|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CPFR** | **VDS Premium** | **VDS Direct** | **CPH** |
| Purpose | Provides fundamental data used by vendors and ISMs for Inventory and order planning | Provide a broader set of data to facilitate insights and deep analysis of supply, operations, and performance | Provides highly granular and customizable data feeds that directly integrate with vendor systems | Aggregates Services from across Chewy, providing a single point of access for vendors |
| Share Method | Emailed | Dashboard (Tableau Server) | API access | Custom portal |
| Level of Granularity | SKU/weekly | SKU/daily; SKU/weekly | SKU/daily; SKU/weekly | TBD |
| (depending on subscription) |  |
| Principle | · Weekly 'snapshot' data | ·  On-demand access | ·   On-demand access | ·   On-demand access |
| Characteristics | · "Tactical" data-scope | ·  "Strategic" data-scope | ·   Weekly or daily refreshes | ·   Customizable views |
|  | · Principal performance metrics | ·  Weekly or daily refreshed, depending on type and source | ·   "Exploratory" data-scope | and data content |
|  | · Tiered subsets of data | ·   Permits complex queries |  |
|  | · Fixed aggregation levels | ·  Limited ability to 'drill-down' into data | ·   Direct vendor system integration |  |
| Data-Shared | ·   Forecast | ·   Autoship Analysis | [Daily & Weekly]: | Same as CPFR |
| ·   Autoship | ·   Inventory & Forecast | ·   Sales |  |
| ·   Inventory | ·   Location Out of Stock | ·   Autoship | *CPH Provides a portal—* |
| ·   OOS | ·   PDP Out of Stock | ·   Receipt / Returns | *data pipelines or platform* |
| ·   Fill Rate | ·   Procurement Scorecard | ·   Trial Rate / Review Avg. | *must be provided by* |
| ·   DOS | ·   Customer Experience Insights | ·   ASN & Compliance | *Business Intelligence or* |
| ·   NOP | ·   Attachment Detail | ·   Inventory direct feed | *Software Engineers (or both)* |
| ·   Catalog Details | ·   Basket Overview | ·   Forecast direct feed |  |
|  | ·   Competitive Comparison |  |  |
| ***CPFR Knowledge Domain*** | ·   Returns |  |  |
| ***VDS Knowledge Domain*** | ·   Sales & Geographical Metrics |  |  |
|  | ·   Trial & Repeat |  |  |
| Revenue Model | None (Free) | 3% of COGS, $400K max | + $100K (weekly); +$250K (daily) | TBD (Presumably None/Free) |
| Users Served | ·   ≈1,650 FC-inventory vendors | ·   65 unique vendors | ·   5 unique vendors | ·   ≈1,650 FC-inventory vendors |
| ·   ≈625 Drop-ship vendors | ·   Includes Top 20 | ·   All within Top 10 | ·   ≈625 Drop-ship vendors |
| Use-Cases | ·   "Plan-of-record" forecasting | ·   Root-cause analysis (vendor) | ·   Complex/granular analysis | ·   Same as CPFR |
| ·   Joint business planning | ·   Sales auditing | ·   POS |  |
| ·   Vendor scorecard reference | ·   EDI issue confirmation | ·   Direct database integration |  |
| ·   Tracking inventory health | ·   Consumer purchase behavior |  |  |
| ·   over/under performance alerts | ·   Competitor analysis |  |  |

Chewy's vendor-facing data-shares currently operate through two primary channels: CPFR and VDS. CPFR serves as the foundational data-sharing platform, reaching approximately 70% of Chewy's vendor population through weekly emailed reports containing tactical inventory and forecast data. In contrast, VDS operates as a premium, revenue-generating service offering strategic insights to a select group of vendors through dashboard and API access. As a new candidate system for data shares, CPH can host vendor access if data pipelines or platforms have already been established.

**APPENDIX 1: CPH Implementation**

CPH functions as a conduit and an aggregator for nearly any kind of service that Chewy wishes to attach to it, however it doesn't automatically supply the underlying services. In CPFR’s case, this means that the infrastructure connecting source data to the hub would need to be provided and configured. This creates two areas of concern that must be coordinated. The first is the development work for the CPH hub presence itself, and the second is development work for the data services or infrastructure supplying data to the hub.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CPH Hub + Raw CPFR Queries** | **CPH Hub + SWE-built Infrastructure** | **CPH Hub + BI-built Infrastructure** | **CPH Hub + SWE/BI Infrastructure** |
| Jobs to be Done | CPH builds the hub portal, and uses CPFR-supplied queries to pipe directly from Snowflake | CPH builds the hub portal, and under the umbrella of that project Software Engineering teams (SWEs) build data infrastructure in consultation with CPFR and SC-BIE teams | CPH builds the hub portal, Supply Chain Business Intelligence Engineering teams (SC-BIEs) build data infrastructure in consultation with SWE teams | CPH builds the hub, SC-BIE builds data infrastructure, SWE builds APIs/endpoints and integrates |
| CPFR Team LOE | Low at build | Mid at build | Mid to build (work is front-loaded) | Mid to build (work is front-loaded) |
| *(Level of effort)* | High to sustain | Mid to sustain | Low to sustain | Low to sustain |
| CPH Team LOE | Mid at build | High at build | Mid at build | Mid at build |
|  | Low to sustain | Low to sustain | Low to sustain | Low to sustain |
| Software Engineering  Team(s) LOE | Low at build | High at build | Low at build | Mid at build |
| n/a—sustainment | Mid to sustain | n/a—sustainment | Low to sustain |
| Business Intelligence Team(s) LOE | Low at build | n/a—build | High at build | High at build |
| Mid to sustain | Low to sustain | Low to sustain | Low to sustain |
| Data Governance Capability | Low / None | Good—possibly slow to update | High | High |
| Clearly Separates CPFR / VDS Knowledge Domains | No | Good—may 'drift' with updates | High | High |
| Enhanced Data Availability | No, and tiers are static | Yes, tiers may be slow to update, limited schema changes | Yes, full schema control | Yes, full schema control |
| Can Release MVP Platform Before Hub is Complete | No | No | Yes | Maybe |
| Advantages | Fastest CPH roll-out | Single threaded developers | Single-threaded sustainment; "in-house" enhancement capabilities | "In-house" enhancement capabilities |
| Complications / Risks | Inherits any current suboptimalities or errors in queries; limited extensibility | Multi-threaded sustainment; externalizes design, build, and future enhancements | Must coordinate two build teams in separate domains | Must coordinate three build teams in overlapping domains |

**APPENDIX 2: CPFR Tiering Structure**

CPFR's tiered data access structure demonstrates how Chewy balances comprehensive vendor coverage with differentiated data needs. The four-tier system serves 2,274 total vendors, with Tier 1 (10 vendors) receiving the most comprehensive dataset including extended forecasting horizons, detailed inventory metrics, and complete catalog information. As tiers progress from 1 to 4, data granularity decreases while vendor count increases significantly—Tier 4 alone serves 1,255 vendors with basic operational metrics. This structure reflects Chewy's approach to scaling data-sharing across a diverse vendor base, with ISMs tailoring data access to align with each vendor's operational capabilities and business needs.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CPFR** | **Tier 4** | **Tier 3** | **Tier 2** | **Tier 1** |
| Forecast | Current Month Forecast | Current Month Forecast | Current Month Forecast | Current Month Forecast |
| Next 3-Months Forecast | Next 6-Months Forecast | Next 6-Months Forecast | Next 6-Months Forecast |
| Autoship |  |  | AS Demand (30 days) | AS Demand (30 days) |
|  |  |  | AS-Backorders |
| Inventory |  |  | OH Units | OH Units |
|  |  | OO Units | OO Units |
| OOS |  |  | PDP % (trailing 30-day avg) | PDP % (trailing 30-day avg) |
| Fill Rate |  |  | Fill-Rate % (trailing 30-day avg) | Fill-Rate % (trailing 30-day avg) |
| DOS |  |  | DOS | DOS |
| NOP |  |  |  | NOP by FC |
|  |  |  | NOP by Region |
|  |  |  | NOP / OP Demand |
|  |  |  | Total Demand |
| Catalog Details |  |  |  | Published Y/N |
|  |  |  | Discontinued Y/N |
|  |  |  | MOQ |
|  |  |  | Base UOM, Purchase UOM |
|  |  |  | Eaches per Case/Layer/Pallet |
|  |  |  | Order divisibility by Pallet/Layer |
|  |  |  | Temp Disable |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Vendors Per Tier \* | 1255 | 955 | 54 | 10 |

*\* Includes FC + Drop-ship vendors; Tiers 1 - 4 are sent by unique vendor number… does not consider parent company*

*\*\* CPFR enrolls approximately 70% of overall vendor population*

**APPENDIX 3: Notes and Errata**

**Additional Considerations:**

1. Buy vs. Build: At this time, Chewy’s CPFR needs are best served by improving consistency and accessibility of data. Chewy’s tech-stack and in-house expertise is already competent for these purposes, and ‘off the shelf’ tools or platforms are not expected to add significant incremental value and increase risk
2. VDS Lite: While VDS Lite should be considered a relevant candidate among these solutions, it’s status in KTLO, as well as the undefined nature of it’s capacities and capabilities make it impossible to accurately evaluate it’s favorability in comparison to the other options listed here. Additionally, the VDS build-process is likely to be complex, incurring a bigger time-penalty than other options. At the point in time when VDS Lite has proven its capabilities and capacities to fully support CPFR’s full vendor cohort, then it should be reconsidered. Until that time, CPFR solutions should not be timeline-dependent upon VDS Lite.