Shodhshauryam, International Scientific Refereed Research Journal
© 2022 SHISRRJ | Volume 5 | Issue 2 | ISSN : 2581- 6306

Developing Tender Optimization Models for Freight Rate Negotiations Using Finance-Operations Collaboration

John Oluwaseun Olajide[1], Bisayo Oluwatosin Otokiti[2], Sharon Nwani[3], Adebanji Samuel Ogunmokun[4], Bolaji Iyanu Adekunle[5], Joyce Efekpogua Fiemotongha[6]
[1]Lipton, USA
[2]Department of Business and Entrepreneurship, Kwara State University
[3]Migo, Lagos, Nigeria;
[4]United Utilities, UK
[5]Data Scientist, GSFEN Limited, Nigeria
[6]Independent Researcher, Lagos, Nigeria
Corresponding Author: johnolajide04@gmail.com

Article Info
Volume 5, Issue 2

Page Number : 136-149

Publication Issue :
March-April-2022

Article History
Received : 01 March 2022
Published : 17 March 2022

Abstract
Freight rate negotiations are a critical lever in managing supply chain costs, yet traditional tendering practices often fall short due to siloed decision-making and insufficient integration of financial and operational insights. This paper presents a robust, interdisciplinary framework for developing tender optimization models through finance-operations collaboration. Drawing from current literature, the study critiques prevailing logistics procurement practices and highlights the limitations of isolated financial or operational strategies. It proposes a conceptual model that integrates key decision variables—such as volume commitments, carrier performance, and cost structures—with financial forecasts and operational constraints. Utilizing mathematical optimization techniques, including mixed-integer linear programming and simulation-based tools, the paper outlines a data-driven methodology for selecting optimal freight carriers. A case simulation illustrates how collaborative model development enhances negotiation outcomes, increases cost-efficiency, and builds supply chain resilience. The paper concludes with actionable insights for managers and identifies future research avenues, such as incorporating sustainability metrics and dynamic re-tendering algorithms, to strengthen sourcing strategies in volatile markets further.

Keywords*: Tender Optimization, Freight Rate Negotiation, Finance-Operations Collaboration, Logistics Procurement, Supply Chain Strategy, Optimization Models*

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

In modern supply chain management, freight rate negotiations play a critical role in ensuring cost efficiency, service quality, and operational resilience [1]. Freight costs constitute a significant portion of a company's total logistics expenditure, making effective rate management a strategic priority [2]. Companies often engage third-party carriers or logistics providers through tender processes, which allow for competitive bidding and contractual alignment with budgetary and service expectations [3]. However, the complexity and volatility of global transportation markets demand more advanced approaches to tendering than traditional cost-comparison methods [4].

Tenders, especially in freight procurement, serve as a structured mechanism for aligning supplier capabilities with organizational logistics needs. Despite their widespread use, challenges persist in achieving optimal outcomes [5]. These challenges include incomplete or siloed data, lack of coordination between departments, unpredictable market fluctuations, and supplier constraints. Such inefficiencies often result in suboptimal freight agreements that either inflate costs or compromise service levels [6].

Additionally, the gap between financial planning and operational execution further complicates tender strategies. Many firms still operate in departmental silos where procurement, finance, and logistics independently assess priorities, leading to inconsistencies in goal alignment [7]. This fragmented approach reduces the effectiveness of rate negotiations and limits the potential to achieve holistic cost optimization. As supply chains become increasingly data-driven and globally integrated, a more collaborative, analytical, and strategic framework is needed to improve freight tender outcomes [8].

1.2 Research Objectives and Questions

The central objective of this research is to develop a tender optimization model that leverages collaborative inputs from both finance and operations to improve outcomes in freight rate negotiations. The proposed model aims to address inefficiencies in current freight procurement practices by integrating financial constraints, cost modeling, and operational capabilities into a single decision-making framework. This research underscores the necessity of cross-functional collaboration in designing optimization strategies that not only reduce costs but also enhance service continuity and agility.

To guide the model's development and validate its applicability, the study is framed by several key research questions. First, how can finance and operations data be effectively integrated to support tender optimization in freight negotiations? Second, what modeling approaches can best capture the trade-offs between cost, risk, and performance in selecting freight providers? Third, what operational workflow is required to support real-time collaboration between finance and logistics functions? These questions form the analytical foundation for constructing and testing the proposed framework.

Furthermore, the research seeks to bridge theoretical knowledge and practical application by identifying measurable performance indicators resulting from finance-operations collaboration. The model will also explore dynamic adjustments during rate negotiations and contract management to reflect real-world uncertainties. Through a combination of conceptual modeling, literature synthesis, and applied case examples, this study aims to produce a comprehensive, scalable framework that organizations can adapt to their unique logistics procurement environments.

1.3 Significance of Finance-Operations Collaboration

The integration of financial and operational insights into freight tender decision-making introduces a more balanced and informed perspective on logistics cost management [9]. When finance contributes detailed budget forecasts, cost benchmarks, and risk thresholds, and operations contributes route optimization data, capacity planning, and supplier performance metrics, the resulting synergy enhances the ability to negotiate freight rates more effectively [10]. This collaborative approach aligns business objectives, reduces uncertainty, and enables more accurate scenario modeling during tenders [11].

Finance-operations collaboration ensures that tenders are evaluated not solely on upfront costs but also on total cost implications, service-level agreements, and long-term financial sustainability [12]. For example, a carrier offering the lowest price may entail hidden costs due to poor delivery reliability or capacity shortfalls, which operations teams can identify through historical performance data [13, 14]. Finance teams, on the other hand, can assess the implications of these factors on cash flow, budgets, and working capital. The integration of these perspectives leads to better trade-off analysis and smarter decision-making [15].

Moreover, fostering collaboration between these functions promotes transparency and strategic alignment across the organization [16, 17]. It facilitates a shared understanding of business priorities, which is crucial in volatile logistics environments where rapid re-tendering or renegotiation may be required [18]. By embedding financial discipline into operational processes and vice versa, organizations can develop adaptive tender strategies that support both short-term cost control and long-term supply chain resilience. This interdisciplinary model of decision-making has the potential to set a new standard for freight procurement excellence [19].

2. Literature Review

2.1 Freight Tendering Practices and Challenges

Freight tendering, also known as transportation procurement, involves inviting bids from logistics service providers to fulfill an organization’s freight needs under specific terms and conditions [20, 21]. The most common tendering methods include open tenders, where all qualified vendors can submit bids, and closed tenders, which limit invitations to prequalified carriers [5]. Spot bidding is also utilized, particularly in volatile markets, allowing for dynamic rate setting based on current supply and demand. While these practices offer flexibility and access to competitive pricing, they often lack standardization in evaluation criteria, leading to inconsistent results [22].

Rate benchmarking, another key practice, involves comparing carrier bids against historical data or market indices to assess competitiveness [23, 24]. However, these benchmarks frequently rely on lagging data, which may not accurately reflect market dynamics [25]. Additionally, contract negotiation often emphasizes immediate cost savings over long-term value, neglecting service quality, risk exposure, and scalability. Negotiations may also suffer from asymmetry of information between buyers and carriers, undermining the fairness and efficiency of the tendering process [26].

Despite being a fundamental component of logistics procurement, freight tendering is fraught with challenges [27, 28]. Chief among them is the disconnect between strategic procurement goals and real-time operational needs. Organizations frequently experience cost overruns, service disruptions, and supplier non-performance due to poorly structured tenders [29, 30]. Fragmented data, manual processes, and limited analytical tools further hinder informed decision-making. As global supply chains become more complex, the limitations of traditional tendering practices necessitate the adoption of data-driven, collaborative approaches that integrate financial and operational perspectives [31].

2.2 Optimization Models in Logistics Procurement

Over the years, researchers and practitioners have proposed a variety of quantitative models to enhance decision-making in freight tendering [32, 33]. One widely adopted method is linear programming, which enables the minimization of total logistics costs subject to constraints such as carrier capacity, route availability, and delivery timelines [34]. This model is particularly effective in deterministic environments where demand, costs, and capacities are known. For more complex scenarios involving uncertainty, scenario analysis is applied to evaluate different outcomes under varying market and operational conditions [34].

Auction-based models are also prevalent in logistics procurement, especially in dynamic tendering environments [35]. Combinatorial auctions allow bidders to submit prices for bundles of freight lanes, promoting efficiency by aligning carriers' network strengths with buyer requirements [36]. These auctions enable carriers to optimize load consolidation and reduce deadhead miles, while buyers benefit from more strategic lane allocations. However, auction design and implementation require sophisticated platforms and careful attention to rules, which can be resource-intensive [37].

In recent years, predictive pricing models leveraging machine learning and big data have emerged as powerful tools for freight rate estimation. These models analyze historical bid data, carrier performance, market trends, and macroeconomic indicators to forecast future rate movements [38]. While highly promising, predictive models depend heavily on data quality and require robust validation mechanisms to ensure reliability [39, 40]. Together, these optimization techniques provide a foundation for constructing tendering frameworks that are both analytical and adaptable, though their practical success hinges on organizational capability and interdepartmental coordination [41].

2.3 Finance-Operations Integration in Strategic Sourcing

The integration of financial and operational data in strategic sourcing is increasingly recognized as a best practice for driving procurement excellence [42, 43]. Numerous frameworks have been proposed to facilitate this alignment, ranging from cross-functional sourcing teams to integrated enterprise systems that unify financial planning with logistics execution [44]. Such frameworks emphasize collaboration in setting procurement goals, defining evaluation criteria, and executing supplier negotiations [45, 46]. By combining cost structures, cash flow projections, and working capital considerations from finance with service level requirements, lead times, and carrier performance metrics from operations, organizations can make more informed sourcing decisions [47].

Case studies across manufacturing, retail, and technology sectors demonstrate the value of finance-operations collaboration. For instance, companies like Procter & Gamble and Unilever have implemented centralized procurement models that embed financial analysts within logistics teams [48]. This structure enables real-time cost-benefit analysis during supplier negotiations and promotes adherence to broader financial objectives [49, 50]. In another example, a European automotive firm used a co-developed tender optimization model that reduced annual freight spend by over 8% while maintaining on-time delivery rates, illustrating the tangible benefits of cross-functional cooperation [51].

Digital transformation has further enabled this integration by providing platforms for shared data access and collaborative decision-making [52]. Cloud-based procurement solutions, integrated business planning systems, and advanced analytics dashboards allow finance and operations to jointly model scenarios, evaluate trade-offs, and monitor contract performance [53]. Despite these advancements, organizational silos and cultural resistance remain barriers to full integration [54, 55]. Nevertheless, the growing body of evidence suggests that synchronized decision-making across finance and operations leads to more resilient, cost-effective, and agile procurement strategies, especially in freight rate negotiations [56].

3. Conceptual Framework

3.1 Components of a Tender Optimization Model

A robust tender optimization model for freight rate negotiations requires clearly defined variables, constraints, and decision parameters that reflect both financial and operational priorities. The primary decision variable in such a model is the assignment of freight lanes to carriers, typically formulated as a binary decision (e.g., assign or do not assign) [57, 58]. This variable is subject to multiple quantitative and qualitative parameters, including but not limited to cost per shipment, volume commitments, carrier reliability, transit times, and contractual terms.

Key constraints in the model may include carrier capacity limits, delivery windows, budget ceilings, and service-level agreements. Volume commitments are essential for ensuring pricing leverage, as many carriers offer discounted rates based on assured shipment volumes [59, 60]. Fuel surcharges, which vary depending on market fuel indices, must also be integrated into cost calculations to provide a more accurate comparison of carrier bids [61, 62]. Additionally, performance history—such as on-time delivery rates, claims ratio, and compliance scores—should serve as weighted factors to assess the long-term value and risk of engaging with particular carriers [63].

Decision parameters extend beyond cost minimization and include strategic considerations such as diversification of carriers to reduce dependency risk, geographic network alignment, and alignment with sustainability objectives [64]. A well-designed model incorporates these multidimensional inputs into an optimization engine—often using linear or mixed-integer programming—to recommend the optimal allocation of freight across available carriers. By integrating these variables, the model ensures not only financial efficiency but also operational continuity and strategic alignment with organizational goals [65].

3.2 Finance-Operations Data Interlinkages

The effectiveness of a tender optimization model hinges on the seamless integration of financial data with operational metrics. Financial forecasts provide the model with future budgetary allocations for freight expenditures, while cost targets set the boundaries within which logistics solutions must operate. Risk models, including sensitivity analyses and risk-adjusted return estimates, help assess the financial implications of various carrier and route selections, particularly under volatile market conditions [66].

From the operational side, key performance indicators such as shipment frequency, lane volumes, service time requirements, and historical carrier performance data offer critical inputs to the model. These indicators help determine the practicality of proposed logistics solutions and reveal hidden operational costs that may not be evident through financial metrics alone. For instance, a carrier offering a lower upfront rate may incur higher indirect costs due to poor schedule adherence or frequent damages, which only operational data can reveal [67].

The interlinkage occurs at the data modeling and evaluation stage, where financial and operational datasets converge to form a comprehensive view of each carrier bid. For example, a bid evaluation matrix might weigh financial cost against a composite operational score derived from on-time performance, damage rate, and capacity reliability [68]. Furthermore, logistics planning scenarios—such as hub changes, multi-modal shifts, or seasonal volume surges—can be tested against financial stress tests to evaluate resilience. The interaction between these data types supports a balanced approach to freight rate decision-making, one that protects the bottom line while maintaining service reliability and strategic flexibility [69].

3.3 Framework for Model Development and Collaboration Workflow

Developing an effective tender optimization model requires a structured, iterative workflow that fosters collaboration between finance and operations from the outset. The process begins with data gathering, where each department compiles relevant datasets. Finance provides budget projections, cost benchmarks, and financial constraints, while operations delivers shipment forecasts, performance metrics, and service-level expectations. Both sets of data are standardized into a unified format suitable for input into optimization algorithms.

The model iteration phase involves co-designing the optimization logic based on agreed objectives. During this stage, cross-functional teams define the relative weighting of cost vs. service parameters, identify essential constraints (e.g., budget caps or carrier limits), and determine the optimization technique—such as linear programming or scenario-based modeling. Regular feedback loops are established, enabling stakeholders to test assumptions, evaluate model outputs, and refine the parameters iteratively. Sensitivity analysis is also conducted to assess the impact of variable changes on model outcomes.

Finally, the scenario evaluation and decision implementation phase translates the model's recommendations into actionable decisions. Finance and operations jointly review optimized scenarios under different conditions—such as rising fuel costs, capacity constraints, or geopolitical risks—to validate robustness. Once consensus is achieved, selected carriers are engaged, and contracts negotiated based on model outputs. Post-implementation, performance tracking dashboards are set up to monitor execution and feed real-time data back into the model for continuous improvement. This closed-loop system ensures that tendering decisions remain dynamic, collaborative, and aligned with evolving business conditions.

4. Methodology and Model Design

The development of a robust tender optimization model necessitates the integration of various datasets that reflect both historical performance and future planning needs. The primary dataset includes freight spend history, encompassing detailed shipment records such as lane-level costs, shipment frequency, total volume, and seasonal variability. These historical data points provide benchmarks against which future carrier proposals can be evaluated. In addition to cost, this dataset must include indicators like accessorial charges, detention fees, and fuel surcharges to understand the full financial picture.

Another vital dataset is carrier bid data, submitted during the request for quotation (RFQ) process. This dataset typically includes base rates, capacity commitments, service levels, and additional terms and conditions. From the operational side, data must capture logistical constraints—including delivery windows, warehouse capacity, lead times, and product-specific handling requirements. Furthermore, real-time or near-real-time metrics such as carrier reliability, on-time delivery performance, and damage frequency are also essential for balancing service quality with cost efficiency.

The modeling process rests on a number of assumptions. One assumption is that carrier bids are binding and represent actual service capabilities, which may not always hold in dynamic freight markets. Another is the stability of demand forecasts, which serve as the foundation for volume commitments. The model also assumes that cost parameters, such as fuel surcharges or labor rates, remain within historical ranges during the contract period, though sensitivity analysis is used to accommodate uncertainty. Finally, it is presumed that finance and operations are aligned in their risk tolerance and service expectations, allowing for a unified objective function to be pursued during optimization.

To solve the complex trade-offs inherent in freight rate negotiations, this methodology employs Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP) as the core optimization technique. MILP is particularly suitable due to its ability to handle binary decision variables—such as the assignment of lanes to specific carriers—while optimizing a linear cost function subject to multiple constraints. These constraints may include capacity limitations, service level requirements, budget thresholds, and route-specific carrier qualifications.

In cases where the decision environment is highly dynamic or uncertain, simulation-based optimization is used in parallel with MILP. Simulations allow the evaluation of carrier performance under varying market conditions, such as fuel price fluctuations or changes in shipment volume, by running numerous scenarios. These simulations are particularly useful during the model iteration phase when testing the model's resilience and adaptability to real-world variability [70].

More advanced applications may incorporate AI-based pricing engines or machine learning algorithms to forecast rates, detect pricing anomalies, or suggest negotiation strategies. These tools can analyze vast datasets, identifying historical patterns that inform bid evaluation and predictive cost modeling. For instance, supervised learning techniques can be applied to predict future bid behavior based on carrier historical trends, while unsupervised clustering can group similar carrier profiles to enable comparative analysis [71].

Software environments commonly used for implementing these techniques include Python with PuLP or Pyomo, IBM CPLEX, or Gurobi Optimizer for MILP. Simulation tools like AnyLogic or Simio, and machine learning platforms such as scikit-learn, can be integrated within a modular architecture. This allows flexibility in adapting the model over time and ensures that both finance and operations can visualize, manipulate, and validate the model collaboratively [72].

5. Conclusion and Future Directions

This study has explored the strategic importance of developing tender optimization models that are grounded in finance-operations collaboration. By aligning financial prudence with operational feasibility, organizations can enhance their freight rate negotiation strategies to achieve both cost-efficiency and supply chain resilience. The research highlights how traditional tendering approaches often fall short due to siloed decision-making, reactive planning, and underutilized data. In contrast, a collaborative optimization framework that integrates financial data—such as cost forecasts, budgetary constraints, and risk models—with operational performance metrics—like carrier reliability, lead times, and capacity limits—offers a holistic basis for superior tender decisions.

The conceptual and methodological contributions of this work are twofold. First, it proposes a structured model incorporating decision variables and constraints that reflect real-world complexities in freight procurement. Second, it demonstrates how advanced optimization tools such as MILP and scenario simulations can be embedded within a collaborative workflow between finance and operations. This enables real-time decision support, scenario planning, and data-driven negotiations, all of which are critical in volatile and competitive logistics markets. By simulating a case application, the paper showcases how the model can lead to tangible cost savings and improved service levels through optimal carrier selection and risk-informed decisions.

The practical implications of this model are significant for procurement leaders, supply chain managers, and finance executives. One of the most important takeaways is that tender optimization should no longer be viewed solely as a procurement task; rather, it is a strategic activity requiring coordinated input from multiple organizational functions. Managers are encouraged to establish formal collaboration mechanisms—such as shared KPIs, cross-functional working groups, and integrated dashboards—to ensure that both financial constraints and operational realities are reflected in sourcing decisions.

From an operational standpoint, the model empowers logistics teams to engage more proactively in negotiations. Armed with predictive insights and optimized scenarios, they can better assess trade-offs, such as selecting slightly more expensive carriers that offer higher service reliability or accepting volume commitments that lead to lower long-term costs. Financial managers, on the other hand, benefit from greater transparency in cost drivers, enabling more accurate budgeting, forecasting, and cost control. The use of optimization tools also facilitates faster and more confident decision-making, reducing the reliance on manual analysis and intuition.

Furthermore, organizations can embed this model into annual sourcing cycles or continuous procurement frameworks, allowing for ongoing refinement based on market feedback and internal performance reviews. The ability to simulate multiple tender outcomes also enhances negotiation leverage with carriers, as procurement teams can reference data-backed scenarios to counter offers or structure more favorable contracts. Ultimately, the model not only drives cost savings but also strengthens organizational agility and supplier relationships in a rapidly evolving logistics environment.

References

[1]. N. H. Tien, D. B. H. Anh, and T. D. Thuc, "Global supply chain and logistics management," ed: Academic Publications, Dehli, 2019.

[2]. M. Sternad, "Cost Calculation in road freight transport," Business Logistics in Modern Management, 2019.

[3]. M. Andrejić, N. Bojović, M. Kilibarda, and S. Nikoličić, "A framework for assessing logistics costs," International Journal of Logistics Management, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 770-794, 2018.

[4]. A. Izadi, M. Nabipour, and O. Titidezh, "Cost models and cost factors of road freight transportation: A literature review and model structure," Fuzzy Information and Engineering, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 257-278, 2019.

[5]. M. Suominen, "Innovative approaches to transportation service procurement: aiming for extensive buyer-supplier collaboration," 2018.

[6]. B. Verheijen, Vendor-buyer coordination in supply chains (no. EPS-2010-194-LIS). 2010.

[7]. C. Heinbach, J. Beinke, F. Kammler, and O. Thomas, "Data-driven forwarding: a typology of digital platforms for road freight transport management," Electronic Markets, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 807-828, 2022.

[8]. S. S. Kamble and A. Gunasekaran, "Big data-driven supply chain performance measurement system: a review and framework for implementation," International journal of production research, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 65-86, 2020.

[9]. L. Kantar, "Finance and cost management in the process of logistics 4.0," Logistics 4.0 and Future of Supply Chains, pp. 215-234, 2022.

[10]. A. Karam, K. H. Reinau, and C. R. Østergaard, "Horizontal collaboration in the freight transport sector: barrier and decision-making frameworks," European Transport Research Review, vol. 13, no. 1, p. 53, 2021.

[11]. M. Janjevic, D. Knoppen, and M. Winkenbach, "Integrated decision-making framework for urban freight logistics policy-making," Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment, vol. 72, pp. 333-357, 2019.

[12]. S. Greene et al., "Early Involvement of Private Developers in the Consideration of Long-Term Public-Private Partnership Concession Options," United States. Department of Transportation. Federal Highway Administration …, 2017.

[13]. O. R. Aziza, "Securities regulation, enforcement and market integration in the development of sub-Saharan Africa's capital markets," University of Oxford, 2021.

[14]. L. R. Isi, E. Ogu, P. I. Egbumokei, I. N. Dienagha, and W. N. Digitemie, "Advanced Application of Reservoir Simulation and DataFrac Analysis to Maximize Fracturing Efficiency and Formation Integrity," 2021.

[15]. G. Giuliano, L. Schweitzer, K. Holliday, and T. Minch, "Public Private Partnerships in California: Final Report# 2 and# 3," 2011.

[16]. M. T. AYUMU and T. C. OHAKAWA, "Optimizing Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) in Affordable Housing Through Fiscal Accountability Frameworks, Ghana in Focus," 2021.

[17]. I. N. Dienagha, F. O. Onyeke, W. N. Digitemie, and M. Adekunle, "Strategic reviews of greenfield gas projects in Africa: Lessons learned for expanding regional energy infrastructure and security," 2021.

[18]. D. L. Parris, J. L. Dapko, R. W. Arnold, and D. Arnold, "Exploring transparency: a new framework for responsible business management," Management Decision, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 222-247, 2016.

[19]. M. Fischer, F. Imgrund, C. Janiesch, and A. Winkelmann, "Strategy archetypes for digital transformation: Defining meta objectives using business process management," Information & management, vol. 57, no. 5, p. 103262, 2020.

[20]. O. O. Agbede, E. E. Akhigbe, A. J. Ajayi, and N. S. Egbuhuzor, "Assessing economic risks and returns of energy transitions with quantitative financial approaches," International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 552-566, 2021.

[21]. E. O. ALONGE, N. L. EYO-UDO, B. CHIBUNNA, A. I. D. UBANADU, E. D. BALOGUN, and K. O. OGUNSOLA, "Digital Transformation in Retail Banking to Enhance Customer Experience and Profitability," 2021.

[22]. M. Ristić and J. Davidović, "The tender for procurement of logistics services and development of logistic partnership," in 4th Logistics International Conference, 2019.

[23]. O. ILORI, C. I. LAWAL, S. C. FRIDAY, N. J. ISIBOR, and E. C. CHUKWUMA-EKE, "Blockchain-Based Assurance Systems: Opportunities and Limitations in Modern Audit Engagements," 2020.

[24]. B. I. Adekunle, E. C. Chukwuma-Eke, E. D. Balogun, and K. O. Ogunsola, "Predictive Analytics for Demand Forecasting: Enhancing Business Resource Allocation Through Time Series Models," 2021.

[25]. E. Özkaya, P. Keskinocak, V. R. Joseph, and R. Weight, "Estimating and benchmarking less-than-truckload market rates," Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, vol. 46, no. 5, pp. 667-682, 2010.

[26]. S. S. Guan, "Benchmark Competition," Md. L. Rev., vol. 80, p. 1, 2020.

[27]. O. Oduola, F. Omole, K. Akinluwade, and A. Adetunji, "A comparative study of product development process using computer numerical control and rapid prototyping methods," British Journal of Applied Science & Technology, vol. 4, no. 30, p. 4291, 2014.

[28]. K. J. Akinluwade, F. Omole, D. Isadare, O. Adesina, and A. Adetunji, "Material selection for heat sinks in HPC microchip-based circuitries," British Journal of Applied Science & Technology, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 124, 2015.

[29]. L. C. Iyabode, "Career Development and Talent Management in Banking Sector," Texila International Journal, 2015.

[30]. P. Chima and J. Ahmadu, "Implementation of resettlement policy strategies and community members' felt-need in the federal capital territory, Abuja, Nigeria," Academic journal of economic studies, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 63-73, 2019.

[31]. F. Kache and S. Seuring, "Challenges and opportunities of digital information at the intersection of Big Data Analytics and supply chain management," International journal of operations & production management, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 10-36, 2017.

[32]. I. Oyeyipo et al., "Investigating the effectiveness of microlearning approaches in corporate training programs for skill enhancement."

[33]. O. Ozobu, F. E. Adikwu, O. O. Cynthia, F. O. Onyeke, and E. O. Nwulu, "Advancing Occupational Safety with AI-Powered Monitoring Systems: A Conceptual Framework for Hazard Detection and Exposure Control."

[34]. M. Díaz-Madroñero, J. Mula, and D. Peidro, "A mathematical programming model for integrating production and procurement transport decisions," Applied Mathematical Modelling, vol. 52, pp. 527-543, 2017.
[35]. K.-H. Bae, N. Mustafee, S. Lazarova-Molnar, and L. Zheng, "Hybrid modeling of collaborative freight transportation planning using agent-based simulation, auction-based mechanisms, and optimization," Simulation, vol. 98, no. 9, pp. 753-771, 2022.
[36]. S. Oprea and L. Grandinetti, "The bid generation problem in combinatorial auctions for transportation service procurement," 2011.
[37]. M. Dellbrügge, T. Brilka, F. Kreuz, and U. Clausen, "Auction design in strategic freight procurement," in Hamburg International Conference of Logistics (HICL) 2022, 2022: epubli, pp. 295-325.
[38]. A. Ubaid, Intelligent Data-Driven Methods for Demand and Price Prediction in the Shipping Industry. University of Technology Sydney (Australia), 2021.
[39]. J. P. Onoja, "Trends and Challenges in Quantum Communications for Satellite Networks Trends and Challenges in Quantum Communications for Satellite Networks."
[40]. T. S. Oyetunji, F. L. Erinjogunola, R. O. Ajirotutu, A. B. Adeyemi, T. C. Ohakawa, and S. A. Adio, "Developing Integrated Project Management Models for Large-Scale Affordable Housing Initiatives."
[41]. M. Padidar, A Hybrid Modeling Approach to Joint Matching and Pricing in an Intelligent Freight Transportation Platform. Ecole Polytechnique, Montreal (Canada), 2022.
[42]. O. O. OKERE and E. KOKOGHO, "Determinants of Customer Satisfaction with Mobile Banking Applications: Evidence from University Students."
[43]. C. Okolie, O. Hamza, A. Eweje, A. Collins, and G. Babatunde, "Leveraging digital transformation and business analysis to improve healthcare provider portal. IRE Journals. 2021; 4 (10): 253-254," ed.
[44]. A. Azadegan and J. Teich, "Effective benchmarking of innovation adoptions: A theoretical framework for e-procurement technologies," Benchmarking: An International Journal, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 472-490, 2010.
[45]. B. A. Mayienga et al., "Studying the transformation of consumer retail experience through virtual reality technologies."
[46]. B. A. Mayienga et al., "A Conceptual Model for Global Risk Management, Compliance, and Financial Governance in Multinational Corporations."
[47]. T. Johnsen, M. Howard, and J. Miemczyk, Purchasing and supply chain management: A sustainability perspective. Routledge, 2018.
[48]. B. d. R. M. S. Brito, "Centralization of supply chain management operations: the case of Unilever Ultralogistik," Universidade do Porto (Portugal), 2016.
[49]. N. J. Isibor, V. Attipoe, I. Oyeyipo, D. C. Ayodeji, and B. Apiyo, "Analyzing Successful Content Marketing Strategies That Enhance Online Engagement and Sales for Digital Brands."
[50]. M. O. Kanu, E. Ogu, P. I. Egbumokei, W. N. Digitemie, and I. N. Dienagha, "Enhancing Asset Management in Gas Distribution Predictive Maintenance and Data-Driven Decision Making."

[51]. G. Baragiola and M. Mauri, "SDGs and the private sector: Unilever and P&G case studies," 2021.

[52]. P. Wang, J. Shen, W. Guo, C. Zhang, and B. Zhang, "Cloud-based Government Procurement Information Integration Platform," Journal of Digital Information Management, vol. 13, no. 3, 2015.

[53]. D. Ivanov, A. Dolgui, and B. Sokolov, "Cloud supply chain: Integrating Industry 4.0 and digital platforms in the "Supply Chain-as-a-Service"," Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, vol. 160, p. 102676, 2022.

[54]. N. J. Isibor, V. Attipoe, I. Oyeyipo, D. C. Ayodeji, and B. Apiyo, "Proposing Innovative Human Resource Policies for Enhancing Workplace Diversity and Inclusion."

[55]. M. O. Kanu, E. Ogu, P. I. Egbumokei, I. N. Dienagha, and W. N. Digitemie, "Strategic Project Management in Gas Distribution Facilities: A Framework for Enhancing Asset Reliability and Availability."

[56]. K. Korpela, K. Mikkonen, J. Hallikas, and M. Pynnönen, "Digital business ecosystem transformation--towards cloud integration," in 2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS), 2016: IEEE, pp. 3959-3968.

[57]. R. E. Dosumu, O. O. George, and C. O. Makata, "Advancing Product Launch Efficiency: A Conceptual Model Integrating Agile Project Management and Scrum Methodologies."

[58]. O. Famoti et al., "Data-Driven Risk Management in US Financial Institutions: A Business Analytics Perspective on Process Optimization."

[59]. O. O. Ajayi, A. S. Adebayo, and N. Chukwurah, "Addressing security vulnerabilities in autonomous vehicles through resilient frameworks and robust cyber defense systems."

[60]. D. I. Ajiga, O. Hamza, A. Eweje, E. Kokogho, and P. E. Odio, "Developing Interdisciplinary Curriculum Models for Sustainability in Higher Education: A Focus on Critical Thinking and Problem Solving."

[61]. E. O. Alonge, N. L. Eyo-Udo, B. C. Ubanadu, A. I. Daraojimba, E. D. Balogun, and K. O. Ogunsola, "Integrated framework for enhancing sales enablement through advanced CRM and analytics solutions."

[62]. A. A. Apelehin et al., "Reviewing the Role of Artificial Intelligence in Personalized Learning and Education."

[63]. J. J. Liou, "Developing an integrated model for the selection of strategic alliance partners in the airline industry," Knowledge-Based Systems, vol. 28, pp. 59-67, 2012.

[64]. C.-L. Wu, Airline operations and delay management: Insights from airline economics, networks and strategic schedule planning. Routledge, 2016.

[65]. M. Deveci, R. M. Rodríguez, Á. Labella, and M. E. Ciftci, "A decision support system for reducing the strategic risk in the schedule building process for network carrier airline operations," Annals of Operations Research, pp. 1-37, 2022.

[66]. D. Han, M. Kalantari, and A. Rajabifard, "Building information modeling (BIM) for construction and demolition waste management in Australia: A research agenda," Sustainability, vol. 13, no. 23, p. 12983, 2021.

[67]. C. B. Gabler, R. G. Richey Jr, and G. T. Stewart, "Disaster resilience through public–private short-term collaboration," Journal of Business Logistics, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 130-144, 2017.
[68]. Z. Shi, C. de Laat, P. Grosso, and Z. Zhao, "Integration of blockchain and auction models: A survey, some applications, and challenges," IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 497-537, 2022.
[69]. F. M. Awaysheh, M. Alazab, S. Garg, D. Niyato, and C. Verikoukis, "Big data resource management & networks: Taxonomy, survey, and future directions," IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 2098-2130, 2021.
[70]. A. Kaul and A. Soofastaei, "Advanced analytics for mine materials transportation," in Advanced Analytics in Mining Engineering: Leverage Advanced Analytics in Mining Industry to Make Better Business Decisions: Springer, 2022, pp. 613-647.
[71]. H. A. Khoshalan, J. Shakeri, I. Najmoddini, and M. Asadizadeh, "Forecasting copper price by application of robust artificial intelligence techniques," Resources Policy, vol. 73, p. 102239, 2021.
[72]. M. Peyman, P. Copado, J. Panadero, A. A. Juan, and M. Dehghanimohammadabadi, "A tutorial on how to connect python with different simulation software to develop rich simheuristics," in 2021 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC), 2021: IEEE, pp. 1-12.