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Problem definition

• UIC – International Union of Railways
  o Direct transshipment between rail and waterborne transport

• Intermodal sea-rail terminals
  o Intermodal loading units (containers, swap bodies, semi-trailers)
  o Connection between ports and rail network

• Quay tracks → potential barrier to port operations?
Research design

• **Purpose**: developments and opportunities direct transshipment → seaports & inland ports

• Distinction between direct, semi-direct and indirect transshipment

• **Research questions**
  
  o What are the opportunities and challenges of direct transshipment?
  
  o Can lead times be reduced when using direct transshipment?
  
  o Can the total port cost be reduced because of the direct transshipment method?
Typology

- 3 types sea-rail transshipment
- Distribution based on various factors:
  - Dwell time
  - Storage area
  - Vehicle movements
- Sea ports vs. Inland ports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Semi-direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwell time</td>
<td>0 days</td>
<td>&lt; 2 days</td>
<td>&gt; 2 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle movements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

- Literature review: transshipment from ship to train
- Interviews with inland ports (2)
- Cases
  - Sea ports: Hamburg, Antwerp and Gothenburg
  - Inland ports: Genk and Lille
- Port model (chain cost model University of Antwerp)
Port of Lille

- General manager
- 20 trains → Bordeaux, Toulouse, Marseille, Aix-en-Provence
- Direct transshipment containers rail- barge?
- No demand → Rennes-Lille-Antwerp?
  - Reach stackers → mix containers and swap bodies
  - Waiting times
Port of Genk

- Operations manager
- No direct transshipment containers rail- barge?
  - bulk transport (rice Mars factory)
Port model

• New York → Hamburg

• Port of Hamburg
  o Direct transshipment containers
  o Total port cost and port time optimal
Opportunities and challenges

Opportunities

• Less handling material
• Less transfer costs
• Less congestion
• Less use of space

Challenges

• High infrastructure cost
• Synchronisation between the two transport modes
• Technically difficult to implement
• Defects → process disrupted
Results

• Variety → development of sea-rail transshipment in ports

• Port of Hamburg and Gothenburg
  o Semi-direct transshipment
  o Rail facilities within the terminal area

o Port of Antwerp-Bruges
  o Indirect transshipment

o Inland ports Genk en Lille
  o Direct transshipment of bulk goods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Semi-direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sea ports</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>Port of Hamburg, Port of Gothenburg</td>
<td>Port of Antwerp-Bruges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inland ports</td>
<td>Port of Genk Port of Lille (dry bulk)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

• Direct transshipment of containers
  • European seaports → no direct transshipment method of containers
    o Opportunities for implementation rise → increase rail share
    o Opportunity to reduce waiting times
Recommendations

• Separate legal framework
• Definition ‘direct transshipment’
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