

COST-BENEFIT OF DATA SHARING FOR CT: INSIGHTS FROM A TSI TELEMATICS IMPACT ASSESSMENT DR. ROLAND KLÜBER



Customers demand data sharing



Do cooperation & data sharing increase supply chain efficiency? 1

Benefits to be unlocked from an improved supply chain visibility?¹



Challenges of data sharing demand urgent call for action!



*A*R

Other modes make position w/o cargo data available!





Energy and military transports, PAX and Cargo flights are visible!

03 DATA SHARING FOR CT

TSI Telematics elements supported by UIRR & members



#	UIRR support	Legal Text (ENo8)
1	Data sharing between all involved parties (incl. freight customers)	Art. 3 (9), Art 4
2	Recognition of Intermodal Transport Operators (CTOs) and Combined Transport Terminal Operators	Recitals: (7) Act: Art. 3 (9) (33) (34)
3	Enhanced IT platform design	Common Union API: Art. 14 (5) (b)
4	Involvement of Freight Terminal Operators in the new data sharing design	Art. 21 (3)

TSI Telematics Impact Assessment for Combined Transport Freight Terminal Operators



Selection of terminals:

5 **C EDICT** project terminals (30-month EU-funded project¹) 3 Non-EDICT terminals

Comprehensive assessment schema with two possible scenarios:

- Scenario A: 8 data exchange requests (ENo7)
- Scenario B: 4 data change requests (closer to ENo8) ۲



(EN07 fully implemented)

Impact Assessment: Method to forecast impact & results





Intro to TSI Telematics + Questionnaire on impact of it covering value, costs, time & resources

	Requirements	Details	Hennage 1	Hessage 2	Pleanage 3	Hessage 6	Hessage 5	Hennage G	Hessage 7	Message 0
			Pathrequest	Working timetable	TEM	Wagan messages	18	18/	TOCH	TRM
1	Process change	Impact on current operations								
	Process change	Benefits or chawbacks								
	Process charge	Pisks (compliance, resources)								
	Process change	Reporting impact								
	Process change	Costs (kEUF)								
	Process change	Duration (workhs)								
	Application (105) change	Impact on current operations								
	Application (105) change	Benefits or chambacks								
	Application (505) change	Risks (compliance, resources)								
	Application (105) change	Reporting impact								
	Application (105) change	Cests (kEUF)								
	Application (105) change	Duration (months)								
	Interfaces	Impact on current operations								
	Interfaces	Benefits or drawbacks								
	Interfaces	Risks (compliance, resources)								
	Interfaces	Costs (kEL#)								
	Interfaces	Duration (months)								
	Duraning costs (seat 5 am)	Data stream (UEUE)								
	Running costs (next fi yrs)	Mantenance 205 (AFLE)								
	Exclusion and Annotation	Date								

- 2 8 TEN-T terminals interviewed ¹
- 3 Companies classified into terminal categories
- Rough-cut extrapolation to the 1'200 European
 freight terminals
- **G** Holistic assessment of in all dimensions



¹ All terminal sizes covered from small (< 5 trains per day, < 40 employees, and c 150 TEU p.a.) that equal 62% of EU terminals to X-large (> 50 trains, > 250 employees and > 600T TEU p.a.)

1

Timelines are too tight for small freight terminals



Results



Further analysis and assessment of likelihood of improved IT integration services and interoperability required for higher confidence levels.

¹ Depending on the digital capabilities some M CT Freight Terminals may belong to the Scenario B* group. The delineation requires further analysis.

Implications for all stakeholders



- 1. Willingness to share data confirmed
- 2. Gradual learning requires time and resources
- 3. Roadmap required to enhance capabilities (coordinated & resource efficient)
- **4.** Interoperable data and IT platforms for fast adoption (incl. transparent, cost efficient and simple CT data governance)
- 5. Efficient end-to-end data exchange to reap efficiencies possible to achieve better customer satisfaction
- 6. Future resilience will require more data sharing (e.g. customer requirements, CO₂, eFTI, Combined Transport Directive)

Collaborate to build future Combined Transport digital supply chain ecosystem now!



Confirmatory scientific research: Ströher, T. et al. (2025) Bridging carbon data's organizational boundaries: toward automated data sharing in sustainable supply chains in Electron Markets 35, 33 (2025) https://doi.org/10.2007/s12525-00279-77

TSI Telematics elements not supported by Combined Transport stakeholders



#	UIRR Position on	TSI Text (ENo8)	Recommendation from Impact Assessment
1	Cost-efficient supporting IT service infrastructure	IT platform interoperability stakeholder alignment required	Reduce data sharing cost burden => Supported by neutral coordination (e.g. by ERA)
2	General timeline for all terminals	Until 13.12.2027	Extended allowance for those who are today not digitally advanced (dominantly smaller ones)
3	Data exchange scope	All messages in focus	Limit the quantity and content of data shared reduces costs for CT Freight Terminals
4	Train Composition Message	Mandatory processing for all terminals with a direct path to the terminal	=> Further analysis on the scope and impact recommended
5	Public data exchange	Mandatory for all may have adverse effects; not common practice in other modes	=> Constraining recipients and scope to be considered



Public data sharing is not necessarily the required outcome

Important step forward: Choice of the requisite degree of data sharing



- 1. Public: all data accessible to everybody
- 2. **Open:** all data accessible to all involved parties (SC stakeholders & contracted IT platforms)
- **3. Selective open:** Specific set of data¹ to be shared with all legitimate stakeholders (and contracted IT platforms)
- **4. Private:** Only bilateral exchange of all data between two known parties
- ¹ Standardisation of the supply chain relevant data has not yet happened in the rail and rail-road sector which should be urgently performed



Objective today: How to improve the situation together with all stakeholders!





Relevant parties from an end-toend perspective are invited to shape the future data sharing ecosystem design!

03 DATA SHARING FOR CT