### Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe

## WHITE PAPER

# Increasing the Use of Rail and Intermodal Transport in Europe: Integration of rail freight information with other supply chain solutions

### Contents

Exe	cutive Summary and Recommendations	1
1	Background	3
2	Survey findings	5
3	Workshop findings	7
Ann	ex: ALICE workshop drawing board rail sector, 2023	11

*Acknowledge:* This white paper has been produced in the frame of ALICE Supply Network Coordination and Collaboration Thematic Group (TG4) and has counted with the support of TRANSPOREON.



### Executive Summary and Recommendations

The ambition of the European Commission and some industry leaders on modal shift, increasing rail and intermodal transport compared to road transport, collides with the reality. The blunt facts paint a completely different picture: Over the last two decades the so-called modals shift hasn't gained any ground. As we speak rail market share has even started declining.

While most endeavours by Europe's Rail Joint Undertaking (ERJU) and other EU driven programs show a strong focus on rather "technical aspects", the workgroup in ALICE focused on the **market acceptance** of rail and intermodal solutions by the very customers of the system, the industry.

In Q4 2022, ALICE ran a survey and a Workshop<sup>1</sup> in which shippers were asked how they rate the competitiveness of rail and intermodal freight compared to road transport. While rail sector recognised road and rail to be equally competitive, shippers identified major shortcomings on rail and intermodal transport (Figure 1)<sup>2</sup>

As a next step, we investigated in which areas the perception of rail performance between the customers (shippers as cargo-owners) and the rail-system deviates most. In essence the biggest gap was found in "the lack of integration in other supply chain solutions".



alice

Figure 1. Competitiveness of Rail & Intermodal versus road views of shippers and rail sector

## "The competitiveness criterium with the biggest difference in perception is integration with other supply chain solutions."

Based on the findings we conducted a workshop to understand how shippers would aim to describe the "*desired outcome and value proposal*" for such an integration and learn how the rail sector would react to these goals.

In essence shippers demand full transparency and visibility as key elements to take the right decisions during planning and execution tracking. Most importantly shippers need to access this information

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> <u>https://www.etp-logistics.eu/workshop-railfreight/</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Main findings from the ALICE survey, 2022. The overall competitiveness is displayed as median (geometric average) to limit the impact of outliers.

Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe

within their ERP (enterprise resource planning) or TMS (transport management system) and not as stand-alone solution which are not ready for plug & play integration, but accessible to the rail system actors (worst case) or the LSPs (logistics service providers) only.

In reaction to this shipper-driven workshop, we've asked the rail stakeholders to elaborate a joint answer. It became evident that despite two workshops and the option to organise more if needed, obtaining a unified response from rail providers to shippers proved to be challenging. The rail stakeholders referred to a set of island solutions which already exist, but partially accessible for the rail actors (railway undertakings and infrastructure managers), intermodal operators or intermodal forwarders and not integrated with shipper IT tools. As a Director in DG Move stated in a recent call, *"finally intermodal transport is managed in islands"*.

Looking forward, the rail sector and its supporters missed out the opportunity to make the very customers (shippers) the core of their efforts. Continuous improvements of the technical, organisational and legal framework will not suffice to let rail and intermodal transport take the role it should play.

All in all, the conclusion of the white paper can be encapsulated into what we call the "island problem":

ALL future market related projects should firmly ensure plug & play accessibility of the solutions to all stakeholders involved in the end-toend supply chain.

Data exchange will be an important topic to address following principles of open standards and common data language as well as universal interfaces across applications and systems.

For a general outlook we can simply quote our fellow, professor Alan McKinnon, since the statement he provided in 2018 is still perfectly true and revealing:

"In summary, there are many legitimate reasons for companies continuing to rely heavily on trucking and resisting governmental efforts to get them to transfer more of their freight to lowercarbon modes. Achieving the ambitious targets that have been set for modal shift will require more radical initiatives...."<sup>34</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Alan McKinnon, in "Decarbonizing Logistics" (2018), chapter "Sifting Freight to Lower-Carbon Transport Modes", p. 120

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> It shall be noted that there are a couple of projects and initiatives , such as Trans4m-r project and FA1 project, which try to sort the issues from an end-to-end supply chain point-of-view. However, apart from the results being expected in a few years, the problem with data sharing will still persist



### 1 Background

On European rail and intermodal freight, the hopes, goals and expectation of the Commission do sharply contrast with the market reality<sup>5</sup>.



*Figure 2. Market share of rail freight 2008 – 2021 (% of all modes incl. maritime, inland waterways, road transport, air freight) – source Eurostat* 

The European Commission adopted the Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy<sup>6</sup> driven towards increasing the use of less CO2 intensive transport modes setting the objective: *rail freight traffic will increase by 50% by 2030 and double by 2050*. While rail and intermodal transport have been largely funded and prioritised transport mode for more than two decades, rail freight still saw its transported volumes decrease over the same period while intermodal managed to keep its market share. Most recently, combined transport even lost ground due to sharp increase of energy cost and other reasons falling outside the scope of this whitepaper.

Bluntly spoken there is no modal shift. The joint market share is even declining <sup>7</sup>.

On the other hand, intermodal and rail transport are suggested to play a major role in the decarbonization of the European industry. Programs such as Horizon Europe or the Fit-for-55 did incorporate the target to double volumes from rail freight over the next 25 years. The Greening Freight Package issued by DG Move (Directorate for Mobility and Transport) is supposed to bring with further facilitations for the intermodal operators.

Modal shift is also one the main measures to decarbonize its operations according to shipper interviews. A survey from 2022<sup>8</sup>, conducted among Transporeon's shippers, revealed the intention to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> EUROSTAT. <u>https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/transport/data/database.</u> More information here: Eurostat Freight transport statistics - modal split, <u>https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-</u> <u>explained/index.php?title=Freight\_transport\_statistics - modal\_split</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Sustainable and Smart Mobility Strategy (2021). <u>https://ec.europa.eu/info/law/better-regulation/have-your-say/initiatives/12438-Sustainable-and-Smart-Mobility-Strategy\_en</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Among others: UIRR Newsletter Q2.2023, <u>http://uirr.com/en/media-</u> centre/newsletters/2023/mediacentre/2623-uirr-newsletter-q22023-weak-performance-continues.html

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Transporeon, unnamed internal survey among 70 shippers, February 2022

shift 15% of all land transports from road to intermodal, which is double of today's intermodal market share only. Single corporations claim they moved up to 40% of their products that way.

Intermodal assignment Q1 Do you think your organization would make use of such a	a platform?
Very likely 25%	
Likely	70%
Unlikely 5%	
Very unlikely 0%	
Intermodal assignment Q2 How many of your land-transports could be booked that	way?
Less than 5%	32%
5-15%	32%
15-30%	32%
30-50% 5%	
More than 50%	

### Figure 3 Results from a shipper survey by Transporeon, 2022.

Since over the years there seems to be a focus on the more technical side, ALICE's thematic group 4 – Global Supply Network Coordination and Collaboration – was eager to figure what insights a focus on the market could bring to the table.

In an initial survey a total of four stakeholder groups have been asked about their perception of rail competitiveness compared to road transport in separation:

- shippers (in their authority as actual customers of the rail system, cargo owners and initial planners of transport modes),
- the rail sector incl. railway undertakings, intermodal operators, infrastructure managers,
- intermediates, namely forwarders and logistics service providers, as well as
- other stakeholders and experts

whereas the focus lied on comparing the shipper view with the railway perception. However, it was also very interesting to see how the intermediates answered on some questions.

A total of 108 respondents, from the ALICE network and beyond, answered the survey. The event was conducted in Nov. 2022.

Alliance for

Logistics Innovation through Collaboration

alice

# alice

### 2 Survey findings

The leading question on the overall competitiveness revealed the huge discrepancy between foreign and self-perception:

The industry sees major shortcomings in intermodal and rail freight whereas the railway sector felt it was equally competitive.

If we look at the intermediates, we notice that the average judgement was rather in line with the rail sector's perception, driven by about 1/3 agreeing with the shippers and another 1/3 which judged intermodal and rail freight to be even more competitive. Going into more details it is to understand that this polarization it appears that some intermediates did put a higher value on the environmental footprint.

Apart from the overall competitiveness we were looking into 12 pre-defined criteria to understand where the perceptions from the industry and the rail sector differ most, still keeping one eye onto the answers from the intermediates:

The interpretation on the **"integration of information into other supply chain solutions"** was the criteria with the highest perception gap it was followed another three criteria with almost exactly the same gap:

- transit-time
- on-time-performance
- Environmental footprint 0.04 Complexity 0.39 Ease of use 0.45 Reliable schedule (no or few cancellations, available capacity) 0.56 Cost 0.66 Trustworthy ETA 0.72 Lack customer-centric information 0.72 Real-time visibility 0.88 Lack of appropriate connections/services matching my flows 1.05 On-time performance (un-/loading) 1.07 Transit-time 1.07 Integration of information into other supply chain solutions 0.00 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20
- lack of appropriate connections / services matching my flows

Figure 4. ALICE survey 2022. Perception gap on all 12 detailed performance criteria. Shipper perception versus rail sector.

The only criteria where shippers and the rail sector had an equal impression was the environmental footprint. On all other criteria shippers perceived the rail and intermodal performance inferior.

1.27

1.40

# alice

Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe

Very interesting also to see how the intermediates' view related to the other stakeholders on the criteria. Intermediates agreed with the shippers only on (long) transit-time and cost level (being mostly competitive to road transport). As regards cost, we've got to consider that the intermediate will include the cost of the first and last mile into their judgement, while the rail sector is usually neglecting those. The intermediates' perception on (the lack of) real-time visibility was similar to the shippers.

More surprisingly the intermediates expressed a significantly better opinion on several criteria, compared to the shippers:

- on-time-performance
- integration into other supply chain solutions
- customer centric information
- trustworthy ETA
- ease of use
- complexity

An attempt to explain this phenomenon:

- the supply chain solution of an intermediate is a different one, LSPs claim they've got to interact with > 50 platforms and solutions in order to execute their business, so they don't complain same as a shippers who are used to work with a very small number of solutions only; recently few LSP operation systems even offer limited direct integrations to some providers.
- in this picture the intermediate is the customer and not the shipper.
- the ETA the intermediate looks at is the one of the train at the train terminal destination whereas shippers in the essence only watch the arrival at the final unloading point; so either the train's on-time-performance is much better compared to the truck which does the last mile, or alternatively the shipper never learns about the ETA since the information isn't passed on if the ETA deviates from the original delivery date, in all fairness we need to stress that a train's delay of only one hour at a terminal may cause a delay of a full day at the destination<sup>9</sup>

Last point of attention is that the intermediates' perception on the environmental footprint is the worst of all interest groups. This may again be explained because the intermediates' judgement includes first and last mile operations as part of the picture to a larger extent than the shippers' view.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> it isn't operationally feasible to track an intermodal trailer from a terminal at any time to any destination and return the same day with a backload; to miss the backload however would increase the last mile trip cost by 100%

#### Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe

5.00 4.50 4.00 3.50 3.00 2.50 2.00 1.50 1.00 0.50 0.00 Integration of information into oth Reliabeschedue motentanellat Onthe patomare undeat Real-timevisio Trustworthy 435e 01 .centricinform Transit ectionsiser Com Lack of appr Intermodal Operator / Railway / Infrastructure unit / Railway associciation

0 (Rail/Intermodal fails to compete with road) -> 5 (Rail/Intermodal is much more competitive than road)

- Logistic service provider / Freight Service provider association
- Shipper Organization / Cargo Shipper association

*Figure 5. ALICE survey 2022. Details on groups perceptions by each criteria.* 

### 3 Workshop findings

The survey was followed by a workshop to which participants from both focus groups – shippers on one and the rail sector on the other hand – have been invited to. Subject of this workshop was the criteria with the highest degree of deviating perception, the lack of Survey participants have been expressively invited to, those who had declared interest in a follow up.

Looking back the workshop was two-folded and included three appointments:

In a first attempt the industry was asked to define the desired outcome, as if it was the year 2030 and their information requirements would have come true.

In a second step the rail system representatives (having listened to the first attempt) should describe what had to happen (within their own scope and also outside) to make this outcome come true.

The first step went very well. In the essence shippers desire rail related visibility within their ERP (enterprise resource planning) and / or TMS (transport management system) which isn't given as of today:

- a kind of map on possible connections incl. train schedules, transit-time, reliability and loading
  unit information to map their own lanes with rail corridors; for short-term planning dwell
  times, actual transit-time and best days for departure and arrival add value; this map must not
  (only) appear as a visualisation.
- for execution the most important element is a reliable ETA warning in case the planned ETA at the destination (not only at the arrival terminal) cannot be met; real-time visibility (GPS based) is needed beyond status-messages based track-and-trace; a part of the industry would require sensors which and extended set of data (temperature, humidity, ...)



Combined transport order fulfilment experience				Open access to intermodal actual services for route planning				Sensor information available					
I. In 24 hours from order lead time for the order, route and ETA to the final terminal is shared with 95 % reliability     Tracking of order fulfilment is available.     Weak the served attrack of the shipper and interconnection with the supplier     S. Final ETA (timing) needs to be share at least 6 hours before of arrival and the day of arrival at least one day before     Optime outcome      Weblity of the Intermodal services status is guaranteed				efore	For freight forwarders and shippers, a way to include potential intermodal routes as part of end to end route/transportation plan. This means getting visibility of possible services in one or a few platforms. Purposes: 1. Planning of transport for example to know the best days for loading and delivery dates in/from terminals according the dates in which there are services leaving or departing from that terminal.				Rail undertakings and owners of rail rolling stock have sensors (temperature, humidity) incorporated in their assets and a good way to share real time status with their customers (temperature won't apply to all consignments).           Common GPS standard to share positioning information that can be independent of the GPS positioning.				
				Desired outcome				provider and can be on boarded in the system plug & play					
Integration of intermodal services status as part of the TMS system of		tS system of	End-to-end network visibility		<ol> <li>We have a decarbonisation leader who has pulled the 250 component of which we ship big regular volumes long distance. He needs a tool into</li> </ol>								
the Logistics Service Provider that is the customer of the shipper so they can share the information with the shipper.			A map on the entire network showing the corridors, terminals, actual transit-times, dwell-times, of all commercial trains the identical below forward of alanaing		which he can input those 250 lanes, and get an initial view on which ones								
					are	e "easiest" to switch based on real trai	n schedules. We aren't the only		Involve freight forward	ders			
Include the moment the transport unit is in the transportation mode Commercial trains by direct (strategic, tactical and execution)		(strategic, tactical and execution	d execution),		Universal timetables across countries			Involve forwarders as they own the equipment					
				- L				so they may incorp	porate sensors for				
there flexibility on the lead time?			Desired outcome						temperature and h	umidity.			
. For some shippers, the lead time	s, the lead time is not that rders can be fulfilled more freight forwarder.			Emission accounting					Trains can also use	the detection points next			
exible, agile by the freight forwar			e get to change our customer			in Schedules			to the track howev	er the railcar movements			
Is there a possibility to have a de	delivery window so	agreements if	we want to increase the share of	Also current emission	To complete the comment above, know not only the day but also the			defect breaking sys	tems).				
ere is a buffer for addressing del Itability?	lays without hitting intermodal t		ansportl:	calculation for rail &	train schedules, showing them all in the same site or app.				Pathway to the outcome				
			industry default		Desired outcome								
	Pathway to the outcome		Pathway to the outcome	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary									
•	Pathway to the outcome		Pathway to the outcome	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures.									
vad time	Pathway to the outcome		Pathway to the outcome	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures. Pathway to the outcome		Pickup time	Data quality			ETA			
wd time e careful with implication in ad time on buffers. Some stomers do not allow for 1 sy + than road wrings to consider with proposal	Pathway to the outcome Terminal pricing Buffers for picking means high extra co (example of Italy) Membros to consider	in terminals ost	Pathway to the outcome Resistime information If we talk real-time Information which is almost live and not just transferred in real time Remings to consider wi	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures. Pathway to the outcome		Pickup time Actual pick up time in the terminal and delivery to customer needs to be arranged one day in advance. 1 hour late pick at the terminal can lead to 1 day late delivery.	Data quality Data provided by the railways information coming from sensi- cleans information entered m applies to ocean-freight etc.). mistakes and errors.	sector m sors and anually Human	nust include live freed to be used to by operators (same entries are rich of	ETA Important to distinguish wh The shipper needs to know mile operator needs to know The train might arrive on tin still. Transparency among a Maybe not in the interest of	ich ETA? only the ETA at the withe ETA at the is but the drop is l stakeholders is every actor?	the final drop. The last- destination terminal. may be late one day could bridge this gap.	
ed time e careful with implication in ad time on buffers. Some ustomers do not allow for 1 ay + than road mings to consider with proposal tail network traffic information not av	Pathway to the outcome Terminal pricing Buffers for picking means high extra cr (example of italy) (Nerrings to consider valiable	in terminals ost with proposal	Pathway to the outcome Real-time information If we talk real-time information this is information which is almost live and not just transferred in real time Warnings to consider wi	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures. Pathway to the outcome		Pidup time Actual pick up time in the terminal and delivery to customer needs to be arranged one day in advance. 1 hour late pick at the terminal can lead to 1 day late delivery. Wanlagt to consider with proposal	Data quality Data provided by the railway to information coming from sensi- cleans information entered m applies to ocean-freight etc.), mistakes and errors.	sector m sors and anually Human	nust include live of need to be used to by operators (same entries are rich of consider with proposal	ETA Important to distinguish wh The shipper needs to know mile operator needs to know The train might arrive on tin still. Transparency among a Maybe not in the interest of	ich ETA? only the ETA at the wthe ETA at the end bat the drop of I stakeholders of every actor?	the final drop. The last- destination terminal. may be late one day could bridge this gap. Ite consider with proposal	
ed time e careful with implication in ad time on buffers. Some ustomers do not allow for 1 by + than road wrings to consider with proposal and network traffic information not av Even having the positioning of th to define the ETA from it because network traffic information (Kerner	Pethnay to the outcome Terminal pricing Buffers for picking means high extra co (example of Italy) memings to consider wallable he train it is difficult e missing of rail a to achieve the execute	in terminals sst uth propess How to share whole value of This should m not in road to	Pathway to the outcome  Rest-time information  If we talk real-time information which is almost live and not just transferred in real time  wisibility information in the chain?  ot be a legal issue as it is ansport  Parties to schleve the suscerne	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures. Pathway to the outcome		Pickup time Actual pick up time in the terminal and delivery to customer needs to be arranged one day in advance. 1 hour late pick at the terminal can lead to 1 day late delivery. Warnlags to consider with proposal	Data quality Data provided by the railway : information coming from sen- cleans information entered m applies to ocean-freight etc.). mistakes and errors.	sector m sors and anually Human	nust include live I need to be used to by operators (same entries are rich of consider with proposal	ETA Important to distinguish wh The shipper needs to know mile operator needs to know The train might arrive on tin still. Transparency among a Maybe not in the interest of	ich ETA? only the ETA at the the ETA at the drop in the but the but th	the final drop. The last- destination terminal. may be late one day could bridge this gap.	
ad time r careful with implication in ad time on buffers. Some istomers do not allow for 1 y + than road wings to consider with proposal tal network traffic information not aw iven having the positioning of th o define the ETA from it because etwork traffic information (Enrice abcontractors and third parties	Pethnay to the outcome Terminal pricing Buffers for picking means high extra co (example of Italy) memings to consider wallable he train it is difficult e missing of rail a to achieve the execone	in terminals sst uth propess Legal aspects How to share whole value of This should m not in road tr	Pathway to the outcome  Rest-time information  If we talk real-time information which is almost live and not just transferred in real time  wisibility information in the chain?  ot be a legal issue as it is ansport  Parties to achieve the susceme	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures. Pathway to the outcome		Pickup time Actual pick up time in the terminal and delivery to customer needs to be arranged one day in advance. 1 hour late pick at the terminal can lead to 1 day late delivery. Warnlags to consider with proposal	Data quality Data provided by the railway : information coming from sen- cleans information entered m applies to ocean-freight etc.). mistakes and errors.	sector m sors and anually Human	nust include live I need to be used to by operators (same entries are rich of consider with proposal	ETA Important to distinguish wh The shipper needs to know mile operator needs to know The train might arrive on tin still. Transparency among a Maybe not in the interest of	ich ETA? only the ETA at the the ETA at the drop in the but the but th	the final drop. The last- destination terminal. may be late one day could bridge this gap.	
d time careful with implication in d time on buffers. Some stomers do not allow for 1 y + than road mings to consider with proposal all network traffic information not av yen having the possitioning of the etwork traffic information of entities and third parties boomtractors and third parties	Pathway to the outcome Terminal pricing Buffers for picking means high extra co (example of italy) memory to consider wallable the train it is difficult to achieve the outcome ata working	in terminals sst with property How to share whole value of This should m not in road tr	Pathway to the outcome  Rest-time information  If we talk real-time Information which is almost live and not just transferred in real time  Termings to consider wi  visibility information in the chain? ot be a legal issue as it is ansport  Cermine to achieve the outcome	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures. Pathway to the outcome		Pickup time Actual pick up time in the terminal and delivery to customer needs to be arranged one day in advance. 1 hour late pick at the terminal can lead to 1 day late delivery. Wamlag to consider with proposal	Data quality Data provided by the railway s information coming from sensi- cleans information entered m applies to ocean-freight etc.). mistakes and errors.	sector m sors and anually Human	nust include live Ineed to be used to by operators (same entries are rich of consider with proposal	ETA Important to distinguish wh The shipper needs to know mile operator needs to know The train might arrive on tin still. Transparency among a Maybe not in the interest of	ich ETA? only the ETA at the the ETA at the the but the droid of the I stakeholders of every actor?	the final drop. The last- destination terminal. may be late one day could bridge this gap.	
d time careful with implication in d time on buffers. Some stomers do not allow for 1 y + than road mings to consider with proposal all network traffic information not av ven having the positioning of the ven having the positioning of the bedrine the ETA from it because etwork traffic information <b>Certion</b> isboontractors and third parties iommunication and visibility da vith a third party is difficult	Petheny to the outcom Terminal pricing Buffers for picking means high extra co (example of italy) memory to consider wallable the train it is difficult to achieve the outcome ata working	in terminals sst with propess() Legal aspects How to share whole value of This should m not in road to	Pathway to the outcome  Rest-time information  If we talk real-time Information which is almost live and not just transferred in real time  Transferred in real time  (Namings to consider wi  visibility information in the chain? ot be a legal issue as it is ansport  Carries to achieve the docome	assumptions. Need to move to more transparent, primary data driven figures. Pathway to the outcome		Pickup time Actual pick up time in the terminal and delivery to customer needs to be arranged one day in advance. 1 hour late pick at the terminal can lead to 1 day late delivery. Wamlags to consider with proposal	Data quality Data provided by the railway s information coming from sensi- cleans information entered m applies to ocean-freight etc.). mistakes and errors.	sector m sors and anually Human	nust include live I need to be used to by operators (same entries are rich of consider with proposal	ETA Important to distinguish wh The shipper needs to know mile operator needs to know The train might arrive on tin still. Transparency among a Maybe not in the interest of	ich ETA? only the ETA at the whe ETA at the drop in I stakeholders of every actor?	the final drop. The last- destination terminal. may be late one day could bridge this gap.	

Figure 6. ALICE workshop drawing board shippers workshop, 2023. Shippers defined the desired outcome (grey) to integrate information on rail and intermodal transports into their supply chain solutions. Also thoughts on the pathway (green), warnings (orange) and barriers (red) have been noted.

alice

It shall be noted that shippers cannot obtain the above information today, neither within their ERP / TMS nor via other sources easy to access (plug & play).

In the specific environment of rail and intermodal transport it appears that the consolidation function provided by the LSPs (logistics service providers) is rather seen as a showstopper which is hindering the transparency than an accelerator which facilitates the use of rail freight.

In the second step the rail sector representatives have met to reply to the shipper's demand and explain how they managed to provide the shippers with the desired outcome. They were invited to also declare what political, legal, technical or other milestones where needed to achieve this result:



*Figure 7. ALICE workshop drawing board rail sector, 2023: Rail sector representatives answered to the desired outcome (grey) suggested by shippers.* 

Two workshops have been held and delivered interesting discussions among the participants that included 12 representatives of rail undertakings and intermodal operators.

During the discussion the rail sector representatives still shared one common reaction: *"What is your problem, the solutions are already there?*!" Without going into details, the exemplary tools, they listed<sup>10</sup> face several shortcomings compared to the desired outcome as specified. All or most of them are:

- island solutions, without integration into any ERP or TMS
- not accessible to shippers in particular (designed to share information within the rail-sector or

   in best case with a LSP logistics service provider)
- not providing any real-time and / or sensor-based information
- not providing the desired coverage (containers only, some flows only, ...)

From a shipper point of view the current tool landscape may be a seen as starting point only. However, they are insufficient as of today and need to be developed further, in the interest of rail. The rail sector isn't fully aware of the industry being the very customer of their system and the need of direct data to obtain what is called "customer experience" today.

The tools which are available need to become ready for plug & play integration into ERP and TMS landscapes and data must be ready to be shared with the industry. A discussion on data sharing

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See Annex

including a universal open model and framework to create common data language and execute data sharing between all actors in the end-to-end supply-chain will be required to achieve this.

On functional level solutions need to be enhanced and their coverage got to be extended. The availability of real-time data generally isn't given today (manual status information only) and must be taken up.

Unfortunately, the two rail specific workshops failed to deliver a joint reply to the needs of the industry or the definition of mile-stones. Several efforts to come to a third meeting remained unsuccessful. Hence ALICE TG4 decided to create this whitepaper as kind of interim report and continue to tackle the other topics addressed in the survey:

- transit-time
- on-time-performance
- lack of appropriate connections / services matching my flows

#### alice Alliance for Logistics Innovation through Collaboration in Europe

### Annex: ALICE workshop drawing board rail sector, 2023.

Describe the functions that the rail need to have	Describe the interfaces with the shipper	Proactivelly sharing available tools/best practices in the pathway to the outcome				
To address the desired outcome: oute planning racking nternational level ETA deviation Who should provide these functions?	Each rail company has its own platform but how these are connected to the shippers/LSPs plug & play independently of the rail company and the shipper so information can flow fluently with those parties.	Provide visibility of those available tools: -Freight forwarder specialised in rail as a subsidiary: https://www.forwardis.com/en/our-company/ Tools for end-to-end booking and tracking: https://www.rail-flow.com/en/intermodal-capacity-broker-forwarder/ https://modility.com/en/				
Rail sector realizing desired outcomes	Rail sector realizing desired outcomes	https://www.youtube.com/@meinkombiverkehrportal/videos				
ngage more with the logistics world	Define open and universal API models	https://www.routescanner.com/				
articularly with shippers.	For the different functions through data ontologies and then technical formats hence ensuring interoperability across rail and shippers platforms	Open access to intermodal actual services for route planning: www.shift2030.eu/match2rail Data exchange:				
Rail sector realizing desired outcomes		https://www.hupac.com/EN/DX-Intermodal-new-service-provider-for-data-exchange-in-combined-transport-e6b56600				
could single wagon load concept be used for Consumer Goods?	Rall sector realizing desired outcomes	https://kombiverkehr.hafas.de/webapp-next/#IP TPIhistId 0!histKey H594250 https://www.ville-rail-transports.com/ferroviaire/lancement.de.rail-route-connect-up-resear-pour-acheminer.le.frat.d				
Awareness between rail operators and shippers to work Real state for consolidation of goods Make service simple and transparent		bout-en-bout/				
		Rall sector realizing desired outco				