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Executive Summary

Welcome to American Shipper’s sixth annual study of transportation payment processes, policies, strategies and technology. American Shipper, in partnership with the Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals (CSCMP), National Retail Federation (NRF) and Retail Industry Leaders Association (RILA), has benchmarked nearly 230 payers (shippers and 3PLs) on their transportation invoice processing and payment practices and systems usage. Participants completed a 28-question survey covering all modes of international and domestic freight transportation between late April and late May.

This report has traditionally focused on some of the blocking and tackling elements of freight payment, including how payers audit their invoices, their payment terms, and whether they automate these processes. In more recent versions, this report has tackled the more abstract concept of freight payment strategy, including the extent to which shippers and logistics service providers aligned finance decision makers with logistics decision makers in their freight payment practices.

This year, we dig deeper into some of the elements that reflect a shipper’s or LSP’s attitude toward freight payment, and many of these elements are explored in Section III: The State of Freight Payment Strategy. The title of this year’s report comes directly from this section, where we explore the seemingly paradoxical situation in which freight payers are concerned about the malfeasance from freight pay systems vendors, but also are unsure about how their own vendor handles their funds. This type of uncertainty can expose a company to undue risk, when some straightforward communication and vetting of their vendor could provide clarity about how their funds are being handled.

Hypotheses

This study assumed that:

- The market would have a clear idea of whether the funds they entrust to freight payment vendors are set aside in separate accounts or in escrow, but the preponderance of respondents were uncertain about this.

- Freight payers would not object to outsourcing some or all of their freight audit and payment process, and the majority of large shippers are comfortable with outsourcing freight payment, compared to fewer than one-third of small- and medium-sized shippers.

- Invoice accuracy would vary greatly among modes, but ocean, trucking, and air invoice accuracy levels are relatively similar, and similarly poor.

- Freight payment processes would vary for companies between their geographies, and nearly half of large global shippers use different systems and processes for different modes and geographies.
Outsourced freight audit and payment is, by now, a well-established practice, with reputable vendors and a catalog of customers who have seen how entrusting the auditing and paying of invoicing to a vendor can reap major savings and improved accuracy. That said, there is an undeniable worry among many shippers about the viability and trustworthiness of certain payment vendors. In this sense, the reputable vendors are often unfairly grouped with those that have been found to have committed financial malfeasance.

A majority of shippers and 3PLs are concerned—to varying degrees—about this malfeasance, yet more than half of respondents are uncertain about how their freight payment vendor handles their funds. To be clear, this does not indicate that more than half of freight payment vendors are improperly handling funds, it merely implies that the majority of shippers and LSPs are unsure about whether their vendors keeps their funds in escrow or in separate, visible accounts.

Large shippers are much more likely than small- and medium-sized shippers to see outsourcing freight payment as a viable solution. That’s likely because the larger the shipper, the more bills to audit and pay, and the more complex the entire process becomes. Large shippers tend to be invoiced for more modes, and tend to have to pay bills in more geographies. Outsourcing becomes compelling after a certain level of volume and complexity.

Nearly two-thirds of large shipper respondents, and nearly three-quarters of small- and medium-sized shipper respondents, see keeping control of writing checks as critical. What’s more, roughly two in five shippers see it as very important, while fewer than 20 percent see it as unimportant.

More than a third of large shippers have very different payment processes across their modes and regions. Only 8 percent of large shippers use the same process globally. That number is significantly higher for smaller shippers and 3PLs, but in general, respondents indicated they have to manage multiple processes depending on the geography.
An encouraging sign is that the percentage of shippers and 3PLs using a purely
manual process to handle freight payment is around 10 to 15 percent, with an
understandably higher proportion of companies handling international audit and
payment manually. That said, the market has yet to coagulate around one or two
general approaches to payment technology. It is still a fragmented market, but a
fragmented market that is gradually becoming less manually-oriented.

Large shippers generate reports using freight payment data more often than their
smaller counterparts, including substantially broader use of their vendors and
payment systems to generate these reports. Large shippers also appear slightly
more advanced in their use of payment data, whether it’s to simply track spend,
or in more sophisticated uses, to index rates or track carrier diversification.

- Do you know how your freight payment vendor handles the funds that you
entrust to them? If you are examining different vendors with a view toward
using one of them, can they answer this question to your satisfaction?
- Is freight payment a function that can be outsourced at your organization,
and are you comfortable doing so?
- And what is your company’s philosophy when it comes to cutting checks?
Can that function be entrusted to a payment vendor? Doing so can increase
your risk, but also provide distinct costs savings and improvements in
efficiency and cash preservation.
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Section I: Introduction

Welcome to American Shipper’s sixth annual study of transportation payment processes, policies, strategies and technology. American Shipper, in partnership with the Council of Supply Chain Management Professionals (CSCMP), National Retail Federation (NRF) and Retail Industry Leaders Association (RILA), has benchmarked nearly 230 payers (shippers and 3PLs) on their transportation invoice processing and payment practices and systems usage. Participants completed a 28-question survey covering all modes of international and domestic freight transportation between late April and late May.

This is the third report in a series designed to explore the lifecycle of freight transportation from procurement through execution (global transportation management), and settlement. Each report seeks to highlight best practices that readers can apply to their own businesses. All reports are made available for download at www.AmericanShipper.com/Research.

This report has traditionally focused on some of the blocking and tackling elements of freight payment, including how payers audit their invoices, their payment terms, and whether they automate these processes. In more recent versions, this report has tackled the more abstract concept of freight payment strategy, including the extent to which shippers and logistics service providers aligned finance decision makers with logistics decision makers in their freight payment practices.

This year, we dig deeper into some of the elements that reflect a shipper’s or LSP’s attitude toward freight payment, and many of these elements are explored in Section III: The State of Freight Payment Strategy. The title of this year’s report comes directly from this section, where we explore the seemingly paradoxical situation in which freight payers are concerned about the malfeasance from freight pay systems vendors, but also are unsure about how their own vendor handles their funds. This type of uncertainty can expose a company to undue risk, when some straightforward communication and vetting of their vendor could provide clarity about how their funds are being handled.

Those uncertainties aside, this report has long argued that automating freight payment and audit functions is a must for most companies with modern, multinational supply chains. The costs of operating a manual process are too hard to ignore—either due to manpower dedicated to auditing invoices across a range of modes, or to missed overbilling because a company doesn’t audit every invoice.
One thing is clear from *American Shipper’s* quantitative and qualitative research into freight payment—hardly any two companies handle this function alike. That’s because there are differing philosophies on automation, outsourcing of business processes, relinquishment of the check cutting function, and basic alignment between supply chain and finance.

**Terminology**

The following report includes many important terms that readers need to be familiar with in order to fully grasp the concepts and suggestions. These include:

**Payer/Payee**

In the context of this study, payers are shippers and intermediaries who pay for transportation services, while payees (also known as billers) are carriers or intermediaries who collect money for their services.

Many of the data points illustrated within these pages break down the differences between companies that “automate” international transportation management versus those that manually handle this process.

**LSP/3PL**

Logistics service providers (LSPs) are companies that charge a fee for supply chain services, including but not limited to transportation, distribution, warehousing, and customs services. A third party logistics provider (3PL) is a non-asset-based LSP.

**Automated/Manual**

Many of the data points illustrated within these pages break down the differences between companies that “automate” international transportation management versus those that manually handle this process. In this context, “automated” companies employ at least one application to support their transportation invoice processing and payment function. “Automated” does not mean human interaction has been eliminated. Likewise, “manual” does not mean these firms do not use e-mail, fax and other technologies. There is an assumption that basic computing power is ubiquitous in the logistics management field.
**Solution**

The mix or combination of technology, in-house processes and outsourced services used to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of a particular business function. In the case of this report, solutions will refer to freight payment processes that leverage a mix of systems, services, and manual processes to complete the task.

**Hypotheses**

Many *American Shipper* research initiatives seek to prove or disprove a set of assumptions. In this case, the study assumed that:

- The market would have a clear idea of whether the funds they entrust to freight payment vendors are set aside in separate accounts or in escrow. Fig. 9, however, shows that the preponderance of respondents were uncertain about this.

- Freight payers would not object to outsourcing some or all of their freight audit and payment process. Fig. 11 finds that the majority of large shippers are comfortable with outsourcing freight payment, compared to fewer than one-third of small- and medium-sized shippers.

- Invoice accuracy would vary greatly among modes. Fig. 5, however, shows that ocean, trucking, and air invoice accuracy levels are relatively similar, and similarly poor.

- Freight payment processes would vary for companies between their geographies. Fig. 13 finds that nearly half of large global shippers use different systems and processes for different modes and geographies.
Section II: Freight Payment Trends

As is typical with *American Shipper* transportation benchmark research, respondents to this study manage a number of modes, and this is reflected in the number of modes for which these companies are invoiced. More than 60 percent of respondents are invoiced for seven modes, and four in five are invoiced for the four most common modes.

Figure 1: Transportation Modes Invoiced
About half of large shipper respondents—defined as those with annual revenue of more than $1 billion—manage more than $100 million in freight spend each year, while 60 percent of small- and medium-sized shippers manage less than $10 million. There are generally distinct differences in the way large freight spend managers view their payment processes relative to their smaller counterparts, and this survey makes frequent use of that comparison.

A hallmark of this study over the years has been to spell out the degree to which automation helps reduce the cost to process a single invoice. This year, the statistics aren’t so stark as in years past, but automation still helps companies lower their cost on a per-invoice basis. A couple possible explanations for the smaller discrepancy in costs between outsourced and in-house processes—first, the number of respondents saying they have a wholly manual process has dropped significantly, as Figs. 15-16 show, and second, the general maturity of the freight payment discipline has forced even those companies with processes that are wholly or partly manual to take a keener look at the costs associated with auditing and paying freight bills.

### Figure 2: Transportation Spend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Large Shippers</th>
<th>Small/Medium Shippers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than $100 million</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between $10 and $100</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10 million</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 total respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 3: Cost to Process and Pay an Invoice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Domestic</th>
<th>International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outsourced</td>
<td>$4.04</td>
<td>$3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house Systems</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house Manual</td>
<td>$4.63</td>
<td>$5.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

135 total respondents

---

*Transportation Payment | Benchmark Study: 2015*
As Fig. 4 shows, there is little movement in the market in terms of a desire to extend payment terms beyond the traditional 15-45 day window. The vast proportion of respondents fit in this window, and have done for the last five years.

A new element in this year’s study was an examination of freight invoice accuracy by mode. Respondents were asked to provide the percentage of invoices that were accurate for three primary modes—ocean, trucking, and air. What was surprising was how similar the accuracy rates were among those three modes. It’s also very disheartening to see that barely one in 10 invoices among all these modes is accurate. If anything underscores the necessity of putting in place a rigorous freight payment process, in which every invoice is audited, it is Fig. 5.
As with Fig. 4, Fig. 6 shows that the market has settled into a predictable pattern when it comes to how companies audit freight bills. Around half pre-audit, another 35-40 percent audit before and after paying, and hardly any only post-audit. It’s encouraging to see that shippers see the value in performing pre-audits. With the data in Fig. 5 showing that so few invoices are accurate, it makes little sense to pay a bill that is wrong between eight or nine times out of 10.
Meanwhile, around 60 percent of shippers and nearly three-quarters of 3PLs say their audit savings are meeting expectations. A large proportion of shippers, however, aren’t certain, and that speaks to how important it is for an organization to set metrics for functions like freight audit. Catching errors is one thing—targeting a certain percentage of invoice accuracy and the costs associated with that is what sets high-performing shippers apart from laggards.
Section III: The State of Freight Payment Strategy

This year’s report takes a keen eye toward some of the elements that govern the more philosophical aspects of how companies pay freight bills. This section will explore the extent to which companies are comfortable with the idea of outsourcing some or all of their freight payment function. It also examines a key consideration for global shippers—the degree to which freight payment varies by mode and region.

Outsourced freight audit and payment is, by now, a well-established practice, with reputable vendors and a catalog of customers who have seen how entrusting the auditing and paying of invoicing to a vendor can reap major savings and improved accuracy. That said, there is an undeniable worry among many shippers about the viability and trustworthiness of certain payment vendors. In this sense, the reputable vendors are often unfairly grouped with those that have been found to have committed financial malfeasance.

Fig. 8 shows that a majority of shippers and 3PLs are concerned—to varying degrees—about this malfeasance, which can manifest itself in a number of ways. The most common occurrence is unscrupulous vendors mixing funds between their clients and siphoning those funds into personal accounts. Remember, these funds are earmarked to pay specific carriers, and malfeasance by the vendor brings with it significant risk to shippers that have essentially failed to pay their bills.

Even if these cases touch a small fraction of all the payment vendors out there, the mere presence of them spooks the market to a certain extent. But it also places in stark contrast the need to regularly vet a payment vendor. A healthy vendor relationship requires frequent communication.

Figure 8: Concern Over Freight Payment Vendor Malfeasance
If the degree to which freight payers worry about misuse of their funds, as seen in Fig. 8, is surprising, then Fig. 9 is outright shocking. More than half of respondents are uncertain about how their freight payment vendor handles their funds. To be clear, this does not indicate that more than half of freight payment vendors are improperly handling funds, it merely implies that the majority of shippers and LSPs are unsure about whether their vendors keeps their funds in escrow or in separate, visible accounts.

Best practice dictates that, at a minimum, a vendor keep one client’s funds separate from other clients’ funds. Better still is when a separate account is established for each carrier of each client. Ensuring that vendors don’t co-mingle funds is an absolutely essential piece of payment vendor management, and yet the data shows most companies are absolving themselves of this duty.
One way to ensure that companies keep abreast of best practices—like the avoidance of co-mingled funds—is to discuss payment processes with outside organizations. These conversations might be facilitated by a common vendor, or an industry association, and they need not be so specific as to require the individual to divulge critical internal information. But ensuring that you are measuring the general trajectory of your freight payment process against peers is just a good idea. It’s also a good chance to learn about new developments in the market—be it strategies, new technologies, or vendor malfeasance.

Yet more than 70 percent of respondents rarely or never discussed payment best practices outside of their organization. In fact, fewer than one in five companies do.

Outsourcing has become a common strategy for those tasked with freight payment. It provides a way for shippers and 3PLs to reduce human resources and time associated with auditing and paying freight bills. But many organizations see paying their bills—be it general payables or freight payment—as a core function of their business, as integral as manufacturing or transporting a good.
Whether a company is comfortable outsourcing freight payment is in some ways influenced by its size, as Fig. 11 shows. Large shippers are much more likely than small- and medium-sized shippers to see outsourcing freight payment as a viable solution. That’s likely because the larger the shipper, the more bills to audit and pay, and the more complex the entire process becomes. Large shippers tend to be invoiced for more modes, and have to pay bills in more geographies. Outsourcing becomes compelling after a certain level of volume and complexity.

**Figure 11: Freight Payment is a Core Process and Should Not Be Outsourced**

An ancillary aspect to the issue of whether payment and audit can be outsourced is if a shipper or 3PL mandates that it keep control of the check cutting function. This is a key distinction. Many freight payment vendors provide both audit and payment services, while some will perform only the audit if a payer prefers it that way. This tends to be largely a function of whether a company’s finance department requires that it (or a person in the company’s transportation or supply chain department) write the actual checks.

Bear in mind that keeping control of the check cutting function does alleviate much of the risk of using an outsourced provider, but it can also sacrifice some of the efficiency benefits of having a vendor issue checks. Especially if the vendor offers some method to extend the days payable outstanding for the payer.
Interestingly, nearly two-thirds of large shipper respondents, and nearly three-quarters of small- and medium-sized shipper respondents, see keeping control of writing checks as critical. What’s more, roughly two in five shippers see it as very important, while fewer than 20 percent see it as unimportant.

For large, global shippers, one of the complexities of paying freight bills is that vendor capability and payment practices vary widely by region. Additionally, some vendors are stronger in certain modes, and overall, vendors lean heavily toward being more mature in domestic or regional modes than in international modes.
With that context, it’s little surprise to see that more than a third of large shippers have varied payment processes across their modes and regions. Only 8 percent of large shippers use the same process globally. That number is significantly higher for smaller shippers and 3PLs, but in general, respondents indicated they have to manage multiple processes depending on the geography.

An encouraging sign in this year’s report is that respondents see freight payment as primarily the responsibility of the transportation or logistics department, and not finance. Though some would disagree with this, there is compelling evidence that freight payment is different from other payables, and should be treated as such.
Section IV: Freight Payment Technology Usage

The basis of this benchmark study has always been to provide perspective on how companies use technology to improve their freight payment process. In that regard, data in Figs. 15 and 16 is highly encouraging.

The percentage of shippers and 3PLs using a purely manual process to handle freight payment is around 10 to 15 percent, with an understandably higher proportion of companies handling international audit and payment manually.

Figure 15: Freight Payment Platform—Shippers

[Chart showing distribution of freight payment platforms among shippers, with percentages for international and domestic payments.]

175 total respondents
These two figures underscore the point made earlier in this report about how each company handles freight payment differently. The market has yet to coagulate around one or two general approaches to payment technology. It is still a fragmented market, but a fragmented market that is gradually becoming less manually-oriented.

**Figure 16: Freight Payment Platform—3PLs**
Fig. 17 also serves as an example of how different payment practices can be between organizations. Overall, large shippers generate reports using freight payment data more often than their smaller counterparts, including substantially broader use of their vendors and payment systems to generate these reports.
Again, large shippers appear slightly more advanced in their use of payment data, whether it’s to simply track spend, or in more sophisticated uses, like to index rates or track carrier diversification. How a company uses payment data is reliant on two factors: its internal willingness to turn the rich data on an invoice into actionable information; and whether it has systems or partners that can help it achieve those goals.

**Figure 18: How is Payment Data Used?**

- **To track transportation spend:**
  - Large Shippers: 90%
  - Small Shippers: 79%
  - 3PLs: 62%

- **To optimize operations:**
  - Large Shippers: 64%
  - Small Shippers: 51%
  - 3PLs: 57%

- **To feed directly into the procurement process:**
  - Large Shippers: 44%
  - Small Shippers: 23%
  - 3PLs: 42%

- **To index our rates:**
  - Large Shippers: 39%
  - Small Shippers: 31%
  - 3PLs: 36%

- **To track carrier diversification:**
  - Large Shippers: 37%
  - Small Shippers: 24%
  - 3PLs: 26%

- **N/A—We do not collect or use our payment data:**
  - Large Shippers: 4%
  - Small Shippers: 13%
  - 3PLs: 21%

168 total respondents
Despite the market’s move away from reliance on manual processes, fewer respondents this year said they are in the market for a new or upgraded system than in 2014. Only 5 percent have the budget to invest in freight payment this year, and another 5 percent over the next two years. Part of this ostensibly discouraging data is that many companies have adopted technology to address freight audit and payment, and just aren’t in the market because they’re satisfied with their current state. To win the remaining business, it’s clearly incumbent upon the market to dispel the negatives associated with freight payment vendors, and more clearly enunciate the advantages of a system-based approach.
Vendors, take note: any buying decision will likely be influenced by more than one department, as Fig. 20 suggests. At least half of respondents say it’s a joint logistics or finance decision, while a third say procurement would be involved. Best practice would dictate that all three departments should be involved in that decision, though it clearly makes it more difficult for vendors to have to persuade three sets of decision-makers.

A major inhibitor toward investing in freight audit and payment technology is a simple lack of financial support for such a project. Data in Fig. 21 is largely in line with the results of last year’s study. Fewer than 30 percent of respondents believe they have the funding to buy a system, and a third are uncertain.

Figure 20: Who is Involved in Freight Payment System Buying Decision?

Figure 21: Is Funding to Invest in Transportation Payment Technology Available?
Section V: Respondent Demographics

Figure 22: Industry Segments

- 3PL/Forwarder/NVOCC/Intermediary: 30%
- Retail/Wholesale: 18%
- Discrete manufacturing: 18%
- Process manufacturing: 18%
- Raw materials/Commodities: 9%
- Government/Public Sector: 4%
- Engineering/Construction/Energy: 1%

Total respondents: 228

Figure 23: Company Size

- Greater than $1 billion: 35%
- $100 million to $1 billion: 33%
- Less than $100 million: 31%

Total respondents: 207

Figure 24: Job Titles Surveyed

- C-Level (CEO, CIO, CFO, etc.): 18%
- Executive (SVP, VP, GM, etc.): 10%
- Director: 18%
- Manager: 10%
- Staff: 11%
- Other: 43%

Total respondents: 208
Section VI: Takeaways

The freight payment market is at a bit of a crossroads presently. Reputable vendors provide efficient solutions to help companies automate the auditing, processing, and payment of freight bills, but they also struggle to keep up with the geographic and modal footprints of large, global shippers.

As shippers ponder how to improve their audit and payment process, they would be well-served to examine how they might have answered the questions that underpin Figs. 9, 11, and 12 in this report.

• Do you know how your freight payment vendor handles the funds that you entrust to them? If you are examining different vendors with a view toward using one of them, can they answer this question to your satisfaction?

• Is freight payment a function that can be outsourced at your organization, and are you comfortable doing so?

• And what is your company’s philosophy when it comes to cutting checks? Can that function be entrusted to a payment vendor? Doing so can increase your risk, but also provide distinct costs savings and improvements in efficiency and cash preservation.
**U.S. Bank**

U.S. Bank is one of the largest and most experienced global freight payment companies, offering integrated invoice audit and processing, financing, payment and business intelligence to some of the largest corporations and government agencies in the world. More than 10,000 active carrier customers receive billions of dollars in payments each year.

U.S. Bank Freight Payment allows shippers and carriers to resolve discrepancies in real time via an web-based application. With flexible business rules and 100% pre-payment audits, users can customize the tool to meet diverse needs, yet still maintain visibility and control across the entire organization. Unique financing options help shippers and carriers maximize working capital.

Discover how it pays to let U.S. Bank Freight Payment—the pioneer in electronic freight payment—make your freight audit and payment processing a strategic advantage in your supply chain. [www.usbpayment.com/freight-payment](http://www.usbpayment.com/freight-payment).

U.S. Bancorp (NYSE: USB), with $410 billion in assets as of March 31, 2015, is the parent company of U.S. Bank National Association, the fifth-largest commercial bank in the United States.
Appendix B: About Our Partners

National Retail Federation

NRF is the world’s largest retail trade association, representing discount and department stores, home goods and specialty stores, Main Street merchants, grocers, wholesalers, chain restaurants and Internet retailers from the United States and more than 45 countries. Retail is the nation’s largest private sector employer, supporting one in four U.S. jobs—42 million working Americans. Contributing $2.6 trillion to annual GDP, retail is a daily barometer for the nation’s economy. NRF’s This is Retail campaign highlights the industry’s opportunities for life-long careers, how retailers strengthen communities, and the critical role that retail plays in driving innovation.

Our mission is to advance the interests of the retail industry through advocacy, communications and education.

Retail Industry Leaders Association

The Retail Industry Leaders Association (RILA) is the trade association of the world’s largest and most innovative retail companies. RILA members include more than 200 retailers, product manufacturers, and service suppliers, which together account for more than $1.5 trillion in annual sales and millions of American jobs, and operate more than 100,000 stores, manufacturing facilities and distribution centers domestically and abroad.
Appendix C: About American Shipper Research

Background

Since our first edition in May 1974, American Shipper has provided U.S.-based logistics practitioners with accurate, timely and actionable news and analysis. The company is widely recognized as the voice of the international transportation community.

In 2008 American Shipper launched its first formal, independent research initiative focused on the state of transportation management systems in the logistics service provider market. Since that time the company has published more than a dozen reports on subjects ranging from regulatory compliance to sustainability.

Scope

American Shipper research initiatives typically address international or global supply chain issues from a U.S.-centric point of view. The research will be most relevant to those readers managing large volumes of airfreight, containerized ocean and domestic intermodal freight. American Shipper readers are tasked with managing large volumes of freight moving into and out of the country so the research scope reflects those interests.

Methodology

American Shipper benchmark studies are based upon responses from a pool of approximately 40,000 readers accessible by e-mail invitation. Generally each benchmarking project is based on 200-500 qualified responses to a 25-35 question survey depending on the nature and complexity of the topic.

American Shipper reports compare readers from key market segments defined by industry vertical, company size, and other variables, in an effort to call out trends and ultimate best practices. Segments created for comparisons always consist of 30 or more responses.

Library

American Shipper’s complete library of research is available on our Website: AmericanShipper.com/Research.

Annual studies include:

- Global Trade Management Report
- Global Transportation Planning & Procurement Benchmark
- Global Transportation Management Benchmark
- Global Transportation Payment Benchmark
- Import Operations & Compliance Benchmark
- Export Operations & Compliance Benchmark

Contact

Eric Johnson
Research Director
American Shipper
ejohnson@shippers.com

Transportation Payment | Benchmark Study: 2015