Transportation Policy Innovation Centre

"WHAT WAS HEARD" REPORT

Critical Conversation™ on bringing transport policy into the 21st century

Carleton University, Ottawa, ON

John Coleman

Adjunct Professor, School of Public Policy and Administration, Carleton University

Director, Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in North America

Carleton University | School of Public Policy and Administration

The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport

Contents

Highlights

Areas of unanimous agreement (see section 8)

1. There was essentially unanimous acceptance that the national framework for improving supply chain performance should be based on identifying and removing constraints.
2. There was essentially unanimous agreement that government has a legitimate and vital role working with industry and other players to find and fix certain supply chain constraints.
3. There was essentially unanimous agreement on the need for further work in using digital twins to identify the nature and magnitude of constraints that limit supply chains' speed and throughput.
4. There was essentially universal acceptance of a common language to express the meaning and significance of concepts like constraints, throughput, exponential growth, and the Rule of 70.
5. There was clear consensus that customs delays and labour disruptions are likely to be serious constraints on speed and throughput at certain times and places, but that are not in Transport Canada's mandate and therefore should be drawn to the attention of relevant agencies and made a high priority in government's economic agenda.

Top three transport policy problems, by majority opinion (see section 5.3)

1. Invest to improve port capacity.
2. Use digital twins to improve the reliability and speed of government permitting.
3. Develop planning tools for road transport that account for congestion and border wait times, in order to reduce border delays.

Purpose and discussions

The session was organized as a dialogue among senior executives to produce insights into national policy that could be put into action with nationwide effect. Before the session participants received a background paper describing the problem and how Canada got into its chronic and now rapidly escalating difficulty of getting goods to market.

Keynote speakers set the stage with a call to action and an introduction to an established method of solution for overcoming weak supply chain performance.

Discussions at the roundtables probed:

- declining productivity
- supply chain vulnerabilities
- the need for transportation to be treated as a strategic national asset rather than a service that stands apart from production, and needs to be treated as an integral part of supply chains, neither elevated nor subordinated to other parts of the system.

The session concluded with a call for courage and leadership by government and industry to prevent supply chains from becoming (or continuing to be) a constraint on Canada's economic growth.

1. Welcome

Dr. Marc Rioux welcomed participants and stressed the importance of a frank, constructive dialogue around Canada's transportation system, competitiveness, and national policy. The gathering was not framed as a traditional conference, but as a Critical Conversation™ in a safe academic environment aimed at producing insights that could be put into action, connecting leaders across sectors, and orienting public policy toward pathways not yet taken.

2. Opening remarks

The Dean of the Faculty of Public and Global Affairs, Dr. Brenda O'Neill, welcomed participants to Carleton University and its School of Public Policy and Administration. She said that Canada has reached an economic inflection point. With new geopolitical dynamics, strained supply chains, and accelerating global change, Canada faces a narrowing window to recover from its deteriorating competitive position.

She urged participants to:

- challenge assumptions
- avoid attribution or blame
- engage in informed, evidence-based debate

She reminded participants that recommendations from this event will be made public, subject to the Chatham House Rule of non-attribution to encourage openness in the discussion.

3. Keynote – the Honourable Lisa Raitt

Co-chair of the Coalition for a Better Future and former Cabinet Minister the Honourable Lisa Raitt gave a pre-recorded address. Click here for a video of her presentation: [To come]

She explained that Canada has all the ingredients for success but there were troubling trends:

Declining productivity and resilience

- Canada's productivity has been slipping relative to our peers
- vulnerability to shocks (labour disruptions, climate-related flooding) has increased
- exporters are struggling to reach global markets

Transportation as strategic infrastructure

The Hon. Ms. Raitt stressed that the transportation network is the backbone of the economy and must be treated as a strategic asset rather than an afterthought. She called for:

- long-term infrastructure investment
- regulatory modernization

- improved supply chain risk management

Changing global context

Geopolitical relationships—particularly with the United States—are becoming less predictable. The current trade model is breaking down, and reliance on legacy institutions and agreements is not enough.

Competitiveness as a shared responsibility

The Hon. Ms. Raitt argued for:

- diversification of markets
- stronger multi-level government and private-sector relationships
- real-time decision-making capability

Crucially: *"If you can't move it, you can't sell it."*

Prevailing culture of inaction

"*Indecision is a decision*", she stressed. It is a widespread and recurring problem in Canada, that shows up in problems like slow permitting, fragmented regulatory processes, and aversion to bold action. All of them carry material economic costs.

Leadership Imperative

The Hon. Ms. Raitt called for:

- courageous modernization
- nation-unifying transportation projects
- focusing on possibility—not just on deficiency

Canada has done this before and can do it again, **if our ambition is matched by timely action.**

4. Keynote – Dr. Alan Barnard

Dr. Alan Barnard spoke about the importance of identifying and removing system constraints, using a proven method of solution that is based on systems theory.

Click here for a video of his presentation: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xJDiHiSTrX0

The constraint-dominated system

Constraints can be caused by many things including:

- insufficient investment
- outdated policy or operating rules
- misaligned incentives

Productivity gains come from finding and fixing the **weakest link**, *not* from incremental improvements made everywhere simultaneously.

Five system goals

Every system, including Canada's transportation system, must have a primary goal. For a system whose function is to produce economic benefits, there are only five possibilities:

- produce *more*
- produce it *faster*
- produce it *more reliably*
- produce it *cheaper*
- produce it *more simply*.

Optimization consists of maximizing the rate of progress towards whichever one is determined to be the primary goal.

Beyond stability

Dr. Barnard cautioned against optimizing for stability. Stability is a false target. In an era of exponential technologies, population growth, and urbanization, the target must be this: to make change at a speed that matches the exponential growth of demands being placed on your system. Stasis will get you into trouble.

Systems thinking vs. fragmentation

Canada's current approach to dealing with complex problems is, like everywhere, to decompose them into parts and optimize each one locally. This always results in:

- fragmented improvements.
- poor system-level results (for example, social housing build-rates keep dropping around the world, despite improvements in individual elements of the house-building ecosystem).

Systems require:

- a clear primary goal.
- metrics for performance—they must score a direct hit on the factors that determine the performance you want from the system.

We all know the rules of the game, but we don't all know the rules needed to **win**. Dr. Barnard used chess as an example of a game with very simple rules, but that is so complex it is difficult to master.

Waste and bottlenecks

- we often see a recurring pattern: policies that were implemented to fix past constraints remain in place long after the constraints move and we have a different problem. The system itself becomes **inertial**.

Capacity, flow, and variability

- constrained operations reduce system throughput, often because unimportant work is being fed into them. This is a waste of their capacity.
- with high utilization rates (for example 98%), a one-day task can take months to complete.
- variability severely reduces throughput; protective capacity is essential.
- the real constraint is often in the **waiting**, not in doing the actual production work.

Anti-fragility

Organizations should:

- be set up to operate in a way that limits damage when negative shocks occur.
- capitalize disproportionately on positive shocks.
- embrace experimentation.

Digital Twins and AI

Dr. Barnard stressed the power of simulation tools to identify:

- bottlenecks.
- declining throughput.
- policy-driven waste, or waste driven by current operating rules.

Five focussing steps

Dr. Barnard explained the robust method for overcoming constraints in any system, which is at the heart of Theory of Constraints:

1. Identify the constraint
   - this is the one stage in a system that restricts flow and therefore limits throughput.
   - It usually occurs where flow is backing up.
   - is not always obvious to the naked eye.
2. Exploit the constraint
   - stop loading it up with unnecessary or low-priority work.
   - keep it busy 100% of the time.
   - change operating rules if they are hindering the above two bullet points.
3. Subordinate other processes to accomplishing step 2
4. If necessary, elevate the constraint
   - add more people or equipment, or build more physical infrastructure.
   - do this only after steps 2 and 3 have achieved all they can.
5. Find the next constraint and relieve it, repeating steps 1 to 4 in a continual cycle.

Improvement, he stressed, is sequential—not simultaneous.

Continuous removal of constraints for roundtable discussions

Dr. Barnard proposed this structured method:

1. identify one goal and one constraint.
6. identify one problem linked to that constraint.
3. Identify one conflict that is blocking change.
   - here, “conflict” occurs between the benefits of making change vs. the benefits of retaining the status quo.
4. innovate to resolve the conflict
5. run one experiment

When that constraint has been relieved, repeat with the next most important constraint. Start again with Step 1.

5. Roundtable working session

Participants were asked to identify one or two of their respective organizations' most important problems and propose a solution for each one. These problem / solution pairs were discussed at their respective tables and a rapporteur facilitated a discussion to identify the two that the table's participants considered most compelling from a national standpoint.

Participants were also asked to list the pros and cons of their own solutions, and pros and cons of maintaining the status quo; and identify other measures that, when implemented, would offset the cons of their solution while retaining the pros of the status quo. Dr. Barnard called the package of the solution with other measures an "innovation".

If the cons of a proposed solution are not removed or counteracted, or if the pros of the status quo are not retained, a conflict will continue to exist that has prevented solutions from being implemented in the past. That is because personal or organizational resistance keeps the status quo in place despite its flaws.

Annex A contains a list of all problems identified at all the tables

5.1. Roundtable summary

The roundtables reached consensus on the following seven problems:

A. Cargo flow, and short sea shipping

Participants discussed:

- keeping the Seaway open year round
- expanding short sea shipping
- using inland ports (e.g., Hamilton, Cleveland)
- cabotage reform (Canadian crews at competitive salaries).

Challenges cited:

- CBSA inconsistencies
- conflicting customs procedures
- need to plan for preventive maintenance of the Seaway
- truck delays
- demurrage costs

Participants advocated a single end-to-end system for every supply chain, including at the port of entry if applicable. While recognizing that CBSA must protect and collect duties and taxes, the current rollout (e.g., CBSA Assessment and Revenue Management ("CARM")) system is shifting new burdens onto businesses and increasing their costs.

B. Known shipper programs and congestion

Benefits of CSA (Customs Self-Assessment) are not being fully realized. Because of traffic congestion at ports of entry, trucks cannot reliably access fast lanes, or can't be sure to arrive at off-peak port hours, which makes congestion worse and reduces throughput.

Participants expressed a need for tools to provide:

- predictive routing capability (accounting for construction, congestion, receiver hours)
- flexibility in border operations

C. Essential service designation

Railways and ports are not deemed essential services under the Canada Labour Code. Labour disruptions cause:

- loss of national competitiveness
- downtime costs
- reduced speed and throughput
- reduced reliability for global shippers

Participants proposed:

- alternative mediation models
- hearing union concerns
- keeping transport systems moving during negotiations

D. Port capacity, permitting, and investment

Growth of throughput is constrained by:

- slow federal permitting (can take up to 10 years)
- chronic last-mile problems
- inter-port competition within Canada, for identical cargo flows

Private equity time horizons (30 – 40 years) are not compatible with regulatory delays, even for well-capitalized proponents. This causes throughput improvements to be delayed, and in some cases abandoned altogether. Some otherwise-attractive investments may not even be contemplated to begin with.

Proposed solutions:

- strategy for increasing national port capacity
- government coordination to prevent intra-Canada competition
- "build fast" mentality and culture, consistent with ensuring that projects gain sufficient public acceptance

E. Rail capacity and demand volatility

Canada's demand-loading on the railway system fluctuates, causing peaks and valleys. Railways optimize for earnings per share and operating ratios, leading to insufficient cars[1] during peaks.

Proposed solution:

- government tax credits to subsidize low-volume periods to ensure sufficient capacity is available during surge periods

1. Comment: this is a symptom of a different problem—if the cycle time of cars from origin to destination and back for reloading is accelerated, concerns about the *number* of cars would essentially resolve themselves.

F. Global perception and market loss

Canada ranks poorly globally in port performance. Shipper perceptions all by themselves affect decisions on routing. Montréal has lost U.S. cargo flows.

Participants warned that:

- Canada is becoming less attractive for global logistics chains
- without intervention, the decline will accelerate

G. Digital integration

A national, shared IT platform has been under discussion for more than two decades. Millions have been spent on independent elements with limited interoperability. Realization of a national IT platform would, in many cases, improve decision-making and increase throughput more and faster than building new physical infrastructure could. Participants called for:

- a single platform
- end-to-end data visibility
- reduced friction among users
- direct access to data that gives users visibility on the supply chain

These will enable supply chain members to take action and meet *real* demand, not just forecasts of demand.

5.2. Top Three proposals

Participants at the roundtables voted on their preferred proposals. 24 participants voted. The following table shows the order of preference for these proposals and their scores. A higher score indicates greater preference. Note that an 8th proposal related to declaring transportation as an essential service was not voted on, as it was deemed to fall outside Transport Canada's mandate and was anyway problematic given the absence of participation at the event from the labour sector.

Rank	Related to problem:	Proposal	Score (out of 7)
1	C and E	**Invest in improving port capacity**	**5.5**
2	C	**Digital twinning to help improve the reliability and speed of permitting**	**3.9**
3	B	**Planning tools for road transportation that account for congestion and border wait times**	**3.7**
4	A	Standardize CBSA's application of its policies and inspection processes	3.5
5	A	Maintain the St. Lawrence Seaway open year-round	2.7
6	F	Develop, promulgate, and share useful supply chain metrics	2.5+
7	D	Provide fiscal (e.g., tax) incentives to help cover cost of building surge capacity	2.5

These proposals have *three things in common*:

- all need **policy change** to achieve them
- all involve **increasing speed and throughput**
- all consist of **relieving or removing constraints**

5.3. Analysis of Top Three

1. Invest in improving port capacity

Participants expressed strong support for building and investing in port capacity.[2] They suggested increasing the number of inland ports and the size of facilities; port automation; accelerating the approval and building process of port facilities; and adding railway crews, jumbo boxcars, and locomotives at ports. Participants also suggested improving the collective bargaining process with port workers.

Pros: Increased port capacity will lead to more demand[3], more work, and higher GDP.

Cons: excess rail capacity during down periods, increased tension with environmental and Indigenous groups (because of the faster pace of building), and possible compromise of workers' rights.

Innovation: continue with expanding throughput capacity and improve the labour framework while continuing to work on solutions.

2. Digital twinning to help improve the reliability and speed of permitting

Participants cited cases where the licensing or permitting processes created delays, uncertainty, and complexity. This applies in many situations, from transporting dangerous goods (e.g., medical isotopes) to approving railway construction or any infrastructure that touches water.

The delays represent idle (i.e., lost) time. The waiting and uncertainty obstruct the deployment of capital, increase costs, and create an inability to plan for capacity expansion to meet exponential growth in demand.[4]

Participants concentrated more on the innovation than they did on solutions and their con's, or the pro's in the current process.

Innovation: conduct rules-based digital twinning of the permitting processes in order to gauge whether, and if so how much, permitting delays are acting as a constraint on supply chains' throughput. Use the results of this work for accountability purposes, and as evidence of need to accelerate the permitting process itself.

---

2. Comment: It is possible that constraints at a given port are not caused by insufficient infrastructure, but from problems described by Dr. Barnard's "focusing step" No. 2 (see above). If so, adding physical capacity should be considered only after "focusing step" No. 3 has been completed.
3. The means by which demand would be stimulated by increasing capacity was not elaborated upon.
4. Observation: This can be a major problem. As Dr. Barnard explained, exponential growth in demand requires exponential growth in supply, otherwise the fast-expanding gap between them will be extremely hard to close.

Pros: This would not circumvent existing requirements, but would provide a basis and a motivation for reaching decisions much more quickly.[5]

This still leaves decision-making power in the hands of the regulator, but adds a new layer of predictability, accountability, and transparency to the process. Pairing AI with the digital twin could significantly accelerate things, and analyze a much larger array of data to arrive at a determination.

Cons: the proposed solution may lead to a perception that corners are being cut, that there is a sacrifice of control by politicians and regulators, and that it would add difficulty in communicating to the public in order to gain social acceptance on projects. Also, regulators may resist this change because it could put their regulatory decisions in question if the digital twin suggests the opposite.

3. Planning tools for road transportation that account for congestion and border wait times

Participants said that programs such as Customs Self-Assessment (CSA) and Trusted Trader have potentially-material benefits for supply chains. However, the benefits are nullified if trucks are stuck in congestion as they make their way to the CBSA port of entry's fast lanes. Participants said we must find a better way for trucks to *reach* the port of entry. They proposed that the government develop an AI-based solution to identify more efficient and reliable ways of reaching a border crossing.

Pros: This could enable shifting of truck schedules to have them arrive at port of entries during off-peak hours, or make use of alternate ports of entry. That may result in a longer route distance-wise, but less travel time in total if the extra distance is offset by a faster border crossing.

Cons: Alternative or secondary ports of entry may not be adequately staffed-up or physically able to receive overflow traffic from the main port of entry.

Innovation: CBSA staffing allocation could be made dynamic and predictive enough to adapt when the planning tool stimulates a surge in traffic at a secondary port of entry.

6. Cross-cutting themes

Urgency

Linear growth rates matter less than exponential growth dynamics. For example, urban populations will double in about twenty years. Industrial outputs sometimes double in a decade. In the final years of a doubling, the amount of growth can be shocking. Participants stressed: we do not have the time we think we do.

Leadership and courage

Leadership and courage in this policy space consist of making decisions at the speed of global competition.

5. Comment: This is consistent with Dr. Barnard's solution to the insidious problem of delays often being "priced in" and tolerated. The solution is to determine the *cost per day* of a delay, make it visible, and hold the creator of the delay accountable for the accumulating cost.

Innovation

Participants said they valued innovation, which, as Dr. Barnard described needs to:

- retain the positive features of the status quo
- minimize or eliminate the negative features of the proposed change

Protective capacity

Systems operating near maximum utilization tend to fail catastrophically during shocks. They need "protective capacity"—capacity that can be brought on-line quickly when the primary system's performance collapses and its baseline service needs to be restored. Such capacity must be intentionally built into the infrastructure and the system's operating resources.[6]

7. Tensions Identified

- labour rights *vs*. reliability of essential services
- local optimization *vs*. national strategic priorities
- project acceleration *vs*. due-process in permitting
- Cost considerations *vs*. protective capacity
- National policy *vs*. competitiveness on a North American scale

8. Unanimous agreement

1. There was essentially unanimous acceptance that the national framework for improving supply chain performance should be based on identifying and removing constraints.
2. There was essentially unanimous agreement that government has a legitimate and vital role working with industry and other players to find and fix supply chain constraints — constraints that:
   - government itself has created by legislation, regulation, and its own operating practices and priorities.
   - arise in the marketplace from resistance by individual firms to pay for things that benefit everyone, like providing surge capacity, minimizing variation, and sharing data.
3. There was essentially unanimous agreement on the need for further work using digital twins:
   - to assess the effect of permitting delays on proposed investments in throughput capacity to meet growing demand.
   - to determine country-wide improvements needed to increase throughput at ports.

---

6. It is similar in concept to "surge capacity" but with a difference. But surge capacity is intended for meeting capacity requirements *above* steady-state, while "protective capacity" is intended for counteracting or recovering from a loss of capacity, in other words *below* steady-state.

in conditions that might never materialize. Surge capacity is generally intended to be used from time to time, e.g., for cyclical peaks in demand, to add throughput capability on top of existing baseline levels.

4. There was essentially universal acceptance of a common language for expressing and understanding the meaning and significance of concepts described by Dr. Barnard like constraints, throughput, exponential growth, and the Rule of 70.
5. There was clear consensus that customs delays and labour disruptions are likely to be significant constraints on speed and throughput of goods-movement at certain times and places—constraints that almost certainly would, and do, suppress supply chain performance to the detriment of Canada's economy.

   There was essentially unanimous acknowledgement that relieving these particular constraints is not within Transport Canada's mandate, but nevertheless participants were seized with the need for drawing them to the attention of relevant government agencies and being made a high priority on the government's economic agenda.

9. Conclusion

Participants agreed that Canada's transportation ecosystem is drifting toward irrelevance in the absence of deliberate intervention, especially by the federal government. The system's inertia—regulatory, cultural, and operational—is itself a growing constraint.

Nevertheless, optimism was high. With clear goals, focused removal of constraints, and willingness to experiment, Canada can:

- regain competitiveness.
- expand our global market share.
- build infrastructure that matches our economic ambition.

Bold leadership will determine whether Canada becomes a global logistics force or merely a resource nation whose upside is constrained by its limited ability to move goods to market.

10. Whole of government

Relevance of findings to CBSA and to Employment and Social Development Canada

This Critical Conversation™ was conceived to provide insight for Transport Canada about constraints in Canada's national system of getting goods to market—constraints that are within TC's remit to alleviate with the policy tools at its disposal, if necessary through its access to Parliament and Cabinet if legislation or regulations need changing.

Participants also found that other important constraints are likely to exist, which are within the remit of two other government agencies: Canada Border Services Agency, and Employment and Social Development Canada.

If those constraints are not prevented or alleviated, supply chains will not improve very much and the policy instruments under those two agencies' remit will, at various times and places, become a constraint on getting goods to market—if they are not so already.

It is not enough to optimize only the goods-moving network as an integrated system, rather than as the sum of its parts. Federal policy and regulations that affect the national goods-moving network also need to be optimized as a whole-of-government system, not treated as the sum of their separate policy and regulatory elements, as they are now.

Participants invited and encouraged consideration by these two agencies of engaging in discussions like the one described in this "What We Heard" report. Participants submit that doing so will help shape these agencies' perception of what needs to be done.

11. Acknowledgements

To the senior executives who travelled and took time from their busy schedules to participate in the event, and who devoted serious executive attention and insight to the subject. They are listed in Annex B.

To keynote speaker the Honourable Lisa Raitt, co-chair of Coalition for a Better Future and Vice-Chair of Global Investment Banking of CIBC, for her ongoing work reflected in her presentation at this event, bringing Canadians to recognize and act on the urgent need for change in this disruptive commercial and government policy space.

To keynote speaker Dr. Alan Barnard, CEO of Goldratt Research Labs, for sharing his knowledge, wisdom, and experience with the participants, and for devoting many hours with the organizing committee to plan the event.

To roundtable moderators and note-takers: Bob Armstrong (CILTNA), Bob Ballantyne (Freight Management Association), Cindy Hick (HPB Management and Freight Management Association), Alain Lumbroso, and Shauna McMillan (CILTNA).

To the organizing committee: Bob Armstrong, Kristine Burr (CILTNA), John Coleman (Carleton University and CILTNA), Cindy Hick, Shauna McMillan, Paul Miller (CILTNA), Dr. Marc Rioux (Carleton University), and Rebecca Whelan (CILTNA).

To colleagues of the organizing committee who helped identify and attract participants for the event: Bob Armstrong, Bob Ballantyne, Dr. Alan Barnard, Hon. Perrin Beatty, Cathy Campbell (Responsible Distribution Canada), Phil Cartwright (Global Public Affairs), John Corey (Freight Management Association), Cindy Hick, Carol Hochu (Tire and Rubber Association of Canada), Derrick Hynes (National Maritime Group), Ben McArthur (Forest Products Association of Canada), Shauna McMillan, David Montpetit (Western Canada Shippers Coalition), Marian Robson (CILTNA), Bruce Rodgers (CIFFA), Marc Roy (Sandstone Group), Ted Salter (KPMG), and Jonathan Thibault (Railway Association of Canada).

Annex A: Problems and solutions identified at all the tables

*Items in red achieved consensus at the tables – those in **bold red** were the 3 most popular. Items are listed alphabetically*

Problem / need: Investments in Infrastructure

1. **Digital twinning to help improve the reliability and speed of permitting**
2. Enforce regulations and use fines and penalties to pay for resources and investments
3. Fast, predictable regulatory approvals with clear, legally mandated requirements and timelines
4. Have governments decide on projects, permitting and financing but then turn to the private sector to deliver the project in a PPP model
5. Improve regulatory framework, government investments and speed up project processes
6. Increase power supply and pumping capacity in the North Thompson region for TMX
7. Provide fiscal (e.g., tax) incentives to help cover cost of building surge capacity

Problem / need: Navigation

8. Dredge the Second Narrows waterway (Vancouver)
9. Maintain the St. Lawrence Seaway open year-round
10. Make physical changes to port channels and infrastructure to allow for larger ships and update port policy
11. Use short sea shipping as an alternative or complement to rail

Problem / need: Ports

12. Create fast lanes for critical healthcare diagnosis products at ports and terminals
13. **Invest in improving port capacity**
14. Synchronize customer inventory with optimized tailgating inspections

Problem / need: Railways

15. Charge the user of interswitching a capital investment fee
16. Regulatory changes to allow single crew or autonomous locomotives
17. Reduce congestion at rail yards due to train metering and vessel scheduling

Problem / need: Supply Chain Management

18. Develop a transhipment framework between shippers, railways and government to outline true capacity and constraints
19. Develop, promulgate, and share useful supply chain metrics
20. Simplified end to end system for exports and imports
21. Vessel tracking to optimize storage

Problem / need: Trucking

22. Allow technology-agnostic emission reduction regulations to dominate rather than mandating electric vehicles
23. Create national standards for trucking to improve safety, driver quality and level the playing field
24. **Planning tools for road transportation that account for congestion and border wait times**

The following problems / needs were considered important at roundtable(s), but in keeping this Critical Conversation™ scope being limited to goods-movement problems that can be dealt with by policy tools available to Transport Canada, this "What Was Heard" report acknowledges, but does not further explore, goods-movement problems that need to be dealt with by other government departments and agencies, in this case CBSA and Employment and Social Development Canada. But we commend them to those agencies' attention, not least because they were considered important by senior industry executives at the roundtables.

CBSA

25. Improve CBSA inspections through the use of technology, remote cameras and make greater use of local law enforcement
26. Mandate CBSA to allow the in-bond movement of containers to be inspected at an inland terminal
27. Standardize CBSA's application of its policies and inspection processes

Labour

28. Expand port marine and rail capacity while improving labour framework to reduce labour disruptions
29. Name railways and ports as essential services and guarantee mediation to insure a fair deal for labour and management

Annex B: Participants in the Critical Conversation™

Serge Auclair	St. Lawrence Seaway Management Corporation
Chris Bachinski	GHY International
Robert Bellisle	QSL
Marc Bibeau	Overseas Express Consolidators
Scott Blacklock	BHP
Ted Brown	Fortigo Freight Services
Pierre-Louis Cartier	Interfor Corp.
Nathan Cato	CPKC
John Corey	Freight Management Association
Étienne Duchesne	Groupe Desgagnés
Sandra Ellis	CN
Jennifer Fox	General Motors Canada
Ian Hamilton	Hamilton-Oshawa Port Authority
Brian Holden	Ceva Logistics Canada
Bikram Kanjilal	Trans Mountain
Stephen Leask	BHP
Karl-Heinz Legler	Rutherford Global Logistics
Capt. Shri Madiwal	Vancouver Fraser Port Authority
Bruce Rodgers	CIFFA
Mathieu St-Pierre	SODES
Mark Seymour	Kriska Transportation Group
Terry Soulsby	Nordion Canada
Stephanie Snider	Trans Mountain
Anne Waldes	Trade Link International