Unite the Union response to the Transport Committee inquiry into the Government's proposal for a revised National Policy Statement for Ports (NPSP).

1. Introduction

1.1. This submission is made by Unite, the UK's largest trade union with over one million members across all sectors of the economy, including manufacturing, financial services, transport, food, agriculture, construction, energy, utilities, information technology, service industries, health, local government and the not-for-profit sector. Unite also organises in the community, enabling those who are not in employment to be part of our union.

1.2. Of particular interest to this inquiry Unite represents workers in the ports, in the waterways that shepherd the cargo vessels to the quayside and out again, as well as those workers that: - supply the ports with energy and fuel supplies; - distribute the cargos to and from the ports by every mode of transport be that road, rail, canal barge or coastal shipping. Unite is also the largest trade union in the aviation sector and combined Unite represents over a quarter of a million members in transport modes.

2. Committee inquiry Questions

a. Does the proposed revised Ports National Policy Statement (NPSP) provide clear guidance to the ports sector and appropriate support for growth in the sector?

2.1. Unite notes that the revised NPSP is not that dissimilar to the existing status quo but makes some sweeping statements that is dismissive of rail and air freight capacity.

2.2. It is true that Rail capacity is "limited" but could be improved dramatically if this end of the tunnel was brought up to the W12[1] European standard loading gauge clearances (space around the tracks) which could allow European trains to transit all the way up to Glasgow[2]. Rail Freight capacity has not found a replacement cargo for the amount of coal it moved round the country so it current has substantial growth potential

2.3. Unite recognises that air freight is likewise "*limited*" by airspace, the availability of runway capacity, space below the feet of passengers and capacity available on cargo only air freighters. A twin-engine Boeing 777F air-freighter by way of example can carry 103,000kg of freight with an effective range of 9,054 km – enough to cover anywhere with a suitable runway in a little over a day[3]. In the time it would take a ship to sail from say London to Singapore and back[4] The problem is the current

[1] A map of the existing container sizes and the routes in 2020 that were up to W9, W10 and W12 standard can be found here. W12 as you will see provides an extra 5cm of width over the W10 standard to allow room for carriages to wobble on the tracks at speed. W10 provides enough space for the containers to pass but only just meaning that at any speed the containers will strike the walls of a tunnel or bridge arch resulting in the possibility of derailment.

[2] Eurotunnel and Getlink as well as UK rail unions have been calling on British rail authorities to redirect some of the HS2 investment to the development of the W12 intermodal gauge between the Fixed Link and the North of England to unlock the growth of cross-Channel rail freight.

[3] More information on the B777F can be found here

[4] A ship would typically take 34 days 19 hours on the safest route or 23 days 16 hours via the more dangerous short route by sea one way plus between 16 hours and two days to turn the ship around or 13 hours 19 minutes by air plus 2 hours to turn the flight around. Therefore, a single aircraft could complete 37 there and back flights if the ship sailed the shorter dangerous route or 54 flights in the time it takes to use the safer, longer route (this assumes of course the aircraft could use two 24/7 open airports with the capacity to handle the aircraft). However, a typical container ship

acceptability of aviation due to its carbon footprint; perceived noise[5] and the financial cost to ship anything by air.

2.4. While it is true that more can be done to make ports less polluting, the main options require a significant increase in the ports national grid capacity, to allow battery shipping to recharge and for ships to connect to shore power while at the quayside, thus allowing them to turn off their engines. When handling the power demands of cruise ship ports to the grid, the capacity is needed not dissimilar to the requirements of a medium sized village[6]. This generational and supply need is greater than some of our smaller power stations and could exceed the output of one of the smaller power stations. Southampton waste to energy power station has the capacity to produce 16GW but that may be not enough to provide shore power to just two of the smaller cruise ships and Southampton has the potential to have up to 10 smaller or just 5 large cruise ships at the quayside with more in the Solent.

2.5. The National Grid currently has a 15-year waiting list for new grid connections[7] and is since 2022, heavily reliant on imported electricity from our neighbours in continental Europe. Indeed, some of our grid workers regularly work 100 hours in a week (if you include overtime), simply due to a shortage of qualified workers and with the average age entering the early 50's this situation is one which will only get worse if nothing is done to invest in the grid.

---

carries 15,000 shipping containers, averaging 2,300kg. The largest container ship MSC Irina, can carry 24,346 shipping containers. Therefore, to carry the same volume of cargo to Singapore and back, the MSC Irina, would require a single Boeing 777F to make 1,088 round trips taking almost **3.47 years**!
But to operate a 777f requires two pilots while a the MSC Irina needs a crew of 35. IF price of equipment, fuel, emissions and most importantly pilot flight hours were not considered, then to deliver the same amount of mass in the same time would require between 7 or 10 B777F's for a typical container ship or between 10 and 15 B777F aircraft. This is easily within the capabilities of an airport to handle that many aircraft at a time. In reality the MSC Irina is reported to have cost $150 million to build but needs 2.17 billion litres of fuel for a voyage one way. The Boeing 777F costs $352.3 million each and requires about 132.7 million litres of aviation fuel per flight. Therefore, for a fleet of aircraft to carry the same mass of cargo would typically require 25.6 times to a maximum of 33.2 times as much fuel. Consequently, there is the mathematical and theoretical capacity to substitute a ship with a fleet of air freighters and the use of the empty space beneath passenger's feet on commercial aircraft but Unite believes to do so would be very damaging to the planet – **currently**. Unite also believes that Net Zero aviation is technically possible, but it will massive investment of resources into fuel and aircraft development, not to mention delivery, before 2050. Because the investment has yet to be forthcoming it is now likely that aviation will miss the 2050 deadline re point of use emissions. Unite believe that if the aviation sector invested into direct air and seawater CO_2 extraction with mineralization to offset emissions, it may still be possible to achieve net zero.

[5] 48dB to 50dB is considered to be the boundary beyond which it would be hard to distinguish airport noise from the background with general conversational noise tipping the scales at 60db on this logarithmic scale.
In 2015 Heathrow airports official 48dB or greater area covered 111.5km^2 with the 60dB or greater boundary covering 9.6km^2 according to official 2015 maps. According to Heathrow's 2019 the nighttime 50 dB noise contour area of 72.2 km^2 - 14% smaller than in 2006 (84.4 km^2) despite the number of passengers growing from 67million to over 80 million by 2019. The pandemic all but destroyed the commercial aviation industry but today passenger numbers are back and exceeding the 2019 levels, yet nighttime noise levels have continued to fall thanks to ever quieter aircraft.
As for GHG emissions the industry has been banking on Sustainable Aviation Fuel production (SAF) as a drop in fuel and zero carbon hydrogen for shorter European flights. See the sadly delayed Airbus ZEROe project.

[6] Cruise Lines International Association is looking for shore power connection that can deliver up to 12 megawatts of shore power from the grid per vessel!! Southampton has five cruise ship terminals, but each can take two mid-sized vessels. Therefore, the power demands in Southampton alone could, theoretically, be as high as 120 MW of shore power.

[7] See the most recent plans to speed up grid connections

b. Whether and in what ways the proposed revised NPSP is likely to be more effective than the current version, and whether any opportunities to further improve its effectiveness have been missed?

2.6. The NPSP calls for s fully sustainable and resilient future development[8] and mentions the Appraisal of sustainability (AoS) found on the DfT's website and mentions in passing future green energy supplies to reduce the ports carbon footprint and as a consequence reduce the dominance of potentially harmful particulate matter from the air, born from the continual operation of fossil fuelled engines. However, when it comes to shore power, and the critical role it has to play in reducing emissions is covered in four paragraphs at the bottom of page 66 and top of page 67[9] . National Grid supplies may not be available, to deliver shore power in the short term unless it involves delivery via a fleet of 40 ft shipping containerised diesel generators and supply controls[10] for smaller vessel, which defeats the aim to cut emissions, but allows time for the ship to disconnect and maintain its onboard generator and engine. The only mention of electrical supplies[11] talks of costs to electricity supply providers regarding doing without impacts reliability for other users.

2.7. Despite the demand, the generators of power and the transmission lines are often heavily opposed by those with power, because of the potential to "spoil the view". Unite therefore welcomes moves to overcome these nationally important goals overcoming NIMBYism. Unite is concerned however where the NPSP could cause the loss of employment due to unintended impacts. Therefore, feels care should be taken over implementation.

2.8. Since 2022, the National Grid has lost the ability to be a net exporter of energy, being heavily reliant on imported electricity from our neighbours in continental Europe[12]. Indeed, some of our grid workers regularly work 100 hours in a week (if you include overtime), simply due to a shortage of qualified workers and with the average age entering the early 50's this situation is one which will only get worse if nothing is done to invest in the grid. Therefore, unless there is investment into grid capacity the NPSP will not have much of an impact on the availability of zero carbon power. Sadly, the days have been lost when a customer could simply plug something into the grid and expect the energy to be there.

2.9. Sustainable Maritime Fuel (SMF)[13], Hydrogen and Ammonia are the leading alternatives to fuel oil, but the UK is seeing the closure of the refineries[14] and other chemical facilities to extract or produce these alternatives rather than investments at scale into Green or Turquoise hydrogen[15]. According to the Committee on Climate Change, there may not be enough hydrogen to go round as most of this will be required to de-carbon the energy network by 2035 but by 2040 on the Balanced Pathway hydrogen will

---

[8] At 1.2.1

[9] From 4.10.18 to 4.10.21

[10] A container ships power demands may only be 60KW but could be as high as 3.8MW for larger vessels averaging out at around 0.6MW.

[11] At 4.10.21

[12] A history of where our energy comes from can be found on the Grid watch website

[13] a form of synthetic fuel made from captured Carbon Dioxide (CO_2) and Hydrogen created using the Fisher Tropsch (FT) process.

[1414] Recently we have seen the closure of Grangemouth has cause the loss of over 2,000 directly employed personnel when it could have switched to the processing of synthetic crude from the FT process to create sustainable aviation, maritime and even road fuels if there was the production infrastructure. As stated by Sharon Graham, Unites General Secretary political leaders have "*utterly failed*" the workers and the Grangemouth community by allowing this closure.

[15] Green Hydrogen is hydrogen from electrolysis and Turquoise Hydrogen is from Pyrolysis or other methods that do not release any Greenhouse gasses. Blue hydrogen schemes where steam methyl reformation is used to extract hydrogen with a Carbon capture pipeline is utilised is not devoid of Greenhouse gas emissions so is far from sustainable.

have an important role to play[16]. This will also delay the creation of SMF which relys on hydrogen supplies.

2.10. Therefore, whilst Unite would agree that more sustainable fuels and energy sources would be very welcome in the ports, the reality is that it may be more than 15 years before this becomes a reality[17].

2.11. Unite would agree that the new and revised NPSP is an improvement on what went before but the world has changed since the original was drafted.

c. Do you agree with the conclusion of the Appraisal of sustainability that there are not likely to be any significant effects from the proposed revised NPSP, and that there is the potential for long-term minor positive effects in some areas?

2.12. Unite would argue that the lack of any capacity to rapidly increase the volume of renewable electrical energy and sustainable fuel delivered to UK ports significantly hinders and undermines any opportunities in the short term for significant savings to Greenhouse Gas (GHG) and particulate emissions in the ports. While the NPSP could provide the means for delivery of more sustainable options, it will not overcome the short comings of other sectors deliverability. Shore power for larger vessels, so they have no need to keep their engines turning over in ports to generate their own power, or the provision of enough electrical power to recharge a fleet of electric tugs, pilot launches etc. rely on the provision of grid connectivity.

2.13. As a consequence, of the National Grid waiting lists, unless the port uses its own roof space, solar panels, offshore wind[18] with a large enough battery storage facility to deliver the supplies needed, which is unlikely in the short term they will need to rely on shipping container scale generators to provide shore power[19].

2.14. In addition, as there is a move to electrification there is a need to provide wholesale investment into the equipment including the need the use of biodiesel to so that the capital investment into the existing fleet of tugs etc. can be leveraged to invest in battery and hydrogen fuelled tugs. Biodiesel and eventually Ammonia, Hydrogen[20] and Sustainable Maritime Fuel (SMF) supplies, are currently facing issues. At the

---

[16] See the CCC 7th Budget

[17] The 15 year estimate refers to the time it would take to obtain a national grid connection given the length of the current waiting list for a connection.

[18] See the project in Falmouth using floating wind turbines

[19] There are various solutions that use diesel generators and others that claim to provide clean power solutions.

[20] The current method of producing hydrogen is to split the methane using high temperature and pressure steam releasing hydrogen but creating a cloud of CO_2 gas. While the Government has given the approval for this CO_2 to be captured and stored at four projects, it will take some time for these CCS pipelines to be built. The process is not perfect and some methane plus numerous other hydrocarbons, sulphur dioxide, Nitrogen Oxides NOx and other pollutants will escape from the process meaning that even with the Carbon Capture this process is not exactly sustainable. Plus, it uses around 2.5 times the amount of fresh water per ton of hydrogen than would be the case with electrolysis.

While the use of hydrogen to store energy is highly inefficient20 the production of the gas is vital in the production of SMF or as a fuel source itself. There are a few methods to industrially produce hydrogen:

Electrolysis could be used but this currently is a long way from perfecting the process of turning water (or ammonia) into hydrogen with minimal losses.

moment, hydrogen demand is very high demand with precious little capacity. Hydrogen fuelled submarines have been at sea for several years, utilising a metal hydride storage[21] as a way of containing large volumes without the risks associated with hydrogen liquification[22].

2.15. The alternative is of course battery storage which is 80%-90% efficient but is very far from being sustainable over the production and disposal lifespan of the battery. Additionally, operating a battery fuelled vessel requires port side fast charging and that requires grid connections capable of providing the capacity needed[23].

2.16. Unite recognises that both hydrogen fuel cells and batteries hold the potential to overcome shore power shortcomings in the short-term providing more time to install capacity.

d. Does the proposed revised NPSP appropriately balance the objectives of:

- Support for local communities.
- Protection of the natural environment and biodiversity.
- Ability for the ports sector to expand, develop and contribute to economic growth.
- Decarbonisation and improved environmental performance of the maritime sector.
- Strengthening the resilience of freight transport?

2.17. Unite believes that the NPSP has the potential to transform the ports into a hot bed of innovation and balance the objectives if they could access the energy supplies to make the ports work and for-fill these objectives.

2.18. Unite does have growing concerns over the use of AI, automation and remote operation

e. Does the proposed revised NPSP give enough clarity on how land can be used, and does it align with the National Planning Policy Framework?

2.19. Unite believes that the NPSP on land use does set out a proposal in enough clarity and it could work given enough time and support. Unite would stress that reducing port storage capacity to accommodate

---

Mining or rather drilling for naturally occurring hydrogen pockets (the geology would suggest that there is the potential for this at two sites in the UK)
Chemically by combining an acid and an alkali to produce a salt or by using a catalyst of some kind to liberate the hydrogen Or via a process called **Pyrolysis** where a substance is heated to a temperature where the molecular bonds breakdown in a substance releasing the elements. In the case of any hydrocarbon this is primarily hydrogen, solid black carbon powder and small amounts of trace elements in their elemental form.

The issue here is that the planet is not geared up to provide the volume of sustainable hydrogen which is required, other than by using Steam Methyl Reformation and the supplies that are being created have already been earmarked for use in other sectors.

[21] The AIP underwater propulsion system on the U212 submarines uses metal hydrides for example
[22] Hanwha Ocean and Hanwha Aerospace are collaborating to develop a Proton Exchange Membrane Fuel Cell (PEMFC) for the 3,000-ton KSS-III submarine, which will allow the submarine to remain submerged for over two weeks which is ultra quiet and provide the boat with fresh water.
[23] There is also the fear of a runaway fire onboard if the battery becomes damaged, although there is a more significant risk with normal fuel tanks than a modern battery given the number of safety systems built in,

manufacturing can backfire as ports can swiftly become clogged with containers and other freight if there is nowhere to safely store cargo before it is shipped on.

f. How effectively does the proposed revised NPSP interact with energy infrastructure National Policy Statements? Will it support development of offshore renewable energy and sustainable energy supply at ports?

2.20. Unite believes, as stated above, that the energy sector was mismanaged by the last government over the course of their 14 years in office and it will require a lot of time and effort to turn that sector around. This is made all the harder by the objective to reach net zero in energy generation by 2035. As things stand, we have workers connecting and maintaining the grids maze of cables doing 16 to over 24 hour shifts just to stand still. One grid company even advised engineers to take a 20-minute power nap and drink a Red Bull energy drink before returning to work if they were fatigued. At times of need because there are not enough engineers employed locally teams of engineers from neighbouring and distant energy grid companies travel to hot spots suffering from storm damage to reconnect homes and businesses.

2.21. Since 2022 the UK has become a net importer of energy, where we regularly import over 25% of our supplies from our neighbours in Europe. To add to this 11% of our supplies comes from our fleet of aging nuclear power plants that according to their designs, should have been decommissioned years ago. As a result, if a fault is detected we could easily lose one or more of the nine reactors that are always operational.

2.22. If the wind is not blowing at the optimum speed and the sun is not shining, we have to fall back on natural gas supplies which at times account for up to 70% of our energy consumption needs. In 2035 we are supposed to be at net zero in the energy industry and that means moving away from natural gas burning to create heat. The last governments plans were to use double the amount of natural gas but convert that to hydrogen first before burning that gas. As stated earlier, however, hydrogen supplies are in high demand so any move to hydrogen burning to generate power will require a major update in infrastructure to realise net zero in that time scale. Besides which it would be stupid to use electricity to create hydrogen using electrolysis only to burn it to produce electricity as the process of burning creates NOx. Far better to use a network of hydrogen fuel cells as they create no NOx.

2.23. Similarly, if the chemical industry does not receive the power to enable it to decouple its production of synthetic fuels with the need to obtain its raw materials from fossil fuels (i.e. hydrogen from natural gas steam methyl reformation or Carbon from CCUS captured CO_2) then there will be emissions from the supply chain making drop in fuel alternatives. For the process to turn into a carbon neutral solution, every element in the supply chain needs to be free of GHG emissions. And that means extracting CO_2 from the atmosphere or from seawater and electrolysis or pyrolysis of hydrocarbons (assuming of course that the heat is derived from a non-combustion source[24]).

2.24. Therefore, unless the energy NPS works and NESO can deliver enough power to the ports and chemicals sector, it is doubtful that the ports will have the energy supplies to eradicate the need to burn fossil fuels creating greenhouse gas emissions.

[24] i.e. the waste heat from some source like a nuclear reactor or industrial process where all the Greenhouse Gases (GHG's) are captured and stored.

g. How effectively does the proposed revised NPSP interact with the NPS for National Networks and other transport policies, and how should it align with the forthcoming Integrated National Transport Strategy?

2.25. Environmentalists would argue that in an ideal world, all goods would have no need for transport as they could be manufactured or grown on site. It is not always practicable to relocate production to a newer closer production facility if the components to produce the item are only available in one location. If you tried, as each component would need protection during its journey, so the additional costs of moving the packaging would cause the costs to skyrocket. Artificial growing conditions may cause additional GHG emissions especially if artificial heating and sunlight production is required.

2.26. The production costs could also increase air travel as you would potentially need individuals to relocate too so they could pass on their practical skills and knowledge. These experts may wish to maintain their links with their birthplace and family/friends which in itself means more travel.

2.27. Unite believes, therefore that transport will always be required and that the NPSP could work well with the NPS for National networks and other transport policies if the right choices are made at the coal face regarding its implementation. For that reason, the committees who make the decisions on transport network delivery should have a union voice to ensure that worker views are considered at every level. If either the NPSP or NPS or transport policies are not implemented correctly with the proper resourcing the plan could collapse into chaos.

2.28. Unite has always campaigned for an integrated transportation system that utilises every transport option to deliver people and freight to where it needs to go. Each transport mode can be made to be carbon neutral and can, given enough time and money, have a net zero impact on the climate. For smaller, shorter journeys road transport is appropriate but for longer distances rail would be better if there was a way to unload and load the lorries at the end of their journey for their final/first mile, and to ensure that fewer lorries travel empty. Where goods are required urgently or they are will deteriorate in value and quality over short periods, then sustainably powered aviation is the best solution. Speed does not have to collate with emissions, but strategic choices are needed to ensure that they do and that depends on energy and technology implementation choices.

2.29. Shipping can cause pockets of methane to be released from the seabed in shallow waters[25], simply by passing over them, because of the turbulence left in the wake. Even if the vessel was powered only by the sun, and wind it could cause the release of GHG's. The only way to prevent this is to ensure that there is a sufficient body of water between the ship and the bottom and areas where the seabed contains oxygen-poor sediments filled with decomposing organic matter are avoided. This either means that the ports would need to be dredged frequently to endure that there is not the sediment build up or those ports may need caps on the design of vessels handled[26]. The problem is, however, that nine of the world's ten largest ports are located in waters with similar conditions as Neva Bay where the phenomenon was discovered.

2.30. In the past the high turnover of smaller ships would have kept sediment in suspension for longer and hence any distribution of the sediment would have been over a wider area of seabed. Today, however, with shipping lines moving to ever larger ships the depth needed in the ports has to be deeper and of course the turbulence at the bottom is more intense when a ship passes.

[25] See the July 2025 article in Air Quality News for details

[26] As noted in the article that the ship's design and propulsion systems may play a key role in determining the size of the wake disturbance.

2.31. The use of ever-increasing vessel sizes may mean greater profits for the shipping lines as the size of the crew on one vessel regardless of size. Therefore, squeezing two ships worth of cargo eliminates the need for the salaries of a ship's crew. In ports larger ships require more tugs but less frequently, so crews can experience long periods of no work punctuated by periods of intense workloads. Similarly on the quayside once the ship docks, the race is on to unload one cargo and load the next to beat the tide, but with larger vessels the ship may be required to be at the quayside for longer as there is more work to unload and reorder the cargo into its safest configuration before it departs. The problem now is that the larger ships mean that only a small number of ports can provide the required port depths resulting in either transhipment onto smaller ships or the movement by surface transport to the area where it is needed creating the potential for internal congestion on the road and rail networks.

2.32. Unite therefore believes that the NPS for transport and more local policies need to be harmonious and not make the situation worse. Braess's paradox[27] highlights that if some infrastructure is built it can cause the overall journey time to increase rather than decrease. This only occurs where two restricted areas are connected by a shorter link with greater capacity, where previously those congested areas were working in parallel rather that in series. As a result, normally improvements result in gains rather than losses in capacity.

h. Does the proposed revised National Policy Statement satisfy the Secretary of State's duties under the Planning Act 2008, particularly those under section 10 relating to having regard to climate change and good design?

2.33. Unite believes that time will tell as the reality of any design comes down to its implementation. The design as drafted has the potential to be of a good and for fill the duties to reduce the emission of GHG's but until the country has the capacity to deliver all that is required of the infrastructure external to the port on which this relies and the improvements are implemented in ports, we will not know, but trust that resources will be found.

i. How robust are the Government's port freight demand forecasts, and have their implications been reflected adequately in the proposed revised NPSP?

2.34. Unite believes that predicting the future is a task best left to fortune tellers and statisticians. The current state of world trade paths will radically change in the near future as first the EU and then the UK impose carbon border adjustment mechanisms. These will hopefully influence manufacturers to insource production where it is practicable to do so. The changes in IMO carbon emission trading rules and more local policies will also heavily influence the destination of cargos especially if one port can supply the fuel requirements and its neighbour cannot.

2.35. And then there are the looming trade tariff wars triggered by Donald Trump and his imposition of port calling charges based on the size of the vessel. For cargo's destined for US shores, this could cause the concentration of goods only larger vessels rather than having one ship to call at a Northeastern US port like Boston while another calls to Southeastern US like Miami or Gulf coast like Houston these may be all loaded onto a single ship calling at a port midway between the two, say Washington. This means in the UK we may see more and more larger ships on the voyage to the West than we do currently.

[27] See the article on Dietrich Braess's 1968 discovery

2.36. Under the Trump presidency the first time around the president had to wait up to 18 months to push through tariff changes. Recently, given his majority in both the Senate and House of Representatives the second time round has allowed the president to make changes and implement them at will. In one case highlighted in the Guardian, the US Presidential order added £100,000 to the cost of a shipment while it was at sea[28].

2.37. As one of the nation's closest both geographically and politically to North America trade wars between the US and Canada are resulting in Canadian companies looking elsewhere for markets, and that can generally mean Europe or the Far East. The adage goes when America sneezes, we catch cold, and in this case, it only takes someone with connections to think the President to said the word "*tariff*" when he sneezes for world trade to be disrupted.

2.38. Unite therefore, given the current state of the shipping industry, believes that it would be a very unwise man to rely on predictions of the future when it comes to shipping volumes.

3. Conclusion

3.1. Unite inconclusion would highlight the need for alternative fuel supplies to the port so that it can cater to the fuel demands of the vessel which will no longer be just Shipping Fuel Oil (SFO). Grid connections need to improve at a pace to convert port vehicles and ships to electrical power, thus reducing the clouds of particulates that can hang over ports and their neighbouring areas.

3.2. The NPSP has the potential to be the catalyst for a green revolution in the ports but Unite would welcome being more involved in any implementation decisions in the near future.

John McGookin
National Officer
Docks, Rail, Ferries and Waterways
Unite House
128 Theobalds Road
Holborn
WC1X 8TN

22nd July 2025

For further information please contact Colin Potter, Research Officer in the Unite the Union.

[28] See the April 2025 article on the Goodfellow shipment