

Wabtec: Simplify the Portfolio Without Losing the Railway?

Internal ID: S&F-STR-591

Topic: Customer Strategy, Corporate Strategy, Mergers & Acquisitions

Industry: Construction Machinery & Heavy Transportation Equipment

Source: Strategy & Finance

Publication date: 5 October 2026

License: Not specified

Student case • Information cutoff: February 12, 2025, 11:59 p.m. ET

On February 12, 2025, Westinghouse Air Brake Technologies Corporation (Wabtec) reported record 2024 sales of \$10.387 billion and announced three distinct strategic programs with different scopes and economics. The additional 2025 Portfolio Optimization initiative targets about \$100 million of low-margin revenue exits, with approximately \$40 million of expected net exit charges. Integration 3.0, a separate three-year program, targets \$100-125 million of run-rate synergies by 2028 and anticipates \$125-155 million of charges, including \$80-100 million of one-time restructuring charges; Wabtec said additional capital investments to simplify and streamline operations may be considered. An earlier Portfolio Optimization program had approximately \$70 million of total net exit charges, about \$56 million of which had been accrued through 2024. [C1, pp. 26-27]

For this exercise, assume you are advising a hypothetical Wabtec portfolio committee on how to execute the new 2025 Portfolio Optimization initiative and how to evaluate a separate set of possible Integration 3.0 investments. This assignment is a teaching construct; public information does not establish that Wabtec used this committee or posed the question in this form.

The decision

Wabtec has announced a revenue-exit target but has not disclosed which offerings, customers, facilities, or product lines are candidates. How should it translate the target into specific exit decisions without weakening customer relationships or the capabilities that support its installed base? Separately, which proposed capital investments, if any, should qualify for consideration within Integration 3.0?

You may recommend a narrow execution of the announced target, a faster or broader simplification, a staged approach that protects uncertain customer and service links, or another clearly defined path. Your recommendation should specify what evidence is required before an individual product or capability is exited and what conditions should govern any Integration 3.0 investment. Do not assume that the two programs have the same charges, targets, or investment pool.

A large installed base-and incomplete product economics

Wabtec sells equipment, parts, modernization, and services to freight railroads, passenger rail operators, transit agencies, and other customers. It reported nearly 24,000 locomotives in its installed base and described aftermarket sales as about 60% of company revenue, higher-margin and less cyclical than original-equipment sales. The company also noted that Transit aftermarket represented about 55% of Transit revenue, while Transit itself accounted for about 28% of company sales. These are rounded, differently denominated measures; Wabtec did not disclose product-level service margins or service attach rates. [C1, pp. 3, 6-7]

The installed base could make product decisions interdependent. A component with modest standalone economics might support parts availability, repairs, modernization, engineering knowledge, customer access, or another offering. Conversely, keeping every legacy product may add manufacturing and inventory complexity, absorb engineering attention, or preserve costs that exceed any related service benefit. Public filings do not identify which of these effects apply to the offerings included in the new target.

2024 performance offers mixed signals

Wabtec's 2024 consolidated sales increased 7.3% to \$10.387 billion, including \$662 million of organic growth, \$81 million of acquisition contribution, and a \$33 million foreign-exchange reduction. Freight generated \$7.468 billion in sales; Transit generated \$2.919 billion. Freight operating margin was 19.0%, up from 15.4%; Transit margin was 11.6%, up from 10.7%. Those segment-level results aggregate different products, customers, and cost changes. They do not reveal the economics of an individual line proposed for exit. [C1, pp. 28-33]

Freight sales of goods increased 12.6% to \$5.524 billion, while the reported accounting line "sales of services" decreased 3.6% to \$1.944 billion. Elsewhere in its Freight product-line bridge, Wabtec reported a \$132 million increase for "Services." The filing does not reconcile those measures, which are presented on different bases. Transit sales rose \$165 million; its bridge attributed \$121 million of growth to aftermarket and \$42 million to OEM manufacturing, with the balance from acquisitions and foreign exchange. Neither bridge provides margin by offering. [C1, pp. 30-33]

Demand indicators also cut both ways. Wabtec reported a \$22.3 billion year-end backlog, subject to standard cancellation rights, and more than \$1 billion of Q4 orders for new locomotives and modernizations. These figures suggest a sizable customer commitment base, but they do not identify which products are profitable, whether backlog relates to candidate offerings, or how much revenue will ultimately convert. Management's 2025 adjusted EPS guidance was \$8.35-\$8.75; it is a forecast, not an outcome or a product-level return measure. [C1, p. 10 and pp. 28-29; C2]

Three programs, three different scopes

Program disclosed by Wabtec	Publicly stated scope at the cutoff	What remains unknown
Earlier Portfolio Optimization	About \$70 million of total net exit charges; about \$56 million accrued through 2024	Remaining timing and product-level operating effects
Additional 2025 Portfolio Optimization	Target of about \$100 million in low-margin revenue exits; about \$40 million of expected net exit charges, primarily noncash asset write-downs	Candidate offerings, avoidable costs, stranded costs, customer effects, and savings by year
Integration 3.0	Three-year program; \$100-125 million target of incremental run-rate synergies by 2028; \$125-155 million of anticipated total charges, including \$80-100 million of one-time restructuring; additional capital investment may be considered	Project-level investment amounts, timing, returns, and operating consequences

The earlier Portfolio Optimization disclosure is not the new 2025 target. Integration 3.0 is not the new target either: its synergy goal, charge range, and possible capital investments belong to a separate program. No public source in the case identifies a shared project list or states that the charge ranges can be netted against one another. [C1, pp. 26-27]

Wabtec also reported \$1.834 billion of 2024 operating cash flow and \$207 million of PP&E additions. At year-end, \$1 billion remained under a share-repurchase authorization; the expected annual dividend rate for 2025 was approximately \$171 million. These measures show that capital allocation has alternatives, but do not establish the amount available for any specific Integration 3.0 project. [C1, pp. 24-25, 33-34, 50]

A portfolio test, not a revenue-only test

The academic evidence gives managers reasons to test both sides of the decision. A study of publicly traded manufacturers finds an observational, nonlinear association between service intensity and firm value; relatedness to the core product matters, and the authors do not establish a Wabtec-specific threshold or causal return. A qualitative manufacturing study identifies capabilities that can support hybrid product-service offerings, while a review of spare-parts forecasting emphasizes installed-base age, usage, maintenance, replacement behavior, and obsolescence. These findings suggest questions to investigate; they do not show that a specific Wabtec offering should be retained. [A1-A3]

For each candidate line, the committee could consider direct contribution after avoidable costs; shared capabilities and stranded costs; customer and contract obligations; effects on parts, modernization, and service access; inventory and obsolescence; capacity and quality; and the time and cash required to exit. Yet the public record supplies none of the product-level data needed to complete that analysis. A rule for requesting and weighing evidence may therefore be more defensible than a public-data-only list of products to cut.

Alternatives for the committee

1. **Execute the new target narrowly.** Complete the approximately \$100 million of announced low-margin revenue exits, but require line-level contribution, customer-transition, and serviceability evidence before each decision. Evaluate capital proposals separately under Integration 3.0.
2. **Accelerate simplification.** Use the target as a starting point for faster or broader exits and limit reinvestment until cost and margin gains are demonstrated. This could reduce complexity and focus resources, while increasing the risk of lost customer access, stranded costs, or damage to related aftermarket capabilities.
3. **Stage exits and capability investments.** Sequence decisions through customer, engineering, and operating gates; defer candidates whose lifecycle or contractual effects remain uncertain. Consider Integration 3.0 investments only against separately specified costs, milestones, and benefits. This preserves learning but may delay savings and leave complexity in place longer.

These are analytical alternatives for the exercise, not options disclosed by Wabtec. Students may propose a different path if its decision rules and evidence requirements are clear.

Assignment

Prepare a recommendation to the hypothetical portfolio committee as of February 12, 2025. Address:

- Which execution path should govern the new 2025 Portfolio Optimization target, and what is the strongest argument against your recommendation?
- What evidence should be required to approve an exit, especially when a product may support parts, service, modernization, contracts, or customer access?
- Which assumptions can be tested from public information, and which require internal product-, customer-, and facility-level data?
- How should the committee keep decisions under Integration 3.0 distinct from the new Portfolio Optimization exits? What gates should apply to possible Integration 3.0 capital investments?
- What milestones would cause the committee to accelerate, pause, or reverse course?

Do not assign a product to the \$100 million target or calculate product-level savings from the aggregate disclosures. Clearly label any teaching assumptions. Do not use events or information after the stated cutoff.

Sources and conventions

Company source IDs and exact locators are listed in the source register; extracted facts and calculation limits appear in the evidence extraction. Academic works A1-A3 and their methods, reading depth, versions, and limitations are described in the literature review. Figures are U.S. dollars unless stated. “Aftermarket,” “sales of services,” and product-line “Services” are kept as Wabtec reports them; they are not treated as interchangeable measures.