

Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness

Adang Haryaman (1) and Arif Budi Raharja (2) (1) Universitas Logistik dan Bisnis Internasional | (2) Universitas Mathla'ul Anwar, Banten

adang@ulbi.ac.id ; budiraharja1970@gmail.com

Abstract

This integrative evidence review examines logistics infrastructure quality and regional industrial competitiveness by asking how logistics infrastructure quality is connected to regional industrial competitiveness and which conditions determine whether that connection becomes operationally meaningful. The article synthesizes peer-reviewed and institutional literature relevant to industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, emphasizing mechanisms, boundary conditions, and measurement choices rather than a universal average effect. The synthesis identifies complementary roles for risk identification and resilience engineering, technical standards, and governance or coordination routines. No survey, interview, experiment, proprietary dataset, or regression estimate is represented as having been collected for this conceptual review.

Keywords: logistics, infrastructure, quality, regional, industrial, competitiveness, engineering, integrative review

Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness addresses a contemporary question in industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments. The title implies a relationship between logistics infrastructure quality and regional industrial competitiveness, but the direction and magnitude of that relationship cannot be assumed from terminology alone. This review identifies mechanisms that plausibly connect the two, conditions that make those mechanisms stronger or weaker, and measurements needed to evaluate them without overstating evidence. Context, timing, implementation quality, and decision rights are therefore treated as analytical variables.

1. Introduction

The introduction defines the decision problem and explains why a conditional interpretation is preferable to a deterministic one.

From a governance perspective, Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Predictive analytics and maintenance planning is most credible when supported by technical standards and maintenance capability. The article therefore

emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

From a governance perspective, Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Systems integration and interoperability is most credible when supported by sensor quality and operating environment. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking logistics infrastructure quality with regional industrial competitiveness. Lifecycle costing and asset prioritization provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on legacy-system compatibility, sensor quality, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines

a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of resource productivity.

For Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking logistics infrastructure quality with regional industrial competitiveness. Resource-loop design and waste prevention provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on maintenance capability, maintenance capability, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of safety.

From a governance perspective, Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Risk identification and resilience engineering is most credible when supported by capital constraints and operating environment. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

2. Conceptual and Literature Review

The literature review organizes evidence around mechanisms, complementary capabilities, and boundary conditions.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, systems integration and interoperability changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while technical standards shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through lifecycle costing and asset prioritization. The pathway is conditional on sensor quality and technical standards; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce resource productivity.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through resource-loop design and waste prevention. The pathway is conditional on legacy-system compatibility and legacy-system compatibility; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce safety.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, risk identification and resilience engineering changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while maintenance capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Kraus et al., 2022 and Tao et al., 2018 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Sensing and condition monitoring is most credible when supported by capital constraints and technical standards. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

3. Research Method

This manuscript is a conceptual narrative draft revised through a chronological source filter. Bibliography entries dated after 31 December 2023 and sentences explicitly invoking those years have been excluded.

Original pre-cutoff references have been retained, with a limited historical source context added separately. This revision does not constitute a new systematic search, a meta-analysis, or a reproducible coding exercise. The historical source cutoff is stated here so that the scope of the discussion is explicit.

The remaining discussion proposes mechanisms and research questions. It does not supply new observations, estimated coefficients, or verified causal effects. Earlier reference entries retained from the source draft are retained as supplied and should be assessed against the original publications when interpreting specific claims. Sources added during this revision support only the historical context described in the dedicated source-context section.

4. Evidence Synthesis: Mechanisms

The first synthesis layer asks how the proposed relationship works in practice and which intermediate processes can be observed before the final outcome changes.

For Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking logistics infrastructure quality with regional industrial competitiveness. Resource-loop design and waste prevention provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on technical standards, technical standards, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of safety.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through risk identification and resilience engineering. The pathway is conditional on sensor quality and legacy-system compatibility; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce operational continuity.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, sensing and condition monitoring changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while legacy-system compatibility shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Logistics Infrastructure Quality may

be associated with regional industrial competitiveness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when maintenance capability is weak. The mechanism examined here is predictive analytics and maintenance planning, which connects the focal practice to changes in energy efficiency.

The most decision-relevant question concerns the conditions under which the proposed relationship strengthens, weakens, or reverses. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through systems integration and interoperability. The pathway is conditional on capital constraints and legacy-system compatibility; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce lifecycle value.

5. Evidence Synthesis: Boundary Conditions

The second synthesis layer examines why results may differ across settings even when the focal intervention appears similar.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through risk identification and resilience engineering. The pathway is conditional on technical standards and sensor quality; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. Evidence associated with Kraus et al., 2022 and Kraus et al., 2022 supports treating implementation conditions as part of the explanation rather than as background noise. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce operational continuity.

A recurring issue in research on Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Logistics Infrastructure Quality may be associated with regional industrial competitiveness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when sensor quality is weak. The mechanism examined here is sensing and condition monitoring, which connects the focal practice to changes in reliability.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through predictive analytics and maintenance planning. The

pathway is conditional on legacy-system compatibility and operating environment; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce energy efficiency.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, systems integration and interoperability changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while maintenance capability shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, lifecycle costing and asset prioritization changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while capital constraints shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

6. Integrated Discussion

The integrated discussion reconciles different findings by distinguishing mechanism, context, timing, and measurement.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, sensing and condition monitoring changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while technical standards shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

From a governance perspective, Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Predictive analytics and maintenance planning is most credible when supported by sensor quality and capital constraints. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

For Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking logistics infrastructure quality with regional industrial competitiveness. Systems integration and interoperability provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on

legacy-system compatibility, technical standards, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of lifecycle value.

A recurring issue in research on Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Logistics Infrastructure Quality may be associated with regional industrial competitiveness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when maintenance capability is weak. The mechanism examined here is lifecycle costing and asset prioritization, which connects the focal practice to changes in resource productivity.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, resource-loop design and waste prevention changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while capital constraints shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Tao et al., 2018 and Carvalho et al., 2019 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

7. Measurement and Decision Framework

A decision framework links leading process indicators, outcome indicators, and explicit assumptions about causality.

A recurring issue in research on Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Logistics Infrastructure Quality may be associated with regional industrial competitiveness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when technical standards is weak. The mechanism examined here is predictive analytics and maintenance planning, which connects the focal practice to changes in energy efficiency.

The topic is best understood as a sequence of decisions rather than as a single intervention. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through systems integration and interoperability. The pathway is conditional on sensor quality and operating environment; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce lifecycle value.

From a governance perspective, Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Lifecycle costing and asset prioritization is most credible when supported by legacy-system compatibility and sensor quality. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

A useful starting point is to distinguish formal adoption from effective use. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through resource-loop design and waste prevention. The pathway is conditional on maintenance capability and maintenance capability; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce safety.

From a governance perspective, Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness requires clarity about who owns the intervention, who validates the information it generates, and who can act when performance deviates from expectation. Risk identification and resilience engineering is most credible

when supported by capital constraints and operating environment. The reviewed literature (Carvalho et al., 2019; Kraus et al., 2022) indicates that these complements often explain why apparently similar settings report different outcomes. The article therefore emphasizes traceable assumptions, explicit decision rights, and periodic review.

8. Practical Implications and Research Agenda

The practical implications translate the evidence into staged actions while preserving the limits of a literature-based design.

A mechanism-based reading avoids assuming that identical labels produce identical outcomes. In Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, logistics infrastructure quality can influence regional industrial competitiveness through systems integration and interoperability. The pathway is conditional on technical standards and capital constraints; these factors determine whether information becomes an operational response or remains a formal feature with limited practical effect. For engineering managers, asset owners, operations teams, and technical decision makers, measurement should capture both the intervention and the intermediate process expected to produce lifecycle value.

A recurring issue in research on Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Logistics Infrastructure Quality may be associated with regional industrial competitiveness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when sensor quality is weak. The mechanism examined here is lifecycle costing and asset prioritization, which connects the focal practice to changes in resource productivity.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, resource-loop design and waste prevention changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while legacy-system compatibility shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. This interpretation is consistent with Tao et al., 2018 and Kraus et al., 2022 and is especially relevant in the population implied by the title. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

For Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking logistics infrastructure quality with regional industrial competitiveness. Risk identification and resilience engineering provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on maintenance capability, capital constraints, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of operational continuity.

A recurring issue in research on Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Logistics Infrastructure Quality may be associated with regional industrial competitiveness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when capital constraints is weak. The mechanism examined here is sensing and condition monitoring, which connects the focal practice to changes in reliability.

9. Conclusion

The conclusion summarizes the evidence logic and priorities for author verification and future empirical work.

The synthesis treats logistics infrastructure quality as an input into a wider system, not as an automatic cause of regional industrial competitiveness. In industrial assets, production systems, infrastructure, and built environments, lifecycle costing and asset prioritization changes what actors can observe, prioritize, or correct, while technical standards shapes how consistently that change is translated into practice. The practical implication is to specify the expected sequence of change before choosing metrics.

A recurring issue in research on Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness is the danger of reading correlation as a universal performance rule. Logistics Infrastructure Quality may be

associated with regional industrial competitiveness, yet the relationship can be delayed, mediated, or offset when sensor quality is weak. The mechanism examined here is resource-loop design and waste prevention, which connects the focal practice to changes in safety.

For Logistics Infrastructure Quality and Regional Industrial Competitiveness, the relevant unit of analysis is the decision process linking logistics infrastructure quality with regional industrial competitiveness. Sensing and condition monitoring provides one plausible channel, but its effect depends on maintenance capability, operating environment, and the time available for adjustment. A stronger assessment therefore combines a leading indicator of process integrity with a lagging indicator of reliability.

Historical source context and interpretation

Historical energy and built-environment context is drawn from Energy Efficiency 2023 and the 2022 Global Status Report for Buildings and Construction (International Energy Agency, 2023; United Nations Environment Programme, 2022). These reports frame resource use and efficiency concerns. Their sector-level discussion does not establish engineering performance, predictive accuracy or project-level causal effects for the systems proposed here.

References

- Tao, F., Qi, Q., Liu, A., & Kusiak, A. (2018). Data-driven smart manufacturing. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, 48, 157-169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2018.01.006>
- Carvalho, T. P., Soares, F. A. A. M. N., Vita, R., Francisco, R. da P., Basto, J. P., & Alcala, S. G. S. (2019). A systematic literature review of machine learning methods applied to predictive maintenance. *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 137, 106024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2019.106024>
- Kraus, S., Durst, S., Ferreira, J. J., Veiga, P., Kailer, N., & Weinmann, A. (2022). Digital transformation in business and management research: An overview of the current status quo. *International Journal of Information Management*, 63, 102466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2021.102466>
- International Energy Agency. (2023). Energy Efficiency 2023. <https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-efficiency-2023>
- United Nations Environment Programme. (2022). 2022 Global Status Report for Buildings and Construction: Towards a Zero-emission, Efficient and Resilient Buildings and Construction Sector. <https://www.unep.org/resources/publication/2022-global-status-report-buildings-and-construction>