section 3.3 for the definition of these variables. In this model, x_i^{k2} is the preference weight attached to the ith criterion by the kth member of the 2nd group. The x_i^{k2}variable is not disclosed since it reveals individual data and is therefore confidential. Note m=4 since there are four members in the biodiversity conservation community social group.

A5.5. Social weights used with the extended goal programing model: Non-governmental organizations.

Z	D	D_1	D_2	D_3	D_4	W_1^s	W_2^s	W_3^s	W_4^s	W_5^s	W_6^s	W_7^s	W_8^s	W_9^s
Majority consensus (λ=1)														
1.70	0.67	0.54	0.67	0.19	0.36	3	3	14	13	13	7	13	14	4
Minority consensus (λ=0)														
1.90	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.40	0.48	3	2	2	13	11.5	7	3	13	8

Note: This Table shows the results of the MCDM model in Table A5.4. Z is the sum of D_1-D_4, D measures the maximum of the values D_1-D_4, D_1-D_4 represents the disagreement of each of the four individuals in the group of non-governmental organizations with respect to the consensus that is obtained, and W_1^s-W_9^s are the reference weights (in percentage) attached by society to each criterion as listed in Table 3.3.