

1 CPFR Vision & Roadmap (Working Draft)

2 **Status:** Draft v0.2 — narrative-first working document.

3 **Note to reviewers:** Sections explicitly marked **[DATA NEEDED]** or **[INTENT TO**
4 **CONFIRM]** require additional input or validation. This document is intentionally
5 incomplete and designed as a starting point for refinement, not a final artifact.

7 1. Introduction & Purpose

8 This document articulates the CPFR program's current reality, the lessons learned through
9 execution, and the direction the program is taking into 2026 and beyond. Its purpose is to
10 establish shared understanding across leadership and partner teams around what CPFR is
11 today, what has materially changed over the last year, and what capabilities must exist for
12 CPFR to scale credibly.

13 CPFR has evolved from a primarily data-sharing function into an operational capability that
14 directly shapes how vendors and Chewy teams identify risk, align on priorities, and act. The
15 intent of this document is not to announce a new initiative, but to consolidate decisions,
16 learnings, and momentum already underway into a coherent narrative that can guide
17 future work.

18 This document is written for Instock leadership, Supply Chain BI, Product and Engineering
19 partners, Vendor Compliance, and adjacent stakeholders who rely on CPFR as an input
20 into decision-making.

22 2. CPFR Today — Current State

23 CPFR today operates at meaningful scale, but through mechanisms that were not
24 designed for the size and complexity of the vendor ecosystem Chewy now supports. The
25 program distributes weekly inventory, forecast, and operational signals to more than 2,300
26 vendors. These outputs support critical conversations, but they are delivered through a
27 patchwork of emails, dashboards, direct queries, and ad hoc tools.

28 While parts of CPFR are automated, the overall operating model still depends on manual
29 coordination. Report runs often require validation and re-sends. Configuration changes
30 around vendor contacts, tiers, or scope introduce recurring overhead. When discrepancies
31 arise, teams frequently spend time reconciling numbers before addressing the underlying
32 business issue.

33 Data access is fragmented across several channels. Vendors may receive emailed files,
34 access VDS dashboards, or request clarification through their ISM. Internally, teams rely

35 on Snowflake queries, Tableau views, and locally maintained scripts. This fragmentation
36 creates version drift and time-of-day inconsistencies that erode confidence in the data and
37 slow down collaboration.

38 The result is a CPFR program that delivers value, but with growing friction. Scale is
39 constrained, manual effort remains hidden but significant, and both vendors and Chewy
40 teams are often pulled into data reconciliation rather than forward-looking planning.

41 **[DATA NEEDED]**

42 Quantitative snapshot of current CPFR vendor tier distribution and approximate volume by
43 tier.

44

45 3. What CPFR Has Learned — Operating Truths

46 Through execution, vendor feedback, and partner alignment, several operating truths have
47 become clear. These are not aspirational principles; they are constraints that CPFR must
48 anchor to if it is to scale responsibly.

49 First, a single source of truth is non-negotiable. When metrics, workflows, or reports
50 reference multiple calculation paths or data layers, collaboration breaks down. CPFR
51 cannot support or scale solutions that are not grounded in a governed, shared data
52 foundation.

53 Second, inspection matters more than reporting. Retrospective reports alone do not
54 change outcomes. CPFR must continuously inspect inputs, outputs, and deviations in
55 order to surface risk early and route action to the right owners before customer impact
56 occurs.

57 Third, manual processes are transitional by definition. Any workflow that relies on local
58 execution, undocumented logic, or bespoke scripts introduces fragility. Manual steps may
59 be necessary in the short term, but they must have an explicit expiration path.

60 Fourth, data transparency creates value only when it enables action. Sharing more data
61 without consistent definitions, lineage, and ownership simply moves debate upstream.
62 Vendors and ISMs must be able to reference the same numbers with confidence.

63 Finally, platforms scale where point solutions do not. CPFR cannot continue solving
64 problems one workflow at a time. Capabilities must be reusable across vendors, tiers, and
65 adjacent programs, even when the level of engagement differs.

66

67 4. Communication as a Core CPFR Capability

68 As CPFR scales, communication is no longer a supporting activity — it is a core capability
69 that determines whether tools, data, and insights actually drive outcomes. Both internal

70 and external communication mechanisms must be intentional, repeatable, and trusted in
71 order for CPFR to function effectively.

72 Internally, CPFR requires a regular, structured communication cadence with Instock
73 teams and leadership. This includes clear forums to review in-progress and upcoming
74 initiatives, surface risks or dependencies early, and explicitly align on priorities before new
75 actions are launched. Regular leadership touchpoints are essential to provide guidance,
76 validate direction, and ensure that CPFR work remains aligned to broader supply-chain
77 objectives. This structure also improves expectation setting with ISMs by creating
78 transparency into what is coming, what is changing, and why.

79 Externally, CPFR must evolve beyond one-way reporting toward two-way engagement. As
80 tools and data access expand, it becomes increasingly important to understand how
81 vendors experience CPFR — not only whether data is delivered, but whether it is usable,
82 trusted, and differentiated compared to other retailers. To support this, CPFR will design
83 and launch a recurring vendor-facing CPFR survey that captures vendor satisfaction across
84 tools, reports, data quality, interactions, and meeting effectiveness, as well as
85 benchmarking CPFR against vendors' other customers.

86 These communication mechanisms serve multiple purposes. They create feedback loops
87 that inform prioritization and product decisions. They provide early signal when tools or
88 reports are not landing as intended. And they reinforce CPFR's role as a collaborative
89 partner rather than a static reporting function.

90 **[DATA NEEDED]**

91 Define proposed cadence, ownership, and audiences for internal CPFR communication
92 forums and leadership reviews.
93 Define survey frequency, target vendor cohorts, and how results will be reviewed and
94 actioned.

96 5. 2025 Retrospective — What Changed

97 The most important change in 2025 was not the launch of individual tools, but a shift in
98 how CPFR work is executed. The program moved away from bespoke, manual workflows
99 toward standardized, automated, and inspectable capabilities.

100 Throughout the year, CPFR reduced manual coordination overhead, aligned previously
101 fragmented definitions, and introduced tooling that allowed ISMs to spend less time
102 assembling data and more time engaging vendors on outcomes. Inspection-oriented
103 workflows replaced purely retrospective reporting in several key areas.

104 Notable deliveries during 2025 included the launch and expansion of Apollo as a
105 centralized analytics surface for vendor conversations, the introduction of a structured
106 Forecast Reconciliation capability, self-service PO status and SKU audit tooling, and
107 automation of CPFR email ingestion and summarization. Tier logic was standardized to

108 eliminate drift, and early visibility into vendor PO rejections was established through the
109 EDI 855 process.

110 Just as important were the learnings. Email-only vendor engagement does not scale
111 beyond a few hundred partners. One-off scripts and bespoke exceptions increase long-
112 term maintenance risk. Manual validation remains a hidden cost even when downstream
113 automation exists.

114 **[INTENT TO CONFIRM]**

115 Confirm which 2025 initiatives should be explicitly attributed to CPFR versus partner
116 teams in the final version.

117

118

6. Scope, Ownership, and Guardrails

119 Clarity of ownership is critical to CPFR's ability to scale. CPFR owns the governance of
120 vendor-facing data, the inspection frameworks that surface risk, and the standardized
121 workflows that enable vendor communication and escalation. CPFR is responsible for
122 ensuring that ISMs are enabled through automated signals rather than manual data pulls.

123 CPFR does not own buying decisions, replenishment model logic, forecast generation, or
124 vendor execution. Those responsibilities remain with their respective teams. CPFR
125 influences these areas by ensuring that inputs are clean, timely, and governed, and that
126 risk is surfaced early.

127

128

7. 2026 Deliverables — Where CPFR Is Going

129 The focus for 2026 is not incremental enhancement, but scale. CPFR must be able to
130 support thousands of vendors without a proportional increase in Chewy TM workload,
131 while improving data trust and collaboration quality.

132 At a program level, CPFR is working toward vendor self-service access to governed data,
133 elimination of routine manual coordination, and forward-looking risk visibility. These
134 outcomes require foundational capabilities rather than additional point solutions.

135 Core initiatives include the establishment of a unified CPFR data platform built on daily
136 immutable snapshots, the extension of CPFR workflows into a vendor-facing portal within
137 CPH, automation of Tier 2 vendor engagement, and the development of standardized
138 forward-looking risk models.

139 **[DATA NEEDED]**

140 Explicit success metrics, adoption targets, and sequencing for 2026 initiatives.

141

142 **8. Measuring Success**

143 CPFR success must be measured at the program level. Indicators of progress include
144 reductions in ISM time spent on routine data preparation, decreases in data discrepancy
145 escalations, increased vendor adoption of self-service access, and fewer forecast
146 mismatch-driven escalations.

147 These measures will be refined as baseline metrics and targets are confirmed.

148 **[DATA NEEDED]**

149 Baseline measurements and agreed success thresholds.

150

151 **9. Long-Term Vision**

152 Over the long term, CPFR evolves from a program into a durable operating capability. It
153 provides a shared data foundation across vendor-facing functions, enables predictive and
154 AI-driven insights through normalized data, and reduces organizational friction by aligning
155 teams to shared facts.

156 This vision is intentionally directional. Specific tooling and expansion paths will be guided
157 by demonstrated adoption and value rather than predefined commitments.

158

159 **10. FAQs**

160 **How is CPFR different from Replenishment?**

161 Replenishment executes buying decisions. CPFR governs the data, risk, and collaboration
162 inputs that shape those decisions.

163 **Why not rely solely on VDS?**

164 VDS serves premium analytics use cases. CPFR must support a broader vendor cohort
165 with consistent, governed access.

166 **Why prioritize Tier 2 automation?**

167 Tier 2 vendors represent the largest source of manual workload and the greatest scale
168 unlock.

169 **What happens if CPFR does nothing?**

170 Manual effort grows, data trust erodes, and CPFR becomes a bottleneck rather than an
171 enabler of scale.

172

173 **11. Appendices**

174 Appendix sections will capture supporting detail without disrupting the core narrative.

175 **Appendix A:** Data share and tiering overview **[DATA NEEDED]**

176 **Appendix B:** Tool inventory and ownership **[INTENT TO CONFIRM]**

177 **Appendix C:** Vendor feedback and entitlement evidence (summary)

178

179 *End of Working Draft*

180