iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

MANAGING HIGH-VALUE AND TIME-SENSITIVE CARGO: A CRITICALITY-BASED FRAMEWORK FOR AIRPORT LOGISTICS, CUSTOMS COORDINATION, AND SUPPLY CHAIN RISK

Diego Fernandes de Oliveira
Logistics and Supply Chain Operations Professional

ABSTRACT

High-value and time-sensitive cargo requires logistics controls proportionate not only to monetary value but also to operational consequence, replacement difficulty, regulatory exposure, security risk, handling complexity, and downstream disruption. Existing standards address risk management, supply-chain security, business continuity, air-cargo handling, customs transit, and trade facilitation, but these controls are not always integrated into a single cargo-specific decision model. This study develops the **Cargo Criticality and Control Alignment Framework (C3AF)** through an applied documentary review of guidance issued by the International Organization for Standardization, International Air Transport Association, World Customs Organization, World Trade Organization, and Brazilian Federal Revenue Service. The reviewed controls were coded according to risk dimension, process stage, responsible function, required evidence, release dependency, and escalation trigger. The resulting framework combines a weighted Cargo Criticality Profile, three control-intensity tiers, minimum custody evidence, dependency-based scheduling, a four-level exception ladder, and a seven-stage operational cycle. The analysis indicates that high-value logistics should be managed as a risk-orchestration function rather than as premium transportation alone. The framework provides a reproducible basis for allocating controls, documenting handoffs, coordinating customs and transportation decisions, and measuring operational reliability. As a conceptual model, the C3AF requires empirical validation and organization-specific calibration before performance effects can be established.

Keywords:
High-Value Cargo; Airport Logistics; Cargo Security; Customs Transit; Risk-Based Control

INTRODUCTION

The movement of high-value and time-sensitive cargo requires a level of operational control that extends beyond conventional transportation planning.

The term **high value** is frequently associated with monetary value. Although financial exposure is relevant, it represents only one dimension of cargo criticality. A shipment may also be operationally critical because it is difficult to replace, vulnerable to theft or damage, subject to customs or regulatory controls, connected to a narrow installation window, or capable of interrupting a larger project when delayed.

Time sensitivity is similarly broader than perishability. A shipment may become time-critical because of:

- aircraft or terminal acceptance deadlines;
- customs-transit time limits;
- production schedules;
- project-installation windows;
- receiving-site availability;
- customer commitments;
- security considerations;
- limited replacement options;
- contractual dependencies.

High-value logistics must therefore combine speed, security, information accuracy, regulatory compliance, custody control, and continuity planning.

The International Air Transport Association's Cargo Handling Manual describes standardized procedures across the air-cargo chain, from booking and collection through carrier acceptance, airport handling, delivery, and proof of receipt [4]. Its 2026 edition also includes guidance concerning operational contingency planning.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

Information is equally important. The Air Waybill constitutes a central contract-of-carriage document between shipper and carrier, while IATA's e-freight and electronic Air Waybill initiatives seek to improve end-to-end information exchange and data quality across the air-cargo chain [8].

Customs procedures add a separate decision layer. The World Customs Organization defines customs transit as the movement of goods under customs control from one customs office to another [5]. Its SAFE Framework connects advance information, risk management, cargo integrity, business cooperation, and trade continuity within international supply chains [6].

The World Trade Organization's Trade Facilitation Agreement addresses the publication, simplification, advance processing, and coordination of procedures affecting importation, exportation, and transit [7]. At the national level, the Brazilian Federal Revenue Service maintains specific procedures governing customs-transit operations through the Siscomex Trânsito environment [9].

These operational requirements can also be examined through established management-system principles. ISO 31000 provides guidance for identifying, analyzing, evaluating, treating, monitoring, and communicating risk [1]. ISO 28000 addresses security-management systems, including aspects relevant to supply chains [2]. ISO 22301 addresses organizational preparation, response, continuity, and recovery following disruptive events [3].

These sources cover complementary aspects of complex logistics. However, organizations still require a practical method for deciding:

- how critical a particular shipment is;
- which controls should apply;
- what evidence must accompany each transfer;
- when cargo should be held rather than moved;
- who must be notified when a deviation occurs;
- how completed operations should be evaluated.

This study addresses that operational need by developing the **Cargo Criticality and Control Alignment Framework (C3AF)**.

The framework is based on a central proposition:

The intensity of logistics control should be determined by the consequences of failure, not by cargo price alone.

OBJECTIVES

2.1 General Objective

The general objective is to develop a practical, risk-based method for assigning documentation, transport, customs, custody, security and exception-response controls to high-value and time-sensitive shipments.

2.2 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives are to: (1) define cargo criticality across dimensions beyond price; (2) translate a criticality profile into proportionate control tiers without weakening mandatory requirements; (3) identify minimum evidence at custody handoffs; (4) incorporate customs and receiving dependencies into scheduling; (5) define escalation levels for disruptions; and (6) propose indicators for testing and calibration.

2.3 Research Question

How can organizations align the intensity of logistics controls with the operational consequences of failure while preserving mandatory customs, carrier, security and cargo-specific requirements?

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study uses an applied documentary review and conceptual framework development. It translates established risk, security, continuity, air-cargo and customs principles into an operational decision model for shipments whose failure could have disproportionate consequences.

3.2 Documentary Sources

Official publication records and publicly available institutional guidance from ISO, IATA, WCO, WTO and the Brazilian Federal Revenue Service were included when they addressed at least one of the following: risk, supply-chain security, continuity, air-cargo handling, data exchange, customs transit or cargo loss prevention [1]–[10]. Proprietary ISO standards and IATA manuals were examined through their public descriptions; the article does not claim access to or reproduce their full licensed texts.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

3.3 Analytical Procedure

The analysis proceeded in four steps. First, a generic shipment was decomposed into classification, preparation, control allocation, planning, handoff, movement, delivery and review. Second, possible consequences were grouped by financial exposure, time dependency, replaceability, regulatory exposure, security risk, handling complexity and downstream disruption. Third, published principles were mapped to an operational decision, responsible function, minimum evidence and exception trigger. Fourth, the mapping was synthesized into a criticality profile, three proposed control tiers, a custody evidence chain, an escalation ladder and a seven-stage cycle.

3.4 Analytical Boundaries

The resulting *findings* are conceptual outputs of the synthesis. The study did not use company transaction data, expert interviews, performance percentages or empirical validation. The proposed tiers and formula are internal decision aids, not WCO, ISO or IATA classifications. Requirements applicable to a particular cargo movement must be checked against the current law, carrier conditions and product instructions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Cargo Criticality Is Consequence-Based

Cargo price is not a sufficient proxy for operational consequence. A replaceable expensive item and a modestly priced but unique project component can call for different controls. Table 1 defines the proposed Cargo Criticality Profile (CCP).

Table 1 Cargo criticality dimensions

Dimension	Assessment question	Example of consequence
Financial exposure	What direct loss or liability could occur?	Replacement and claim cost
Time dependency	Is there a narrow acceptable delivery window?	Missed flight, installation or production
Replaceability	Can an equivalent item arrive in time?	Extended lead time or unique specification
Regulatory exposure	Does a controlled procedure apply?	Hold or failed customs transit
Security exposure	Is diversion, theft or tampering plausible?	Loss or compromised cargo integrity
Handling complexity	Are special methods or equipment necessary?	Damage or carrier refusal
Downstream impact	Does another operation depend on receipt?	Interrupted project or service

4.2 Cargo Criticality and Control Alignment Framework

For a particular shipment, an organization could assign scores from 0 (immaterial) to 3 (critical) to these dimensions and use documented weights to calculate an indicative criticality value: $\mathbf{K = \Sigma(w_j \times s_j)}$, where the weights sum to one. The equation exposes assumptions; it is not a validated predictor of loss. The scales, weights and thresholds require calibration to cargo mix and documented risk tolerance. A composite score must never override a legal or technical condition.

The Cargo Criticality and Control Alignment Framework (C3AF) connects that Cargo Criticality Profile (CCP) to a written Control Allocation Plan (CAP). The plan records the approved control level, responsible persons, evidence to be retained, applicable exceptions and circumstances requiring reassessment. In this way, control intensity can be explained and audited for each shipment, including cases in which modest monetary value masks severe project or time consequences.

4.3 Control-Intensity Tiers

The three proposed internal tiers in Table 2 organize a proportional response. They do not confer certification or substitute for a binding requirement [1], [2].

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

Table 2 Proposed control tiers

Tier	Situation	Illustrative control package
1 Controlled	Standard procedures cover foreseeable consequences	Identity and document checks, confirmed schedule, proof of receipt
2 Enhanced	Failure may materially affect delivery, security or a customer dependency	Approved provider, route review, named escalation contacts, enhanced handoff evidence
3 Critical	Failure could have severe regulatory, security or downstream effects	Authorized movement decision, restricted custody, active status visibility where feasible, documented contingency

The rule is **Applicable tier = the higher of the risk-indicated tier and any mandatory minimum tier**. This is a policy rule, not a mathematical finding. It prevents a low aggregate score from relaxing a customs restriction, carrier condition, security requirement or product-specific handling instruction. The CAP should identify who approved the tier, which controls apply, the records required and when reassessment is necessary.

4.4 Information Readiness Precedes Controlled Movement

Physical cargo availability does not establish information readiness. Air Waybill data, commercial documents, consignment identity, weight, special instructions and consignee information can determine whether a shipment is accepted or correctly delivered [4], [8]. An inconsistency can cause a missed acceptance window or hold even when a vehicle is waiting.

The information-readiness check should cover the Air Waybill, commercial documents, cargo identifiers, weight and dimensions, special-handling instructions, authorized consignee and applicable customs data. It should identify who can correct inconsistencies and whether a correction changes the acceptance slot or route. The operational release decision requires positive confirmation of the relevant information rather than an assumption that physical availability makes the cargo ready.

4.5 Customs Status Is a Transportation Constraint

Customs transit is a legally controlled process. The WCO Revised Kyoto Convention assigns responsibilities for bringing goods to the destination customs office under applicable conditions [5]. The WTO agreement addresses documentation and transit formalities [7]. A national procedure, such as the Brazilian customs-transit regime, adds local status and participant requirements [9]. The C3AF therefore requires the CAP to identify which legal status must be confirmed before dispatch. Customs officials retain customs authority; an internal operations sign-off cannot replace it.

For a controlled movement, planning must identify authorization timing, approved origin and destination, transporter and guarantee requirements where applicable, and arrival and completion obligations. This makes customs status a real transportation prerequisite rather than a document checked after dispatch.

4.6 Custody Transfers Require Positive Evidence

At each handoff, the proposed Custody Evidence Chain (CEC) captures shipment identity, quantity, apparent condition, packaging or seal status where applicable, releasing and authorized receiving parties, place, time, associated records and known exceptions. The participant in physical possession may lack authority to change a customs route or resolve a security incident. A handoff record should therefore identify the relevant decision contact as well as the holder. The WCO SAFE Framework and ISO 28000 provide the security context for such traceability [2], [6]; IATA also publishes a cargo claims and loss-prevention handbook [10].

Positive evidence should identify the releasing party and authorized recipient, establish when responsibility transferred, and record discrepancies before they become untraceable. Depending on the shipment, seal numbers, signatures, photographs, system records or location data may supplement the record. The evidence needed should follow the criticality profile without implying that any single technology guarantees cargo integrity.

4.7 Scheduling Requires Dependency Control

Schedules should record predecessor conditions as well as times. Collection may depend on cargo release and corrected documents; airport acceptance on terminal availability and a cut-off; departure on carrier acceptance or customs authorization; delivery on the receiver's availability. If a prerequisite changes, the planned route and control tier should be reconsidered rather than merely updating the estimated arrival time.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

The schedule should name the owner of each dependency, the last point at which a delay can be recovered, and a controlled fallback. This lets teams distinguish a recoverable local change from an event affecting customs status, cargo security or the final receiving window.

4.8 Exception Escalation Ladder

The proposed Exception Escalation Ladder distinguishes four levels: Level 1, a local correction with no material effect; Level 2, a deviation requiring coordination across functions; Level 3, damage, loss of visibility, customs irregularity or unauthorized access requiring a hold and management decision; and Level 4, a continuity event such as an airport closure or major system failure requiring a contingency response. Each level requires an event record, responsible decision-maker and documented closure. These are proposed internal categories inspired by continuity principles [3], not categories prescribed by ISO.

Escalation thresholds should be agreed before dispatch. A delayed vehicle may be a Level 1 event if the receiving window remains open, but a Level 2 or Level 3 event when it jeopardizes a terminal cut-off or controlled customs movement. Predefined thresholds improve decision speed while maintaining accountability.

4.9 Seven-Stage Integrated Operational Framework

The complete cycle is: **(1) classify cargo; (2) allocate controls; (3) prepare documents and customs information; (4) plan transport and dependencies; (5) release and document custody; (6) monitor and manage exceptions; (7) confirm delivery and review the operation.** Each stage supplies evidence needed by the next. A material change in cargo, route, legal status or receiving capacity triggers a reassessment of the applicable controls.

4.10 Performance Measurement and Scalability

Implementation could measure the percentage of shipments accepted without document correction, the proportion executed with all controls in the CAP, complete handoffs, customs-related delays, Level 3 response time, delivery discrepancies and complete operation closures. Indicators need denominators and locally established baselines before targets are set. Without measured baseline and follow-up records, no cost or reliability improvement can be attributed to the C3AF.

Repeatable checklists, approved provider criteria, risk-classification guidance, handoff records and escalation matrices can turn individual judgment into an organizational process. Professional discretion remains necessary, particularly where an unusual cargo or changing conditions make the standard controls insufficient.

4.11 Practical Application and Limitations

The framework is designed for adaptation to airport cargo, project-critical components and other shipments with disproportionate consequences of failure. Its conceptual nature limits the conclusions. Weights, score thresholds, evaluator agreement and the relationship between control tier and actual outcomes have not been tested. A pilot should use contemporaneous shipment records and compare classification consistency, compliance with allocated controls and exception outcomes. The framework cannot replace carrier rules, customs instructions, technical specifications or a security management system.

CONCLUSION

This study examined how logistics organizations can classify high-value and time-sensitive cargo according to its operational consequences and align that classification with proportionate documentation, customs, security, custody, transportation, and exception-management controls.

The documentary analysis demonstrates that monetary value alone is insufficient for determining logistics-control intensity. Cargo criticality may also result from time dependency, replacement difficulty, regulatory exposure, security vulnerability, handling complexity, and downstream operational consequences.

The study therefore proposes the **Cargo Criticality and Control Alignment Framework**.

The C3AF connects four operational mechanisms:

1. a multidimensional Cargo Criticality Profile;
2. a tiered Control Allocation Plan;
3. a documented Custody Evidence Chain;
4. a four-level Exception Escalation Ladder.

These mechanisms operate through a seven-stage cycle covering classification, control allocation, information and customs preparation, transportation planning, controlled custody, exception management, delivery, and operational review.

The central contribution of the framework is the explicit connection between consequence and control:

The greater the consequence of logistics failure, the stronger the required control, evidence, authority, and contingency structure should be.

iJETRM
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH & MANAGEMENT (IJETRM)
https://ijetrm.com/

The framework also establishes a mandatory-control override so that legal, customs, security, or technical requirements cannot be weakened by a low composite score.
By connecting cargo classification with operational evidence and escalation, the C3AF transforms high-value logistics from a collection of isolated transportation activities into a structured risk-orchestration process.
The framework remains conceptual and requires organization-specific calibration and empirical validation. It should not be treated as a substitute for applicable regulations, carrier requirements, customs instructions, contracts, security procedures, or technical standards.
Future studies can evaluate the model using real operational datasets and compare documentation accuracy, custody completeness, exception-response time, customs delays, delivery discrepancies, and recurrence rates across cargo categories and control tiers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author acknowledges the publicly available standards information and institutional guidance issued by the International Organization for Standardization, International Air Transport Association, World Customs Organization, World Trade Organization, and Brazilian Federal Revenue Service.
These materials provided the documentary foundation for the analytical framework developed in this study.
Reference to these organizations does not imply their endorsement of the Cargo Criticality and Control Alignment Framework, its interpretation, or the conclusions presented by the author.

REFERENCES

1) International Organization for Standardization, *ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management Guidelines*, 2018. https://www.iso.org/standard/65694.html
2) International Organization for Standardization, *ISO 28000:2022 Security and Resilience Security Management Systems Requirements*, 2022. https://www.iso.org/standard/79612.html
3) International Organization for Standardization, *ISO 22301:2019 Security and Resilience Business Continuity Management Systems Requirements*, 2019. https://www.iso.org/standard/75106.html
4) International Air Transport Association, *IATA Cargo Handling Manual*, 10th ed., 2026. https://www.iata.org/en/publications/manuals/iata-cargo-handling-manual/
5) World Customs Organization, *Revised Kyoto Convention Specific Annex E Chapter 1 Customs Transit*. https://www.wcoomd.org/en/topics/facilitation/instrument-and-tools/conventions/pf_revised_kyoto_conv/~/link.aspx?_id=7D0DBF5C6D5E4A44A2211C94F8656DDC
6) World Customs Organization, *SAFE Framework of Standards to Secure and Facilitate Global Trade*, June 2025. https://www.wcoomd.org/-/media/wco/public/global/pdf/topics/facilitation/instruments-and-tools/tools/safe-package/safe-framework-2025_en.pdf
7) World Trade Organization, *Agreement on Trade Facilitation*, Arts. 9–11. https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/tfa-nov14_e.htm
8) International Air Transport Association, *e-freight and Electronic Air Waybill*. https://www.iata.org/en/programs/cargo/e/efreight/
9) Receita Federal do Brasil, *Manual do Trânsito Aduaneiro de Importação*. https://www.gov.br/receitafederal/pt-br/assuntos/aduana-e-comercio-exterior/manuais/transito-aduaneiro
10) International Air Transport Association, *Cargo Claims and Loss Prevention Handbook*. https://www.iata.org/en/publications/manuals/cargo-claims-and-loss-prevention-handbook/

