


# Potable Water Quality on Non-Passenger Ships Calling Belgian Ports <sup>†</sup>

Leonidas Kourentis <sup>1</sup>, Lemonia Anagnostopoulos <sup>1</sup>, Zafeiris Tsinaris <sup>1</sup>, Achilleas P. Galanopoulos <sup>1,2</sup>, Diederik Van Reusel <sup>3</sup>, Raf Van den Bogaert <sup>3</sup>, Björn Helewaut <sup>3</sup>, Inge Steenhout <sup>3</sup>, Hasse Helewaut <sup>3</sup>, Dion Damman <sup>4</sup>, Christos Hadjichristodoulou <sup>1</sup> and Varvara A. Mouchtouri <sup>1,\*</sup> 

<sup>1</sup> Department of Hygiene and Epidemiology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Thessaly, 41222 Larissa, Greece

<sup>2</sup> Department of Immunology & Histocompatibility, Faculty of Medicine, University of Thessaly, 41500 Larissa, Greece

<sup>3</sup> Seaport Cell, 2018 Antwerp, Belgium

<sup>4</sup> Federal Environmental Inspection (Biocides and Pesticides, Dangerous Products), Federal Public Services Health, Safety of the Food Chain and Environment, Victor Hortaplein 40/10, 1060 Brussel, Belgium

\* Correspondence: mouchtourib@med.uth.gr; Tel.: +30-2410565009

<sup>†</sup> Presented at the Public Health Congress on Maritime Transport and Ports 2022: Sailing to the post-COVID-19 era, Athens, Greece, 21–22 October 2022.

**Abstract:** Waterborne disease due to the microbial contamination of potable water onboard ships is a potential threat for seafarers. The results from the samples collected at Belgian ports from 2010 to 2018 during inspections of non-passenger ships are used to evaluate the microbiological and chemical quality of potable water. A small proportion of the samples was found positive for indicator organisms (7.5%), indicating the lack of proper disinfection and possible contamination. Further analyses and risk assessments are recommended for examining possible contributing factors. Inspections for the issuance of SSC should focus on water safety and the prevention of waterborne diseases.

**Keywords:** microbiological parameter; chemical parameters; potable water; ships; SSC inspections



**Citation:** Kourentis, L.; Anagnostopoulos, L.; Tsinaris, Z.; Galanopoulos, A.P.; Van Reusel, D.; Van den Bogaert, R.; Helewaut, B.; Steenhout, I.; Helewaut, H.; Damman, D.; et al. Potable Water Quality on Non-Passenger Ships Calling Belgian Ports. *Med. Sci. Forum* **2022**, *13*, 16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/msf2022013016>

Academic Editor: Volker Harth

Published: 1 December 2022

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Waterborne diseases have been associated with water systems on ships and most reported outbreaks involve Norovirus and Enterotoxigenic *E. coli* [1,2]. The factors contributing to these waterborne outbreaks include contaminated bunkered water, inadequate disinfection, the ingress of grey/black water into potable water tanks, the use of seawater in the galley and contamination via cross-connections [1,2].

The World Health Organization's (WHO's) *Guide to Ship Sanitation* and *Handbook for Inspection of Ships and Issuance of Ship Sanitation Certificates* provide guidance for ships on international voyages with respect to various areas, including potable water [3,4]. The latter is used during inspections performed by competent port health authorities in order to issue a Ship Sanitation Certificate (SSC) within the framework of the International Health Regulations (IHR) [5]. During these inspections, the potable water system is inspected and samples are taken in order to verify compliance.

In this study, the results from the samples collected at Belgian ports from 2010 to 2018 during inspections of non-passenger ships are used to evaluate the microbiological and chemical quality of potable water.

## 2. Materials and Methods

The results of the microbiological analysis along with other information including the name of the ship, sample location, temperature and pH were provided by the Belgian port's health authority. Information related to the ships, including ship type, year build and flag, was acquired from an online database [6]. The classification of ship types followed the categories used in the EU Common Ship Sanitation Database [7].

### 3. Results

From 2010 to 2018, the port health authorities collected potable water samples for microbiological and chemical analysis on 3489 SSC inspections performed on board 2063 different ships calling Belgium ports. The total number of collected samples was 5640. Most samples were collected from 2012 to 2016 (71.9%).

Table 1 shows the number of samples collected for each parameter and the results of the analysis. From the 3471 different inspections where samples for microbiological analyses were collected, 260 (7.5%) had at least one positive sample for the parameters of Total Coliforms, *E. coli* and Enterococci. These samples were taken from 2056 ships and 229 (11.1%) of them had at least one positive sample. From the 108 different inspections where samples were collected for chemical analyses, 11 (10.2%) had at least one sample exceeding the parametric values of either Cd, Cu, Pb or Ni [8]. These samples were collected from 97 ships and 11 (11.3%) of them had at least one positive samples.

**Table 1.** Description of the data available for each parameter, acceptable levels and the number of samples outside the acceptable levels.

| Parameter                   | Number of Samples | Min | Max    | Mean  | SD     | Acceptable Level     | Samples Outside Acceptable Levels (%) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|-----|--------|-------|--------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Temperature (°C)            | 1551              | 7   | 60     | 23.0  | 4.6    | ≤25 <sup>1</sup>     | 347 (22.4%)                           |
| HPC at 22 °C (CFU/100 mL)   | 5601              | 0   | 47,000 | 635.4 | 1438.3 | ≤1000                | 1057 (18.9%)                          |
| HPC at 27 °C (CFU/100 mL)   | 934               | 0   | 35,000 | 772.4 | 2542.1 | ≤1000                | 166 (17.8%)                           |
| Coliforms (CFU/100 mL)      | 5506              | 0   | 1001   | 0.9   | 15.2   | <1 <sup>1</sup>      | 252 (4.6%)                            |
| <i>E. coli</i> (CFU/100 mL) | 5550              | 0   | 240    | 0.2   | 4.3    | <1 <sup>1</sup>      | 65 (1.2%)                             |
| Enterococci (CFU/100 mL)    | 5529              | 0   | 109    | 0.1   | 2.6    | <1 <sup>1</sup>      | 30 (0.5%)                             |
| pH                          | 1550              | 4.9 | 10.8   | 7.8   | 1.1    | 6.5–9.5 <sup>1</sup> | 330 (21.3%)                           |
| Conductivity (µS/cm)        | 1548              | 2   | 2460   | 208.4 | 255.9  | 2500 <sup>1</sup>    | 0 (0.0%)                              |
| Fe (µg/L)                   | 132               | 20  | 18,700 | 683.5 | 2117.3 | 200 <sup>1</sup>     | 34 (25.8%)                            |
| Cd (µg/L)                   | 130               | 1   | 20     | 1.2   | 1.7    | 3 <sup>1</sup>       | 1 (0.8%)                              |
| Cu (µg/L)                   | 130               | 1   | 4410   | 292.8 | 596.8  | 2000 <sup>1</sup>    | 3 (2.3%)                              |
| Pb (µg/L)                   | 130               | 1   | 273    | 6.511 | 33.5   | 10 <sup>1</sup>      | 8 (6.2%)                              |
| Zn (µg/L)                   | 130               | 1   | 215.9  | 215.9 | 403.8  | 3000 <sup>1</sup>    | 1 (0.8%)                              |
| Ni (µg/L)                   | 125               | 0   | 7950   | 75.1  | 710.2  | 70 <sup>1</sup>      | 3 (2.4%)                              |

<sup>1</sup> Typical value according to WHO [3].

### 4. Discussion and Conclusions

Less than 5% of the samples were positive for Coliforms, fewer were found positive for *E. coli* and even less were positive for Enterococci. These positive samples correspond to a significant percentage of the ships inspected (11.1%). A similar study examined the microbiological quality of 342 ships calling UK and Channel Islands and reported that 6.76% of the samples were positive for Coliforms, 0.74% were positive for *E. coli* and 2.07% were positive for Enterococci [9]. The rate of ships with at least one of these parameters positive was reported to be slightly higher than the rate in the present study (16.1%).

Positive samples for Coliforms *E. coli* and Enterococci indicate poor sanitary conditions and the possible contamination of the potable water of those ships [10]. Inadequate treatment is also evident considering that HPC levels increased in many samples. The free residual chlorine measurements of potable water were not available. pH values were found outside the typical values for one out five ships. pH values that are larger than eight may hinder the effectiveness of chlorination and values lower than 6.5 may lead to corrosion [3]. Although the description of the samples did not explicitly specify whether the samples were collected from the cold or the hot water line, it can be safely assumed that the majority of samples were collected from the cold water line.

Eight of the ships were found with Pb levels exceeding the typical values as per WHO, indicating that lead materials may be present in the potable water system of these ships [3,10]. One-fourth of the ships were found with iron levels exceeding the typical values of WHO and few ships were found with nickel and copper exceeding the typical

values. This is most probably caused by corrosion in the piping system and low pH levels [3,10].

The results indicate that a significant number of the ships may have inadequate disinfection and a few of them were found with fecal contamination and chemical parameters above the parametric values. Additional analyses of the data may reveal associations of positive results with specific characteristics of the ship. Finally, an analysis of the data recorded in the EU Common Ship Sanitation Database may provide further insights on the relationship between the inspection findings and the positive results.

**Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, V.A.M. and C.H.; methodology, L.K. and V.A.M.; formal analysis, Z.T. and A.P.G.; investigation, D.V.R., R.V.d.B., B.H., I.S., H.H. and D.D.; writing—original draft preparation, L.K.; writing—review and editing, L.K., L.A. and V.A.M.; supervision, C.H. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** This research received no external funding.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** Third-party data.

**Acknowledgments:** We would like thank the port's health officers who conducted the samplings and the staff of the laboratories who performed the laboratory analyses.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## References

1. World Health Organization. *Sanitation on Ships: Compendium of Outbreaks of Foodborne and Waterborne Disease and Legionnaires' Disease Associated with Ships 1970–2000*; World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland, 2001.
2. Rooney, R.M.; Bartram, J.K.; Cramer, E.H.; Mantha, S.; Nichols, G.; Suraj, R.; Todd, E.C. A review of outbreaks of waterborne disease associated with ships: Evidence for risk management. *Public Health Rep.* **2004**, *119*, 435–442. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
3. World Health Organization. *Guide to Ship Sanitation*; World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland, 2011.
4. World Health Organization. *Handbook for Inspection of Ships and Issuance of Ship Sanitation Certificates*; World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland, 2011.
5. World Health Organization. *International Health Regulations (2005)*, 2nd ed.; World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland, 2008.
6. MarineTraffic. Available online: [www.marinetraffic.com](http://www.marinetraffic.com) (accessed on 26 August 2022).
7. Mouchtouri, V.A.; Van Reusel, D.; Bitsolas, N.; Katsioulis, A.; Van den Bogaert, R.; Helewaut, B.; Steenhout, I.; Damman, D.; Dávila Cornejo, M.; Hadjichristodoulou, C. European Web-Based Platform for Recording International Health Regulations Ship Sanitation Certificates: Results and Perspectives. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2018**, *15*, 1833. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
8. Directive (EU) 2020/2184 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2020 on the quality of water intended for human consumption (recast). *Off. J. Eur. Union* **2020**, *435*, 1–62.
9. Grenfell, P.; Little, C.L.; Surman-Lee, S.; Greenwood, M.; Avers, J.; Westacott, S.; Lane, C.; Nichols, G. The microbiological quality of potable water on board ships docking in the UK and the Channel Islands: An association of Port Health Authorities and Health Protection Agency Study. *J. Water Health* **2008**, *6*, 215–224. [CrossRef] [PubMed]
10. World Health Organization. *Guidelines for Drinking-Water Quality: Fourth Edition Incorporating the First Addendum*; World Health Organization: Geneva, Switzerland, 2017.