



**DECISION MAKING IN PORT SELECTION FOR EXPORTING
COMPLETELY KNOCKED DOWN (CKD) AUTOMOTIVE
PARTS APPROACH OF AHP AND TOPSIS METHODS
A CASE STUDY OF PT. XYZ**

THESIS

**Submitted as one of the requirements to obtain
Magister Manajemen**

By

Zalal Bakti

023202005014

FACULTY OF BUSINESS

MASTER OF TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT STUDY

PROGRAM

CIKARANG

JULY, 2023

SIMILARITY INDEX REPORT

Master Project Zalal Bakti Pane

ORIGINALITY REPORT

14%

SIMILARITY INDEX

10%

INTERNET SOURCES

8%

PUBLICATIONS

5%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

1pdf.net

Internet Source

1%

2

Adi Saptari, Mohamad Toha, Supratman, Isa Bin Halim. "Multi-Criteria Decision Making on Supplier Selection in Supply Chain Network", 2020 IEEE International Conference on Sustainable Engineering and Creative Computing (ICSECC), 2020

Publication

1%

3

hj.diva-portal.org

Internet Source

1%

4

Alexander Benlian. "Is traditional, open-source, or on-demand first choice? Developing an AHP-based framework for the comparison of different software models in office suites selection", European Journal of Information Systems, 2017

Publication

<1%

5

Submitted to Liverpool John Moores University


Student Paper

<1%

GPT ZERO REPORT


Stats

Average Perplexity Score: 178.556



A document's perplexity is a measurement of the randomness of the text

Burstiness Score: 209.189



A document's burstiness is a measurement of the variation in perplexity

Your sentence with the highest perplexity, "*XYZ Thesis author: Zalal Bakti Studen*", has a perplexity of: 986

© 2022-2023 GPTZero

ABSTRAK

Studi ini dilakukan dalam sebuah perusahaan logistik yang mengkhususkan diri dalam ekspor suku cadang otomotif dalam bentuk CKD. Dengan ekspansi perusahaan di Indonesia, tugas penting untuk memilih pelabuhan yang paling cocok muncul. Tujuan utamanya adalah mengevaluasi dua pelabuhan potensial, yaitu Pelabuhan Tanjung Priok dan Cikarang Dryport, berdasarkan beberapa kriteria kritis seperti kualitas layanan, keterjangkauan, layanan pelanggan, infrastruktur, dan inovasi. Untuk mencapai penelitian ini menggunakan metode Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) dan Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) untuk pemilihan pelabuhan. Penelitian ini mengidentifikasi seperangkat lima kriteria utama dan dua puluh sub-kriteria untuk proses evaluasi. Melalui implementasi metode AHP, Pelabuhan Tanjung Priok mencapai skor 10.35, sementara Cikarang Dryport mencetak 9.65. Selain itu, analisis TOPSIS menghasilkan nilai 0.61 untuk Pelabuhan Tanjung Priok dan 0.38 untuk Cikarang Dryport. Akibatnya, berdasarkan temuan ini, Pelabuhan Tanjung Priok dianggap sebagai pilihan yang paling optimal bagi perusahaan. Hasil penelitian ini memberikan kontribusi signifikan dalam bidang pengambilan keputusan strategis dalam pemilihan pelabuhan, memungkinkan perusahaan logistik untuk meningkatkan efisiensi operasional dan optimasi biaya untuk ekspor CKD mereka. Selain itu, studi ini memberikan wawasan berharga tentang aplikasi praktis metode AHP dan TOPSIS dalam konteks pemilihan pelabuhan.

Keywords: *Port Selection, Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) , Strategic decision-making.*

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted within a logistics company specializing in the export of CKD automotive parts. With the company's expansion in Indonesia, the crucial task of selecting the most suitable port arose. The primary objective was to evaluate two potential ports, namely Tanjung Priok Port and Cikarang Dryport, based on several critical criteria such as service quality, affordability, customer service, infrastructure, and innovation. To accomplish this, the study employed the Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) and the Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) methods for port selection. The research identified a comprehensive set of five main criteria and twenty sub-criteria for the evaluation process. Through the implementation of the AHP method, Tanjung Priok Port achieved a score of 10.35, while Cikarang Dryport scored 9.65. Furthermore, the TOPSIS analysis resulted in a value of 0.61 for Tanjung Priok Port and 0.38 for Cikarang Dryport. Consequently, based on these findings, Tanjung Priok Port was determined to be the most optimal choice for the company. The outcomes of this research offer significant contributions to the field of strategic decision-making in port selection, enabling the logistics company to enhance operational efficiency and cost optimization for their CKD exports. Moreover, the study provides valuable insights into the practical application of AHP and TOPSIS methods within the context of port selection.

Keywords: *Port Selection, Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS) , Strategic decision-making.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PANEL OF EXAMINERS APPROVAL SHEET	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	v
SIMILARITY INDEX REPORT	vi
SCIENTIFIC PUBLICATION APPROVAL FOR ACADEMIC INTEREST	viii
ADVISOR APPROVAL FOR PUBLICATION	ix
ABSTRACT.....	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	xii
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xvii
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	3
1.3 Research Question.....	10
1.4 Research Objectives	11
1.5 Structure of the Thesis.....	13
CHAPTER 2	15
LITERATURE REVIEW	15
2.1 Completely Knocked Down (CKD).....	15
2.2 Global Supply Chain	16
2.3 Risk Management In Global Supply Chain.....	19

2.4	Transportation in Supply Chain	20
2.4.1	Water.....	21
2.4.2	Intermodal	22
2.5	Risk Management in Transportation.....	23
2.6	Seaport.....	24
2.7	Challenges of Seaport.....	25
2.7.1	Increase in Global Seaborne Trade	26
2.7.2	Urbanization.....	27
2.7.3	Congestions within the Seaport	28
2.7.4	Traffic Congestion around the Seaport	30
2.7.5	Long-term Storage	31
2.7.6	Short -Term Storage.....	31
2.7.7	Port Management Challenge.....	32
2.8	The Dry Port Concept	33
2.8.1	Intermodal Terminal	34
2.8.2	Situated Inland	35
2.8.3	Direct Rail Connection to a Specific Seaport	35
2.9	Types of Dry Port.....	35
2.9.1	Distant Dry Ports.....	36
2.9.2	Mid-Range Dry Ports.....	36
2.9.3	Close Dry Ports	37
2.10	Overview of Port Competitiveness	38
2.11	Multicriteria Decision Making.....	39
2.12	The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP).....	41
2.12.1	The Process	41

2.12.2	AHP Evaluation of Results	42
2.13	Technique for Order of Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS)	44
CHAPTER 3		46
RESEARCH METHOD.....		46
3.1	Research Design	46
3.2	Research Procedure	46
3.3	Research Flow Chart	47
3.4	Research Stage	49
3.4.1	Field Studies.....	49
3.4.2	Literature Study	49
3.4.3	Problem Identification and Formulation	49
3.4.4	Data Collection	50
3.4.5	Data Analysis	54
3.4.6	Result and Analysis.....	56
3.4.7	Conclusions and Suggestions.....	58
CHAPTER 4		60
RESULTS AND ANALYSIS		60
4.1	Company Profile	60
4.2	Data Collection.....	61
4.3	Port Data.....	62
4.3.1	Respondent Overview.....	62
4.3.2	Determine Port Criteria	64
4.3.3	Determine Port Sub Criteria	66
4.3.4	Port Selection Hierarchy Structure	74
4.3.5	Criteria Comparison	72

4.3.6 Port Assessment Questionnaire Results	73
4.4 Data Analysis	81
4.4.1 Analytical Hierarchy Process	81
4.4.2 Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS).....	125
4.4.3 Research Discussion	133
CHAPTER 5	139
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	139
5.1 CONCLUSION	139
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	141
REFERENCES	143
APPENDIX.....	147
APPENDIX .I PAIRWISE COMPARISON MATRIX RESULT BETWEEN CRITERIA	147
APPENDIX .II CALCULATION OF THE ANALYTIC HIERARCHY PROCESS (AHP)..	148
APPENDIX .III QUISTIONNAIRE.....	155

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2. 1 Seaport With a Distant Dry Port.....	36
Figure 2. 2 Seaport With a Mid-range Dry Port	37
Figure 2. 3 Seaport With a Closed Dry Port	38
Figure 3. 1 Research Flow Chart	48
Figure 4. 1 Port Selection Hierarchy Structure	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4. 1 List of candidate ports for PT. XYZ	62
Table 4. 2 Profile Data Obtained from Respondents for Questionnaire to Determine Weight of Criteria and Sub-Criteria.....	63
Table 4. 3 Criteria for selecting ports for PT. XYZ.....	64
Table 4. 4 Sub-Criteria of the Port Selection Criteria.....	67
Table 4. 5 Matriks Pairwise Comparison (Saaty,1993)	72
Table 4. 6 Results of Criteria Comparison Questionnaire	74
Table 4. 7 Results of the Comparison Questionnaire For Sub-Criteria	75
Table 4. 8 Quality Alternative Comparison Questionnaire Result	77
Table 4. 9 Price Alternative Comparison Questionnaire Result	78
Table 4. 10 Service Alternative Comparison Questionnaire Result	79
Table 4. 11 Infrastructure Alternative Comparison Questionnaire Result	80
Table 4. 12 Innovative Alternative Comparison Questionnaire Result	81
Table 4. 13 Pairwise Comparison Matrix Results Between Criteria From Respondent 1.....	82
Table 4. 14 Weight Average Result of Criteria	84
Table 4. 15 Geometric Mean Result of Criteria.....	85
Table 4. 16 Normalized Weight Each Criteria.....	86
Table 4. 17 Eigenvector Each Criteria.....	87
Table 4. 18 Eigenvalue Each Criteria	88

Table 4. 19 Random Index (Saaty, 1993)	89
Table 4. 20 Weight and Consistency Results of the Criteria Element Matrix	90
Table 4. 21 Matrix of Inter-Subcriteria Quality for Respondent 1	91
Table 4. 22 Average Weighting of Quality Subcriteria Respondent 1	91
Table 4. 23 Geometric Mean Quality Sub Criteria	92
Table 4. 24 Normalized Weight Quality Subcriteria	93
Table 4. 25 Eigenvector Quality Subcriteria.....	93
Table 4. 26 Eigenvalue Quality Subcriteria.....	94
Table 4. 27 Random Index (Saaty, 1993)	95
Table 4. 28 Weighting Calculation Results for the Quality Subcriteria	96
Table 4. 29 Weighting Calculation Results for the Price Subcriteria	97
Table 4. 30 Weighting Calculation Results for the Service Subcriteria	98
Table 4. 31 Weighting Calculation Results for the Infrastructure Subcriteria	99
Table 4. 32 Weighting Calculation Results for the Innovation Subcriteria.....	100
Table 4. 33 Weight and Consistency Matrix For the Subcriterion of Timely Delivery	101
Table 4. 34 Weight and Consistency Matrix Calculation for the Alternative Velocity of Document Processing.....	102
Table 4. 35 Weight and Consistency Matrix of the Alternative Document Management Simplicity.....	104
Table 4. 36 Weight and Consistency Matrix Calculation Results of the Alternative Guarantee of Security and Safety of Goods	105

Table 4. 37 Weight And Consistency Matrix Calculation Results of the Alternative Competitive Price	106
Table 4. 38 Weight and Consistency Matrix Calculation Results of the Alternative Negotiation	107
Table 4. 39 Weight and Consistency Matrix Calculation Results of the Alternative Payment Method	108
Table 4. 40 Weight and Consistency Matrix Calculation Results of the Alternative Price Breakdown	109
Table 4. 41 Weight and Consistency Matrix Results For the Alternative Criterion of Shipping Container Congestion.....	111
Table 4. 42 Weight and Consistency Matrix For The Alternative Criterion of "Provide The Required Information.....	111
Table 4. 43 Weight and Consistency Matrix of the Alternative Handling Dangerous Goods....	112
Table 4. 44 Weight and Consistency Matrix for the Alternative "The Rapidity of Complaint Response	113
Table 4. 45 Weight and Consistency Matrix for the Alternative Loading and Unloading Equipment.....	114
Table 4. 46 Weight and Consistency Matrix Calculation Results for the Alternative Stacking Area / Container Yard	115
Table 4. 47 Weight and Consistency Matrix Analysis Results for the Alternative Empty Container.....	116
Table 4. 48 Weight and Consistency Matrix Calculation for the Alternative Lighting.....	116
Table 4. 49 Weight and Consistency Matrix for the Alternative Tracking Device	117
Table 4. 50 Weight and Consistency Matrix of the Alternative Technological Advancement ..	118

Table 4. 51 Weight and Consistency Matrix of the Alternative Employee Technical Competence	119
Table 4. 52 Weight and Consistency Matrix of the Alternative Service Development.....	120
Table 4. 53 Results of the Partial Calculation Weights of the Sub-Criteria and Criteria	121
Table 4. 54 Results of Partial Weights for Each Sub-Criteria for Each Alternative Port.....	123
Table 4. 55 Table of Port Rankings Based on Final Weight	125
Table 4. 56 Weighted Values for Each Criterion, Sub-Criterion, and Port Alternative	126
Table 4. 57 Decision Normalization Matrix in Each Element.....	127
Table 4. 58 Weighted Decision Normalization Matrix.....	128
Table 4. 59 Positive Ideal Calculation Solution Matrix With Negative Ideal Solution Matrix for the On-time Delivery Sub Criterion.....	129
Table 4. 60 Determining the Distances Between the Values of Each Alternative and the Positive Ideal Solution (A^+) and Negative Ideal Solution (A^-)	131
Table 4. 61 Preference Values for Each Port Alternative	132
Table 4. 62 Final Weight Value of Subcriteria With Criteria Values of 0.20	134
Table 4. 63 Comparison of Results between AHP Method and TOPSIS Method	137