A holistic approach to your terminal design process

Jarno Kuipers, Kalmar Terminal Design Services





What you need depends on your specific situation



Flexible Layouts



Short investment horizon Low Capex Easy to resell equipment Long investment horizon High Capex Fixed assets

Higher Opex Capacity limitations Lower Opex Less capacity limitations



Fixed Layouts

What to consider here?







Examples of options with a limited investment horizon

- Buy an eco-efficient RS with fuel saving guarantee and save ~25% on fuel cost and emissions
- Invest in data-based information and control
- Future ready design: prepare your yard for the implementation of a RTG at a later point in time

IIIII Take control of your future:

- Analyze, understand, optimize
- Align with all stakeholders (customers, local authorities, rail network manager etc.)
- Share data and improve the quality of data
- Plan, execute, check, re-plan







Don't save on the planning phase







Commercial representation of the design process

Investigate

Map the options for Terminal Design alternatives to meet the objectives

 Identify different layout options high level



Qualify

Research the alternative solutions and numerically assess the feasibility of the options

- Full range of layout options
- Full business case calculations including CAPEX, OPEX and ROI analysis on preferred options
- High level delivery and project plan
- Terminal capacity calculations and fleet size estimations



Demonstrate

Demonstrate and validate that 'the selected option can meet the objectives

- Terminal simulations to demonstrate the design
- Verify the design in different scenarios
- 3D modelling of preferred terminal design









Actual representation of the design process



Design problems and challenges noted

Problems and challenges:

Business case comprehensiveness

- Equipment, IT, Infrastructure
- Risk and scenario comprehensiveness
 - Sensitivity analysis and alternative scenarios
- Involving all required skills throughout the project.

Later refinements or additional information

 Not always fed back into the models to verify if the chosen concept is still the optimal choice.

Not enough time for a proper analysis.

Result:

In order to meet time, skill and budget limitations

Too early focus on 1 operational concept, lacking solid checks of sensitivities and alternative scenarios.

🕾 KALMAR

Real representation of the design process



Customer Feedback



Flexible Decision Tool – High level overview

Inputs include amongst others:

- Timing aspects
- Financing assumptions
- Terminal parameters
- Activity statistics
- Equipment parameters
- Investment cost
- Other operational cost
- Revenues per container type

Outputs for each scenario include amongst others:

- Total cost of ownership, IRR, NPV
- Cash flow statement
- Balance sheet





The Flexible Decision Tool includes 2D and 3D visualization of container terminal operations







Outputs of the flexible decision tool

STRADDLE TERMINAL

LAY-OU



	Average	Tutal	Discounte	
Capital Experiment	IC 100	647 925	200565	142
Operational Expenses	10 632	425 570	65:597	-6.2
Labour Expenses	75 552	3153652	439,245	14
Financing Costs	2 808	112 320	55276	11
TerelCore	109.237	4355497	561187	11
		DWNER	SHIP	
		2 V 3	. ~ ~ ~	1
Not Cash Flor Not Dash Flor Not Provent Valuery (2nd Internet Patran) Performer Percentigeneral	NPU) RIN ON	0 1 0 Usesall 4 303 437 65 107 77 /7s 8.25 8.65	Anno Anno Anno N N N	
Ner Cach Files Ner Each Files Ner Provent Valuery (2st. Istern of Betran (2st. Pathar est beautimers (2) Pasback Period (searc)	NPV RIN DN RETURN	Unerall 4 303 437 65 107 77 /74 8,65	Sure Sure Sure N Harr	
Net Cash/Ros Net Cash/Ros Net Person Valency (20: Literard Beirard Benard (20) Restan rest was stream (20) Persona Valency (20)	NPV) RN DN RETURN	0 6 9 Uneerall 4 303 437 05 107 77 /7s 8,25 8,66	And A A	
Net Cash/Ros Net Fash/Ros Net Person Valency (25c Net Person Valency (25c Net Person Rosen (25) Person Person Rosen Person Rosen (25) Person Rosen (25) Pers	NPV) RIN DN RETURN •THENO	 Second Conservation 4 306 407 46 107 77 7x 10,7x 10,7x 10,7x 10,86 	Coop Coop Coop N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	
Not Cash Flow Not Cash Flow Not Provent Value of Dec Not Provent Value of Dec Not Provent Value of Dec Not Provent Value of Dec Not Prove the Not Not Not Not Prove the Not Not Not Not Not Prove the Not Not Not Not Not Prove the Not	NPM RIN UN RETURN	 4.303 k97 65 107 77 /5% 8.65 8.55 	Anna de de	
Net Cash Flor Net Cash Flor Ref Process Value of Uts Reforment Value of Uts Reforment Action Petrano Petrano (Second Second Petrano (Second Second Petrano (Second Second Petrano (Second Second Second Petrano (Second Second Second Second Petrano (Second Second S	RETURN	 Verrall 43224427 4324427 4324427 43254427 4325427 	Sanno Sanno Sanno N Holmer Transf	

RTG TERMINAL



	Average	Testal	Discounte	
Expetial Engineering	16.721	300.057	204.014	Alteri
Operational Expenses	776	300 647	47750	Aline
Labour Expenses	05 043	3 593 7 16	495 533	1 Euro
Financing Costs	2 841	113 6 3 3	54740	1.2.00
TotalCortr	115 121	4804853	89Z 744	1.000
			- T- 11	
94.0 - 2 - 2 - D	222.	Userall		20
Net Cardo Flore Net Present Value & 1210	NPV)	4 604 853	Caro	
Not Cards Flore Not Present Value of 126 (1 Internal Pate of Perturbation	NPV) Rite	4 604 853 002 744 -30,355	Euro Euro N	
Net Cardo Flore Net Present Value (g. 1250) Internal Brite of Betweet(BF Between International (BC)	NPV) R)%	4 004 053 002 744 30,355 17,055	Daro Daro N	
Net Cardo Flore Net Provent Value (g. 1244) Internet Rate of Return (1987) Return on Investment (1970) Peoblack Period (versal)	NPV) R) 16 (16	4 604 853 802 744 .30,355 17,655 8,82	Curr Curr N N N N	
Net Cade Pice Net Protect Value (p. 1264) Internal Bate of Patient (PP Patiences Recentered (PO) Patiences Patient (value)	NPV) R% IN RETURN	4 604 853 002 744 36,35 17,65 6,82	Caro Caro N N Nam	
Ner Cade Piex Net Persons Valuersy (2:c) Network Care of Patient (PP) Perback Period (versal Perback Period (versal)	NPV) Ris RETURN	4 504 853 602 744 .36,35 17,65 6,32	Euro Euro N N Nater Nater	
Ner Carl Flow Net Person Volancip Die 1 Network Renard Retain (RR Pertonsie Ausstance) (RD Pertonsie Period (search Retains Period (search Retains Period (search Retains Period (search Retains Retains Retai	NPV) RN IN RETURN	+ 504 853 002 744 36,35 17,65 6,82	Curo Curo N N Noner Noner	
Ner Caal / Kor Net Person Volancy (201) Internation (201) Performant Rate of Performant	NPV) RS N RETURN	* 004 053 002 744 31,35 17,65 8,32	Euro Guin N N Newr Heart	
Ner Caal, Pioz Net Person V. Vancy (Etc.) International Brite of Britan (BPR Betranson Housenson (BPR) Persback Period (years) * Radymectors and second	NPV) RS IX RETURN • Teles	* 004 053 002 744 30(3): 17,03 8,82	Guo Guin N S Naar	
Ner Caal, Pios Net Person Volancy (2011) International Rate of Retaining (RR Perton en loss transmer (RR) Perton (Retaining of R)) Perton (Retaining of R) Perton (R) Perton (R) P	NPV) Rix IX RETURN •medianit	4 004 053 002 744 30,35 17,05 6,32	Guo Guin N N N N N N N N N N N N N	
Ner Caale Flow Net Person Valeo (E.S.) Internal R. to of Retain (RF Perturbative Pe	NPV) Bits Its RETURN • Tradients	* 604 653 052 744 30,35 17,65 6,82	Gain N N N Polar	
Nor Cash Pice Not Person Value (p. 1214) Intervent Neuron (PRF Personal Neuron (PRF Personal Neuron (PRF Personal Neuron (Neuron (PRF Personal Neuron (Neuron		* 000 053 002 744 31,35 17,65 6,82	Coop Ann X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X X	

ASC TERMINAL



We arrive

Incol

and the second se			
CapitalEqueres	12:215	666:190	356 \$
Operator of Experience	7.232	203 203	4540
Labour Expenses	52 371	2 0 9 4 6 2 7	285 06
FinancingCosts	3 347	T53 871	66.36
LetalCests	80.154	821#177	- /6/0
Badd Agrona - Ou			
	2221	a ap ap a	e 2 2
Net Use's Flow		Overall 3206177	2000
Net Daris Hon Net Propert Value (\$12% if	NEW	Overall 8206177 757057	20ma 20ma
Nes Davis How Nes Preserv Value (\$12%) Internal Hate of Haruss (Hit	NFV) 0%	Overall 32061/7 757057 30.5%	cons cons V
Nes Cash Hon Nes Preserv Vake @12% II Internal Flate of Flatum IRF Restant Parind Issand	NFV) 024 126	Overall 9206177 757057 90.6% 19.4% 6.47	Cons Cons N N
Net Cash Hos Net Present Value (2023) Internet Fate of Herum (201 Resent on Interstment (201 Payback Period (sears)	NFV) 0% 1%	Overall 32041// 30.55 30.55 8.47	dont dont V V Haar
Net Cash Hon Net Passer Value (20124 I) Internal Pase of Herum (HC) Reven on Investment (HC) Rayback Pletod (years)	NFV) 0× 1× RETURN	Overall 3204177 30,555 30,555 8,47	dona dona N N Near
Nec Cash's Hon Nec Freserer Value (D125) () Herman in Incommerce (FIO) Payhaoli Pletod (Jesere) Witgstynamine	RETURN	Oversall 32061777 757057 30,555 9,457 6,47	Cont Cont N N Nary
Nec Carls Hon Nec Hearer Value (DTCN) Hearer of Hanna (DT Hearer of Hearer) Paybadi Pierce (Dearer) Witgstragenese	N=V) 0× 1× RETURN	Oversetii 3 206177 75 7057 30,5% 78,4% 6,47	Const dont N N Noney
Nec Usath Hon Nec Preserv Value (D1254 () Internal Hare of Haron ()H Resons on Internet (Part) Payback Period (searce) Resonance () Resonance () Res	RETURN	Flores all \$206177 757057 \$0.5% \$30.5% \$30.5% \$30.5% \$30.5%	Const Const N N Filmery
Nec Cash's Flox Nec Frequency Value (0125) (Horan on Incomment (FIO) Payback Partod (payar) Without partod (payar) Missisympatian (1995) 1995) 1995 1995	N=VI 05 18 RETURN Filedans	Oversall 3 206 177 75 7057 30057 30057 30,057 9,85 6,87	Contr Contr V N Haary
Nec Carls Hox Nec Preserv Value (P1254 () Premail Size of Hermin (H- Recars on Inconstruct (P121) Payback Period (bears) Pagatyogenese Recargogenese Size Size Size Size Size Size Size Size	RETURN	Oversall 3 206177 357057 30,657 38,657 8,647 6,647	Contr dona V V N Nawy
Nec Carl's Flox Nec Frazere Value (DT2% I) Herman is however (Flox Rears on Incomment (Flox Rears on Incomment (Flox Rears) Regulation (Second Regulation) Regulation (Second Regulation) Regulation Regul	RETURN	Overaall \$206177 \$5057 \$0.655 \$9.655 \$6.67	Const Const N N Haww
Nec Carls Hox Nec Freezer Value (F1254 (F Freezer Value (F1254 (F Recurs on Investment (F121)) Payback Piertod (Search)	RETURN	Charrendii Stote T// 757 (157 50,555 78,455 8,457 8,457	Const Const N N Housey
Nec Usaris Hon Nec Prozence Value (D1254 I) Horana Di Honesmarch (PUI) Paybacki Period (second) Paybacki Period (second)	RETURN	Dereadi State 177 75 703 30,655 75,655 6,67	Const dont V V Shary
Nec Carls Hon Nec Freezers Value (F125) (F Hormon in Houseneck (F21)) Payback Pierce (Locard) Payback	RETURN	Conversall StateTrip 757(157 30,555 39,455 8,427 # Tenday Conv 8,427	cont cont V N Narr







Implication of using an integrated & flexible decision tool







360-degree perspective on value creation

Financial Value







Static models are not sufficient

"Don't validate only 1 future, test the design sensitivity by creating different scenarios and use cases"

Technology

Impact of:

- Speeds and delays
- Fleet sizes
- Variances to reveal bottlenecks
- Traffic arrival patterns
- Stacking height
- Unexpected changes
- TOS decision making modeling
- Humans decision making during operation

🛄 Data

Usage:

- Access restrictions to the main lines
- Shunting capacity
- 3D equipment models can reveal space issues overlooked
- Share your historical and current data to use as an input for the simulation
- Feed back the outcomes of the simulation into the static model to review the potential impact on the business cases









Example of a simulation exercise

Is that statement still valid when looking with a holistic perspective ?

What is the difference between coupled and decoupled horizontal transport systems when looking at:

- STS crane performance
- Yard crane performance
- Possibilities for optimization

parallel stacks

Typical statement heard from industry: "In parallel C-RMG concept the horizontal transportation system travel distances increase so much, that a decoupled system does not add value anymore. Therefore AGV or AutoTT is the way to go."





Simulation scenarios

Scenario 1 (coupled system)

LoLo AGV operation Exchange under QC portal Parallel buffer for waiting behind QC AGV fleet sizes varying between 24...64

Scenario 2 (decoupled system)

AutoShuttle operation Exchange under QC backreach No parallel buffer or waiting area on the apron AutoShuttle fleet sizes varying between 24...36





Simulation environment

Container stack occupancy In initial situation, stack occupancy 70% of the max capacity

Discharge

Load

Discharge

Load

Discharge

Load

Load

Container stack operation 12 parallel C-RMG stacks Single cantilever, 13 wide stacks 20 C-RMG cranes

Quay crane operation 8 Quay cranes (single trolley) Mixed load and discharge operation Nominal productivity 35 cycles per h Only 4oft containers singlelift

Discharge

Decking of incoming and selection of departing containers

Departing containers

70% of the departing containers were selected from top tier. 30% of the departing containers were selected randomly in such way that they required 0...3 rehandling moves. Random selection of containers from the assigned blocks Incoming containers Decking decision based on specific decking rules within the selected range of stacking blocks.

Decking rules for incoming containers

Balancing workload between stacks

- The stack with less occupied transfer lane gets higher score
- Length of the working queue (with 30 min. look ahead)
- Aiming to take benefit from dual cycling opportunities of HT equipment
 - The positions in the close proximity to where there is a high priority export container waiting get higher score
- I Keeping the stack levels equal
 - The stack positions with lower stack height gets higher score
- No stacking of incoming and departing containers on top of each other. No other categorization of containers.

Simulation results - Quay crane productivity

QC performance

In AGV scenario the QC productivities grow linearly as the fleet size grows. In the simulation the maximum average QC productivity 31,3 mph is reached with fleet size of 64 units

With AutoShuttle solution the maximum average QC productivity of 33,6 mph is reached already with fleet size of 32 units, after which increasing fleet size does not increase productivity anymore.

Simulation results - Time usage by HT units

Time usage / work cycle

In the attached graph it can be seen, that the time spent for driving per HT unit is approximately same for both AutoShuttle and AGV scenarios.

Big differences can be seen in waiting times at handling position. This is where the conceptual difference between decoupled and coupled system is seen, as decoupled units don't need to wait for crane.

Second big difference is in waiting time to access the C-RMG handling position. In decoupled scenario the transfer lanes get congested, AGV:s block the way from each other. AutoShuttle has the benefit of being able to travel over containers sitting on the transfer lanes.

Simulation results - Gantry time for yard crane

Yard crane gantry time / productive move

Attached graph indicating average C-RMG gantry movement time per productive move shows a clear difference between coupled and decoupled horizontal transportation system. As the import and export containers can be buffered on the transfer lane, this leaves a lot more room for optimizing the best possible execution order for the jobs (and especially handle the import jobs when time allows and in an optimal order). This reduces average gantry movements 15 - 25%.

Simulation results - Yard crane productivity

Yard crane productive moves/hour

Using decoupled horizontal transportation system gives a lot more flexibility to optimize the execution order of the jobs on the transfer lane. Crane gantry travelling distances can be optimized, as departing containers can be buffered on the transfer lane beforehand, and incoming containers can be lifted into the stack when they fit to the plan. This improves yard crane productivity up to 20% compared to operation with the coupled horizontal transportation.

Simulation exercise conclusions

- The simulation project shows that in combination with parallel C-RMG stacks, a decoupled horizontal transportation system provides significant advantages compared to coupled horizontal transport system.
- Eliminating most of the waiting time between crane and HT units
 - Reducing congestions especially in the stack interchange lanes
- im With the capability to buffer containers on transfer lanes
 - Optimization opportunities for yard crane job sequencing
 - Flexibility to handle peak load situations
 - Higher quay crane productivity
- This requires re-thinking the whole concept of how to use the parallel transfer lane, but the advantages are significant
 - 20% higher yard crane productivity
 - 7% higher quay crane productivity
 - 50% higher HT equipment utilization

Concluding – Get ready for your future

- Don't save on the design phase.
- Get really involved, make your people enthusiastic.
- Use the technology and data available out there.
- Don't plan for 1 future only.
 - Adopt and internalize the use of technology and data in your organization.

Thank you

jarno.kuipers@kalmarglobal.com

