

# CPFR Vision & Roadmap (Working Draft)

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

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

---

## 1. Introduction & Purpose

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

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

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

---

## 2. CPFR Today — Current State

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

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

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

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

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

#### **[DATA NEEDED]**

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

---

### 3. What CPFR Has Learned — Operating Truths

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

### 4. Communication as a Core CPFR Capability

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

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

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

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

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

#### **[DATA NEEDED]**

Define proposed cadence, ownership, and audiences for internal CPFR communication forums and leadership reviews.

Define survey frequency, target vendor cohorts, and how results will be reviewed and actioned.

---

## **5. 2025 Retrospective — What Changed**

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

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

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

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

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

**[INTENT TO CONFIRM]**

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

---

## 6. Scope, Ownership, and Guardrails

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

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

---

## 7. 2026 Deliverables — Where CPFR Is Going

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

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

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

**[DATA NEEDED]**

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

---

## 8. Measuring Success

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

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

### **[DATA NEEDED]**

Baseline measurements and agreed success thresholds.

---

## 9. Long-Term Vision

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

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

---

## 10. FAQs

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

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

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

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

### **Why prioritize Tier 2 automation?**

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

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

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

---

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