Logistics Report.
9. Langley, C.J., Novack, R.A., Gibson, B.J. and Coyle, J.J. (2020). Supply Chain Management: A Logistics Perspective. 11th ed. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.
10. Lee, H.L., Padmanabhan, V. and Whang, S. (1997). "Information Distortion in a Supply Chain: The Bullwhip Effect." Management Science, 43(4), pp. 546-558.
11. McKinsey & Company. (2022). Supply Chain Resilience: How Are Companies Performing? New York: McKinsey & Company.
12. Pettit, T.J., Fiksel, J. and Croxton, K.L. (2010). "Ensuring Supply Chain Resilience: Development of a Conceptual Framework." Journal of Business Logistics, 31(1), pp. 1-21..
13. Statista. (2023). Return Rate for Online Purchases Worldwide from 2019 to 2023. Hamburg: Statista.

GLOBAL LOGISTICS PROBLEMS: NAVIGATING A WORLD IN TURMOIL

Ye. Berezhnaya, student,

T. Gerasymchuk, Ph.D, Associate professor,

Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University

Global logistics is the connective tissue of the world economy. It spans oceans and continents, links thousands of suppliers to millions of consumers, and enables the international trade that has lifted billions from poverty and transformed how humanity lives and works. Yet the very scale and complexity that make global logistics so powerful also make it profoundly vulnerable. When disruptions occur—and they are occurring with unprecedented frequency—they cascade across borders, industries, and economies with speed and severity that can paralyze commerce and destabilize societies.

The past five years have delivered a relentless barrage of shocks to global logistics networks. A pandemic that closed factories and ports. A container ship wedged across the Suez Canal. A war in Europe's breadbasket. Attacks on commercial shipping in the Red Sea. Trade disputes between the world's largest economies. Climate-driven extreme weather events disrupting transport corridors. Each event, examined in isolation, appears as an unfortunate contingency. Viewed collectively, they represent a new normal of systemic fragility that demands a fundamental reassessment of how global logistics is designed, managed, and governed.

This article examines the most critical global logistics problems facing international trade and supply chains, analyzing their causes, their interdependencies, and the strategies available to governments, multilateral institutions, and private-sector organizations seeking to maintain the flow of goods in an increasingly turbulent world.

Geopolitical Instability and Trade Fragmentation

The Problem Global logistics operates within a geopolitical framework that is fragmenting under the pressure of great power competition, regional conflicts, and protectionist nationalism. The relatively stable, rules-based trading order that emerged after 1945 and accelerated after the Cold War is under sustained strain. Trade disputes between the United States and China have imposed tariffs on hundreds of billions of dollars in goods, redirecting supply chains and creating compliance burdens for companies caught between the world's two largest economies. Sanctions regimes against Russia, Iran, North Korea, and other states have created complex legal and operational barriers that logistics providers must navigate with extreme care.

Armed conflict directly disrupts logistics infrastructure and trade routes. The Russian invasion of Ukraine has destroyed ports, rail networks, and distribution facilities while rendering Black Sea shipping routes hazardous. Houthi attacks on commercial vessels in the Red Sea since late 2023 have forced major shipping lines to divert vessels around the Cape of Good Hope, adding ten to fourteen days and millions of dollars in cost to Asia-Europe voyages. Research by the World Bank on trade disruptions emphasizes that the economic damage extends far beyond the immediate conflict zone, affecting global commodity prices, shipping rates, and the reliability of supply (Arvis et al., 2023).

The fragmentation of global trading relationships threatens the multilateral institutions and agreements that have historically facilitated cross-border logistics. The World Trade Organization's dispute resolution mechanism has been weakened. Regional trade agreements proliferate but create a patchwork of rules that complicates rather than simplifies compliance. For logistics providers and their customers, the result is a more complex, more uncertain, and more costly operating environment.

The Strategic Response Diversification of supply sources, manufacturing

locations, and logistics routes is the primary strategic response to geopolitical fragmentation. The "China plus one" strategy—maintaining Chinese operations while developing alternative supply bases in Southeast Asia, South Asia, or Latin America—has moved from risk management theory to widespread corporate practice. Near-shoring and friend-shoring locate production and sourcing in countries that share geopolitical alignment, reducing exposure to sanctions, export controls, and conflict disruption.

At the multilateral level, governments can reduce logistics friction through trade facilitation agreements, mutual recognition of authorized economic operator programs, and investment in cross-border infrastructure. The World Trade Organization's Trade Facilitation Agreement, which entered into force in 2017, has been shown to reduce trade costs and border delays for signatory countries, though implementation remains uneven (World Trade Organization, 2022).

Maritime Chokepoints and Route Vulnerability

The Problem Global maritime logistics depends on a small number of chokepoints—narrow passages through which a disproportionate share of world trade must transit. The Strait of Malacca, through which approximately 40% of global trade passes. The Suez Canal, linking Europe to Asia. The Panama Canal, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific. The Strait of Hormuz, through which roughly 20% of the world's oil flows. The Bab el-Mandeb at the southern entrance to the Red Sea. These chokepoints are marvels of engineering and geography, but they are also single points of failure for global commerce.

When the Ever Given blocked the Suez Canal for six days in March 2021, an estimated $9.6 billion in trade was held up each day, and the ripple effects disrupted supply chains for months (Lee and Wong, 2021). When drought reduced water levels in the Panama Canal in 2023, transit restrictions forced ships to carry lighter loads or take vastly longer alternative routes. When Houthi attacks targeted Red Sea shipping, container spot rates on Asia-Europe routes more than tripled in a matter of weeks (Freightos Baltic Index, 2024).

The vulnerability of chokepoints is compounded by the concentration of

shipping. The top ten container carriers control approximately 85% of global capacity, and the three major shipping alliances control an even larger share on key trade lanes. When a major carrier or alliance diverts from a route, the impact on available capacity and freight rates is immediate and severe.

The Strategic Response Route diversification is constrained by geography but not impossible. The Northern Sea Route along Russia's Arctic coast, while politically sensitive and seasonally limited, offers an alternative Asia-Europe corridor that bypasses both Suez and Malacca. Multimodal alternatives combining ocean, rail, and road can circumvent chokepoints; the China-Europe rail network has grown substantially, though capacity remains a fraction of maritime routes.

Investment in port infrastructure and intermodal connectivity reduces dependence on individual chokepoints by enabling more flexible routing. Stockpiling of critical commodities and strategic materials provides a buffer against short-term disruptions. For the private sector, scenario planning that models the logistics implications of chokepoint closures enables faster, more effective responses when disruptions occur.

Port Congestion and Infrastructure Deficits

The Problem Global port infrastructure has not kept pace with the growth of trade volumes, vessel sizes, and the operational demands of modern supply chains. Port congestion—where vessels queue at anchorage waiting for berths, and containers stack up on terminals waiting for onward transport—has become a recurring problem at major gateways worldwide. The causes are multiple: labor shortages, inadequate terminal automation, insufficient yard space, poor coordination between port and hinterland logistics, and the ripple effects of upstream disruptions.

The impact of port congestion cascades through supply chains. Vessel delays propagate to subsequent port calls, disrupting schedules weeks after the initial congestion has cleared. Container dwell times increase, tying up equipment and exacerbating shortages. Importers face stockouts and production stoppages. Exporters lose sales as shipments miss vessel connections. Research on port efficiency by the International Transport Forum confirms that port performance is a critical determinant

of trade competitiveness, and that underperforming ports impose significant costs on their national economies (International Transport Forum, 2022).

Infrastructure deficits extend beyond ports. Inland transportation networks—road, rail, and barge—are often inadequate to move containers from ports to distribution centers efficiently. Customs procedures and border clearance processes add days to transit times in many countries. The World Bank's Logistics Performance Index consistently finds that infrastructure quality is one of the strongest predictors of a country's logistics performance, and that the gap between high-performing and low-performing countries remains wide (Arvis et al., 2023).

The Strategic Response Port infrastructure investment is essential but slow. Expansion of terminal capacity, automation of yard operations, and improved intermodal connectivity require years of planning and billions in capital. Public-private partnerships have become the dominant model for port development, aligning government planning with private-sector operational expertise.

In the nearer term, operational improvements can increase throughput without physical expansion. Extended gate hours, appointment systems for truck arrivals, and better data sharing between terminal operators, carriers, and shippers all reduce congestion. Inland ports and dry ports, connected to seaports by dedicated rail or barge corridors, can decongest coastal terminals by moving containers inland more rapidly.

Container and Equipment Imbalances

The Problem Global container logistics is plagued by chronic imbalances. The world's manufacturing centers—primarily in Asia—export far more containerized goods than they import, creating structural surpluses of empty containers in import-heavy regions like North America and Europe and structural deficits in export-heavy regions. Repositioning empty containers to where they are needed costs the shipping industry an estimated $20 billion annually (Boston Consulting Group, 2023).

During disruptions, these imbalances intensify rapidly. The COVID-19 pandemic saw containers pile up at U.S. and European ports while Asian exporters scrambled for equipment, driving container prices to historic highs. When demand patterns shift suddenly—as they did during the pandemic's e-commerce boom—the

container fleet cannot adjust quickly enough, creating shortages in some locations and surpluses in others.

The Strategic Response Improved visibility and forecasting are the most powerful tools for addressing container imbalances. Digital platforms that track container locations and predict demand enable carriers to reposition empties more efficiently. Collaboration between carriers and shippers on demand forecasting allows for proactive container positioning.

Equipment innovation offers partial solutions. Foldable containers that reduce the space required for empty repositioning have existed for decades but have not achieved widespread adoption due to cost and durability concerns. Regional container pools, where multiple carriers share equipment, can improve utilization rates in imbalanced trade lanes.

Regulatory Complexity and Compliance Burdens

The Problem International logistics operates across jurisdictions with different and sometimes conflicting regulatory requirements. Customs procedures vary widely in efficiency and complexity. Product standards, safety regulations, and labeling requirements differ between markets. Sanctions and export controls add layers of compliance scrutiny. Environmental regulations are proliferating, from the International Maritime Organization's carbon intensity requirements to the European Union's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism.

The compliance burden falls disproportionately on small and medium-sized enterprises that lack the internal expertise and resources to navigate complex regulatory environments. For larger organizations, the cost of compliance—including dedicated staff, legal counsel, technology systems, and penalties for inadvertent violations—represents a significant and growing overhead.

Customs procedures remain a major source of friction. In many countries, clearance processes are still largely paper-based, requiring physical presentation of documents and manual inspection of goods. The World Customs Organization's Revised Kyoto Convention provides a framework for modernization, but implementation is incomplete and uneven.

The Strategic Response Authorized Economic Operator programs, where customs authorities certify compliant companies for expedited clearance, reduce border delays for participating firms. Mutual recognition agreements between countries extend these benefits across borders. Investment in customs automation and single-window systems that allow traders to submit documentation once to multiple agencies reduces processing times.

For companies, investment in trade compliance capabilities is non-negotiable. Automated compliance screening, restricted party list checking, and customs documentation systems reduce both the risk of violations and the cost of compliance. Engagement with industry associations and regulatory agencies enables companies to anticipate regulatory changes rather than react to them.

Climate Change and Environmental Disruption

The Problem Climate change poses multiple threats to global logistics. Extreme weather events—hurricanes, floods, heatwaves, and wildfires—disrupt transport corridors, damage infrastructure, and delay shipments with increasing frequency. Rising sea levels threaten coastal port infrastructure and the communities that support it. Changing precipitation patterns affect the navigability of inland waterways that are critical for barge transport in regions such as Europe, North America, and China.

The logistics industry is not only a victim of climate change but a contributor to it. International shipping accounts for approximately 2-3% of global greenhouse gas emissions, and aviation cargo for a smaller but rapidly growing share. Road freight, the dominant mode for domestic logistics, is an even larger emitter. The sector faces intensifying pressure from regulators, investors, and customers to decarbonize, yet the technological and economic pathways to net-zero logistics remain uncertain.

Research by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change confirms that climate impacts on transport infrastructure will intensify throughout this century, with coastal flooding, extreme heat, and permafrost thaw among the most significant risks (IPCC, 2022). Adaptation and resilience investment are no longer optional but essential.

The Strategic Response Decarbonization strategies vary by transport mode. For maritime shipping, alternative fuels—methanol, ammonia, hydrogen, and advanced

biofuels—represent the primary pathway, supported by the International Maritime Organization's target of net-zero emissions by or around 2050. For road freight, electrification is advancing rapidly for urban and regional applications, while long-haul decarbonization remains more challenging. For air cargo, sustainable aviation fuels are the primary near-term option.

Infrastructure resilience requires investment in hardened port facilities, flood defenses, and redundant transport corridors. Supply chain design that builds in flexibility—multiple transport modes, diversified routes, and distributed inventory—provides operational resilience against climate disruptions.

Labor Standards and Human Rights

The Problem Global logistics employs tens of millions of workers worldwide, many in conditions that raise serious human rights concerns. Seafarers aboard commercial vessels may work contracts of nine months or more, with limited shore leave and inadequate access to medical care. Cases of abandonment—where shipowners abandon crews without pay or provisions—occur with disturbing regularity. During the COVID-19 pandemic, hundreds of thousands of seafarers were stranded aboard vessels beyond their contracts due to crew change restrictions, a humanitarian crisis that received limited public attention.

Truck drivers, warehouse workers, and delivery personnel in global logistics chains often face precarious employment conditions, including misclassification as independent contractors, excessive working hours, and inadequate safety protections. In developing countries, logistics labor may involve child labor, forced labor, or other severe human rights violations.

Regulatory responses are strengthening. The European Union's Corporate Sustainability Due Diligence Directive requires companies to identify, prevent, and remedy human rights impacts in their supply chains, including logistics operations. Similar legislation is under consideration in other jurisdictions.

The Strategic Response Responsible logistics organizations are implementing human rights due diligence processes aligned with the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. Supplier codes of conduct, auditing programs, and worker

grievance mechanisms are foundational. Collaborative initiatives such as the Responsible Business Alliance and the Maritime Labour Convention provide frameworks for industry-wide action.

Technology can support compliance. Blockchain-based systems for verifying labor conditions, digital identity platforms for workers, and satellite monitoring of vessel movements to detect abandonment all offer potential, though technology alone cannot substitute for genuine management commitment and worker empowerment.

Cyber Threats to Logistics Infrastructure

The Problem The digitalization of global logistics has created vast new attack surfaces for malicious actors. Port terminal operating systems, shipping line booking platforms, freight forwarder networks, and customs clearance systems are all potential targets for cyberattack. A successful attack on a major port or carrier can paralyze goods movement for days or weeks, as the 2017 NotPetya attack on Maersk demonstrated when it forced the complete reinstallation of the company's IT infrastructure and cost an estimated $300 million (Greenberg, 2018).

State-sponsored cyber threats are of particular concern in the context of geopolitical tensions. Critical logistics infrastructure represents a high-value target for adversaries seeking to disrupt an opponent's economy or military supply chains. Ransomware attacks by criminal groups have also targeted logistics companies, recognizing that operational disruption creates powerful incentives to pay.

The Strategic Response Cybersecurity for logistics requires defense-in-depth. Network segmentation, multi-factor authentication, regular vulnerability assessments, and incident response planning are foundational protections. Information sharing between industry participants and with government cybersecurity agencies enables faster detection of and response to emerging threats.

Operational resilience—the ability to maintain essential functions during a cyber incident—requires manual fallback procedures, redundant systems, and tested recovery plans. The lesson of NotPetya and subsequent attacks is that cybersecurity is not solely an IT function but an operational risk management function requiring board-level attention and investment.

Conclusion: Toward Resilient Global Logistics The global logistics problems of the current era are interconnected, compounding, and systemic. They cannot be solved by any single organization, industry, or government. They demand collaborative responses that span the public and private sectors, that align commercial incentives with societal resilience, and that balance the competing demands of efficiency, security, sustainability, and human dignity.

Building resilience into global logistics requires investment—in infrastructure, in technology, in workforce development, and in redundancy. It requires governance—rules and institutions that facilitate trade while protecting against the risks that unconstrained globalization can amplify. And it requires a shift in mindset—from viewing logistics as a cost to be minimized toward recognizing it as a strategic capability to be nurtured.

The global logistics system has demonstrated remarkable adaptability in the face of unprecedented challenges. Trade has continued to flow, goods have continued to move, and economies have continued to function. But adaptation under crisis conditions is expensive, stressful, and wasteful. The task ahead is to build proactive resilience—the capacity to anticipate, withstand, and recover from disruptions before they become crises. The countries and companies that succeed in this endeavor will be the winners in the turbulent decades to come.

References

1. Arvis, J.F., Ojala, L., Wiederer, C., Shepherd, B., Raj, A., Dairabayeva, K. and Kiiski, T. (2023). Connecting to Compete: Trade Logistics in the Global Economy. Washington, DC: World Bank.
2. Boston Consulting Group. (2023). The Empty Container Crisis: Solving the Repositioning Challenge. Boston, MA: BCG.
3. Freightos Baltic Index. (2024). Container Freight Rate Data. Hong Kong: Freightos.
4. Greenberg, A. (2018). "The Untold Story of NotPetya, the Most Devastating Cyberattack in History." WIRED, 22 August.
5. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Geneva: IPCC.
6. International Transport Forum. (2022). Port Performance: Benchmarking Container Ports. Paris: OECD Publishing.
7. Lee, J.M. and Wong, E.Y.C. (2021). "Suez Canal Blockage: An Analysis of Legal Impact, Risks and Liabilities to the Global Supply Chain." Maritime Business

Review, 6(4), pp. 316-333.
8. World Trade Organization. (2022). Trade Facilitation Agreement: Five Years of Implementation. Geneva: WTO.

CARGO INSURANCE IN GLOBAL SUPPLY CHAINS: FUNCTIONS, POLICY STRUCTURES, AND RISK MITIGATION STRATEGIES

A. Reznik, student,
T. Gerasymchuk, Ph.D, Associate professor,
Kharkiv National Automobile and Highway University

Global supply chains move an estimated $33 trillion in goods annually across oceans, continents, and borders (Aon, 2025). Each shipment—whether a container of electronics from Shenzhen to Rotterdam or a pallet of pharmaceuticals from Mumbai to Nairobi—faces a gauntlet of risks: storms that can wash containers overboard, theft by organized criminal networks, temperature excursions that spoil sensitive cargo, and geopolitical disruptions that close shipping lanes without warning. The World Shipping Council estimates that approximately 1,400 containers are lost at sea each year on average, and that figure excludes losses from theft, damage, and other causes (World Shipping Council, 2023).

Cargo insurance exists to transfer these financial risks from shippers, consignees, and logistics providers to specialized underwriters. Yet despite its fundamental importance, only an estimated 20% of global shipments are insured, leaving a vast proportion of international trade exposed to uninsured loss (Aon, 2025). This article examines the functions cargo insurance serves, the policy structures available, and the risk mitigation strategies that leading organizations deploy to protect goods in transit and strengthen their supply chain resilience.

The Core Functions of Cargo Insurance

Financial Risk Transfer The primary function of cargo insurance is to transfer the financial consequences of cargo loss or damage from the cargo owner to an insurer. When goods are damaged in transit, destroyed by a vessel casualty, or stolen from a warehouse, the financial impact can extend far beyond the invoice value of the goods themselves. Lost sales, production stoppages, contractual penalties, and reputational