



HAL
open science

On the proper modelling of multioutput port cargo handling costs

Sergio Jara-Diaz, Beatriz Tovar, Lourdes Trujillo

► **To cite this version:**

Sergio Jara-Diaz, Beatriz Tovar, Lourdes Trujillo. On the proper modelling of multioutput port cargo handling costs. *Applied Economics*, 2008, 40 (13), pp.1699-1705. 10.1080/00036840600892902 . hal-00582035

HAL Id: hal-00582035

<https://hal.science/hal-00582035>

Submitted on 1 Apr 2011

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

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



On the proper modelling of multioutput port cargo handling costs

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-05-0722.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
JEL Code:	L91 - Transportation: General < L9 - Industry Studies: Transportation and Utilities < L - Industrial Organization, L98 - Government Policy < L9 - Industry Studies: Transportation and Utilities < L - Industrial Organization
Keywords:	multiproduct, economies of scale and scope, port and cargo handling.

powered by ScholarOne
Manuscript Central™

1
2
3
4 **The importance of multi output of cargo handling activities**
5
6 **in the port industry**
7
8
9

10
11
12 Sergio Jara-Díaz

13 jaradiaz@cec.uchile.cl

14
15
16 Phone: (56-2) 678 4380 and Fax: (56-2) 689 4206

17
18 Departamento Ingeniería de Transporte

19
20 Universidad de Chile

21
22
23
24
25 Beatriz Tovar*

26 btovar@daea.ulpgc.es

27
28
29 Phone: +34 928 45 17 94 and Fax: +34 928 45 81 83

30
31 Grupo de Investigación en Economía de las Infraestructuras y el Transporte

32
33 (Research Group Economics Of Infrastructure And Transport).

34
35 Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

36
37
38
39
40 Lourdes Trujillo

41 lourdes@daea.ulpgc.es

42
43
44 Phone: +34 928 45 18 09 and Fax: +34 928 45 81 83

45
46 Grupo de Investigación en Economía de las Infraestructuras y el Transporte

47
48 Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria

49
50
51
52
53
54
55 *Corresponding Author :

56 Beatriz Tovar de la Fé
57 Departamento de Análisis Económico Aplicado
58 Campus Universitario de Tafira, 35017
59 Modulo D, Despacho 2.20

60 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria
España

The importance of multi output of cargo handling activities in the port industry

Abstract

Cargo handling activities in ports have been usually analysed using aggregate descriptions of output such as total tons moved. These activities, however, involve various heterogeneous outputs, e.g. general cargo, containers, dry and liquid bulk, and so on. The main purpose of this paper is to show that ignoring this heterogeneity may lead to two types of problems of interest to policy makers and sector regulators: the underestimation of the relevance of key dimensions (i.e. marginal costs per product and economies of scope) and a bias in the estimates of the relevance of other dimensions (economies of scale). To do so, we rely on a unique new set of data based on information collected from three cargo handling firms operating in a Spanish port between 1991 and 1999. We use it to estimate both a multi-output cost for these three operators as well as an aggregate cost function. The policy conclusions are derived from an explicit and detailed comparison of these two sets of estimates.

Key words: multiproduct, economies of scale and scope, port and cargo handling.

JEL Classification system: L9

1. Introduction: Cargo handling in multipurpose port terminals

Up to now, the analysis of cargo handling and port activities has, in general, relied on an aggregate measure of output such as total tons moved or its value, as in Chang (1978), Rekers et al. (1990), Tongzon (1993), Kim and Sachis (1986) and Martínez Budría (1996). In this paper we first follow this tradition, analyzing cargo handling activities through the estimation of a cost function with output described as total volume handled and we derive marginal costs, scale economies as well as some policy conclusions from this initial estimation. Then we compare these “traditional” results with those arising from an explicit modelling of the heterogeneity of the output. This comparison allows us to document that various ways in which the analysis based on a synthetic output indicator misleads policymaking.

2. Data and aggregate model formulation

We focus on a cost function $C(W, Y)$ which represents the minimum expenditure necessary to produce *output* Y at given input prices W . Its estimation requires data on expenditure, production and input prices for one or more firms during one or more periods. Our data was collected directly from three private medium size firms operating within the port area of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, one of the largest in the Spanish port system. They deal mainly with containers (87% of total volume), but also operate roll-on/roll-off cargo (ro-ro, 3%) as well as general break-bulk (general) cargo (10%). We collected 264 monthly observations from 1991 through 1999 (not all years available for all three firms).

The productive factors have been grouped into four categories: personnel, total area, capital and intermediate inputs. The personnel working in port terminals may be classified in two categories: stevedores or port workers, who handle cargo, and non-port workers, who do not (administratives, executives, maintenance and

control personnel, among others). In turn, port workers are divided into two categories: those who are on the payroll (ordinary employment) and those who are not (special employment). This latter category can be recruited on a provisional basis by any company to work 6-hour shifts, under the management of the *Sociedad Estatal de Estiba y Destiba (SEED)*.

Capital encompasses all the components of tangible assets of the company —i.e. buildings, machines, etc. The monthly cost results from the addition of the accounting depreciation for the period plus the return on the active capital of the period. This rate of return evidences the compensation earned by risk-free capital, which is made up of bank interest plus a risk premium. For the period under analysis the return for both concepts amounts to 8% per annum. Lastly, the rest of the productive factors used by the company that have not been included in any of the three preceding categories, such as office supplies, water, electricity, and the like, have been classified as intermediate consumption.

Regarding occupied space, each terminal can make use of an area that has been granted under concession, which may be increased by provisionally renting —upon prior request— additional area from the port authority, turning area into a variable factor

With this information, a quadratic long run cost function (1) was estimated along with the input expenses equations (2) obtained using Shephard's lemma

$$\begin{aligned}
 CT = & A_0 + \alpha(y - \bar{y}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i(p_i - \bar{p}_i) + \phi(T - \bar{T}) \\
 & + \frac{1}{2}(y - \bar{y})^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{ij}(p_i - \bar{p}_i)(p_j - \bar{p}_j) \\
 & + \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_j(y - \bar{y})(p_j - \bar{p}_j) + \lambda(y - \bar{y})(T - \bar{T}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(p_i - \bar{p}_i)(T - \bar{T}) \\
 & + \pi(T - \bar{T})(T - \bar{T}) + \sum_{i=1}^N \vartheta_i D_i
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$G_i = p_i \cdot x_i = p_i \cdot \left[\beta_i + 2\gamma_{ii}(p_i - \bar{p}_i) + \sum_{j \neq i}^m \gamma_{ij}(p_j - \bar{p}_j) + \rho_i(y - \bar{y}) + \mu_i(T - \bar{T}) \right] \tag{2}$$

1
2
3 where y is the amount of output, p_i is input i price, n is the number of inputs, D_i are
4
5 firm specific dummies to capture specific effects, N is the number of firms and T is
6
7 time trend, included to capture possible technical change. Variables with a
8
9 horizontal bar on top are sample means.
10

11 12 13 14 15 **3. The aggregate (single) output cost**

16
17 In this section, we follow the tradition of the last 30 years or so in the
18
19 sector and we estimate a cost function estimated for a single synthetic output. Table
20
21 1 shows all the first order coefficients that are relevant for our interpretation of
22
23 results.
24

25
26 All first order parameters are statistically significant and have the expected
27
28 signs with the exception of the trend coefficient that has a counterintuitive positive
29
30 sign indicating that, everything else constant, cost increases with time. The dummy
31
32 variables are both negative and similarly small, indicating that the smaller firms
33
34 would exhibit some 2.3% less costs than the larger one if the three produced the
35
36 mean amount. The single marginal cost estimated at the mean is 715 pesetas/ton
37
38 and the corresponding value of the degree of economies of scale (the inverse of the
39
40 cost-product elasticity) is $S=1.959$, indicating clear increasing returns. These
41
42 results are fairly compatible with the average cost curve presented in Figure 1
43
44 based on the aggregated production volume. The curve looks as a traditional long
45
46 run one, and graphically suggests the presence of economies of scale and,
47
48 therefore, marginal costs that should fall below the average figures, i.e. less than
49
50 750 pesetas/ton, as obtained.
51
52
53

54
55 Marginal cost calculated at the mean production of each firm (terminal)
56
57 yields little variation (from 706 to 724 pesetas/ton), but scale economies at each
58
59 mean do vary, yielding 2.38, 3.01 and 1.22 for firms 1, 2 and 3 respectively,
60
monotonically decreasing with average production.

1
2
3 According to these results, all three firms should be encouraged to increase
4 production to take advantage of scale economies. All three occupy neighbouring
5 sites. Pushing the three firms to merge and operate as one could be convenient. If
6 optimal prices were a target, charging marginal cost per ton would require a modest
7 subsidy or, if this is not wanted, a single second best price equal to the average cost
8 in the neighbourhood of 1420 pesetas could be set, accepting a modest social loss.
9 Regulation would play an important role.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

22 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE
23
24
25
26
27

28 **4. The multi-output cost function.¹**

29
30 In this section, we use the same information to estimate a long run cost
31 function where outputs are individually identified, namely, the volume of
32 containers, general cargo and ro-ro and modelled explicitly. The model
33 specification is just as the previous function (1) and equations (2) but in this case
34 we have a vector of outputs and each output is identified as y_i , with i going from 1
35 to 3, making this a multioutput cost function.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Table 2 contains all the relevant coefficients of this long run multioutput
44 cost function. It shows very clearly that marginal cost estimates do vary across
45 products. It also shows the expected ranking: containers exhibit the lowest value,
46 followed by ro-ro cargo and general cargo. As the average cost figure is not useful
47 in this case, these results were compared against maximum tariffs currently applied
48 at the port, grouped by type of cargo. They happen to follow the same relative
49 ranking and to be always above our marginal costs estimates, which reinforces the
50 quality of the estimation. Note that the marginal costs for both general cargo and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹ This section is based on Jara Díaz et al (2005)

1
2
3 ro-ro are definitely larger than the maximum single figure that could be expected
4
5 from the pseudo average cost curve in Figure 1.
6
7

8 The differences among the estimated marginal costs by product are fully
9 consistent with the underlying technical aspects. Handling general cargo presents
10 complicated operations to a degree where machines are less important than labour.
11 Nevertheless, the figures per firm suggest that volume plays a role as well, as the
12 firm that moves a larger quantity (firm 2) exhibits the lowest marginal cost for this
13 output (see Table 3 below).
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 On the other hand, the marginal cost estimates for ro-ro (some 40% larger
22 than those of the containers) seem to respond to two effects. In general, operations
23 are simpler than those for containers, making some stages disappear, and they
24 require less equipment. However, space is fundamental for this type of movement
25 and its volume is lower, which seems to influence marginal cost.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE
36
37
38
39

40 The trend variable is negative, as expected, and the firm specific dummies
41 are both small and close to 2,5 % of the cost at the mean. The global degree of
42 scale economies is 1.64 and the product specific degree of returns to scale is
43 practically one for all three outputs. This suggests that economies of scope are
44 present, as these magnify specific scale economies.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 The product specific degrees of scale economies are all close to unity,
52 which suggests that the reason for the difference between the global figures on
53 scale, are due to the possible presence of economies of scope, which magnifies
54 scale, something impossible to verify with the aggregate approach. If we analyse
55 all possible orthogonal partitions of the product set into two firms, one handling a
56 single output and the other handling the other two, the degree of economies of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 scope are all close to 0.39. This means that it is better to handle all three cargo
4 types with one firm than to create an additional firm to take care of one output,
5 provided that all three outputs have to be handled. This merits further discussion.
6
7
8
9

10 Product specific scale economies close to one mean that the incremental
11 cost (cost of the addition of that product to the line) is similar to the marginal
12 variation of total cost, which fits intuition. But it also means that are economies of
13 scope what causes overall economies of scale, due to the presence of common (non
14 operative) costs related to non port personnel and general expenses, plus some
15 complementarities in production provoked by common use of the surface space,
16 labour managed by the firm, shore cranes used for containers and some form of
17 general cargo, and so on.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Finally, scale economies are noted for the two smallest firms as the
29 calculated values for S are 2.26 and 2.13. For the largest one, this value is 1.08,
30 reflecting nearly constant returns to scale. These results coupled with those
31 regarding scope suggest that the two small firms could be allowed to merge, as
32 they are located in neighbouring sites. This would maintain some degree of
33 competition in the market.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **5. Comparisons and discussion.**

46
47 The comparison of the results of the cost functions estimated from the two
48 specifications of product offers a wide range of insights along various dimensions,
49 including the dispersion of marginal costs of the various outputs, the economies of
50 scale as well as the economies of scope as seen in Table 3. These should be of
51 interest to a wide range of policy makers, including reformers, regulators and
52 competition agencies.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3 shows that the marginal cost estimates for containers are some 4%

1
2
3 larger than the corresponding figures obtained from the aggregate model. However,
4
5 ro-ro marginal costs are between 44% and 55% larger than the single figure for
6
7 each firm. The most impressive differences are found for general cargo, where
8
9 marginal costs are more than 170% larger for the disaggregate model than for the
10
11 original one. Moreover, note that for the disaggregated models, the differences in
12
13 marginal cost estimates among terminals are very small and the order is the same.
14
15 The similarity of the figures for marginal costs for the aggregate estimate of the first
16
17 model and the estimate for containers in the second model seems to be a
18
19 consequence of the important volume of containers at each terminal, which vary
20
21 from 76 to 97%.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE
29
30
31
32

33 The firm specific dummies become some 10% more negative than in the
34
35 aggregate model. It keeps a relatively low value for the constant, which is an
36
37 estimate of the cost of the largest firm at the mean. However, the time coefficient
38
39 becomes negative, as expected.
40
41

42 Regarding scale economies with multiple outputs (see Appendix),
43
44 the overall figure of 1.64 is smaller than the 1.96 obtained with the
45
46 aggregate model. But this hides even larger differences when individual
47
48 firms are considered, as the three figures drop from 2.38, 3.01 and 1.22 to
49
50 2.26, 2.13 and 1.08 respectively when output is correctly specified. This
51
52 means that the largest terminal has reached constant returns. Therefore, the
53
54 policy conclusions change dramatically, as the aggregate results suggest that
55
56 merging could be desirable from a cost viewpoint, charging an optimal price
57
58 of about 1420 pesetas per ton moved, while the disaggregate model would
59
60

1
2
3 call for the two smallest firms to join operations, keeping competition with
4 the largest that has already reached constant returns. Different prices should
5 be charged for the movement of one ton moved in a container, as a ro-ro, or
6 as fractioned general cargo, with prices above 760, 1120 and 2040
7 pesetas/ton respectively, the extra charge depending on the price elasticity
8 of demand.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **6. Conclusions.**

21
22
23 Port activities have been usually analysed describing output through some
24 synthetic measure of total volume of cargo moved. Inputs required, however, differ
25 according to the type of cargo handled. Furthermore, input combinations also vary
26 depending on the packaging. When output is described as a scalar hiding multiple
27 outputs, the observed variation in total output (volume) may reflect a wide range of
28 variations in each of the individual outputs
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37 This causes various important problems. For instance, if product specific
38 marginal costs are actually very different, a single synthetic figure will mislead any
39 discussion on optimal pricing. Also, the impossibility of estimating economies of
40 scope will bias the estimate of scale economies, because potential advantages (or
41 disadvantages) of joint production will not be captured properly. These problems
42 have various policy implications.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 The first is from the viewpoint of a regulator concerned with the optimal
52 pricing of the sector activities. In this context, this note shows how important it is
53 to recognize the consequences of the failure to model explicitly the cost diversity
54 associated with the output diversity. This failure can lead to very significant
55 distortions in resources allocations in an industry in which residual monopoly
56 power or at least the risks of collusion between a few operators can be quite
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 important.
4
5

6 From the viewpoint of a competition agency, the note clearly illustrates the
7 value of making better use of the information available on the composition of the
8 output. Indeed, in the case analyzed here, the multioutput approach makes a clear
9 case to allow only two of the three terminals to merge while with the single output
10 model would have endorsed the merger of the three operators.
11
12
13
14
15

16 From the point of view of a sector reformer, in addition to providing some
17 evidence on the existence of a limit to the unbundling into terminals of port
18 activities, the paper also shows that reformers should consider more carefully the
19 limits to specialization in the sector. Indeed, the information on the economies of
20 scope generated by the multioutput approach provides some guidance on the
21 optimal market structure for the industry. It shows that the operators are better off
22 not specializing, competing on the three main business lines available instead. This
23 is an important consideration in an industry undergoing, or subject to pressure to
24 undergo, restructuring around the world and in which specialization is often one of
25 the expected outcomes.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Overall, what this note highlights is that the proper approach to analyse
40 port activities is multi-productive, and the consequences of not taken into account
41 this important fact are quite relevant for the adequate regulation in cargo handling
42 port activities. Single output studies could suggest erroneous structures.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 **Acknowledgements.** 54

55 This research was partially funded with Grant 1050643 from
56 Fondecyt-Chile, the Millenium Nucleus Complex Engineering Systems, and
57 Gobierno Autónomo de Canarias.
58
59
60

References

1
2
3
4
5 Chang, S. (1978): "Production function and capacity utilization of the port of
6 Mobile". *Maritime Policy and Management*. Vol. 5, pp. 297-305.
7
8

9
10 Jara-Díaz S., Tovar de la Fé B., and Trujillo L. (2005). Multioutput análisis of
11 cargo handling firms: An application to a Spanish port. *Transportation*. 32, 275-
12 291.
13
14
15

16
17 Kim, M. and Sachish, A. (1986) The structure of production, technical change and
18 productivity in a port. *International Journal of Industrial Economics*, 35, 209-223.
19
20
21

22
23 Martínez-Budría, E. (1996) Un estudio econométrico de los costes del sistema
24 portuario español. *Revista Asturiana de Economía*, 6, 135-149.
25
26
27

28
29 Panzar, J. and Willig, R. (1977) Economies of scale in multioutput production.
30 *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 91, 481-494.
31
32
33


34 Rekers, R.A., Connell, D. and Ross, D.I. (1990) The development of a production
35 function for a container terminal in the port of Melbourne. *Papers of the*
36 *Australasian Transport Research Forum*, 15, 209-218.
37
38
39

40
41 Tongzon, J.L. (1993) The Port of Melbourne Authority's pricing policy: its
42 efficiency and distribution implications. *Maritime Policy and Management*, 20,
43 197-203.
44
45
46
47

48
49 Tovar de la Fé, B. (2002) Análisis multiproductivo de los costes de manipulación de
50 mercancías en terminales portuarias. El Puerto de La Luz y de Las Palmas (A multioutput
51 cost analysis for cargo handling services in port terminals. La Luz y de Las Palmas' Port),
52 Ph. D. Thesis, Departamento de Análisis Económico Aplicado. Universidad de Las Palmas
53 de Gran Canaria. España.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. First order coefficients from the long run aggregated model.

Parameter	Estimate	t-statistic
Total cost at the mean (thousand ptas)	95960.00	120.23
Marginal cost (ptas/ton)	715.90	33.18
Demand for ordinary workers (worked hours)	1.56	62.86
Demand for special workers (worked hours)	2.33	42.28
Demand for intermediate consumption (thousand ptas)	981.39	87.59
Demand for total area (m ²)	61755.30	103.51
Demand for capital (thousand ptas)	575120.00	38.43
Demand for non-port workers (number of men)	0.02	72.55
Trend	83.30	2.55
Dummy T1 (thousand ptas)	-2227.64	-10.98
Dummy T2 (thousand ptas)	-2212.13	-8.25

Figure 1. Average Cost Curve.

Source: Tovar de la Fé (2002).

Table 2. First order coefficients from the long run multioutput cost function

Parameter	Estimate	t-statistic
Total cost at the mean	96680.2	140.02
Marginal cost containers (ptas/ton)	744.568	28.4829
Marginal cost general cargo (ptas/ton)	1973.57	14.192
Marginal cost ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1055.81	2.96036
Demand for ordinary workers (worked hours)	1.57645	69.7386
Demand for special workers (worked hours)	2.33895	45.8603
Demand for intermediate consumption (thousand ptas)	982.53	87.2994
Demand for total area (m ²)	61592.9	106.851
Demand for capital (thousand ptas)	583266	40.6078
Demand for non-port workers (number of men)	0.021919	76.6747
Trend	-67.0148	-1.96005
Dummy T1(thousand ptas)	-2460.71	-11.1526
Dummy T2 (thousand ptas)	-2479.14	-7.86803

Source: Jara-Díaz et al. (2005).

Table 3. Marginal costs (MC) and scale economies (ES) by firm for the two models

	Model with aggregated output		Model with disaggregated output	
Terminal 1	MC (ptas/ton)	720,232(*)	MC containers (ptas/ton)	743,866(*)
			MC general cargo (ptas/ton)	1993,92(*)
			MC ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1116,78(*)
	ES	2,38113(*)	ES	2,2577(*)
Terminal 2	MC (ptas/ton)	706,529(*)	MC containers (ptas/ton)	735,383(*)
			MC general cargo (ptas/ton)	1914,77(*)
			MC ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1017,11(*)
	ES	3,00650(*)	ES	2,1259(*)
Terminal 3	MC (ptas/ton)	724,277(*)	MC containers (ptas/ton)	757,006(*)
			MC general cargo (ptas/ton)	2031,77(*)
			MC ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1053,38(*)
	ES	1,21561(*)	ES	1,0752(*)
sample mean	ES	1,95901(*)	ES	1,64416(*)
			ES containers	1,00548(*)
			ES general cargo	1,00147(*)
			ES ro-ro cargo	1,08108(*)

* statistically significant at 5%.

On the proper modelling of multioutput port cargo handling costs

Abstract

Cargo handling activities involve various heterogeneous outputs, e.g. general cargo, containers, dry and liquid bulk, and so on. These activities in ports, however, have been usually analysed using aggregate descriptions of output such as total tons moved. The main purpose of this paper is to show that ignoring this heterogeneity may lead to two types of problems: (i) the underestimation of the relevance of key dimensions (i.e. marginal costs per product and economies of scope) and (ii) a bias in the estimates of the relevance of other dimensions (economies of scale). To do so, we rely on a unique new dataset on three cargo handling firms operating in a Spanish port between 1991 and 1999. We use it to estimate both a multi-output cost for these three operators as well as an aggregate cost function. The policy conclusions are derived from an explicit and detailed comparison of these two sets of estimates.

Key words: multiproduct, economies of scale and scope, port and cargo handling.

JEL Classification system: L9

1. Introduction

Up to now, the analysis of cargo handling and port activities has, in general, relied on an aggregate measure of output such as total tons moved or its value, as in Chang (1978), Rekers et al. (1990), Tongzon (1993), Kim and Sachis (1986) and Martínez Budría (1996). In this paper we first follow this tradition, analyzing cargo handling activities through the estimation of a cost function with output described as total volume handled and we derive marginal costs, scale economies as well as some policy conclusions from this initial estimation. Then we compare these “traditional” results with those arising from an explicit modelling of the heterogeneity of the output. This comparison shows that the usual type of analysis based on a synthetic output indicator can mislead policymaking, particularly in terms of marginal costs, which affects pricing, and economies of scale and scope, which helps detecting optimal industry structure.

2. Variables description and cost model

We focus on a cost function $C(W,Y)$ which represents the minimum expenditure necessary to produce *output* Y at given input prices W . Its estimation requires data on expenditure, production and input prices for one or more firms during one or more periods. Our data was collected directly from three private medium size firms operating within the port area of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, one of the largest in the Spanish port system. They deal mainly with containers (87% of total volume), but also operate roll-on/roll-off cargo (ro-ro, 3%) as well as general break-bulk (general) cargo (10%). We collected 264 monthly observations from 1991 through 1999 (not all years available for all three firms).

The productive factors have been grouped into four categories: personnel, total area (surface space) occupied for cargo handling, capital and intermediate inputs. The personnel working in port terminals may be classified in two categories: stevedores or port workers, who handle cargo, and non-port workers,

1
2
3 who do not (administratives, executives, maintenance and control personnel,
4 among others). In turn, port workers are divided into two categories: those who are
5 on the payroll (ordinary employment) and those who are not (special employment).
6
7 This latter category can be recruited on a provisional basis by any company to
8 work 6-hour shifts, under the management of the *Sociedad Estatal de Estiba y*
9 *Destiba (SEED)*. The price of each type of labour is calculated as the
10 corresponding monthly expenses divided by the number of worked hours.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 Capital encompasses all the components of tangible assets of the company
20 —i.e. buildings, machines, etc. The monthly capital cost results from the addition
21 of the accounting depreciation for the period plus the return on the active capital of
22 the period. This rate of return evidences the compensation earned by risk-free
23 capital, which is made up of bank interest plus a risk premium. For the period
24 under analysis the return for both concepts amounts to 8% per annum. The price of
25 capital is calculated as the ratio of the capital cost over the active capital of the
26 period (net fixed assets under exploitation for a given period).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Regarding occupied space, each terminal can make use of an area granted
37 under concession by the port authority. This surface may be increased by
38 provisionally renting additional area from the port authority, turning the total area
39 used by the operator into a variable production factor, as it can be accommodated
40 on demand. It is measured in square meters, and its price is calculated as the ratio
41 of the area-related monthly expenses over the total area used that corresponding
42 month.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Lastly, the rest of the productive factors used by the company that have not
53 been included in any of the three preceding categories, such as office supplies,
54 water, electricity, and the like, have been classified as intermediate consumption.
55 The price of electricity has been used as an index of the price of intermediate
56 consumption, as the price of the other components do not undergo changes.
57
58
59
60

The total monthly production expenses for each of the terminals result from the aggregation of expenses over all the productive factors defined above. Among those factors, labor shows the largest share of terminal expenditure in the sample, representing an average of 53% of the monthly expenses¹. Note that this is the same figure obtained by Cullinane et al. (2003) for Korean container terminals.

This data was used to estimate a quadratic long run cost function (1) and the input expenses equations (2) obtained using Shephard's lemma

$$\begin{aligned}
 CT = & A_0 + \alpha(y - \bar{y}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i(p_i - \bar{p}_i) + \phi(T - \bar{T}) \\
 & + \frac{1}{2}(y - \bar{y})^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_{ij}(p_i - \bar{p}_i)(p_j - \bar{p}_j) \\
 & + \sum_{j=1}^n \rho_j(y - \bar{y})(p_j - \bar{p}_j) + \lambda(y - \bar{y})(T - \bar{T}) + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i(p_i - \bar{p}_i)(T - \bar{T}) \\
 & + \pi(T - \bar{T})(T - \bar{T}) + \sum_{i=1}^N \theta_i D_i
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$$G_i = p_i \cdot x_i = p_i \cdot \left[\beta_i + 2\gamma_{ii}(p_i - \bar{p}_i) + \sum_{j \neq i}^m \gamma_{ij}(p_j - \bar{p}_j) + \rho_i(y - \bar{y}) + \mu_i(T - \bar{T}) \right] \tag{2}$$

where y is the amount of output, p_i is input i price, n is the number of inputs, D_i are firm specific dummies to capture specific effects, N is the number of firms and T is time trend, included to capture possible technical change. Variables with a horizontal bar on top are sample means.

3. The aggregate (single) output cost

In this section, we follow the tradition of the last 30 years or so in the sector and we estimate a cost function for a single synthetic output. Table 1 shows all the first order coefficients that are relevant for our interpretation of results.

All first order parameters are statistically significant and have the expected signs with the exception of the trend coefficient that has a counterintuitive positive sign indicating that, everything else being constant, cost increases with time. The

¹Total area, capital and intermediate consumption represent 13%, 8%, and 26%

1
2
3 dummy variables are both negative and similarly small, indicating that the smaller
4 firms would exhibit some 2.3% less costs than the larger one if the three produced
5 the mean amount. The single marginal cost estimated at the mean is 715
6 pesetas/ton and the corresponding degree of economies of scale (the inverse of the
7 cost-product elasticity) is $S=1.959$, indicating clear increasing returns.² These
8 results are fairly compatible with the average cost curve presented in Figure 1
9 based on the aggregated production volume. The curve looks as a traditional long
10 run one, and graphically suggests the presence of economies of scale and,
11 therefore, marginal costs that should fall below the average figures, i.e. less than
12 750 pesetas/ton.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Marginal cost calculated at the mean production of each firm (terminal)
26 yields little variation (from 706 to 724 pesetas/ton), but scale economies at each
27 mean do vary, yielding 2.38, 3.01 and 1.22 for firms 1, 2 and 3 respectively,
28 monotonically decreasing with average production.
29
30
31
32
33

34 According to these results, all three firms should be encouraged to increase
35 production to take advantage of scale economies. As they occupy neighbouring
36 sites, pushing the three firms to merge and operate as one could be convenient. If
37 optimal prices were a target, charging marginal cost per ton would require a modest
38 subsidy. If it is not a goal, a single second best price equal to the average cost in the
39 neighbourhood of 1420 pesetas could be set, accepting a modest social loss. For
40 synthesis, the single output approach yields clear implications for regulation, as
41 increasing returns suggest that a single operator would be cost-efficient, but price
42 regulation should be imposed. We will see in the next section that this is not
43 necessarily so.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

respectively.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

4. The multi-output cost function.³

In this section, we use the same information to estimate a long run cost function where outputs are individually identified, namely, the volume of containers, general cargo and ro-ro, which are modelled explicitly. The model specification is just as the previous function (1) and equations (2) but in this case we have a vector of outputs and each output is identified as y_i , with i going from 1 to 3, making this a multioutput cost function.

Table 2 contains all the relevant coefficients of this long run multioutput cost function. It shows very clearly that marginal cost estimates do vary across products. It also shows the expected ranking: containers exhibit the lowest value, followed by ro-ro cargo and general cargo. As average cost figures are undefined in a multioutput context, these results were compared against maximum tariffs currently applied at the port, grouped by type of cargo. They happen to follow the same relative ranking and to be always above our marginal costs estimates, which reinforces the quality of the estimation. Note that the marginal costs for both general cargo and ro-ro are definitely larger than the maximum single figure that could be expected from the pseudo average cost curve in Figure 1.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The differences among the estimated marginal costs by product are fully consistent with the underlying technical aspects. Handling general cargo presents complex operations to a degree where machines are less important than labour.

² Note: 1 Euro () = 166.386 pesetas

³ This section is based on Jara Díaz et al (2005)

1
2
3 Nevertheless, the figures per firm suggest that volume plays a role as well, as the
4
5 firm that moves a larger quantity (firm 2) exhibits the lowest marginal cost for this
6
7 output (see Table 3 below).
8
9

10 On the other hand, the marginal cost estimates for ro-ro (some 40% larger
11
12 than those of the containers) seem to respond to two effects. In general, operations
13
14 are simpler than those for containers, making some stages disappear, and they
15
16 require less equipment. However, space is fundamental for this type of movement
17
18 and its volume is lower, which seems to influence marginal cost.
19

20
21 The trend variable is negative, as expected, and the firm specific dummies
22
23 are both small and close to 2,5 % of the cost at the mean. The global degree of
24
25 scale economies is 1.64 and the product specific degree of returns to scale is
26
27 practically one for all three outputs. This suggests that economies of scope are
28
29 present, as these magnify specific scale economies.
30
31

32
33 The product specific degrees of scale economies are all close to unity (see
34
35 Table 3 below), which suggests that the reason for the difference between the
36
37 global figures on scale, are due to the possible presence of economies of scope,
38
39 which magnifies scale, something impossible to verify with the aggregate
40
41 approach. If we analyse all possible orthogonal partitions of the product set into
42
43 two firms, one handling a single output and the other handling the other two, the
44
45 degree of economies of scope are all close to 0.39. This means that it is better to
46
47 handle all three cargo types with one firm than to create an additional firm to take
48
49 care of one output, provided that all three outputs have to be handled. This merits
50
51 further discussion.
52
53

54
55 Product specific scale economies close to one mean that the incremental
56
57 cost (cost of the addition of that product to the line) is similar to the marginal
58
59 variation of total cost, which fits intuition. But it also means that are economies of
60
scope what causes overall economies of scale, due to the presence of common (non

operative) costs related to non port personnel and general expenses, plus some complementarities in production provoked by common use of the surface space, labour managed by the firm, shore cranes used for containers and some form of general cargo, and so on.

Finally, note that the two smallest firms exhibit strongly increasing returns to scale as the calculated values for S are 2.26 and 2.13. For the largest one, however, this value is 1.08, reflecting nearly constant returns to scale. These results coupled with those regarding scope suggest that the two small firms could be allowed to merge, as they are located in neighbouring sites. This would maintain some degree of competition in the market.

5. Aggregate versus disaggregate models.

The comparison of the results of the cost functions estimated from the two specifications of product offers a wide range of insights along various dimensions, including the dispersion of marginal costs of the various outputs, the economies of scale as well as the economies of scope as seen in Table 3. These should be of interest to a wide range of policy makers, including reformers, regulators and competition agencies⁴.

Table 3 shows that the marginal cost estimates for containers are some 4% larger than the corresponding figures obtained from the aggregate model. However, ro-ro marginal costs are between 44% and 55% larger than the single figure for each firm. The most impressive differences are found for general cargo, where marginal costs are more than 170% larger for the disaggregate model than for the original one. Moreover, note that for the disaggregated models, the differences in marginal cost estimates among terminals are very small and the order is the same. The similarity of the figures for marginal costs for the aggregate estimate of the

⁴ The role that multioutput cost function estimation could play in the debate about regulation is recognised in other sectors as well. For example, Fraquelli et al. (2004)

1
2
3 first model and the estimate for containers in the second model seems to be a
4
5 consequence of the important volume of containers at each terminal, which vary
6
7 from 76 to 97%.
8
9

10
11
12 INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE
13
14
15

16
17 The firm specific dummies become some 10% more negative than in the
18
19 aggregate model. It keeps a relatively low value for the constant, which is an
20
21 estimate of the cost of the largest firm at the mean. However, the time coefficient
22
23 becomes negative, as expected.
24
25

26
27 Regarding scale economies with multiple outputs, the overall figure
28
29 of 1.64 is smaller than the 1.96 obtained with the aggregate model. But this
30
31 hides even larger differences when individual firms are considered, as the
32
33 three figures drop from 2.38, 3.01 and 1.22 to 2.26, 2.13 and 1.08
34
35 respectively when output is correctly specified. This means that the largest
36
37 terminal has reached constant returns. Therefore, the policy conclusions
38
39 change dramatically, as the aggregate results suggest that merging could be
40
41 desirable from a cost viewpoint, charging an optimal price of about 1420
42
43 pesetas per ton moved, while the disaggregate model would call for the two
44
45 smallest firms to join operations, keeping competition with the largest that
46
47 has already reached constant returns. Different prices should be charged for
48
49 the movement of one ton moved in a container, as a ro-ro, or as fractioned
50
51 general cargo, with prices above 760, 1120 and 2040 pesetas/ton
52
53 respectively, the extra charge depending on the price elasticity of demand.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

analyzed scope and scale economies in multi-utilities; and Sav (2004) applied this methodology to the higher education for public and private sector .

6. Conclusions.

Port activities have been usually analysed describing output through some synthetic measure of total volume of cargo moved. Inputs required, however, differ according to the type of cargo handled. Furthermore, input combinations also vary depending on the packaging. When output is described as a scalar hiding multiple outputs, the observed variation in total output (volume) may reflect a wide range of variations in each of the individual outputs

This causes various important problems. For instance, if product specific marginal costs are actually very different, a single synthetic figure will mislead any discussion on optimal pricing. Also, the impossibility of estimating economies of scope will bias the estimate of scale economies, because potential advantages (or disadvantages) of joint production will not be captured properly. These problems have various policy implications.

The first is from the viewpoint of a regulator concerned with the optimal pricing of the sector activities. In this context, this paper shows how important it is to recognize the consequences of the failure to model explicitly the cost diversity associated with the output diversity. This failure can lead to very significant distortions in resources allocations in an industry in which residual monopoly power or at least the risks of collusion between a few operators can be quite important.

From the viewpoint of a competition agency, the paper clearly illustrates the value of making better use of the information available on the composition of the output. Indeed, in the case analyzed here, the multioutput approach makes a clear case to allow only two of the three terminals to merge while results with the single output model would have endorsed the merger of the three operators.

From the point of view of a sector reformer, in addition to providing some evidence on the existence of a limit to the unbundling into terminals of port

1
2
3 activities, the paper also shows that reformers should consider more carefully the
4 limits to specialization in the sector. Indeed, the information on the economies of
5 scope generated by the multioutput approach provides some guidance on the
6 optimal market structure for the industry. It shows that the operators are better off
7 not specializing, competing on the three main business lines available instead if the
8 three are to be produced. This is an important consideration in an industry
9 undergoing, or subject to pressure to undergo, restructuring around the world and
10 in which specialization is often one of the expected outcomes.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Overall, what this note highlights is that the proper approach to analyse
21 port activities is multi-productive. Ignoring this important fact may distort
22 regulatory decisions in the cargo handling port activities. Single output studies
23 could suggest erroneous structures, which ultimately would hurt the users of these
24 port services.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Acknowledgements.**

33
34 The authors are grateful to the reviewers of the journal for their
35 suggestions. This research was partially funded with Grant 1050643 from
36 Fondecyt-Chile, the Millennium Nucleus Complex Engineering Systems, and
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

References

- 1
2
3
4
5 Chang, S. (1978): "Production function and capacity utilization of the port of
6 Mobile". *Maritime Policy and Management*. Vol. 5, pp. 297-305.
7
8
9
10
11 Cullinane, K. and Song, D. W. (2003): A Stochastic Frontier Model of the
12 Productive Efficiency of Korean Container Terminals. *Applied Economics*, 35,
13 251-267.
14
15
16
17
18 Franquelli, G., Piacenza, M. and Vannonis, D. (2004). Scope and scale economies
19 in multi-utilities: evidence from gas, water and electricity combinations. *Applied*
20 *Economics*, 36, 2045-2057.
21
22
23
24
25
26 Jara-Díaz S., Tovar B., and Trujillo L. (2005). Multioutput análisis of cargo
27 handling firms: An application to a Spanish port. *Transportation*. 32, 275-291.
28
29
30
31 Kim, M. and Sachish, A. (1986) The structure of production, technical change and
32 productivity in a port. *International Journal of Industrial Economics*, 35, 209-223.
33
34
35
36 Martínez-Budría, E. (1996) Un estudio econométrico de los costes del sistema
37 portuario español. *Revista Asturiana de Economía*, 6, 135-149.
38
39
40
41
42 Panzar, J. and Willig, R. (1977) Economies of scale in multioutput production.
43 *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 91, 481-494.
44
45
46
47
48 Rekers, R.A., Connell, D. and Ross, D.I. (1990) The development of a production
49 function for a container terminal in the port of Melbourne. *Papers of the*
50 *Australasian Transport Research Forum*, 15, 209-218.
51
52
53
54
55 Sav, T. (2004). Higher education costs and scale and scope economies. *Applied*
56 *Economics*, 36, 607-614.
57
58
59
60 Tongzon, J.L. (1993) The Port of Melbourne Authority's pricing policy: its

1
2
3 efficiency and distribution implications. *Maritime Policy and Management*, 20,
4
5 197-203.
6
7


8
9 Tovar, B. (2002) Análisis multiproductivo de los costes de manipulación de
10 mercancías en terminales portuarias. El Puerto de La Luz y de Las Palmas (A
11 multioutput cost analysis for cargo handling services in port terminals. La Luz y de
12 Las Palmas' Port), Ph. D. Thesis, Departamento de Análisis Económico Aplicado.
13
14
15
16
17 Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria. España.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1. First order coefficients from the long run aggregated model.

Parameter	Estimate	t-statistic
Total cost at the mean (thousand ptas)	95960.00	120.23
Marginal cost (ptas/ton)	715.90	33.18
Demand for ordinary workers (worked hours)	1.56	62.86
Demand for special workers (worked hours)	2.33	42.28
Demand for intermediate consumption (thousand ptas)	981.39	87.59
Demand for total area (m ²)	61755.30	103.51
Demand for capital (thousand ptas)	575120.00	38.43
Demand for non-port workers (number of men)	0.02	72.55
Trend	83.30	2.55
Dummy T1 (thousand ptas)	-2227.64	-10.98
Dummy T2 (thousand ptas)	-2212.13	-8.25

Note: 1 = 166.386 pesetas

Figure 1. Average Cost Curve.

Source: Tovar (2002).

Note: 1 = 166.386 pesetas

Table 2. First order coefficients from the long run multioutput cost function

Parameter	Estimate	t-statistic
Total cost at the mean	96680.2	140.02
Marginal cost containers (ptas/ton)	744.568	28.4829
Marginal cost general cargo (ptas/ton)	1973.57	14.192
Marginal cost ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1055.81	2.96036
Demand for ordinary workers (worked hours)	1.57645	69.7386
Demand for special workers (worked hours)	2.33895	45.8603
Demand for intermediate consumption (thousand ptas)	982.53	87.2994
Demand for total area (m ²)	61592.9	106.851
Demand for capital (thousand ptas)	583266	40.6078
Demand for non-port workers (number of men)	0.021919	76.6747
Trend	-67.0148	-1.96005
Dummy T1 (thousand ptas)	-2460.71	-11.1526
Dummy T2 (thousand ptas)	-2479.14	-7.86803

Source: Jara-Díaz et al. (2005).

Note: 1 = 166.386 pesetas

Table 3. Marginal costs (MC) and scale economies (ES) by firm for the two models

	Model with aggregated output		Model with disaggregated output	
Terminal 1	MC (ptas/ton)	720,232(*)	MC containers (ptas/ton)	743,866(*)
			MC general cargo (ptas/ton)	1993,92(*)
	ES	2,38113(*)	MC ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1116,78(*)
			ES	2,2577(*)
Terminal 2	MC (ptas/ton)	706,529(*)	MC containers (ptas/ton)	735,383(*)
			MC general cargo (ptas/ton)	1914,77(*)
	ES	3,00650(*)	MC ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1017,11(*)
			ES	2,1259(*)
Terminal 3	MC (ptas/ton)	724,277(*)	MC containers (ptas/ton)	757,006(*)
			MC general cargo (ptas/ton)	2031,77(*)
	ES	1,21561(*)	MC ro-ro cargo (ptas/ton)	1053,38(*)
			ES	1,0752(*)
sample mean	ES	1,95901(*)	ES	1,64416(*)
			ES containers	1,00548(*)
			ES general cargo	1,00147(*)
			ES ro-ro cargo	1,08108(*)

• statistically significant at 5%.

Note: 1 = 166.386 pesetas