|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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 (collectively, “services”) have already been established.

**APPENDIX 1: CPH Implementation**

To consider CPH as a potential sharing solution for CPFR data, we must first recognize that 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 data services. In CPFR’s case, this means that the service connecting source data to the hub would need to be provided and configured as an additional workstream. This creates two areas of development that must be coordinated. The first being the CPH hub presence itself, and the second is the data service supplying the hub.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CPH Hub + Raw CPFR Queries** | **CPH Hub + data-service** | **CPH Hub + BI-built data-service** | **CPH Hub + SWE/BI data-service** |
| Jobs to be Done | CPH builds the hub portal, and uses CPFR-supplied queries to pipe as-is from Snowflake | CPH builds portal, and also lead data-service development using Software Engineers (SWEs) working in consultation with CPFR team | CPH builds portal, Supply Chain Business Intelligence Engineering teams (SC-BIEs) build and deliver production-read data-service in consultation with CPFR team | CPH builds portal, SC-BIE + CPFR prototype data-service, and SWEs work in consultation with the above teams to integrate for production  ***(Recommended)*** |
| 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* if updates are sporadic | 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. This illustrates the depth and breadth of CPFR data that services must support.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 2 - 4 are sent by unique vendor number… Tier 1 considers only parent company*

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

**APPENDIX 3: Notes and FAQ**

**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. ‘Off the shelf’ tools or platforms are not expected to add significant incremental value and potentially increase risk/cost.
2. VDS Lite: While VDS Lite should be considered a relevant candidate among these solutions, VDS’s present status in KTLO, as well as the undefined nature of the ‘Lite’ offering’s capacities and capabilities make it difficult to accurately evaluate in comparison to the other options listed here. If VDS Lite requires further build-out, development might be protracted. However, if more substantial appraisals of VDS Lite’s capabilities, capacity and readiness become available, it’s suitability should be reconsidered. Until that time, CPFR solutions should not be predicated on VDS Lite.

**Frequently Asked Questions:**

* ***Can CPFR be migrated to CPH now—without waiting on data-service build-out***

Yes, but this doesn’t solve data quality issues, and would actually make it more difficult to isolate and fix errors or misalignment in sources.

* ***Why aren’t we giving all data across VDS, CPFR (including its different tiers), and VC to vendors?***

The reasons for segregating data-shares are due to observed differences in the analytical capabilities of different vendors (think: Nestle vs Mom & Pop), the way that “law of small numbers” can skew perceptions of trend for small vendors, and the responsibility for managing data-driven adverse-actions among a large number of vendors using a relatively smaller In-stock staff. However, reduction of data-sharing segments might further streamline operations or open-up opportunities for both vendors and Chewy, so this topic merits periodic reevaluation.

* ***Why is an external portal better than the emails we currently use for CPFR?***

In addition to immediate reductions in CPFR administrative overhead, a single point-of-access vastly improves the consistency of experience for vendors, and simplifies future efforts to improve accuracy, consistency, and cadence of data delivery.

* ***Why won’t a portal or external presence solve the internal needs of Chewy In-stock as well, when asking about the same data?***

While it wouldn’t be a problem for Chewy Team Members to use the a portal for “at a glance” data viewing, Chewy TM’s frequently need to combine data for deep-dives, and may have good reasons to substitute alternate data definitions at times (think: different forecast models, fill-rate calculations, etc.).

* ***What is meant by data- “pipeline”, “platform”, or collectively “service”? …does this require new business software?***

These terms all refer to data management tools or assets like data tables and queries that “sit” between primary database sources and the final viewer tools (Tableau, et al) or portals. “Pipelines” and “platforms” differ in their approach, and “data-service” is a catch-all term for both—but in all cases, these assets seek to pre-aggregate data using clear definitions that avoid inconsistent or errant representations of business data. A well-governed data-service also vastly improves the speed of troubleshooting, root-cause analysis, or making tactical changes to CPFR data (think: changing a KPI calculation). Chewy already employs all the business / I.T. tools needed to support CPFR’s data-service needs.

* ***What’s the user going to see in a portal?***

The portal can be configured in different ways, but for CPFR purposes the most important thing to showcase is the “last mile” view of the data, after data-services have transformed and compiled it. This will resemble the tables sent in emails, but with more advanced ability to filter, and summarize.

* ***What is the Chewy Team Member’s experience accessing data in these different cases?***

Chewy Team Members should retain their ability to access data independently from the portal. However, the use-cases for CPFR present an unusually acute need for well-defined, and consistent data sources. With this in mind, Chewy TMs would benefit from data-service assets as well, albeit with broader access.