The main topic was to understand the capabilities of the CPH support team to implement a data-sharing solution that meets our needs. In particular, I want to make sure that we can contrast a solution based on CPH with VDS in a way that makes sense for In-stock, satisfies the revenue question, and is technically sound. In the long run, it sounds like CPH makes the most sense for external delivery of data to our vendors. However, CPH alone does not give us the end-to-end solution. CPH functions as a conduit and an aggregator for nearly any kind of service (which could also be a data platform) that Chewy wishes to attach to it, but it doesn't supply pre-canned services. We would need to either point to an existing one or provide it. So, there are really two pieces to this effort, the first is building the portal on the CPH hub, and the second is identifying or building a data platform/service to "feed" the data to the portal.  
  
That means that to utilize the CPH platform we would need to do one of these options:

*(SWE = "software engineers")*

1. ***"CPH does the whole ball of wax, using current-state CPFR data processes"*What this looks like:** CPH builds a portal for us on the hub, we give them our current queries, and they pipe them as-is (raw queries in Snowflake).  
   **Level of effort:** Least for CPFR; medium for CPH; low for SWEs initially, but maximum for updates (nearly have to start-over)  
   **Amount of control over data:** Least… what you see is what you get  
   **Clear domain split with VDS:** No, same questions as before  
   **Improves data availability for internal users:** No change
2. ***"CPH builds the portal, and 'sub-contracts' SWEs to build a service/platform"*What this looks like:** CPH builds a portal for us on the hub, and under the umbrella of that project SWE teams build a custom service/platform.**Level of effort:** Medium effort for CPFR team; medium for CPH team; maximum for SWEs during initial build, but medium for updates  
   **Amount of control over data:** Initially very good, possibly slow to update  
   **Clear domain split with VDS:** Improved, but the "line of demarcation" will be difficult to update over time  
   **Improves data availability for internal users:** Yes, with scope-limitations, and might incur additional build-time for SWEs.
3. ***"CPH builds the portal, BI builds the service/platform"*What this looks like:** CPH builds a portal for us on the hub. Our BI teams provide a service/platform either in Snowflake or with APIs already in-place.  
   **Level of effort:** Medium effort for CPFR team (I "pre-gamed" a lot of this); low for CPH team; high for BI during initial build, but low for future updates  
   **Amount of control over data:** Maximum. I hesitate to say, "sky's the limit", but almost  
   **Clear domain split with VDS:** Yes, can be completely policy-controlled  
   **Improves data availability for internal users:** Yes, limited only by BI team capacity and backlog priority  
   **Can roll-out MVP service/platform before CPH hub portal is finished:** Yes, this is the only option that realistically allows this.

As it stands, I'm fully behind option 3 with a mid-project roll-out using (probably) Tableau Cloud before flipping it over to CPH. However, I recognize that sometimes the "wind is blowing" in a different direction, so I can get behind option 2 if necessary. Option 1 doesn't make sense to me at all.