ISAHP 1999, Kobe, Japan, August, 12-14, 1999

INTEGRATION OF THE AHP AND SWOT ANALYSIS FOR PORT COMPETITION EVALUATION IN THE EASTERN ASIAN REGION

*Wen-Chih HUANG, **Junn-Yuan TENG, *Miin-Jye HUANG and *Sheng-Chieh WU
*Dept. of Harbor and River Engineering, National Taiwan Ocean University
P. O. Box 7-107 Keelung, 202, Taiwan.
**Dept. of Industrial Management, Huafan University
Shihdin Hsiang Taipei County, 223, Taiwan
*huangwc@ntou66.ntou.edu.tw / **jyteng@huafan.hfu.edu.tw

Abstract: This paper proposes an evaluation model to evaluate the competition among international ports in the Eastern Asian Region. The proposed model is combination of Analytic Hierarchy Process and SWOT analysis to evaluate competitive ports. The evaluation hierarchical structure of port competition is composed of eight levels. At the third level, we combine SWOT into the evaluation system. Strengths and weaknesses are internal environments. Opportunities and threats are external environments. There are eleven evaluation criteria are considered in the model, and each of criterion has one or more sub-criterion. There are eight competitive ports as Keelung, Taichung, Kaohsiung, Kobe, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Pusan and Singapore are considered. According to the results of AHP questionnaire survey and the evaluation method put forward in this paper can be utilized to conduct the comparison of the outranking of these eight competitive ports.

Introduction

Competition is a terminology of economics, it appears in many papers, books and reports. These literatures could be classified into two levels. At the business operation level, business competition dominance is discussed. Where, some talk about individual industry and business global competition. They emphasize that businesses must improve their quality of management and strategy (Tang et al, 1995), cost and quality (Hamel et al, 1988), and methods to maintain a competitive advantage(Rothschild, 1984). Some discuss the core competence of businesses (Hamel et al, 1994). Core competence, submitted by Hamel in 1990, is applied to the study of market share and market position. Others study the competitive strategies of industry, country and cooperation (see Hood, 1988). The above-mentioned literature starts from the viewpoint of business competition. On the country level, some literature discuss international trade and fair trade for multinational business (see OECD, 1984). Porter's. publication, Competition.Advantages of nations, discusses the competition of nations and business from ten competitive countries (1990). When it comes to the assessment of countries competitiveness, we all know The Competitiveness Yearbook published by the International Institute for Management Development. To take the 1997 yearbook (IMD, 1997) for example, it considers domestic economy, internationalization, government, finance, infrastructure, management, science and technology, and people as the eight factors of competitiveness. These factors include 244 criteria (indicators). The indicator data consists of soft data and hard data. There are 84 items of soft data, compiled through a questionnaire survey of 2515 businessmen, and 160 items of hard data collected from official and non-official statistics over 46 countries and areas. A scoring method was used to calculate performance and ranks. The characteristics of multiple criteria, qualitative and quantitative are among these items.

SWOT analysis considers the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats as evaluation factors. Strengths and weaknesses are internal environments, while opportunities and threats are the external environments. The SWOT matrix includes four groups of factors: SO, ST, WO, and WT. According to the SWOT matrix, one could propose a future strategy. SWOT is generally used in situational analysis (see Weihrich, 1980). No quantitative data analysis is included. The local studies on port competition analysis applied the SWOT method to generate developing strategies (Keelung Harbor, 1998; Taichung Harbor,

1998; Kaohsiung Harbor, 1998; Lin, 1998). These studies consider the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats as four objectives individually and then derive some criteria. The criteria were quite different between the two ports. For example, the location of a port could be the strength for one port, but could be the weakness for another. SWOT analysis cannot express the degree of importance among the four factors and criteria or indicators under these factors. One cannot compare the dominance of these ports. This is the disadvantage of SWOT analysis.

Many studies have used AHP in transportation projects. Saaty (1988) formulated the AHP model to select Keelung, Taichung, and Kaohsiung harbors in Taiwan. Sharp (1987) applied AHP in the hauler selection. Bagchi (1989) used it to construct maritime carrier selection model. The local Institute of Transportation (1998) used it to evaluate the competition of international airports. The AHP method is a relatively young theory. Some of the topics on which researches concentrate are; economic/ management problems, political problems, social problems and technological problems (Vargas, 1990). AHP can deal with a variety of problems (Saaty, 1980) and combine the qualitative and quantitative criteria (Wedley, 1990). For competition problems, AHP can deal with predictions on behavior in chess (Saaty *et al*, 1980), portfolios in competition (Lauro *et al*, 1986), and competition dominance in businesses (Tang *et al*, 1995). The characteristics of port competition are as follows: (1) multiple criteria and indicators, (2) hierarchical evaluation criteria, (3) combining qualitative and quantitative criteria, (4) covering positive (effectiveness, strength, and opportunity) factors and negative (cost, weakness, and threat) factors, and (5) reflecting weights of criteria. Essentially, ports competition is a topic of multi-criteria decision-making problem, rather than a single objective problem.

In order to prevent the disadvantages of SWOT analysis and make use of AHP, this study applied the ideas of SWOT and integrated AHP together. The evaluation criteria are divided into two groups. Hardware and software facilities, operational efficiency, port management style, service charge, comprehensive plan, development style, and so on are internal factors under the strength and weakness factors. Political/economic stability and economic productivity of hinterland are external factors under the opportunity and threat factors.

Outline of Port Competition Hierarchical Analytic Structure

This paper applies SWOT concept integrated in AHP hierarchy structure as analytic model. Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats of SWOT as four factors are merged in the hierarchy structure. The method of design of hierarchy can refer to Vargas' paper (1990). Hierarchy design involves three interrelated processes: level and element identification, concept definition, and question formulation. The analysis process in this case is the same as Vargas, and describes as follow:

1. Construct Hierarchical Analytic Structure

The hierarchical structure involves eight levels; overall objective, environments, factors, concerns, goals, criteria, sub-criteria, and competitive ports (Figure 1.). Where, internal environment involves two factors and links to the three individual concerns. Two factors are strengths and weaknesses, and the three concerns are manpower, organization, and physical facilities. External environment involves opportunities, threats two factors, and politic, society, economy, and links to the four finance concerns.

2.Select Criteria

(1)Factors that affect port competition

The measurement of port operational performance has to be considered from the following three viewpoints: A. comparison among container terminals or berths in the same port, B. analysis of operational performance and competition among ports within an area and a country, C. analysis of competition among international ports. Comparisons among different container terminals or berths belong to the operational performance measurement, i.e. operational efficiency. When discussing competition analysis among domestic or international ports, we must consider both the operational efficiency and total

economical effectiveness of the ports contributing to the area and assessing the goal achievement. Competition analysis of international ports, this study is based on inter-port competition.

Maritime carriers are the customers of ports. Carriers create their maximum benefit by selecting suitable ports. To judge if ports are competitive, the factors carriers consider are as follows (Evergreen, 1998): A. size of hinterland and cargo source of ports, B. wharf hardware and software, C. national situation of ports, D. port operational strategies, E. laws and regulations. From the logistics operators' point of view, the factors they consider for selecting a transfer and distribution base are as follows: A. operational cost, B. just in time, C. Ship schedule and network density, High efficient processes. To sum up, cost and efficiency are mutual consideration of carriers and logistics operators.

(2) Category of evaluation indicators

There are several studies on the evaluation indicators of ports(Hsieh, 1995; Chen, 1993; Ho, 1983; Ni, 1993; Huang, 1997; Hsu, 1996). Moreover, Huang (1997) separated these indicators into two parts: efficiency and effectiveness. Effectiveness indicators involve the degree of congestion, ships' waiting time in port (without cost consideration), total cost, and IND (with cost consideration). Efficiency indicators include two parts: ship/berth indicators and container terminal indicators. The details are average service time for ships, ship average loading and discharge time, and ship average waiting time, container loading and discharge machine operational efficiency, container claim rate, terminal land use efficiency, movement capacity, and container process capacity.

(3) Select competition evaluation criteria

After taking several rules into consideration, such as: the comparison basis, quantification, and degree of difficulty, unification, and so on. This paper proposes eleven goals and thirty-one criteria or sub-criteria under seven concerns (see Figure 1.).

3.Question Formulation and Questionnaire Survey

This paper considered some issues in the question formulation phase: A. paired comparison for each level of factors and criteria. B. Scale of performance for each criteria; quantitative data are from official and non-official statistic, and measurement of non-quantitative criteria are questionnaire survey judged subjectively by experts. All questions should be answerable and consistent with the existing information (Vargas, 1990). C. Supply hierarchic structure chart and detail instructions of criteria. D. Provide experts with background information on competitive ports.

4. Hierarchy Evaluation

This step involves computing the total score for each port. The criteria weights, that is the representation of experts' preference, and port performance have been surveyed and collected. Then, except for AHP, the synthesis process could use many methods to produce the final score for each port. For example, Simple Additive Weighting (SAW) method, and Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution (TOPSIS), and so on. According to the total score for each port, we can compare and produce the order of the ports.

Numerical Example

This paper selects Keelung, Taichung, Kaohsiung, Kobe, Hong Kong, Shanghai, Pusan, and Singapore, the eight Eastern Asian Region ports as a numerical example. The numerical example is used to demonstrate the computational process of the proposed model proposed.

Step 1. construct hierarchical analytic structure: The structure involves eight levels, and thirty-one evaluation criteria (Figure 1.).

Step 2.select criteria: The criteria include efficiency and effectiveness groups, a total of thirty-one items (Table 1.).

Step 3.questionniare survey: We received ten questionnaires from officials, experts, and carrier leaders.

Step 4.evaluation: This paper computes the weight of the items in each level, including eight ports in the Eastern Asian Region. The order of the ports using SAW are as follows: high competition-Singapore (0.42919), Hong Kong (0.40022), middle competition Kaohsiung (0.35064), Kobe (0.33724), low competition- Taichung(0.29293), Pusan(0.28874),Keelung(0.28850), and Shanghai(0.27064). From concerns' viewpoints, the order is organization (0.332), physical facilities (0.196), economy (0.124), manpower(0.102), and finance(0.099). Politic (0.088), society (0.058). From factor's viewpoints, the order is strengths (0.455), opportunities (0.247), weaknesses (0.175) and threats(0.123) (see Table 1).

Conclusions

1. Discussions of competition dominance have appeared primarily in the strategic management field.

- 2.Indicators of port competition involve efficiency and effectiveness. Effectiveness covers cost factors, and is more sensitive to carriers.
- 3. The AHP method makes problems systemized and structured. Strength, Weakness, Opportunity, and Threat are the four factors that merge in the AHP hierarchy. The experts can reach concordance through questionnaire survey.
- 4. Qualitative data are collected through questionnaire surveys under a certain score, for example 1-5. Quantitative data maintains the original scale. After normalization, the performance can be put into a computation process together with the qualitative data.
- 5. The final orders of the ports are as follows: high competition- Singapore, Hong Kong, middle competition Kaohsiung, Kobe, low competition-Keelung, Taichung, Pusan, and Shanghai.
- 6.From concerns' viewpoints, the order is as follow: organization, physical facility, economy, manpower, politic, finances, society. From factor's viewpoints, the order is strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats.

References

Bagchi, P. K., (1989)," Carrier selection: the Analytic Hierarchy Process", Logistics and Transportation Review, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp.63-73.

Chen, R. T., (1993), A survey on carrier's satisfaction to ports situation of three international ports in Taiwan, master thesis, National Chiao-Tung University.

Evergreen Marine Transportation Co., (1998), Pert competition: from ship carrier's viewpoint, Port marketing seminar 1999.

Hamel, G., and A. Heene, (1994), *Competence-based competition*, W. Sussex: John Wiley & Sons. _____, and C. K. Prahalad, (1988)," Creating global strategic capability", *Strategies in global competition*, selected papers from the Prince Bertil Symposium, London: Routledge.

Ho, S. L., (1987), Setting up surface, marine, and air cargo inter-model transfer center, Eighth Conference Chinese Institute of Transportation.

Hood, N., and J-E. Vahlne, (1988), *Strategies in global competition*, London: Routledge. Hsieh, S. H., (1995), *Discussion on developing Kaohsiung as Asian Pacific marine hub from marine essence viewpoint*, Tenth Conference Chinese Institute of Transportation.

Hsu, C. W., (1996), Carrier's selection behavior to regional operation center. Master thesis, National Taiwan Ocean University.

Huang, W. C., K. L. Chen, and C. W. Jenny, (1997), *The evaluation criteria on port Transportation system*, Eleventh Conference of Chinese Institute of Transportation.

Institute of Transportation, (1998), The Asian Pacific Area international airport competition analysis and trend judgement, Taipei.

International Institute for Management Development, (1996), World competitiveness yearbook, Lausanne. Kaohsiung Harbor Authority, (1998), A comprehensive study on future competition analysis and core competence construction of international port in Taiwan --Kaohsiung harbor (draft), Kaohsiung. Keelung Harbor Authority, (1998), A comprehensive study on future competition analysis and core competence construction of international port in Taiwan(draft), Keelung.

Lauro, G. L. and A. P. J. Vepsalainen, (1986)," Assessing technology portfolios for contract competition: an Analytic Hierarchy Process approach", *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, Vol. 20, No. 6, pp.407-415.

Lin, C. K., (1998),"Strategies for improving Taiwan Area international ports competition," Proceedings of seminar on national ocean policy, Kaohsiung, pp. 2-19---2-41.

Ni, A. S. (1993),"Operational performance and evaluation system for local international ports," *Marine Transportation Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 4.

OECD, (1984), Competition and trade policies: their interaction, France. Porter, M. E., (1990), The competitive advantage of nations, New York: Free Press. Rothschild, W. E., (1984), How to gain (and maintain) the competitive advantage in business, McGraw-Hill.

Saaty, T.L., (1980), The analytic hierarchy process: planning, priority setting, resource allocation, McGraw-Hill.

_____. and L. G. Vargas, (1980)," Hierarchical analysis of behavior in competition: prediction in chess". *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 25.

____. (1988), Decision making for leaders, RWS Publications, Pittsburgh.

Sharp, J. A., (1987)," Hauler selection: an application of the Analytic Hierarchy Process", *Journal of Operational Research Society*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp.319-328.

Taichung Harbor Authority, (1998), A comprehensive study on future competition analysis and core competence construction of Taichung Harbor (draft), Taipei.

Tang, V., R. Bauer, (1995), Competitive dominance: beyond strategic advantages and total quality management, Van Norstrand Reinhold.

Vargas, L. G., (1990)," An overview of the Analytic Hierarchy Process an its applications", European Journal of Operational Research, 48, pp. 2-8.

Wedley W. C., (1990)," Combining qualitative and quantitative factors-an Analytic Hierarchy Approach", *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 57-64.

Weihrich, H., (1982)," The TOWS matrix-a tool for situational analysis", Long Range Planning, Vol. 15, no.2, pp.54-66.

Object- itve(wgs) Environ- ment(wgs) Factors (wsks) Concerns (wsks) Concer	Table 1.	Weightof	criteria n	and final sc	ore of ports		<u>.</u>	
B Strength C Strength 1.1.bbor (192) 2.1.space of castom K celuing (192) G Strength Organization (192) Operational strength 2.1.space of castom K celuing (192) G Strength Organizational cost (192) Operational cost (192) 3.0.perational cost of castom 0.3393) G Strength Organizational cost (192) For charge and castom of ca	Objec- tive(W st)	Environ- ment(Wgt)	Factors (Weight)	Concerns (Weight)	Goals (Weight)	Criteria (Weight)	Sub-criteria (Weight)	Ports (Score)
Evaluation of portion of competition (1.300) Organiza- transport (.4351) Operational style (.4351) Operational style (.4351) Taichung (.4351) A- (1.000) A- internal (.500) A- internal (.500) A- (.4351) Operation (.330) Operation (.151) Operation (.151) Taichung (.151) A- (1.000) A- internal (.530) D- (.151) Taichung (.151) Operation (.151) Operation (.151) Operation (.151) B- (.151) D- (.151) Taichung (.151) Control (.151) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) B- (.153) D- (.151) Taichung (.151) Control (.151) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) B- (.153) D- (.153) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) B- (.153) D- (.153) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) Taichung (.151) B- (.153) D- (.153) D- (.153) Taichung (.153) Taichung (.153) Taichung (.153) B- (.153) D- (.153) Taichung (.153) Taichung (.153) Taichung (.153) Taichung (.153) B- (.153) D			<u>г</u>	G. Manpower (.102) R.	l.Labor quality (.102) N.	1	2. Impact of custom	Keelung (28850)*
(1.000) A. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) B. Internal (.030) Internal (.030) Internal (.031)	Evaluation of porti com peli- tion (1.000)	A. Internal environment (.630)	D. D. Weakness (,175)	O rganiza- tion (.332)	Operational style & Cost (.151)	(.069)	service (.031) 3.0 perational efficiency(.023)	Taichung (0.29293)*
1.0007 A. A. Internal envirosment (.030) D. B. B. External envirosment (.030) D. B. B. External envirosment (.030) Image: Construct of the second construction of the second of the second construction of the second construction							4.Liberalization(.013)	
A. Internal environment (.030) P. Weskness I. I. Internal environment (.030) P. Weskness I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I						[] Port charge and carrier's cost (.082)	5.0 peration cost of carrier(.043)	K aohsiung (0,35064)**
A. D. 0. 0. 0.10 percelon 0000700000000000000000000000000000000							charge(.039)	Hone Kone
A hiteraal exvironment (.630) D Weskness (.175) Interest (.175) Interest (.175) Interest (.175) Interest (.175) Shanghai (0.27003)* B (.175) Interest (.175) P typical footback P typical footback P typical footback Interest (.175) P typical footback P typical footback Interest (.175) P typical footback P typical footback Interest (.175) Interest (.175) P typical footback P typical footback Interest (.175) Interest (.175) P typical footback Interest (.175) In					O. Operation Efficiency (.181)	7.Ship meas lime in port(.078)		(0,40022)***
B. D. Weakness F. D. Shanghai (.175) Weakness F. D.						8,Loading & discharg-ing ratio(.957)		
B. decision of portunation of port (0.12) P. decision of port (0.12) P. decision of port (0.12) P. decision of port (0.12) Vertical recently of the control of the con						9.Terminal movement capability		Shanghai (0.27063)*
B. E. E. Compre- training of the set				I, Physical facilities (.196)	P. Location of port & cargo source of hinterland (.075)	III Location of port (.033)	10.Location of port(.012)	Buenn
B. E. J. 27.9 points 12.5 scheduic(.010) K Cores source of binteriaad (.043) 13.1 hound/outbound (.0.28) K Cores source of binteriaad (.043) 14.7 ranshipment (0.33724)** Q. V Transportation transhipment 15.8 stit/highway(.012) Sin gapore (0.33724)** Q. V Transportation transhipment 15.8 stit/highway(.012) Sin gapore Will Cores source of stitles(.034) 15.8 stit/highway(.012) Sin gapore Vill Transport(.004) 15.8 stit/highway(.012) Sin gapore Vill Cores transport(.004) 17.8 vo. of deep wharf (.142919)** Y11 Core of transport(.004) 17.8 vo. of deep wharf (.003) V11 Compre- Container autom stion (.003) No Compre- Compre- Compre- Compre- Accestore X Compre- Compre- Compre- Accestore X Compre- Compre- Compre- Accestore X Comprehensive plan Costainer auton							11.Sailing points(.011)	(0.28874)*
B. E. 0. 0. Cargo source of hinterland(.043) 13. Inbound/outbound (.0.33724)** V 14. Transhpment ratio(.015) 14. Transhpment (.016) (0.33724)** Q. Nardware ratio of the rati of the rati of the rati of the ratio of the ratio of the ratio of							12.Schedule(.010)	1
B: E. J. Viii Constance of portion in a system (0.33724)** B: E. J. R. Viii Constance of portion in a system (0.33724)** B: External D. Viii Constance of portion in a formation (0.03) (0.33724)** B: E. J. R. Viii Constance of portion in a formation (0.03) B: External Differentiation (0.03) 23. Land of warehoused Information (0.03) 23. Land of warehoused Information (0.03) 24. Investment plan (.014) B: E. Differentiation (0.03) B: E. J. Constance (0.038) 24. Investment plan (.014) If Constance of portion in a formation (0.03) 25. Invester of portion (0.09) Viii Costance of portion (0.03) B: E. Costance of portion (0.03) 25. Invester of portion (0.09) If A: Transhipment plan (.014) 25. Operator of portion (0.09) If A: Transport plan (0.014) Costance of portion (0.09) If A: Transport plan (0.014) 25. Operator of portion (0.014) If A: Transport plan (0.014) 25. Operator of portion (0.014) If A: Transport plan (0.014) 26. Operator of porti(.009) If A: Transport plan (IV Cargo source of hinterland(.043)	13.Inbound/outbound (.028)	Kobe
B. E. Viii Viiii 15.R sil/highway(.012) Singapore B. E. F. Compre- hersive plan Viiii 16.8 sil/highway(.012) Singapore B. E. F. Viiii Viiii 17.No. of deg wharf (.042))** 0.42919)** B. E. F. Viiii 20.C ontainer(.002) 20.C ontainer(.002) B. E. Viiii 20.C ontainer(.002) 20.C ontainer(.002) B. E. Viiii Compre- hersive plan Viiii B. E. Viiii Compre- hersive plan 23.L and of warehouse/ logistics(.024) B. E. J. Portical science 25.Invester of port(.010) B. Comportu- ment style (.038) 24.Investiment plan(.014) 25.Operator of port(.009) W. Sciely (.038) Costainer (.038) Sciely (.038) Sciely (.038) P. L. 29.Producti vity (.068) Sciely (.0350) Sciely (.0351) P. L. 29.Producti vity (.068) Sciely (.0350) M. 31.Financia stability (.0356) Sciely vity (.068)							14.Transhipment	(0.33724)**
B. E. J. J. Solution of the second is					Q. Hardward and software facilities (.063)	V Transportation system (.016)	15.Rail/highway(.012)	Singapore
B.E.J.Z. Pollical stability (.370)VI Port facilities(.034)17. No. of deep wherf (.14m) (.018) 18. M achinery (.007) 19. O persition land for container autom ation (.013)B.E.VII Information system (.013)20. Container autom ation (.003) 21. ED I(.005) 22. Ship information(.003) 23. Land of varehouse/ logistics(.024) 24. Investment plan(.014) 25. Invester of port(.010) 26. O persitor of port(.010) 26. O persitor of port(.009)B.E.J.27. Pollical stability (.058) (.247)27. Pollical stability (.058)F.J.27. Pollical stability (.058)26. O persitor of port(.009) (.019)F.J.27. Pollical stability (.058)F.J.28. Social stability (.058)M.29. Producti vity (.068)F.L. conomic c.124)29. Producti stability d.038)M.31. Financia r stability c.13tability							16.Sea/river transport(.004)	(0,42919)***
B. E. J. Yill 20, Container(0.003) B. E. Vill Compre- hensive plan Vill B. E. J. Y.Pollical rability Vill C.370) J. Pollice Z. Pollical rability F. L. 29, Producti (.123) Postor M B. J. Postor M J. Financia (.123) Social rability						VI Port facilities(.034)	17.No.ofdeep wharf (-14m)(.018)	
B. E. J. Yii 20. Container automation (.003) B. E. J. Viii 23. Land of warehouse/ information(.003) B. E. J. Yiii 23. Land of warehouse/ information(.003) B. E. J. 27. Political stability 26. O perator of port(.009) B. E. J. 27. Political stability 26. O perator of port(.009) B. E. J. 27. Political stability 26. O perator of port(.009) B. E. J. 27. Political stability 26. O perator of port(.009) B. E. J. 29. Producti - M. Society (.058) Society (.058) - - M. 31. Financia stability 30. Econom i c stability -							18.M achinery(.007)]
$B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ portu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 1370 \end{bmatrix}$ $B_{-} = \begin{bmatrix} E_{-} \\ 0 \text{ protu-} \\ 0$							I 9.0 peration land for container(.009)	
$B: \\ External environment (.370) B: \\ F. \\ Threat (.123) F. \\ Threat$						VII Information system (.013)	20,Container automation (.005)	
B. External environment (.370)E. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.123)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat (.124)J. F. Threat Threat (.124)J. F. Threat Threat (.124)J. F. Threat Threat (.124)J. F. Threat <b< td=""><td>21.ED1(.005)</td><td>-</td></b<>							21.ED1(.005)	-
B. E. J. Compression pression pressio							information(.003)	j
B. E. J. 2.0 portion 2.0 po					R. Compre- hensive plan & Develop- ment style (.058)	V 11 Comprehensive plan (.038)	23.Land of warehouse/ logistics(.024)	
B. External environment (.370)E. Opportu- nity (.247)J. Politic (.088) (.038)J. (.038) (.038) $(25. Invester of port(.010)$ $26. Operator of port(.009)$ B. External environment (.370)E. Opportu- nity (.247)J. Politic (.088) (.038)J. (.038) $(25. Invester of port(.010)$ $26. Operator of port(.009)$ B. External environment (.370)F. F. Economic (.123)J. (.058) $(29. Producti)$ vity (.068)F. Economic (.124)J. Pingurcia (.058)J. P. Economic (.124)J. Pingurcia (.058)M Fingurcia L31. Fingurcia L LJ. Fingurcia L LJ. Fingurcia L L							24.Investment plan(.014)	-
B. E. Opportu- environment (.370) B. E. Opportu- nity (.370) B. E. Opportu- nity (.247) F. Threat (.123) M M M Society Societ						Development style (.019)	25. Invester of port(.010)	-
B. External environmentC. Opportu- nity (.370)C. Opportu- nity (.247)C. Collic (.038)C. (.038)(.370)(.370)(.247)K. Society (.058)28, Social (.058).F. E. Threat (.123)L. Conomic conomi							20.0 perator or purities)	-
(.370) (.247) K. 28.Social Society stability (.058) L. 29.Producti Chreat (.123) (.124) 30.Economic (.123) M 31.Financia Finance Lambility		B. External environment (.370)	C. Opportu- uity (.247)	Politic (.088)	27.Political stability (.088)			
F. L. 29. Producti Threat Economic vity (.068) (.123) (.124) 30. Economic M 31. Financia Finance L. inspecia				K. Society (.058)	28.Social stability			
(.123) (.123) (.123) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.123) (.124) (.123) (.124) (.123) (.124) (.123) (.124) (.123) (.124) (.123) (.124) (.123) (.124) (.124) (.124) (.125) (.124) (.125) (.			F. Threat (.123)	L. Economic (.124)	29.Producti vity (.068)]
M 31.Financia Finance Istability					30,Economi c stability (.056)			
(.099) (.099)				M Finance (.099)	31.Financia I stability (.099)			

Source: This paper surveys and calculates. Note: *** indicates high competition, ** middle competition, *low competition.



Figure 1 Hierarchy Structure

Note:A,B,C.....please refer to Table1.