JUPITER PRIME

Consulting • Training • Advisory

جوبيتر برايم للاستشارات والتدريب

COURSE BROCHURE

Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience Training Course

10 – 14 January 2027
Muscat

jupiterprime.uk

info@jupiterprime.uk

Registered in the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia

Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience Training Course

Ref: 886_33504 **Date:** 10 – 14 January 2027 **Location:** Muscat **Fees:** 6500 GBP

Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience is a 1-week training course for senior maritime and logistics managers, built around a corridor cost and resilience scorecard for one trade lane. Carrier alliance changes, port congestion and route disruptions now move landed cost and service reliability faster than annual contracts can react. Jupiter Prime Training offers this view of multimodal maritime supply chain cost and resilience.

Why Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience Matters Now

Three forces shape this field: ocean carriers redesigning service loops and blank sailings, shippers demanding door-to-door visibility rather than port-to-port promises, and inland rail, barge and trucking operators competing for the same containers. An organisation that prices each leg in isolation pays twice for buffer stock and detention, while one that models the whole corridor can reroute early, rebalance modes and protect margins. The course rests on cost-to-serve modelling, total landed cost accounting, scenario-based stress testing and the shared event messaging used for container milestone tracking, each explained in general terms with sector examples from retail, petrochemicals and food.

Who Gains Most from Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience

- Those who select ocean carriers, freight forwarders and service contracts for a portfolio of trade lanes
- Those who decide port choice, inland routing and the split between rail, barge and road haulage
- Those who own landed cost budgets, detention and demurrage exposure and freight accruals
- Those who run control towers that track container milestones from booking to final delivery
- Those who prepare contingency routings when canals, straits or terminals are disrupted

A logistics leadership group gains most when its procurement, network and finance leads attend together and agree one corridor view.

Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience Capabilities

Each capability converts a corridor decision into cost, time and exposure that senior colleagues can compare.

- Calculate cost-to-serve by customer, lane and mode — the pricing and network leadership
- Compare port and inland routing options on landed cost and transit variability — the routing committee
- Design a mode-shift case between road, rail and barge legs — the finance and sustainability leads
- Specify milestone visibility requirements for carriers and forwarders — the control tower and customer service
- Test corridor resilience against closure and congestion scenarios — the executive risk forum
- Weigh buffer stock against faster or alternative routings — the inventory and commercial owners

Key Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience Terms

- Multimodal transport — moving cargo under one contract using two or more modes such as sea, rail, barge and road.
- Cost-to-serve — the full cost of fulfilling a customer or lane, including freight, handling, storage, detention and administration.
- Total landed cost — the delivered cost of goods including purchase price, freight, duties, port charges and inland haulage.
- Dry port — an inland terminal linked by rail or road to a seaport where containers are handled and cleared.
- Schedule reliability — the share of vessel calls or deliveries that arrive within an agreed window of the planned time.
- Control tower — a central function that monitors shipments across carriers and modes and triggers corrective action.

Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience Day by Day

Day 1: Corridor Forces and Network Shape

- Carrier Alliances, Service Loops and Blank Sailings — Capacity Available on a Lane
- Port Selection Criteria and Transhipment Hubs — Gateway Choice for Inbound Cargo
- Inland Corridors, Dry Ports and Rail Shuttles — Hinterland Reach and Transit Time
- Freight Rate Indices and Contract Versus Spot Mix — Procurement Exposure
- Trade Lane Mapping Canvas — Visual Baseline of Legs, Nodes and Dwell Times

Day 2: Cost-to-Serve and Landed Cost Models

- Activity-Based Cost-to-Serve Model — Profitability by Customer and Lane
- Total Landed Cost Build-Up — Comparing Origin, Port and Routing Options
- Detention, Demurrage and Storage Charge Drivers — Equipment Return Discipline
- Mode-Shift Economics for Road, Rail and Barge — Unit Cost and Emissions Trade-Offs
- Freight Accrual and Invoice Audit Logic — Closing Gaps Between Quote and Bill

Day 3: Visibility and Digital Milestones

- Container Milestone Event Messaging — Common Status Language Across Carriers
- Control Tower Operating Model — Exception Alerts and Escalation Paths
- Estimated Time of Arrival Prediction Inputs — Planning Berths, Trucks and Warehouses
- Forwarder and Carrier Data Requirements in Contracts — Visibility Obligations
- Performance Dashboard for Schedule Reliability and Dwell — Supplier Scorecards

Day 4: Resilience and Disruption Choices

- Chokepoint and Single-Node Exposure Mapping — Where One Closure Halts Flow
- Scenario Stress Testing for Corridor Closures — Rerouting Cost and Delay Estimates
- Dual Gateway and Alternative Mode Playbooks — Pre-Agreed Contingency Routings
- Buffer Stock Versus Routing Speed Trade-Off — Inventory Investment Decisions
- Carrier and Port Diversification Rules — Concentration Limits in Procurement

Day 5: Corridor Scorecard Practice

- Lane Cost-to-Serve Recalculation for a Chosen Corridor — Applying Day Two Models
- Visibility Gap Assessment of Current Carriers — Applying Milestone Requirements
- Disruption Simulation With Rerouting Decisions — Applying Contingency Playbooks
- Executive Briefing on Mode and Gateway Options — Securing Leadership Agreement
- Completed Corridor Cost and Resilience Scorecard — Reference for Lane Reviews

Applying Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience After the Course

- Rebuild the cost-to-serve model for the highest-volume trade lane and present the gap between quoted and actual landed cost
- Run one corridor closure scenario with carrier and forwarder partners and agree a pre-approved alternative routing

Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience Questions FAQ

What is multimodal maritime supply chain cost and resilience and why does it matter now?

It is the discipline of managing sea, port and inland legs as one corridor priced on full landed cost and protected against disruption. Frequent route closures and congestion make this corridor view decisive for margins and service.

Which roles gain most from multimodal maritime supply chain cost and resilience skills?

Senior leaders who buy freight, design logistics networks, own landed cost budgets or run control towers gain most. Each sees how one leg's choice changes cost and risk elsewhere on the corridor.

How does a multimodal maritime supply chain cost and resilience course differ from a port operations course?

It looks across the whole corridor from carrier to final delivery rather than inside the terminal gate, and it measures decisions in landed cost and disruption exposure rather than berth productivity.

What do you bring back from multimodal maritime supply chain cost and resilience training?

You bring back a corridor cost and resilience scorecard for one real trade lane. It combines cost-to-serve figures, visibility gaps and contingency routings you can present to leadership.

Multimodal Maritime Supply Chain Cost and Resilience: The Way Forward

The corridor cost and resilience scorecard first informs whether a lane keeps its current gateway and mode mix or shifts volume. Procurement, network and finance leads use it in quarterly lane reviews. After its first use, revisit the disruption scenarios, since carrier networks and chokepoint risks change faster than contract cycles.