

Supply Chain Simulation and Optimization with anyLogistix

Decision-oriented teaching notes for model-based management decision making

Prof. Dr. Dmitry Ivanov

Berlin School of Economics and Law *Professor of Supply Chain Management*

To be cited as: Ivanov D. (2018). Supply chain simulation and optimization with anyLogistix. 2nd, updated edition, Berlin School of Economics and Law.

© Prof. Dr. Dmitry Ivanov, 2017. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

About the Author	7
Foreword	8
Understanding Projects	
Understanding Scenarios	
Option 1: Setting Up a Green Field Analysis Experiment	
Option 2: Setting Up a Network Optimization Experiment	
Option 3: Setting Up a Simulation Experiment	
Chapter 1: Two-stage Supply Chain	
Our Learning Objectives	20
Performing a Green Field Analysis (GFA) for a New Facility	
Our Green Field Analysis Case Study: Facility Location Planning	
Creating a Scenario	20
Defining Supply Chain Structure and Parameters	
Adding Customers and their Locations	
Defining Products and Customer Demand	23
Importing Data from Microsoft Excel workbooks	
Creating Groups	
About Green Field Analysis	
Creating a New Experiment	
Determining the Optimal Location for a Single Warehouse	
Determining the Minimal Number of Warehouses and their Locations	
Discussion Questions	
New Simulation Experiment	
KPI Dashboard	
KPI System	
Revenue, Costs, Service Level, Lead Time and On-time Delivery	
Transportation Distance and Costs	
Sourcing Policy Definition	
Experiments and Analyses	38
Simulation Experiments for Multiple Warehouses with Real Routes	
Simulation Experiments for Single Warehouses with Real Routes	
Supply Chain Redesign	
Our Case Study: Multi-Product Supply Chain Redesign	
Scenario Settings	
Simulation Experiments	
AS-IS Supply Chain Simulation	51
Supply Chain Redesign	51
Network Optimization Approach and Optimization-based Simulation	55
Case Study	

Simulation Experiment	
Optimization Experiment	
Optimization-based Simulation Experiment	59
Chapter 2. Three-stage Supply chain: Inventory Control and Transportation Policies	62
Our Learning Objectives	62
Inventory Control Policies	62
Case Study: Distribution Centers with Storage	62
Starting the Case Study	
Demand and Expected Lead Time	64
Transportation Policy and Costs	64
Entering a Fixed Value	64
Reviewing the Path Table's Parameters	65
Grouping Supply Chain Elements	67
Inventory Control Policy	67
Sourcing Policy	
Defining Operational Costs at Distribution Centers	
Creating a KPI Dashboard	68
Tab 1: Financial and Customer Performance KPI	
Tab 2: Operational Performance KPI	72
Inventory and Capacity Dynamics	75
Experiment and Result Analysis	77
Experimental Results	77
Result Analysis	80
Impact of Inventory Control Policy	81
Experiment	
Results Analysis	
Using AnyLogic to Extend anyLogistix	
Impact of Transportation Policy	87
Experiment	
Results Analysis	
Chapter 3. Four-stage Supply Chain: Production Factories and Sourcing Policies	92
Our Learning Objectives	
Production Factories	92
Case Study: Smartphone Supply Chain	
Assessment Questions:	
Supply Chain Design	93
Multi-stage Supply Chain Design	
Transportation, Sourcing and Inventory Policy	
Production Policy and Bill of Materials (BOM)	
Production and Sales Batches	

AS-IS Simulation	
Experiment Preparation and KPI Dashboard	
Experimental Result for Pessimistic Scenario	
Experimental Result for Optimistic Scenario	
Result Analysis	
Sourcing Policies	
Our Case Study: Extended Supply Chain for Smartphones	100
Improvement Action: Single Distribution Center - Increased Capacity	100
Experimental Result	
Result Analysis	
Improvement Action: New Distribution Center - Dual Sourcing	
Changing the Scenario's Sourcing Policy	
Experimental Result	
Result Analysis	
Comparison to New Distribution Center – Single Sourcing	
Comparing Sourcing Strategies	109
Single Sourcing Advantages	
Single Sourcing Disadvantages	
Chapter 4. Risk Management in Supply Chains	
Our Learning Objectives	
Bullwhip Effect in the Supply chain	112
Case Study	
Experiment and Bullwhip Effect Analysis	113
Supply Chain Design and Policies	
KPI Dashboard	
Experiments and Result Analysis	
Batching and Ordering Rules	119
Transportation Batches	
Sales and Production Batches	
Ordering Rules	
Impact of Batching and Ordering Rules on Bullwhip Effect	
Comparison Experiment	125
Ripple Effect in the Supply Chain	126
Case Study: A Distribution Center Stops Working for a Month	
Events	
Simulation Experiment for Ripple Effect	
Analysis of Proactive and Reactive Policies	130
Impact of Inventory Increase	
Impact of a Backup Distribution Center	
Impact of Recovery Strategies	

Variation Experiment	133
Create New Variation Experiment	
Performing a Variation Experiment	
Literature	135
Summary and Discussion Questions	136
Chapter 1	136
Discussion questions:	
Chapter 2	137
Discussion Questions:	
Chapter 3	137
Discussion Questions:	
Chapter 4	138
Avoiding Typical Conceptual Mistakes	139
Appendix 1: Examples of Case Study Problem Statements	141
Example 1: Consolidation Effects in the Retail Supply Chain	141
Management Problem Statement	141
Object of Investigation	
Investigation Process	
The Problem and its Relationship to the Literature	
The Goal of Investigation	
Our Main Decision	
Research Question	
Questions to be Answered to Make the Decision	
Data Needed to Solve Management Problem	
Description of Experiments	147
Direct shipment analysis	
Central Distribution Center Shipment Analysis	
Comparing Two Scenarios	
Example 2	148
Example 3	148
Example 4	149
Example 5	149
Appendix 2: Methods in Facility Location Modelling	151
Appendix 3. Advanced skills in CPLEX-based network optimization in anyLogistix	160
Optimization-based decision-making	160
Three-stage, one-period supply network design	162
Problem statement	
Input data	
Network optimization experiments	166

How to analyze the optimization results and make a management decision	. 168
Is the mathematically optimal solution automatically the right decision?	168
Variation experiment	170
Four-stage, multi-period supply chain planning with capacity disruptions, inventory, and transportat constraints	tion . 170
Problem statement	170
Setting the management problem in anyLogistix Network Optimizer	171
Network optimization results	176
Additional features	176
References	. 177

About the Author

Dr. Dmitry Ivanov is professor of Supply Chain Management at Berlin School of Economics and Law (BSEL). For over 15 years, he has taught courses in operations management, production and supply management, supply chain management, logistics, management information systems, and strategic management at undergraduate, master's, PhD and executive MBA levels at universities in Germany, Russia, UK, US and China.

Before he became an academic, Dr. Ivanov was engaged in *industry and consulting*, especially on process optimization in manufacturing, logistics and ERP systems. His practical expertise includes many projects on application of operations research and process optimization methods for operations design, logistics, scheduling and supply chain optimization.

His research explores supply chain structure dynamics and control, with an emphasis on global supply chain design with disruption management consideration, distribution planning, and dynamic rescheduling. He is (co)-author of structure dynamics control method for supply chain management. He applies mathematical programming, simulation and control theoretic methods. Based on the triangle "process-model-technology", he investigates the dynamics of complex networks in production, logistics and supply chains. Most of his courses and research take place at the intersection of supply chain management, operations research, industrial engineering and information technology.

He is the author or coauthor of more than 260 *publications*, including a textbook, "<u>Global</u> <u>Supply Chain and Operations Management</u>" and a monograph, "<u>Adaptive Supply Chain</u> <u>Management</u>". Professor Ivanov's research has been published in a variety of academic journals, including the International Journal of Production Research, European Journal of Operational Research, Journal of Scheduling, Transportation Research, International Journal of Production Economics, Computers and Industrial Engineering, International Journal of Systems Science and Annual Reviews in Control.

He has been a guest editor different journals, including International Journal of Production Research and International Journal of Integrated Supply Management. He is an associate editor of International Journal of Systems Science and Editorial Board member of several international and national journals such as International Journal of Systems Science: Operations and Logistics. He is Chair of IFAC Technical Committee 5.2 "Manufacturing Modelling for Management and Control". He is General Conference Chair of <u>9th IFAC Conference MIM 2019 "Manufacturing Modelling, Management and Control"</u>.

He regularly presented his research results and has been co-chair and IPC member of many international conferences where he has organized numerous tracks and sessions (including IFAC MIM, INCOM, EURO, INFORMS, POMS, OR, MCPL, LDIC, IFAC World Congress, PRO-VE and ICINCO).

Contact:

Dr. Dmitry Ivanov Professor of Supply Chain Management Berlin School of Economics and Law

dmitry.ivanov(at)hwr-berlin.de

Foreword

anyLogistix is an easy-to-understand tool students and professionals can use to address a wide range of supply chain management (SCM) problems. This guide explains how to use anyLogistix to create supply chain models, conduct experiments and analyze the results. By reducing technical complexity to a minimum, anyLogistix allows students to focus on management decision analysis and use KPIs for operational, customer and financial performance measurement and decision-making.

This guide groups the content into three parts that correspond to three basic process structures — two-stage, three-stage and four-stage supply chains — as well supply chain-based risk management. It presents simulation and optimization examples by describing how to develop and build models and evaluate KPI. It also discusses how to use these models and their simulation and optimization results to improve management decision-making.

Because this guide is focused on management issues, it uses simple terms to describe model developments. If you want to import sample models and use them to perform experiments, you can point to anyLogistix's **File** menu and then click **Import**.

Please excuse any errors in the text and formatting. This guide is a work in progress and we welcome any comments and suggestions that may help us improve it.

This guide's author has also co-authored the textbook "Global Supply Chain and Operations Management" by Springer

(<u>http://www.springer.com/us/book/9783319242156</u>) and its companion web site *http://global-supply-chain-management.de* where additional AnyLogic and AnyLogistix models can be found. In addition, he has also authored the e-book "Operations and Supply Chain Simulation with AnyLogic" (<u>http://www.anylogic.com/books</u>).

Note: this handbook was developed in ALX 2.6. In the current version 2.7, some of interfaces are different and additional features have been added (see <u>https://www.anylogistix.com/re-sources/blog/tags/new+version/</u>

Technically, four most important changes need to be considered in ALX 2.7:

- "Period" in Table "Inventory" cannot be 0 anymore, the minimum value is 1.
- "Aggregation period" in Table "Paths" cannot be 0 anymore, the minimum value is 1.
- A duplication of site, product and period names is not allowed anymore within the same table, e.g., in Table "Period groups", the columns "Name" and "Period" cannot contain the same name.
- If you export a scenario, you need to double click on right-hand side of the scenario name to select the folder to save the scenario, and then press "OK".

Select scenario to export:	Case 2_ NO		*
Select file:	Case 2_ NO		
Export experiments			
Export external tables			
Export empty tables			
Onen superted file	\bigcirc		
		ОК	Cancel

The author deeply thanks the AnyLogic Company for their valuable feedback and improvement suggestions.

An Overview of Supply Chain Management

A *supply chain* is a network of organizations and processes where enterprises (suppliers, manufacturers, distributors and retailers) cooperate and coordinate along the value chain to acquire raw materials, to convert these raw materials into products, and to deliver these products to customers (Ivanov et al. 2017).

Supply chain management (SCM) is a cross-department and cross-enterprise integration and coordination of material, information and financial flows to use the supply chain resources in the most rational way along the value chain, from raw material suppliers to customers (Ivanov et al. 2017).

Supply chain management integrates production and logistics processes at several levels. *Strategic* issues include decisions such as the size and location of manufacturing plants or distribution centers, the structure of service networks and designing the supply chain. *Tactical* issues include production, transportation and inventory planning. Finally, *operative* issues address production scheduling and control, inventory control and vehicle routing.

Decision making in supply chain management implies the use of qualitative and quantitative methods. Quantitative methods are typically based on optimization or simulation. To understand the application of quantitative methods to SCM in practice, SCM courses are often enhanced by decision-support software such as anyLogistix. Universities can use anyLogistix to support SCM, operations and logistics courses.

anyLogistix also makes it possible to develop real-life examples for many of the most important supply chain management domains, including:

- Facility Location Planning
 - Center-of-Gravity Method for Single and Multiple Locations
 - Network Optimization using Mixed-Linear Programming
- Capacity Planning of Distribution Centers
- Inventory Control Policies and Ordering Rules
- Sourcing Policies (Single and Multiple Sourcing)
- Transportation Policies (Full Truckload/FTL and Less-Than-Load/LTL)
- Batching in Transportation, Production, and Sales
- Bullwhip Effect and Ripple Effect Analysis in the supply chain

You can use KPI (key performance indicators) to assess the quality of your decisions in these areas as well as their impact on financial, operational and customer performance in the supply chain. The anyLogistix software can assess the impacts and interfaces of decisions and KPIs in all these domains to help you better answer the following questions:

- Where are the best locations for our warehouses, distribution centers and production sites?
- What are the best policies for replenishment, sourcing and transportation?
- How robust is our supply chain?
- What will happen if we change our inventory policy?
- What will happen if we increase a distribution center's capacity?
- What will happen if demand changes?
- What will happen if we add a new product?
- What does an out-of-stock event cost?

You can model the supply chain in two ways (Figure I-1):

- Analytical modeling that uses optimization models to investigate the supply chain
- Simulation modeling that uses a set of objects and rules that describe their dynamic behavior and their interaction to represent the supply chain



Figure I-1: Analytical and Simulation methods in anyLogistix.

Both methods have certain application areas, advantages and disadvantages. anyLogistix uses both and helps to understand differences and application issues. For example, you can optimize the supply chain's facility locations and then simulate their inventory control policies, transportation and sourcing rules.

You'll start at the strategic level by using a green field analysis (GFA), sometimes called a center-of-gravity analysis, to define your supply chain design. During the second stage, you'll use other parameters — such as transportation costs, real routes and feasible facility locations — and perform network optimizations. As your problem statements become more detailed, your simulations can include combinations of inventory control, sourcing, transportation and production policies (Figure I-2).



Figure I-2: A pyramid of supply chain design and analysis problems.

In addition to the standard functionality you'll find in anyLogistix, you can use AnyLogic to extend a policy or structural object (Figure I-3).



Figure I-3: An AnyLogic extension helps improve anyLogistix's supply chain modeling.

You can use AnyLogic's agent-based, discrete-event and system dynamics simulation models to customize inventory control, sourcing, transportation and production policies as well as distribution centers, customers and suppliers.

As an example, you might decide to <u>not</u> define a distribution center's processing time as a fixed time. Instead, you could embed a simulated distribution center you built in AnyLogic that uses details such as forklift capacities, real layouts and loading and unloading times.

You can also integrate anyLogistix with ERP or SCM systems (Figure I-4).



Figure I-4: anyLogistix's integration with ERP and SCM systems.

We think you will find working with anyLogistix to be intuitive, and you'll find helpful descriptions of the program's features throughout this book.

Enjoy your supply chain simulation and optimization with anyLogistix!

Introducing anyLogistix

Understanding Projects

The anyLogistix software uses projects to organize data and experiments. Each project can include any number of scenarios and experiments. When you create a project, anyLogistix creates a dedicated database to store your project information.

Note: You can only work on one anyLogistix project at a time.

Understanding Scenarios

Your simulation and optimization starts when you create a scenario or import one from a Microsoft Excel workbook. A scenario is made up of the supply chain's :

- Design structure
- Sourcing, transportation, inventory control and production policies
- Parameters of the structural elements and policies

After you've created or imported a scenario, you can perform the following experiments (Figure I-5):

- Supply Chain Optimization: Green Field Analysis (GFA) and Network Optimization
- Supply Chain Analysis: Optimization-based simulation, simulation, variation, and comparison



Figure I-5: An overview of the anyLogistix process that starts when you create a scenario and ends with your experiment's results.

The following illustrations introduce you to anyLogistix's user interface and show you how to create new project. If you're using the program for the first time, the **Projects** dialog box will open automatically. To open it at any other time, point to the **File** menu and click **Select Project**.

anyLogistix	COLUMN TO STREET, or Line 10.			- 6/ 3
File Extensions Settings Help				
file Danson Sitting Taip GFA NO SIM + E-	List of ALX project	ts Project is not selected		
		Canc	el Project name: Database:	New project Default *
		New Project dialog		

Figure I-6: Using anyLogistix's Projects Menu.



Figure I-7: Creating a project in anyLogistix.

Figure I-8 shows the basic steps you'll use to log on to anyLogistix's project database. If you haven't created a user account, the program will prompt you to set up a username and password.



Figure I-8: Logging on to anyLogistix's project database.

As you've seen, your anyLogistix project contains scenarios that describe the supply chain. Figure I-9 shows the basic steps you'll need to perform to create a scenario.

📀 anyLogistix - Training 4.0		-	o x	
File Extensions Settings Help				
GFA NO SIM + E-				2 Name the scenario
1 Click this button to				2. Name the scenario
create new scenario	Scenario name:	Simple GFA		3. Choose scenario type
	Scenario type:	GFA	Υ	
	Created by:	guest		
	Creation date:	2017-05-03		
	Default access:	Full	v	
	Start date:	01.01.2017		
	End date:	31.12.2017		
			^	
	Description:			
			~	
	Add scenario data			
4. C	lick "OK" button	ОК	Cancel	

Figure I-9: Creating a scenario.

After you select a scenario from the list that displays on the left part of your screen (Figure I-10), you'll see a list of options for that scenario. For example, you may see options such as **Scenario Data** and **Experiment Settings**.

If you click **Data** for the selected scenario, a map with your supply chain objects will display in the right part of your screen. You can use the toolbar on top of the map to add objects to your supply chain, show or hide sourcing paths and show or hide object names. At the bottom of the screen, you'll see a list of tables you'll use to set up the supply chain.



Figure I-10: A sample of anyLogistix's graphical user interface.

Basic Advanced All	<u></u> А	dd Remo	ove						
Customers	#	Customer		Product		Demand Type	Parameters	Time Period	
Demand			т		T	T	T		T
Groups	1	Customer 1	Ŧ	Dish washer	•	Periodic demand v	Period=5.0, Quant	(All periods)	V
Products	2	Customer 2	Ψ.	Dish washer	~	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Quant	(All periods)	~
	3	Customer 3	· ·	Dish washer		Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Quant	(All periods)	∇
	4	Customer 4	Ŧ	Dish washer		Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Quant	(All periods)	~
	5	Customer 5	Ŧ	Dish washer	~	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Quant	(All periods)	∇
	6	Customer 6	Ŧ	Dish washer		Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Quant	(All periods)	~
	7	Customer 7	-	Dish washer	~	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Quant	(All periods)	∇
Click the"#" filed to Shift+click to select Ctrl+click for multiple	select the r a range of e selection	ow. row.		Click Shift+ Ctrl+c	the (⊦click click	cell to select it. to select a rang for multiple sele	ge of cells. ection.		
Click the"#" filed to s Shift+click to select Ctrl+click for multiple 2 Customer 2 *	select the r a range of e selection	ow. row.	Enter new	Click Shift+ Ctrl+c	the (+click click	cell to select it. to select a rang for multiple sele nt (All periods)	ge of cells. action.		
Click the"#" filed to Shift+click to select Ctrl+click for multiple 2 Customer 2 × 3 Customer 3 ×	select the r a range of selection Dish washer Dish washer	ow. row.	Enter new Dish wa	Click Shift+ Ctrl+c	the (⊦click click	cell to select it. (to select a rang for multiple sele nt (All periods) nt (All periods)	ge of cells. ection.		
Click the "#" filed to Shift+click to select Ctrl+click for multiple 2 Customer 2 ¥ 3 Customer 3 ¥ 4 Customer 4 ¥	select the r a range of e selection Dish washer Dish washer Dish washer	ow. row. Peri Peri	Enter new Dish wa OK	value sher Cancel	the click	cell to select it. (to select a rang for multiple sele nt (All periods) nt (All periods) nt (All periods)	ge of cells. ection.	Droop	
Click the "#" filed to s Shift+click to select Ctrl+click for multiple 2 Customer 2 3 Customer 3 4 Customer 4 5 Customer 5 *	select the r a range of selection Dish washer Dish washer Dish washer Dish washer	ow. row. Peri Peri Peri	Enter new Dish wa OK	Click Shift+ Ctrl+c sher Cancel	the click	cell to select it. to select a rang for multiple sele nt (All periods) nt (All periods) nt (All periods) nt (All periods)	ge of cells.	Press Sp the value in	ace to ch

Figure I-11 shows how you can change scenario data.

Figure I-11: A detailed look at anyLogistix's scenario data view.

Figure I-12 helps you understand anyLogistix's navigation menus.

• Menu "File"	修 anyLogistix - Ne	ew project	
	File Extensions S	Settings Help	Create New Scenario
	New Scenario Import Scenari	io <u>Ctelel</u>	Import data from Excel
	Export Scenario Add External T	o <u>Chrle F</u>	Export data to Excel
Change user to work	Undo Redo	Ctrl+Z Ctrl+Y	Add external tables to store additional information
Change Project	Change User Select Project Exit		

• Menu "Extensions"

	🙆 :	anyLogist	tix - New	/ proje	ct			
	File	Extensio	ons Se	ttings	Help	_		
	G	Ru	un AnyLo	ogic	-			
								Click to run AnyLogic Professional
• Menu "Settings"	,	修 anyLo	ogistix - N	lew pro	ject			
	_	File Exte	ensions	Setting	s Help			Add, remove, edit database users
		GFA 3 NO 2 NO	NO Distri US Di	U A L U	sers ccess Rul anguage nits	es		Manage access rules to the database Choose UI language
							Add,	remove, edit units
• Menu "Help" 🧧	anyL	.ogistix - N	lew proje	ct				
Fil	e Ext	tensions	Settings	Help				Import examples from Excel
	GFA	NO	SIM		Import E Welcom	ample Screen		Open welcome screen
	3 NC) Distrib	oution a	a _	Show Lo	g File		
	2 NC	D US Dis	stributi	?	ALX Help About Al	X		Open log file
I								anyLogistix help
							Version,	, license, copyrights

Figure I-12: An overview of anyLogistix's menus.

Option 1: Setting Up a Green Field Analysis Experiment

The image below (Figure I-13) shows you how to prepare a green field analysis (GFA) experiment. In anyLogistix's left pane, click the **GFA** heading, click **Simple GFA**, and then click **GFA experiment**. Afterward, you'll need to select your experiment's settings.

myLogata - Taxing File Semicire Setting GFA NO SIM Simple GFA	e Hep Data GifA experiment Custom experiment External tables	1. Click "GFA exp open experimer	veriment" to th settings	Cutomes Sees Supples	eriment – – ×
Basic All Q. Customers (H) Demand (H) Products (1)	Add Remove Name Type New York City 2 Los Angeles 2, Chooc	GFA NO SIM + Simple GFA	Data GFA experiment Custom experiment External tables	Experiment duration: All periods Start date: 2017-01-01 2017-12-31 O Desired number of sites: 1 Maximum service distance: 1000.0	Groups of desti Included v v (Al customers) (Al sites) 3 c 3. Define maximum service distance 1000
	3 Ohicago 4 Bioreugh of C 5 Phoenix Customer	e" button		Distance step for statistics: 100 Products measurement unit: pcs v Distance measurement unit: km v	4. Choose pieces 5. Choose kilometers
		Flows New Sites Distance by Demand Demand by Distance	Flows		- 0 I

Figure I-13: A green field analysis (GFA) experiment's settings.

Option 2: Setting Up a Network Optimization Experiment

The following image (Figure I-14) shows you how to set up a network optimization experiment. In anyLogistix's left pane, click the **NO** heading, click **Simple NO** to select the network optimization scenario, and then click **NO experiment**.



Figure I-14: Network optimization experiment settings.

Option 3: Setting Up a Simulation Experiment

The image below (Figure I-15) shows you how to set up a simulation experiment. In anyLogistix's left pane, click the **SIM** heading, click **Simulation Experiment** and then decide which statistics you want AnyLogistix to collect during the experiment.



Figure I-15: Simulation experiment settings.

Figures I-16 and I-17 show you how to work with anyLogistix's dashboard. You'll use this dashboard—which may include one or many pages—to display the statistics the program collects during your experiment.



Figure I-16: Simulation experiment settings: dashboard (1 of 2).



Figure I-17: Simulation experiment settings: dashboard (image 2 of 2).

Figure I-18 shows you the steps you need to complete to set up a variation experiment. You'll start by navigating to the right to the experiments tree and clicking **Variation experiment**. Afterward, you must select the scenario you want, define the variations and then select the statistics you want anyLogistix to collect.

File Extensions Settings	Help		
GFA NO SIM			
MySC	Data Simulation experiment	Experiment duration: All periods	2. Click "Use replications"
ect "Variation periment"	Comparison experiment Safety stock estimation Custom experiment External tables	1/1/17 12/31/17 Use replications: O Replications per iteration: 10 Variable parameters:	3. Define replications per iteration
4. Press "Add" 1 for the	o set up variations experiment	Add Edit Remove	5. Press this button to select the st to be collected during variation
Page 1 Add new tab			

Figure I-18: Variation experiment settings.

If you want more information about anyLogistix's user interface, you can open the program's Help feature by pointing to the **Help** menu and clicking **anyLogistix Help**.

Chapter 1: Two-stage Supply Chain

Our Learning Objectives

- 1. Develop the analytical and management skills to use the center-of-gravity method and network optimization (uncapacitated facility location planning) to select the optimal locations for your company's facilities
- 2. Develop the technical skills you need to use anyLogistix to create two-stage supply chain models, perform experiments and measure performance
- 3. Understand the major trade-offs in facility location planning that affect the number of sites, lead time and demand uncertainty
- 4. Understand the areas of simulation and optimization

Performing a Green Field Analysis (GFA) for a New Facility

Our Green Field Analysis Case Study: Facility Location Planning

Suresh, a supply chain manager at a German-based retail network, needs to decide where his company should build their new distribution centers and how many centers they need to open to minimize supply chain costs. The data he needs for his analysis are the company's:

- Customers and their geographical locations
- Products and measurement units
- Customer demand
- Per-kilometer transportation costs
- Distances in the supply network

He began gathering the data by asking sales and marketing managers to estimate the annual demand from customers in different regions and then grouping those regions into ten major markets. Afterward, Suresh asked the transportation manager to estimate the company's shipment costs.

In this case study, we'll use anyLogistix to help Suresh improve the distribution center network. The following steps will show you how to:

- 1. Create a scenario and define the supply chain's structure and parameters
- 2. Define the supply chain's customer demand, transportation and sourcing policies
- 3. Parametrize the sites and policies
- 4. Perform the Green Field Analysis experiment to determine the best locations for one or many warehouses
- 5. Create a KPI dashboard and collect statistics on supply chain performance
- 6. Simulate the supply chain design with the new greenfield locations and determine their impact

Creating a Scenario

The first step in building a decision-support model for facility location planning is to create a new scenario. Figure 1, below, shows you the basic steps you need to complete to create a scenario and make it available in anyLogistix's central panel. Each scenario has a supply chain structure and parameters you can use during your simulation and optimization experiments.

anyLogistix - New project File			40 M 40		a care and be		<u>- 0 x</u>
GFA NO SIM	<u> </u>	Click File					
File Extensions Settings	Help		2 Click New Sc	enario			
New Scenario	Ctrl+N			chano	J		
Export Scenario	Ctrl+E						
Add External Table							
Undo	Ctrl+Z						
Redo	Ctrl+Y						
Change User							3. Name the scenario
Select Project			Scena	ario name:	New scenario 1	-	"Green Field Analysis"
Ent			Scena	ario type:	GFA		
			Creat	red by:	Daria		A Select Scenario type
			Creat	tion date:	2017-03-20		4. Select Scenario type
			Parer	nt:	None		
			Defa	ult access.	Full	v	GPA
				an occess.	1 Gil		GFA
			Start	date:	01.01.2017 🖉 🕶	0:00:00	NO SIM
			End o	date:	01.01.2018 🗊*	0:00:00 🗘	INIC
						~	
			Desc	ription:			
						×	
					ОК	Cancel	
							1
					5. Cild	CK OK	J

Figure 1: Creating a scenario.

You can modify a scenario's properties by right-clicking the scenario's name to open the context menu, and then clicking **Properties**. You can also import a scenario from a Microsoft Excel workbook and use it to perform an experiment.

🦄 anyLogistix - New project			- 0 <u>- X</u>
File Extensions Settings Help			
GFA NO SIM +		▶ 😣 🙆 🛞 💱 🔛 abc	Customers
Green Field Analysis	Data GFA experiment Custom experiment External tables	Ardir Dees Ardir A	Sites of Suppliers
Basic Advanced All Q Customers Demand Groups	Add Remove # Name Type T	ANTARCTICA ANTARCTICA Location T T T T T T T	ANTARCTICA
Products			

Figure 2: Using the Start window to prepare a new scenario.

We've named our new scenario **Green Field Analysis** (GFA), and it now displays in the program's list of scenarios. Our next step is to define the supply chain's structure and parameters.

Defining Supply Chain Structure and Parameters

Adding Customers and their Locations

Our first step in defining the supply chain's structure is to define our customer locations. To define a location, right-click on the map, click **Create Customer** and enter the required information (Figure 3). Afterward, anyLogistix adds the customer location and its latitude and longitude to the list of customers (Figure 4).



Figure 3: Defining a new customer.



Figure 4: A view of anyLogistix's list of Customers.

Defining Products and Customer Demand

Before we define customer demand, we need to use the **Products** table to add and define the products we will ship to our customers. In our example, we'll define a new product (**Water**) by opening the **Products** table and clicking **Add** (Figure 5).



Figure 5: Adding and defining a product.

To set the product's demand parameters, click the **Demand** heading on the screen's left pane. The **Demand** table that opens lists our customers and allows us to select each customer's demand type and demand parameters. In time, anyLogistix will use these values to compute our service levels.

🔥 anyLogistix - New project	_ 0 x
File Extensions Settings Help	
GFA NO SIM +	V (R) (a) (B) (B) (C) I abc relevant Moderate (Control (C
Green Field Analysis	Data viet strikerd excession elleray survive Sites a
	GFA experiment Serverous Lubect Rostock estimation Oligityn Fooder Suppliers
	Custom experiment Ameland Breneflaven Hamburg Schwerin Neutrangehaung
	Evennal tables of Based Greiningen Bremen of Based of Christian Cryu
	Corzów Yrego uninetica Assen Corzów Toruń o Cłechanow Białystok
	Hoofdoor Nederland, Controling Hangover Wolfsburg Gerlin Wickwee gPlock Warshawa
	Den Haag dutrecht Engelede a Braunschweig Waldehung Zuiters Polska Sedie Generr Onerre
	Rotterdam Anjimeen Munster Bicefeld Cottous Godia
	Madeleurg, Eindhoven, Essens Dortmund Kassel Leipzig Cirgow Radom Capar
	anwarpen kay Deutschland Presen Wrotaw Crestoniows Kiele Lubin Chem
	uie de Beigie / pour Marburg Chemitzene uibere waterrych oppie Dabrowa o'ijuka Piese o
	Bergren Goodenz Frankfurt am Labern Praha Katowice Gorado Katowice Gorado
	ens Bichardbard Barnister Prend Carrier Orandolice Ostravas Carrier Participation Presson Analis
	Charlender Annahering Vesko odlomouz Bula o'na bata berender ber
	and samound several developing Budgeree Din Olina of Presor Base Americana Americana Several Cessa Din Olina of Presor Base Americana Cessa Din Olina Cessa Din Oli
	Paris Marcy Assure Ostuttear singeliast Slovensko «Kolice Veropan namine»
Beete Adversed All Q	Add Bannain
Basic Advanced An S	ruu Remove
Customers	# Customer Product Demand Type Parameters Time Period
Demand	Y Y Y Y Y
Groups	1 Customer 1 v Water v Periodic demand* Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) v
Products	2 Customer 2 v Water v Periodic demand Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) v
	3 Customer 3 v Water v Historic demand Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) v
	4 Customer 4 × Water × Periodic demand × Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) ×
	5 Customer 5 × Water × Periodic demand × Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) ×
	6 Customer 6 × Water × Periodic demand × Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) ×
	7 Customer 7 × Water × Periodic demand × Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) ×
	8 Customer 8 · Vater · Periodic demand · Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) ·
	9 Customer 9 × Water × Periodic demand × Period=10.0, Qua (All periods) ×
	10 Customer 10 × Water × Periodic demand × Period=10.0. Qua (All periods) ×

Figure 6: Selecting product demand data.

For now, we'll use two parameters—**Time Period** and **Quantity**—to define customer periodic demand. By setting the **Period** value to 10 days and the **Quantity** value to 5, we've ensured our simulated customers will send a new five-unit order to the distribution center every ten days.

You can set customer demand to be *deterministic* or *stochastic* by using the **Demand** table's **Demand Type** column to select **Periodic demand** or **Historic demand**.

You can use periodic demand if you know the sales quantity that takes place during a given period. In this example, we know we can expect to sell five water pallets within ten days. By contrast, historical demand assumes you use data about sales over a longer period such as the previous year. To define our historical data, we'll select the **Historic demand** option and click **Add** (Figure 7).

Ac	ld	Remove				
#	Date		Quant	ty		
		T			т	
1	<mark>29</mark> .04.20	16 💵 12:2	10			
2	4/30/16	12:27 PM	20			
				ОК		Cancel

Figure 7: Setting up historical demand.

To define periodic demand data, we select the **Periodic demand** option and then define the customer's demand for a given period. For example, Figure 8 shows you how to set **Customer #1**'s demand for five water pallets over a ten-day period.

👌 anyLogistix - New project						
File Extensions Settings Help					1/4/10/	
GFA NO SIM +		× 🙆 🙆	🕘 🚳 🕎 abc 🔜	Rügen (inzel) Hadensee	Соупар Калинина рад	Customers
Green Field Analysis	Data GFA experiment Custom experiment External tables	And Horse And And And And Horse H	Land Contract of the second se	And and a second	And Andrew Constants and Andre	Sine Convertient C
Basic Advanced All Q	Add Remove		Quantity 5.0			
Customers	# Customer	Product Demar	ОК	Cancel		
Demand	T		T	T		
Groups	1 Customer 1 v	Water * Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods)		
Products	2 Customer 2 *	Water * Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua			
	3 Customer 3 *	Water Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods) =		
	4 Customer 4 *	Water Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods) =		
	5 Customer 5 *	Water * Periodic	demand = Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods) *		
	6 Customer 6 *	Water * Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods) *		
	7 Customer 7 *	Water • Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods) =		
	8 Customer 8 *	Water Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods) 👻		
	9 Customer 9 =	Water • Periodic	demand = Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods) *		
	10 Customer 10 *	Water • Periodic	demand * Period=10.0, Qua	. (All periods)		

Figure 8: A Periodic demand setup.

To make our analysis more valuable, we'll change the default customer names—for example, **Customer 1** and **Customer 2**—to the names of the markets we serve such as Hamburg and Berlin. To do this, open the **Customer** table and change the **Name** values as needed.

anyLogistix - New project					
File Extensions Settings Help	n				Niel / Strabulu 0K052alin oFibian Suwalk
GFA NO SIM +		r (§	3 🙃 🚳 🚱	abc ekeroog	Lübeck Rostock oswinaujscie Oligztyn Customers
Green Field Analysis	Data		Vieland	Propiolity	8 Sites
1	GFA experiment	gham	North s. Den Helder	Oldenburg	Bremen o ^{Pila} Bydgoszcz o ^{tomza} Suppliers ^H
	Custom experiment	A CA	Jea	Assen	Wielkopolski Toruń oCechanow
	External tables	Norw	Hoofddorp	Nederland Osnabr	uck Hannover eWolfsburg Pottam oPoznań www. Warszawa
		Ipswich	Den Haag	oUtrecht Enschede	Braunschweig Magdeburg Zielona Polska Siedice Bpect
		London	Rotterda Middelburg, Eindhr	m Nijmegen Münster	aderborn Göttingen Halle
			anterbury	Esseno Dortm	nund Kassel o Leipzig
		Brighton	Dunkerque Belgigu	e / Köln Bonn	Deutschand Wroclaw Częstochowa Kielce
			Lilled België België	Liège Z Koble	Marburg Chemnitz Liberec Walbrzych Opole Dabrowa Usti nad Hradec Gorbicza
			Saman 3 A	Luxembourg Hun	Main Schweinfurt Praha Kralové Rygnike Kraków Tarnow
		Cale Manual	Saint-Quentin Charles	ArionTo	Darmstadt Pizeh Česko Ostravač Bielsko Nowy Sącz
		PR	ouen Mézièn	es Saarbrücken Speve	e Heidelberg Ceske Broo of Zilina
		in hotel d	e villed O	Metz Karlsruhe	Stuttgart Regensburg Budéjovice Triencin Prešov Ope
		at the	Paris	Strasbourg?	Augsburg Linz Wine Trnava Nitra
		Le Mans	1222	Fre	elburg CMünchen St. Polten Bratislava
		20X	Orléans	Mulhouseo	Breisgau Kempten oSatzburg Rudanest Debreren oBala Mare
Basic Advanced All Q	Add Remove				
Customers	# Name	Туре	Location	Inclusion Type	
Demand	Ϋ́	Ť	Ŧ	Ŧ	
Groups	1 Hamburg	Customer	 Hamburg locatior * 	Include v	
FIODUCIS	2 Berlin	Customer	Berlin location	Include v	
	3 Hannover	Customer	Hannover location	Include 🔻	
	4 Dresden	Customer	 Dresden location * 	Include v	
	5 Frankfurt	Customer	 Frankfurt locatior * 	Include v	
	6 Erfurt	Customer	▼ Erfurt location ▼	Include v	
	7 Munchen	Customer	Munchen locatior	Include v	
	8 Stuttgart	Customer	 Stuttgart location * 	Include 👻	
	9 Cologne	Customer	Cologne location v	Include v	
	10 Nurnberg	Customer	Nurnberg location	Include v	

Figure 9 below shows the results of our renaming process.

Figure 9: Renaming customers.

anyl onistix . New r

Now, we'll define the periodic demand for each customer (Figure 10).

File Extensions Settings Help						
GFA NO SIM +		*	8 🙆 🚳 🚱	abc exercoop	k Rostock OSwinou	e Elblag Suwato, ujście Olsztyn Customers
Green Field Analysis	Data			Ameland Bremerhaven Ha	mburg oSchwerin Neubrandenburg	g Sites
	GFA experiment	gham	North Sea Den Helder	Oldenburg Deremen	Sale J	Gorzów Bydgoszcz o ^{tomza} Suppliers
	Custom experiment	200	Norwich	Assen	Berlin	aWielkopolski Torun a Włocławeko oPłock
	External tables	Camt	bridge Den Haag	OUtrecht Enschede Brauns	o Wolfsburg o Potsdam	Polska Warszawa
		Ipswi	Rotterda	m Nijmegen Munster Bielefeld	tingen welle	Azelona bpect bpect
		0 A 4	Canterbury Gent	oveno Esseno Dortmund Kassel	Leipzig	Legnica
		Brighto	on Dunkerque Belgiqu	e / Koln Bonn Deutso	chemnitz	Wrocław Częstochowa Kielce
			Belgie	n Liege S Koblenz Frankfurt am	Ustinad Labern Prai	Hradec Gornicza Králové Katowice Gornicza
			Amiens 21	Arion Ther Mainzo Darmstadt	ichweintuit Pizeń	Pardubice Ostravao Biolsko, Novo Sara
		o Le Ha	Rouen Charles	Saarbrucken, Mannheim, Heidelberg	BNurnberg	Bino Bino
		in he	otel de villes Op	Metz Karlsruhe Stuttgart	Regensburg Budejovice	Trendin oPresov
		The second	Paris	Strasbourg Reutlingen Pulle	Augsburg Linz	Wien Trnava Nitra
		o Le-M	Tans Ordeans	Freiburg im Breisgau	6 Munchen	St. Polten Bratislava Egero Satu Mare
		FX	Orieans	Mulhouseo Basel Swinterthur	- And Broading	Budapest Debrecen oBala Mare
Basic Advanced All Q	Add Remo	ove				
Customers	# Customer	Product	Demand Type	Parameters	Time Period	
Demand		т	т		т	
Groups	1 Hamburg	* Water	• Periodic demand •	Period=5.0, Quantity=10.0	(All periods)	
Products	2 Berlin	∞ Water	* Periodic demand *	Period=5.0, Quantity=12.0	(All periods) 🔹	
	3 Hannover	• Water	 Periodic demand * 	Period=5.0, Quantity=8.0	(All periods)	
	4 Dresden	• Water	* Periodic demand *	Period=5.0, Quantity=8.0	(All periods)	
	5 Frankfurt	- Water	 Periodic demand 	Period=5.0, Quantity=10.0	(All periods)	
	6 Erfurt	 Water 	 Periodic demand * 	Period=5.0, Quantity=7.0	(All periods) 🔍	
	7 Munchen	• Water	 Periodic demand 	Period=5.0, Quantity=13.0	(All periods)	
	8 Stuttgart	- Water	 Periodic demand = 	Period=5.0, Quantity=8.0	(All periods)	
	0 Calana	v Water	* Deriodic demand *	Reded 5.0 Question 12.0	(III)	
	9 LOIOPhe			Period=5.0. UDantity=12.0	(All periods)	
	9 Cologne	water	Periodic demand Periodic demand	Period=5.0, Quantity=12.0	(All periods)	

Figure 10: Setting the experiment's demand data.

Note: If you want a flexible approach to demand data, you can define **Time Periods** (for example, spring, summer, winter and fall) and use the **Demand Fore-cast** table to define demand coefficients (Figure 11).

 \rightarrow You can define stochastic demand, we can select different types of distributions clicking the arrow in the respective parameter (that is, period or quantity):

#	Customer	Product		Demand Type	and Type Parameters			Time Period		
		T		-	T			T		T
1	Hamburg	Ŧ	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Qua	ntity=10.0		(All periods)	T
2	Berlin	v	Water	v	Periodic demand				ds)	T
3	Hannover	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Period, days	• 5.0		ds)	v
4	Dresden	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Quantity	10.0		ds)	v
5	Frankfurt	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻		Туре:	Value	▼ ds)	v
6	Erfurt	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻		Value	Value	ds)	T
7	Munchen	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Qua	ntity=13.0	Uniform	eriods)	v
8	Stuttgart	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Qua	ntity=8.0	Exponential	eriods)	v
9	Cologne	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Qua	ntity=12.0	Normal	eriods)	v
10	Nurnberg	v	Water	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=5.0, Qua	ntity=8.0	Lognormal	eriods)	v

A	Add Remov	e			
#	Name	Start		End	
		r	т		т
1	Basic period	1/1/16		1/1/17	
	#	Add Remov	Add Remove # Name Start 1 Basic period 1/1/16	Add Remove # Name Start 1 Basic period 1/1/16	Add Remove # Name Start End 1 Basic period 1/1/16 1/1/17

Figure 11: Defining Periods.

Importing Data from Microsoft Excel workbooks

If you have a long list of customers and products or you want to avoid manually entering demand data, you can import this data from a Microsoft Excel workbook. To do so, point to the **File** menu and then click **Import**.

You can import sample ALX scenarios and your own scenarios with experiments. You can also accelerate the scenario creation process by using a Microsoft Excel workbook to create a scenario. After your scenario is complete, you can import it into anyLogistix.

Creating Groups

The problem in this example is simple, but other problems can be complex. To simplify your simulation modelling and experiments, you might want to group similar objects, such as distribution centers, customers or suppliers. You'll do this in the **Groups** table (Figure 12).

AnyLogistix - New project			
File Extensions Settings Help			
	× 8	🖲 🕘 🚱 🎇 abc 🚛	Kiel strasund o'Koszalin o'Elolag Suwalk Lúbeck Rostock oSwnoujšce Okztyn Customers
Green Field Analysis	Data	Ameland Bremerhaven	Hamburg oSchwerin Neubrandenburg Sites
1	GFA experiment	Vieland Groningen Breme	en Bydgoszcz otomza Suppliers w
	Custom experiment	"The Sea Den Helder of Assen	Gorzów o Ocechanów Białystok
	Eutoroal tables	ch Nederland Hang	nover Weltham Berlin Wlocławeko oPłock
	Cambridge	Den Haag oUtrecht Enschede	Braunschweig OMenderung Potsdam
	Ipswich	Rotterdam Nijmegen Münster Bielefeld	Cottbus o Gora
	Car	Middelburg Eindhoven Esseno Dortmund Ka	Goodingen Halle Cassel Leipzig
	Brighton		nd Oresden Wrocław Czestochowa Kielce Lublin Chem
	0		Chemnitz
		# Customer Included	Labern Praha Králové Katowice Górnicza Králové
		T T	Pizeň Pizeň Ostravao Pauluke Ostravao Pizeň Alexandrov Pizeň
	oLe Havre Ro	1 Hamburg	berg Cesko colomouc Biaso county sales
	in hotel de	2 Berlin	Regensburg Budejovice
		3 Hannover 🦲	urg Lunz Wien Trnava Nitra
	Le Mans	4 Dresden 💽	St. Polten Bratislava Egero Miskolc Satu Mare
	True	5 Frankfurt 💽	Győr Budapest Deprecen oBaia Mare
Basic Advanced All	Add Remove	6 Erfurt 💽	
Customers	# Group Description	c 7 Munchen 💽	Groups
DCs and Factories	T T	8 Stuttgart 💽	T .
Demand	1 Customers		
Groups	- customes	Ľ	
Location Lists		OK Ca	ancel
Locations			
Measurement Unit Conversion			
Measurement Units			
Period Groups			
Periods			
Product Groups			
Products			
Sourcing			

Figure 12: Creating a group.

To create a group, click **Add** and then enter the new group's name (for example, **Customers**). Second, we open the list of all customers in the new **Customers** table and activate those we need in the group. For distribution centers and factories, we activate objects in the **Sites** column. Supplier groups are created in the **Suppliers** column.

After you create your groups, you can use them in sourcing, transportation, inventory and production policy definitions instead of individual objects. In the **Product groups** table, you can group individual products in a similar way. This helps to *reduce modeling complexity*.

With our data set up, we are ready to perform our first experiment.

About Green Field Analysis

The objective of our first experiment is to determine the best location for our distribution center. We want to find the location that allows us to fulfill our customer demands at the lowest total transportation cost.

A green field analysis (GFA), also known as center-of-gravity analysis, is a common method for determining the optimal locations for new facilities (Ivanov et al. 2017). The issues we need to consider during a green field analysis are our customers' locations, the distances from our warehouse or warehouses to our customers and our customers' demands for our products.

In anyLogistix, an ordered pair of (x;y)-coordinates represents each customer location. You can't change these data; they are input data or problem *parameters*. By contrast, your new warehouse's (x;y)-coordinates $(p_x;p_y)$ are variable. anyLogistix will determine them after it calculates the data you provide in a way that matches the parameters you set. As a result, we say p_x and p_y are this scenario's *decision variables*. We also assume our transportation cost is linearly proportional to the distance and the transportation volume (that is, the demand). We can see the total transportation costs will depend on the coordinates $(p_x;p_y)$ of our prospective warehouses and distances. We assume the transportation costs from the prospective warehouse $(p_x;p_y)$ to a customer location $(x_i;y_i)$ is more or less equal to the distance and demand.

With that in mind, we need to determine the distances $d((p_x;p_y); (x_i;y_i))$ between the *i*-customer location and the warehouse to calculate transportation costs. To minimize the payments to the forwarding company, you must vary p_x as well as p_y as long as $Z(p_x;p_y)$ becomes minimal.

Creating a New Experiment

In **Experiments**, we select Green Field Analysis. We select our new **Green Field Analysis** scenario (Figure 13).

🔗 anyLogistix - New project	NAME AND ADDRESS OF OWNER	or Manufill or with law 11 and 120						- 0 - X-
File Extensions Settings Help								
GFA NO SIM +								
Green Field Analysis	Data GFA experiment Custom experiment External tables	Start date: End date: 01.01.2016 □ 01.01.2017 □ Desired number of sites: 1 1 ■ Maximum service distance: 2000 20000 □ Distance step for statistics: 1 100 ■ Products measurement unit: ■ m³ * Distance measurement unit: ▼	# 1 2 3	Groups of destinations (All customers) (All sites) Customers	Ţ	Included © ©	Υ	
Flows New Sites Distance by Demand Demand by Distance Add new tab	Flows							0

Figure 13: Setting data for a Green Field Analysis experiment.

We'll start by selecting the locations and customers we want to include in our analysis. In this example, we'll include all our customers. Second, we can perform the computation in two modes:

- Define optimal location for a single warehouse
- Define minimal number of warehouses and their locations subject to a maximum service distance.

Determining the Optimal Location for a Single Warehouse

In a Green Field Analysis experiment, the default value for the **Desired number of sites** parameter is **1**. While you can easily change the default value if you want to consider more than one location, we'll continue our work to determine the optimal location for a single warehouse (Figure 14).

🔥 anyLogistix - New project															. 0 ×
File Extensions Settings Help															
				*	8 💿 () 🚯 ք	abc Flensbur	rg Fehmarn Hiddensee	ügen (Insel)		Gdansk Gdynia	оКали	нинград	CL	ustomers
Green Field Analysis	Data					wa	ttenmeer	Kiel Stralsun	d	n Koszalin	oGdan	SK	Sinvalki	200	Sites
	GFA e	experiment	~				Spiekeroog	Lubeck	9 Świnoujście			Olsztyn		for S	uppliers
	Pou	cult 1				Ameland	Bremerhaven	Hamburg oSchwerin	Veubrandenburg					O Long	E
	110.	Juici		4	Vilelan	d Gron	ingen	Provense.	oSzczecin	Pita	Bydaoszcz		Łomża	6	ananonen
	Custo	m experimer	ht	-	Prth Sea Den Helder	o Oli	denburg Offerner	122 CONT	Gor	zów	Tonin	Cleck	nanów Biały	stok	1º
	Extern	nal tables		0				AHST MAY	Berlin	elkopolski	Włocławeko	aBlack		23	
				dge	Hoofddorp	Nederland	Osnabrúck Hann	over pWolfsburg Potedam	m	oPoz	nań	was 1	Narszawa		
				0	Den Haag	oUtrecht Ensched	Bielefeld	Magdeburg Magdeburg	oz oz	lielona	Polsk	a	Siedice	Брест	n
				2.	Rotterd	Nijmegen	Paderborn	Gottingen Halle	Contous	Glonów	Kalisz	Lódź	Tel to	for	A.F.
				Canterbury	- Section	Esseno	ODortmund Ka	asso	7.30	Legnica		Rad	om	2	
				Dunke	Gent	twerpen Koln	Deut	schand	Bresden	W	ocław Czestoch	owa Kiel	ce Lublin	chelm	23
				A	Lilleo Belgie	e/ ~ ~ ~	Marburg	Chemnitz	Liberec	Wałbrzyc	h Opole D	abrowa		- F	олуцьк
				Real	Belgie	n bege	Koblenz Frankfar	ft apr	Labem	Hradec Králové S	Katowice	iornicza		1	
				Amie	ins 21	Luxembourg	Mainzo B	OSchweinfurt	O O	Pardubice	Rybniko	Nrakow Tarne	Rzeszów /	Льві	is State
				re	Saint-Quentin Charle	ville Arion to	lannheim	Nümberg	Česl	(0	Momouc Bia	elsko- Nov	vy Sącz	~	Терно
				Rouen	aReim	Saarbrücken	Spever Heidebe	ing grand	České	Brno	· Zilina	mens.	~)		IRANO. XM
				el de villed		Metz	Karlsruhe Stut	ttgart	Budejovice	AS	Trendin		Presov	Xten	Франківськ
				S SC	Paris	Nancy		oingoistadt	and	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	Slove	ensko	Košice Varop	до	
					Troye	500300	Reutlingen	1 Ulm München	Linz	Wien	Nitra	met Mit	skolc		Чернівц
				Port	ans	The state of the s	eim Breisgau	Kempten	Izburg	Iten B	atislava	Egero	25	atu Mare-	s -
				iurs	A Dunie	mainouse	Basel Winterth	in the second	1522 - V	150	iyor Bu	udapest	Debrecen	o Baia Mar	e Suceavao
				The second	Bourges	Besancon 2	Zürich	Innsbruck Österi	reich Graz	Szombathely	Magya	rország	Oradea	0 0 ^B	Bistrița
	Flows													í.	中商口
Flows															
New Sites	F	From	То	Product	Flow, m ³	Geodesic Dista	Flow Cost Esti								
Distance by Demand															
Domand by Distance	1 (Green Field An	Cologne	Water	74.4	254.92	18,965.92								
Demand by Distance	2 0	Green Field An	Hannover	Water	49.6	182.62	9,058.18								
Add new tab	4 (Green Field An	Frankfurt	Water	62.0	144.26	8944.13								
	5 0	Green Field An	Hamburg	Water	62.0	301.78	18,710.61								
	6 (Green Field An	Dresden	Water	49.6	229.27	11,371.69								
	7 (Green Field An	Erfurt	Water	43.4	44.56	1,933.73								
	8 (Green Field An	Munchen	Water	80.6	301.19	24,276.29								
	9 (Green Field An	Stuttgart	Water	49.6	240.68	11,937.94								
	10 0	oreen riela Añ	venin	water	74.4	211.19	20,001.11								
Comparison															

Figure 14: Computed optimal location for single warehouse.

Determining the Minimal Number of Warehouses and their Locations

In our experiment, we select the **Minimize sites number** option and enter a value in the **Maximum service distance** box. In this example (Figure 15), the maximum service distance is 300 kilometers.

Note: anyLogistix's Personal Learning Edition (PLE) does not allow you to set a set a **Maximum service distance**.

🖄 anyLogistix - New project		and the Party of Street Street	and become an and	and the second	
File Extensions Settings Help					
GFA NO SIM +					
Green Field Analysis	Data CGFA experiment Result 1 Custom experiment External tables	Start date: End date: 01.01.2016 ■ Desired number of sites: 1 1 ■ Maximum service distance: ■ 0000 ■ Distance step for statistics: 100 100 ■ Products measurement unit: ■ m³ ■ Distance measurement unit: ▼	 Groups of destinations (All customers) (All sites) Customers 	TINCLUGED	
Flows New Sites Distance by Demand Demand by Distance	Flows				0

Figure 15: Settings to determine minimal number of warehouses and their locations based on the value we enter for the maximum service distance.

AnyLogistix - New project								
File Extensions Settings Help								
GFA NO SIM +	÷			*	8 🙆	o 🚯 👔	abc	Holdensee Guylla Gdańsk Customer
Green Field Analysis	Data			and the second	upon Hull			Spiekeroog Lübeck Rostock oSwinoujście Olszt Sites
	GEA eve	periment	~	diordo o	eeds		A	ameland Bremerhaven Hamburg oSchwerin Neubrandenburg O
	Orner	Jennient	<i>.</i>	05	Sheffield	di.	Väeland	Groningen OSzczecin Pila Budroszcz L
	Resu	ilt 1		Derbyo	Nottingham	orth Sea	Den Helder	o Oldenburg Demen Gorzów To Clechanów
	Resu	lt 2		on o Lich	tield	O		Berlin Wielkopolski Wiotaweko oPhrk
	Custom	experimen	t	nam ^o oC	Cambrid	lge Den	oofddorp Neo	Jerrand Osnabruck Control North Potsdam OPoznań Work Warszaw
	Externa	l tables		rcester	Outord Ipswich	Den	o oll	trecht Enschede Biefefeld Magdeburg Zielona POISKa Siedice
				Bristol	London	Middelburg	Rotterdam	Nijmegen Hullster Broerborn Göttingen Halle Ginnów Kalisz Lódź
				Bath	and the second	Canterbury	Sala	o Esseno Dortmund Kassel o Leipzig Legnica
				Southar	npton Brighton	Gent	Antwer	pen Köin Deutschand Bresden Wrocław Czestochowa Kielce
				Port	smouth	Lilled	Belgique /	Bonn Marburg Chempizero Liberec Walterzych Onein Daham
				houth		1 AS	Belgien L	lege Koblenz Frankfurt am Usti nad Labem Kalove Katowice Gornicza
						Amiens	E j Lu	xembourg Mainzo A Discharpfurt A OPana Prana Province Rybniko Kraków Tamów o
				yo	A State	Saint-Quer	ntin Charleville	Aronio Trier ODarmMagt Pizen Česko Ostravao Bielsko Nowy Sącz
				6.00	Ce Havin	Rouen	Mézières	Saatbrucken
				LE HOCO	Caen		oReims	Metz Spever Regensburg Budéjovice Trentin Presov
					A shotel	Paris		Nancy Karisruhe Skottgart eingoistadt
					(maple)		Troyes	Strasbourg Beutingen Bus Aussburg Linz Wien Tinava Nitra
				Re	Le Man	1 LANT	Prove	Freiburg GMunchen St. Polten Bratislava Miskolc
				THA		Orléans		Mulhouseo Bacel Church & Salzburg Budaneet Debi
					Tou	irs (1)	Dijon	Györ Obugest Of
				ON	lantes	Bourges		Besancon Schweiz (Innsbruck OSterreich Graz (* Magyarorszag Or
				0	Poitiers	1420	VIA 3	Lausanne Suisse / Liechtenstein Klagenfurt Kecskemeto Bekessa
Flower	Flows							
New Sites								
New Sites	Fro	m	То	Product	Flow, m ²	Geodesic Dista.	Flow Cost E	sti
Distance by Demand	1 Gre	en Field An	Numberg	Water	49.6	0.56	27.7	
Demand by Distance	2 Gre	en Field An	Frankfurt	Water	62.0	183.19	11,358.07	
Add now tab	3 Gre	en Field An	Dresden	Water	49.6	263.83	13,085.94	
Add new tab	4 Gre	en Field An	Erfurt	Water	43.4	173.72	7,539.59	
	5 Gre	en Field An	Munchen	Water	80.6	146.83	11,834.35	
	6 Gre	en Field An	Stuttgart	Water	49.6	156.38	7,756.35	
	7 Gre	en Field An	Cologne	Water	74.4	256.28	19,067.6	
	8 Gre	en Field An	Hannover	Water	49.6	0.18	8.98	
	9 Gre	en Held An	Hamburg	Water	62.0	124.51	1,/19.7	
	10 Gre	en rieid An	Denin	water	/4.4	292.33	10,031.07	
Comparison								

Figure 16: Computation result for the minimal number of warehouses and their locations that meets our need for a maximum service distance of 300 km.

The information in Figure 16 shows us the company needs to add two distribution centers if they want their maximum service distance to be 300 km. To determine their location, you'll need to perform another factor rating-based analysis.

Note: You can export the results of your green field analysis to a new scenario. Doing so will help you perform simulation experiments.

Discussion Questions

- If we reduced the maximum service distance, would the number of distribution centers change? Try to compute the case with a maximum service distance of 150 km!
- 2. What other costs and factors should be part of your facility location planning?

New Simulation Experiment

Our simulation experiment is to observe supply chain behavior in dynamics. The static view on supply chain structure will be a *dynamic* form. In this example, we'll simulate the effect of those two new distribution centers. How well will they help us meet our goal of a maximum service distance of 300 km?

First, we need to convert the results of our green field analysis to a SIM scenario by right-clicking **Results 2** in **GFA 1** (Figure 17). Afterward, AnyLogistix displays **GFA 1: Results 2** in our list of scenarios.

anyLogistix - New project							
ile Extensions Settings Help							
			*	8 🙆 (🗅 🚯 👔	abc	Hotsteinisches Gdańsk G
Green Field Analysis	Data		and the second	upon Hull			Spiekeroog Lübeck Rostock Swinoudcie Olszt
	GEA ovporime	ant A	dfordo 9	eeds °		Amel	ameland Bremerhaven Hamburg oSchwerin Neubrandenburg
	GrAexperime		05	Sheffield	4	Viieland	Groningen Bidone rez
	Result 1		Dorbuco	Nottingham	Vorth Sea	Den Helder	o Oldenburg Bremen Gorzów - O, Clecha
	Result 2		beruyu	field		A T	Assen Wielkopolski Torun o
	Custom e	Rename	0	Soventry No	rwich	oofddorp Nede	derland Osnabrück Harger pWolfeborg of oPoznań ePlock W
	customic	Delete		Cambrid	Den	Haag oUtre	Irecht Enschede Polska
	External t	Convert to GFA scenar	io	Oxford		Rotterdam	Numster Biefeld Cattbus Gora
		Convert to NO scenari	0	London	Middelburg	Eindhoven	o Esseno Dodmund Karsel Leipzig Ologów Kalisz Lodz Rador
		Convert to SIM scenar	10	10 pt .	Gent	Antwerpe	men buttere bland Dresden
			Southar	Brighton	Dunkerque	Belgigue /	Bonn Bonn Czestochowa Kielce
			Port	tsmouth	Lillea	België / o	ege Liberec Walbrzych o Opole Dabrowa
						Beigien	Main Labern Praha Kralové Katowice Gomicza
					Amiens	Luxe	Ther Darmstadt Pized Pardubice Octravia
			y jogo	Le Have	saint Que	thin Charleville	Mannheim Mannheim Cesko Olomouc Bietsko Nowy
			234	- And	Rouen	oReims Sa	Saarbrucken Snaver Heidelberg
			LE HOCO	Caen	de villeo		Metz Karscuba Suttaart Regensburg Budéjovice Trenčín o
					Paris		Nancy Slovensko o
			SCH	proch ?		Troyes	Strasbourg Reutlingen Pulm Ausburg Linz Wien Vina Nitra
			PRO	Le Man	1 Part		Freiburg St. Polten Bratislava
					Orléans		Mulhousep Basel Wildrachur Kempten Salzburg Budapest
			220	Tou	JIS A	Dijon	Szombathely Szombathely
			ON ON	lantes	Bourges	Be	Besançon Schweiz / Innsbruck Osterrerch Graz Zalaegerszeg
			0 45V	Poitiers		VIEK 2	Lausanne Suisse / Liechtenstein Klagenfurt
Flows	Flows						E
New Sites	From	Те	Draduct	Elen and	Geodesis Dista	Elen Cast Esti	
	riom	10	Floduct	Flow, III	Geodesic Dista.	Flow Cost Esti.	24La
Distance by Demand	1 Green Field	An Numberg	Water	49.6	0.56	27.7	
Demand by Distance	2 Green Field	An Frankfurt	Water	62.0	183.19	11,358.07	
Add now tab	3 Green Field	An Dresden	Water	49.6	263.83	13,085.94	
Add Hew tab	4 Green Field	An Erfurt	Water	43.4	173.72	7,539.59	
	5 Green Field	An Munchen	Water	80.6	146.83	11,834.35	
	6 Green Field	I An Stuttgart	Water	49.6	156.38	7,756.35	
	7 Green Field	An Cologne	Water	74.4	256.28	19,067.6	
	8 Green Field	An Hannover	Water	49.6	0.18	8.98	
	9 Green Field	An Hamburg	Water	62.0	124.51	7,719.7	
	10 Green Field	An Berlin	water	/4.4	242.35	18,031.07	
Comparison							

Figure 17: Our transformation of the green field analysis to a SIM scenario.

KPI Dashboard

We select **GFA1: Results 2** as the scenario for simulation experiment and click **Configure statistics** to create a KPI (key performance indicators) dashboard (Figure 18).

Note: anyLogistix uses a general term ("statistics") instead of KPI. However, this book uses KPI because it is more familiar to managers.

🤌 anyLogistix - New project			_ 0 ×
File Extensions Settings Help			
gfa no sim + 🗲			Show input tables
GFA 1: Results 2	Data Simulation experiment Variation experiment	Start date: End date: 01.01.2016 Image: 01.01.2017 Image: 01.01.2017	
	Comparison experiment Custom experiment	Configure statistics	
	External tables	Finances statistics unit: USD v	
		Time statistics unit: day v	
		Distance statistics unit: km =	
		Select statistics to collect during simulation.	
Dashboard		# Enabled Name Value type Filters Type	
Add new tab		T T T T	
		1 Facility cost Finances 0	
		2 Maximum capacity Products 0	
		3 • Total cost Finances 0	
		4 iransportation cost Finances 0	
		Alpha service level Ratio	
		OK Cancel	

Figure 18: KPI list by default.

Note: If anyLogistix's configuration interface changes in upcoming releases, you may have to use another method to structure your KPIs. However, the underlying principles will not change.

To add KPI to the dashboard, right-click on the dashboard, select **Add item**, and then use the following screen to select the KPIs and the form (Figure 19) the KPIs will take.

GPA NO SIM Image: Statistics selection Preview GPA Statistics selection Preview Image: Statistics selection Image: Statistics selection Image: Statistics selection Image: Statist	nyLogistix - New project	and and the second s	_ _ _ _ X
GFA NO SIM + C At the second of the second	Extensions Settings Help		
GFA 1: Results 2 Set Set Set Finances Finances Total Cost Total Cost Set Products Maximum capacity Temporation cost Total Cost Set Products Maximum capacity Temporation cost Temporation cost Total	IFA NO SIM + E		Show Input tables
Dashboard Add new tab Dashboard Additional settings Databoard Additional settings Additional settings Total \bigcirc Patientic \bigcirc P	GFA 1: Results 2	Statistics selection Preview	
Additional settings # Detail by Contains Show T T T PPE All Total Dely By Item	Dashboard Add new tab	r Finances Facility cost Total cost W Transportation cost M Maximum capacity Table U Statistics name Value 1 Transportation	Ne Barcharc Unit USD
# Detail by Contains Show T T T T 1 Type All Total • By item		Additional settings	Daily Accumulate
т т т 1 Туре All Total • By Item		# Detail by Contains	Show
1 Type All Total 💽 By Item		Ŧ	Y Y
		1 Type All	Total 💽 By item
2 Object All Total By item		2 Object All	Total 💽 By item
3 Destination All Total 💽 By item		3 Destination All	Total 💽 By item
4 Vehicle type All Total 💽 By item		4 Vehicle type All	Total 💽 By item
Comparison	omparison		OK Cancel

Figure 19: Starting to create a KPI dashboard.

KPI System

By default, anyLogistix classifies the 200 KPIs into six groups:

- KPIs for distribution centers
- KPIs for factories
- KPIs for distribution centers with storage
- KPIs for distribution centers with staff
- KPIs for customers
- KPIs for suppliers

Predefined KPIs can help us analyze financial, operational and customer performance. The KPIs in **Statistics collection** are organized in the following groups:

Group	Provides
Finances	Detailed information on generated revenue and incurred expenses
Distance	Detailed information on the distance covered by the vehicles
Volume	Detailed information on the volume of products in stock

 Table 1: KPI classifications.

Group	Provides
Quality	Detailed information on the quantity of processed (as well as dropped/lost) orders and products.
Ratio	Detailed information on the quality of provided delivery services based on an analysis of the received or initially dropped orders and ordered products
Time	Detailed information on time spent processing tasks or idle time
Custom table	A table created by the user within the Anylogic environment
Preset	Grouped sets of regular statistics that allow users to better view and analyze data

In each group, we need to select the KPI and chart type (a table, line, bar chart or histogram chart). For a large model, we can filter or detail KPI by products, types and objects:

- Types: Distribution Center, Factory, Supplier and Customer,
- Objects: individual distribution centers, factories, suppliers and customers
- Products: individual products

Revenue, Costs, Service Level, Lead Time and On-time Delivery

We will create a KPI dashboard for our example. Since we're using a two-stage supply chain, we will take a closer look at the following KPIs for distribution centers and customers:

Financial performance:

• Transportation costs, fixed warehousing costs, total costs, total profit, total revenue

Customer performance:

• ELT service level*, customer revenue, OTD (on-time-delivered) orders, delayed orders, lead-time (that is, the time within which the product is expected to be received by the customer)

anyLogistix uses three types of service levels:

- The **Alpha service level** measures the probability all customer orders that arrive within a given time interval will be completely delivered from stock on hand. Said another way, a lack of stock will not delay the deliveries.
- The **Beta service level** is a quantity-oriented service level with backordering consideration.
- The **ELT service level** is the ratio of orders delivered within the "Expected lead time" (table demand) to total orders.

→ The Alpha service level does not allow a backlog. If a supply chain can't fulfil the or-

	L
4	Ratio
	Alpha service level, by items q-ty
	Alpha service level, by orders q-ty
	Beta service level, by money

- ELT service level, by items q-ty
- ELT service level, by orders q-ty

der, the order is rejected. By comparison, the **ELT service level** includes account backlog and transportation time to the customer..

Since we created distribution centers during our green field analysis, we haven't defined distribution center-based parameters. We need

to define variable processing and fixed warehousing costs (**Other costs** in the Facility expenses table and **Outbound processing costs** in the **Processing costs** table) (Figure 20).

Facility Expenses	#	Facility	Expense Typ	e	Value	Cost Unit		Time Unit		Product Unit		Time Period	
Fleet Size		T		т	T		т		т		Υ.		T
Groups	1	Green Field Analysis GFA DC 0	 otherCost 	v	66	USD	Ŧ	day		,		(All periods)	Ŧ
Inventory	2	Green Field Analysis GFA DC 1	 otherCost 	V	66	USD	v	day				(All periods)	v
Loading and Unloading Gates													
Processing Cost	#	Source	Product		Туре	Units		Cost		Cost Unit		Time Period	
Processing Time		T		т	T.		т		т		т		т
Product Groups	1	Green Field Analysis GFA DC 0	Water	Ŧ	Outbound ship *	m ³	Ŧ	10		USD	Ŧ	(All periods)	v
Production	2	Green Field Analysis GEA DC 1	Water	v	Outbound ship	m ³	v	10		USD	T.	(All periods)	v
	_	areen need need need to be need t	T T C C C C C		o acoouna simplin								

Figure 20: Distribution center cost parameters

For both distribution centers, we define fixed warehousing costs per day at \$66. Outbound processing costs are set at \$10 per m³. Fixed warehousing costs is defined as **Other Cost**. Inventory holding costs can be defined by **interest ratio** or by setting **carrying costs** for each unit per year. In addition, if we have inventory, we need to define **facility costs** per month per m³.

Note: We'll discuss inventory management problems in the supply chain and their implementation in anyLogistix in Chapter 2.

We also need to define our product's cost and selling price:

#	Name	Unit	Selling	Price Cost	C	ost Unit
		T	T	T	T	т
1	Water	m³	▼ 100	50	U	JSD -

Figure 21: Product cost parameters

Transportation Distance and Costs

The final step in input data setting is defining transportation distances and costs. We'll start by using **Vehicle Types** to define a vehicle type as well as the vehicle's capacity and speed (Figure 22).

AnyLogistix - New project	
File Extensions Settings Help	
GFA NO SIM + E- GFA 1: Results 2	Data Data Description Description
Basic Advanced All 🤍	Add Remove
Paths	A New Country Country Country Country
Parlad Casuas	# Name Capacity Capacity Unit Speed Speed Unit
Period Groups	T T T T T T
Periods Processing Cost	1 Truck 50 m ³ * 80.0 km/h *

Figure 22: Vehicle type definition.

We now need to use the **Paths** option to define routes and shipment parameters (Figure 23).

🤌 anyLogistix - New project	
File Extensions Settings Help	
File Extensions Settings Help GFA NO SIM +	Data Simulation experiment Output Simulation experiment Output Simulation experiment Simulation experiment Comparison experiment Comparison experiment Comparison experiment Simulation Simulat
Basic Advanced All	Add Remove
Paths	# From To Cost Calculation Cost Calculation Cost Unit Distance Distance Unit Transportation Time Time Unit Straight Vehicle Type Transportation P.
Period Groups	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y
Periods Processing Cost	1 (All locations) * (All locations) * Distance-based c. * 1.2 * distance USD * 0 km * 0.0 day * 💽 Truck * LTL ·

Figure 23: Routes and shipment parameter definition.

In **Paths**, the first step is to define the routes as **From-To**. In our example (Figure 23), we identify only one group of routes "From All locations To All locations". If our model used different supply chain layers such as distribution centers, production factories and suppliers, we could add other paths to differentiate shipment parameters.

Second, we need to define a rule for calculating shipment costs. In our example, we select **Distance-based cost** and then set up a coefficient of 1.2 per kilometer. In simple terms, this means we will pay \$1.20 for one kilometer.



Third, we can explicitly define the distance and transportation time or allow AnyLogistix to use truck speed and customer locations to compute them. In this example, we'll allow the program to calculate these values.

Fourth, we can decide which distance metrics to use: straight distances or real routes. For simplicity, we will use straight lines.

Fifth, you can select Full Truckload (**FTL**) or Less than Load (**LTL**) transportation options and define minimal load for FTL as well as the rules for order aggregation.

Vehicle Type		Transportation Policy		Min Lo	Aggregate	Aggregation Period		
	т		т	T	T	T		
Truck	Ŧ	FTL	∇	0.6		10		

Note: Use the **MinLoad** and **Aggregation Period** columns to define the rules for transportation batching. In this example, we allow shipments with a minimum load of 60% but limit the wait period to 10 days. In ten days, the truck will be dispatched for shipment even if the load is below 60%.

Sourcing Policy Definition

We need to use the **Sourcing** table to define our sourcing rules. The most general rule could be that all sites (that is, all distribution centers) can supply all customers.

anyLogistix - New project		And the Address of Manager		and the second second			and the second second	
File Extensions Settings Help				Contract 1				
GFA 1: Results 2	Data Simulation experiment Variation experiment Comparison experiment Custom experiment External tables	Annon Control Long of	Acordante Nederla Handerlan Partier Retriefam Antworken Belgier Belgier Belgier Antworken Antworken Antworke	Creating States of Construction of Constructio	emen autor to the second seco	Berin Postar gradeurg Leggy Centrus Carlos Conso Conso Centrus Lubers Pranta Pr	a Brdasser Tarian and Paran Paran Paran Kaisa Code Viroclaw Crestochow Archaw Berney Carcava Ber	Customers Customers Step Step Suppliers Radon Kiece Lubin Kiece Lubin Resco Nerco Novy Sac Preloy Missoc
Basic Advanced All 🤍	Add Remove							
Milk Runs Ordering Rules Path Selection Mode Paths Period Groups Periods Processing Cost Processing Time Product Groups Production Production Batch Production Batch Products Sale Batch Site States Changes Suppliers Vehicle Types	 Elivery Destination Customers and sites supplied Customers and sites supplied 	Trom Green Field Analysis GFA DC 1	Product Type * Water * * Water * * Water *	e st (Single Source) ¥ st (Single Source) ¥	Parameters No parameters No parameters	Sources Green Field Analysis GFA DC 1 Green Field Analysis GFA DC 0	Time Period (All periods) = (All periods) = (All periods) =	Include * Include *

Figure 24: Sourcing rules.

In addition, we can select among different sourcing rules as follows:
First (Single Source)
First (Single Source)
Cheapest (Single Source)
Closest (Single source)
Fastest (Single Source)
Cheapest (Multiple Sources)
Closest (Multiple Sources)
Fastest (Multiple Sources)
Most Inventory (Multiple sources)
<custom> Farthest (Single source)</custom>

Note: In multi-stage supply chains, you can make your simulation modeling flexible and convenient by setting up sourcing policies for each supply chain echelon. Even in a two-stage supply chain, you might need to set up different sourcing policies for different distribution centers, products and customers.

Figure 25 shows our new KPI dashboard.



Figure 25: KPI dashboard

You can customize the manner anyLogistix presents each KPI by enlarging the KPI window and using a toolbar (Figure 26).



Figure 26: KPI presentation customization in the toolbar

Note: To make a diagram smaller or larger, right-click in the dashboard area, select **rearrange**, and then draw the diagram's lower-right corner. To delete a diagram, close it.

Experiments and Analyses

Simulation Experiments for Multiple Warehouses with Real Routes

We're ready to run a simulation experiment and analyze KPI (Figure 27).



Figure 27: Experimental results.

We can see from the experiment's results how our supply chain would perform by analyzing the following KPIs (Table 2).

Table 2: KPIs for GFA analysis with two distribution centers
--

КРІ	Value
Financial DC performance:	
Other cost, \$	48 312.0
Outbound processing cost, \$	70 080.0
Profit, \$	446 817.0
Revenue, \$	700 800.0
Total cost, \$	253 983.0
Transportation cost, \$	135 591.0
Customer performance:	
Lead time, days	0.81*
Service level, %	100*
Customer delayed orders	0
Customer in-time orders	730.0
Customer items arrived	7 008.0
Customer orders arrived	730.0
Current backlog orders	0
Customer ordered items	7008.0
Incoming replenishment items	7008.0
Items shipped	7008.0
Orders shipped	730.0
Outgoing replenishment orders	0

*These KPIs present total lead time and total service level for ten customers. You can change the presentation in the lead time and service level diagrams by detailizing for objects: (Additional setting \rightarrow Detailization by \rightarrow Add \rightarrow Objects). The presentation would show individual service levels (the ration would be 1) and lead times.



Note: You can export KPIs to a Microsoft Excel worksheet by pointing to the **File** menu and then clicking **Export**.

To check the quality of the computed solution, copy the current scenario and move the distribution centers to other points (place your cursor on the map, click a site icon and then drag it to another point on the map) and simulate the supply chain with these new locations. Figures 28 and 29 and Table 3 display the results:



Figure 28: Updated distribution center locations.



Figure 29: Experimental results with updated distribution center locations.

КРІ	GFA locations	Changed locations
Financial DC performance:		
Other cost, \$	48 312.0	48 312.0
Outbound processing cost, \$	70 080.0	70 080.0
Profit, \$	446 817.0	423 238.71
Revenue, \$	700 800.0	700 800.0
Total cost, \$	253 983.0	277 562.29
Transportation cost, \$	135 591.0	159 170.29
Customer performance:		
Lead time, days	0.81	0.95
Service level, %	100	100
Customer delayed orders	0	0
Customer in-time orders	730.0	730.0
Customer items arrived	7 008.0	7 008.0
Customer orders arrived	730.0	730.0
Current backlog orders	0	0
Customer ordered items	7008.0	7008.0
Incoming replenishment items	7008.0	7008.0
Items shipped	7008.0	7008.0
Orders shipped	730.0	730.0
Outgoing replenishment orders	0	0

Table 3: KPI comparison for GFA and changed distribution center locations.

You can see in Table 3 that total costs have increased (\$277 562.29 as compared to \$253 983.0) due to increase in transportation costs. At the same time, the location changes have reduced profit (\$423,238.71 compared to \$446,817).

Simulation Experiments for Single Warehouses with Real Routes

We've learned the supply chain with two distribution centers is more flexible, more responsive and more expensive. Now, we'll run the simulation with a single distribution center: the location from our first green field analysis experiment.

We convert experimental result **GFA1: Results 1** into a new scenario. Figure 30 and Table 4 display our results:



Figure 30: Simulation results for the supply chain with one distribution center.

Table 4: KPI comparison for two distribution centers (GFA and changed distribution center locations) and one distribution center.

КРІ	2 DCs: GFA locations	2 DCs: Changed locations	Single DC
Financial DC perfor- mance:			
Other cost, \$	48 312.0	48 312.0	24 156.0
Outbound processing cost, \$	70 080.0	70 080.0	70 080.0
Profit, \$	446 817.0	423 238.71	419 829.24
Revenue, \$	700 800.0	700 800.0	700 800.0
Total cost, \$	253 983.0	277 562.29	280 970.76
Transportation cost, \$	135 591.0	159 170.29	186 734.760

КРІ	2 DCs: GFA locations	2 DCs: Changed locations	Single DC
Customer performance:			
Lead time, days	0.81	0.95	1.11
Service level, %	100	100	100
Customer delayed orders	0	0	0
Customer in-time orders	730.0	730.0	730.0
Customer items arrived	7 008.0	7 008.0	7 008.0
Customer orders arrived	730.0	730.0	730.0
Current backlog orders	0	0	0
Customer ordered items	7008.0	7008.0	7008.0
Incoming replenishment items	7008.0	7008.0	7008.0
Items shipped	7008.0	7008.0	7008.0
Orders shipped	730.0	730.0	730.0
Outgoing replenishment orders	0	0	0

Table 4 shows us the one distribution center has lowered distribution center-related costs. However, transportation costs have increased significantly, which has led to higher total costs. In this example, we can easily see the effects of consolidation and centralization in the supply chain design (see Figure 31, adopted from Chopra and Meindl, 2015).



Figure 31: General relations in the supply chain design.

The major concepts we cover in this chapter are:

- Green field analysis helps us determine the optimal facility locations
- Input data: to conduct a green field analysis experiment, you must define:
 - ✓ Locations the Locations table
 - ✓ Customers the **Customers** table

- ✓ Products the **Products** table
- ✓ Demand the **Demand** table
- The following green field analysis algorithms are for computation:
 - ✓ K-means algorithm for clustering
 - ✓ Aykin and Babu algorithm for a facility location problem
 - ✓ Criteria: estimation of transportation cost based on volume
- The following tables present green field analysis results:
 - ✓ Locations
 - ✓ Distribution Centers/Factories suggested facilities linked to Locations table
 - ✓ Sourcing defines which product to buy and where to buy it
 - ✓ Locations for the facilities
 - Inventory green field analysis creates simple inventory policies for simulation experiment

Because a green field analysis does not count roads, cities or means of transportation, it may suggest placing distribution centers in surprising locations such as on top of a mountain or in the middle of the ocean. A green field analysis considers all customers with coefficients equal to sum on all products of total demand multiplied by product volume.

Supply Chain Redesign

Our Case Study: Multi-Product Supply Chain Redesign

Alexander, a supply chain manager at a U.S.-based FMCG company, needs to reduce supply chain costs in a distribution network. The supply chain is made up of customers with the following periodic demands and lead time requirements (Table 5):

Customer	Product	Parameters	Expected lead time
New York City 1	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Philadelphia 2	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 8	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Fort Worth	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Boston	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 2	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Portland	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Phoenix 3	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
San Jose 2	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
San Francisco	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Memphis	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 14	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Charlotte	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Oklahoma City	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Nashville	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Columbus	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Chicago 3	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Philadelphia 3	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 12	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Los Angeles 3	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 6	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
San Jose 1	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Tucson	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Columbus	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5

Table 5: Customer demand

Customer	Product	Parameters	Expected lead time
San Antonio 1	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Chicago 2	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 15	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Nashville	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Washington D.C.	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Houston 4	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Dallas 1	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Baltimore	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Denver	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Austin	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Houston 3	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Indianapolis	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 11	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Louisville	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Memphis	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 7	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Chicago 4	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Dallas 2	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Phoenix 2	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
San Diego 1	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Los Angeles 2	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Boston	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Jacksonville	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Chicago 5	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Los Angeles 1	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Albuquerque	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Fresno	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Jacksonville	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 16	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5

Customer	Product	Parameters	Expected lead time
Houston 1	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
El Paso	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Chicago 1	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Portland	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Los Angeles 7	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Baltimore	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Albuquerque	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Milwaukee	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Austin	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 5	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
San Diego 2	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Los Angeles 4	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Houston 2	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Seattle	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
El Paso	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 10	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
San Antonio 2	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Detroit	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Detroit	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
San Francisco	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 9	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 13	Furniture	Quantity=16.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Phoenix 1	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Los Angeles 6	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Milwaukee	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Fort Worth	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Philadelphia 1	Gardening equipment	Quantity=20.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Los Angeles 5	Small appliances	Quantity=4.0;Period, days=5.0	5
New York City 4	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5

Customer	Product	Parameters	Expected lead time
New York City 3	Lighting	Quantity=8.0;Period, days=5.0	5
Las Vegas	Large home appliances	Quantity=12.0;Period, days=5.0	5

Note: This data is included in the sample Microsoft Excel workbook (**01 – Green-field Analysis**) you can find by pointing to the **Help** menu and clicking **Examples**.

The supply chain handles five products:

#	# Name		Unit	
		T		Т
1	Small appliances		pcs	Ŧ
2	Large home appliances		pcs	v
3	Lighting		pcs	Ŧ
4	Gardening equipment		pcs	T
5	Furniture		pcs	Ŧ

Figure 31: Product list.

The supply chain is made up of three distribution centers. Figure 32 shows all three distributon centers and their operating parameters.



Figure 32: The supply chain's distribution centers.

Scenario Settings

During the executive meeting, Alexander suggests the company improve their supply chain's performance by locating their distribution centers no more than 1,000 km from their customers. A Green Field Analysis gives him the following results (Figure 33):



Figure 33: The optimal supply chain design for a maximum service distance of 1,000 km.

The green field analysis suggests the company needs to add a distribution center and place the other three distribution centers in new locations. In the next step, we'll build a KPI dashboard like the example you saw in Section 1.

Simulation Experiments

Before we compare simulation experiment results of our AS-IS and redesigned supply chain scenarios, we convert both green field analysis results to SIM scenarios. Then put the following data to related tables in both scenarios:

- New DC group (activate all objects in the Sites column);
- A **Truck** vehicle type with a capacity of 20 m3 and an average speed of 50 km/hour (to be defined in **Vehicle Types**);
- Transportation costs computation is based on the rule <u>"volume x distance x \$15"</u>. LTL shipments are allowed;
- Unlimited inventory policy type for all products (this policy assumes the specified products are always in stock at the given facility at any required quantity);
- Product cost parameters:

#	Name	Unit	Se	lling Price	Cost	Cost Ur	nit
		T	T	т	1	r	Т
1	Small appliances	pcs	▼ 2,0	000	700	USD	v
2	Large home appliances	pcs	▼ 6,0	000	2,500	USD	∇
3	Lighting	pcs	▼ 5,0	000	2,000	USD	Ŧ
4	Gardening equipment	pcs	▼ 5,5	500	2,500	USD	∇
5	Furniture	pcs	▼ 8,0	000	300	USD	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$

AS-IS Supply Chain Simulation

To analyze the existing supply chain, Alexander needs to define variable processing and fixed warehousing costs (Figure 34).

Facility Expenses	#	Facility	Expense Type	Value	Cost Unit	Time Unit	Product Unit	Time Period	
Fleet Size		т	T	T	T	T	T		T.
Groups	1	1 GFA US Distribution network GFA DC 0	otherCost	* 12	USD	day	v	(All periods)	Ŧ
Inventory	2	1 GFA US Distribution network GFA DC 1	otherCost	* 13.6	USD	day	v	(All periods)	v
Location Lists	3	1 GFA US Distribution network GFA DC 2 $^{\scriptscriptstyle \mp}$	otherCost	▼ 14.3	USD	day	Ŧ	(All periods)	Ŧ
Processing Cost		Courses Decident	Turne		11-24-	Cash	Contillate	These Deviced	
Processing Time	#	Source Product	т	Ŧ	T	Cost T	T T	Time Period	r
Product Groups Production	1	DCs v (All products)	 Outbound ship 	ment processing 🔹	m ³ v	5	USD v	(All periods)	Ŧ

Figure 34: Distribution center-related costs for the existing supply chain

Our first experiment simulates the AS-IS supply chain. Figure 35 displays the results.



Figure 35: Experimental results for AS-IS supply chain.

Supply Chain Redesign

Alexander will now analyze supply chain efficiency by changing the distribution center locations to match the outcome of the green field analysis. He first estimates distribution center-related operational costs as shown in Figure 36.

Facility Expenses	#	Facility	Expense Type		Value	Cos	t Unit	Time Unit		Product Uni	it	Time Period	
Fleet Size		т		т	T		т		Ŧ		т		T
Groups	1	DCs .	initialCost	Ŧ	10,000	US	D	Ŧ				(All periods)	, –
Inventory	2	1 GFA US Distribution network GFA DC 0 🔻	otherCost	v	10	US	D	day		v		(All periods)	
Loading and Unloading Gates	3	1 GEA US Distribution network GEA DC 1	otherCost	÷	16.6	US	D ,	- day		~		(All periods)	, ,
Location Lists	4	1 GEA LIS Distribution network GEA DC 2	otherCost	~	15	110	- D)		~		(All periods)	
Locations	-		othercost		13	05		uay		_		(All periods)	
Measurement Unit Conversions	5	I GFA US Distribution network GFA DC 3 *	otherCost	Ť	13.3	USI	U I	day		*		(All periods)	1 *
<u>م</u>													
Processing Cost	#	Source Product	Туре			Units		Cost		Cost Unit		Time Period	
Processing Time			T		Ŧ		т		Ŧ.		T.		т
Product Groups	1	DCs v (All products)	• Outbound :	shipm	nent processing 👻	m ³	v	5		USD	Ŧ	(All periods)	v
Production													

Figure 36: Distribution center-related costs for new supply chain design.

Alexander now simulates this new supply chain design. Figure 37 and Table 5 display the results.

🙆 anyLogistix - New project		-			Manager and Parlington	Contraction of the local division of the loc			and the second second	-	- 0 - X
File Extensions Settings Help											
GFA NO SIM +					max						Show input tables
GFA 1: Results 2	Data			Start data	ad dates	er Island		and the second second	mark		1
Copy of GFA 1: Results 2 1	Simulati	ion experimer	nt	01.01.2017	01.01.2018	Jan 1, 2018, 12:00:00 AM	A	DAKOTA	014		Mental MEN
GFA 1: Results 1	Variation	n experiment					1	SOUTH	WISCONSIN M		Ottawa Mains
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 1	Compar	rison experime	ent	Coofigure stat	istics	CARECON DAND	OMING	DAKOTA	6	Toront	•
1 GEA US Distribution petwork: GEA result 2	Custom	experiment		203 Comigure state	ISUES			NEBRASKA	Chicag	OHIO PENNS	VLVANIA
1 dires bishbator nework director 2	External	tables				AEVADA	8	United	ILLINOIS	A Aashingto	leiphi
	CALCING	i tubica				CALL UTAN	COLORAG	States ,	AISSOUAL	WEST VIRGINIA	VIA
						0 0	20	oralia	hense	NORT	TH CHARTER STREET
						B S Angelas Moenix	NIW MPC	e \	ARKANSA (3)	SOUTH	
						San Dieg 8	- Calud	ad June	ALABA	MA GEORGIA	
							1	San Antonio	iuston	8	
										FLORIDA	
							Mc	onterreyo	Gulfof		Nassau
							1		Mexico	Cuba	COL.
						and a state of the second		Leon	-		
							Guad	dalajara o Can	Va de speche		Haiti
								México	Belize		Kingston Jamoca
									Guatemala	-	Caribbean Sea
									El Salvado Nie	raragua	
	Other cost	t, Outbound p	processing	cost, Profit, Rev	Total cost, Revenue,	Profit 🗉 🔞	Cur	rrent backlog ord	ers, Custome	r ordered item	s, Incoming r@k
Dashboard	Stat	tistics name Va	alue	Unit	403,106,000	T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-T-		Statistics name	Value	Unit	
Add new tab				1100	350.000.000						
	1 Oth 2 Out	though nro 14	0,038.5	USD	300.000.000			1 Customer orde 2 Incoming real	29,346.0	m ²	
	3 Prof	fit 17	0,558,901.99	USD	250 000 000			3 Items shipped	29,346.0	m ³	
	4 Rev	venue 36	56,460,000.0	USD	250,000,000			4 Orders shipped	6,132.0	Order	
	5 Tota	tal cost 19	95,901,098.01	USD	200.000.000						
	6 Tran	nsportation 19	95,734,329.51	USD	150,000,000						
					100,000,000						
					50 000 000						
					50,000,000						
					0						

Figure 37: Experiment results for the green field analysis.

 Table 6: KPI comparison

КРІ	AS-IS	Redesigned Supply Chain
Financial Distribution Center Perfor- mance:		
Other cost, \$	14 563.49	20 038.5
Outbound processing cost, \$	146 730.0	146 730.0
Profit, \$	135 410 190.44	170 558 901.99
Revenue, \$	366 460 000.0	366 460 000.0
Total cost, \$	231 049 809.56	195 901 098.01
Transportation cost, \$	230 888 516.06	195 734 329.5
Customer performance:		
Current backlog orders	0	0
Customer ordered items	29 346.0	29 346.0
Incoming replenishment items	29 346.0	29 346.0
Items shipped	29 346.0	29 346.0
Orders shipped	6 132.0	6 132.0
Outgoing replenishment orders	0	0

Table 6 shows us a supply chain design that uses four distribution centers is more efficient and profitable. It could reduce total supply chain costs and increase total profit by almost 35 million U.S. dollars without affecting customer performance.

Alexander understands it will be too expensive to build four new warehouses. He notes the suggested locations on the East and West coasts are close to the company's current locations. The south location in Texas is also near the current location in Houston. With that in mind, he decides to analyze the supply chain efficiency for three current locations and a new distribution center in Louisville (1 GFA US Distribution network GFA DC 0).

Let's create a copy of AS-IS supply chain scenario, then add new site and activate it in our group distribution centers.

Adding a site may change inventory policies and sourcing paths. That means we first need to remove all records from the **Inventory** table other than the last one, remove all records in the **Sourcing** table and then add the new row as shown in Figure 38.

Ivanov D. (2018) Supply Chain Simulation and Optimization with anyLogistix

Sourcing	#	Delivery Destination		Product		Туре	Parameters	Sources		Time Period	Inclusion	n
Suppliers		T		T		T	T.		т	т		т
Vehicle Types	1	(All customers)	Ŧ	(All products)	Ŧ	Closest (Single sour.*	No parameters	(All sites)	Ŧ	(All periods) 🔻	Include	Ŧ

Figure 38: Inclusion type.

Every site has facility expenses. Find all records about Louisville distribution center-related costs in the redesigned supply chain scenario and then add them to the related tables. Figure 39 and Table 7 show the results.

Note: To accurately compare different runs, ensure each completed scenario has the the same data, especially while converting the green field analysis or optimization results into a scenario. You should check the groups, paths and sourcing policies that make up the scenario you are converting from an experimental result.

🔀 anyLogistix - New project				and the other						-	- 0 X
File Extensions Settings Help											
GFA NO SIM + E					max					Shor	w input tables
GFA 1: Results 2	Data	а		Start date:	ind date:	lop 1 2019 12:00:00		-12		1	
Copy of GFA 1: Results 2 1	Sim	ulation experi	ment	01.01.2017	01.01.2018 💷-	Jan 1, 2010 12.00.00	NORTH	1. 10	1		In man
GFA 1: Results 1	Vari	ation experim	ent			8		MINNESOTA		Montréa	BRUNSWICK NOVA 3
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 1	Com	nparison expe	riment	Configure stati	istics	DATEON IDANO	SOUTH	WISCONS	IN MICHIGAN	Toronto	HAM
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 2	Cust	tom experime	nt			Carl Andrews W	NEBRASKA	IOWA Chicag	8 8		8
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 1 w	Exte	rnal tables				NEVADA	o Unite	d ALLINON	an Onto	Phila (2) (8)	York
						UTAN	State	s	WEST N	hingto	
						O MAN O		MISSOURI	AN	VIRGINIA	
						(O maples	- OKLA	A ARKANSA	SOL	ROLINA	
						San Dieg	Dalla Giudad Juárez			LINA	
							TEXAS	LOUISIANA		116	
							San Andring	-0	FLORIDA		
							Lafe and	Gulfo	1	1	
							Monterreyo	Mexic	-	Nassau	
						and the second second	México			uba	
							Guadalajara	Bah'a de Campeche			alti 250 les inc
						and the second s	Ciudad c	0	Participant		0 SSO MIL Sally
Dashboard	Other	cost, Outbour	nd processing	cost, Profit, Revenue,	Trofit, Revenue	, Total cost	E @ D Curi	ent backlog ord	ers, Custom	er ordered items	, Incon@g门
Add new tab		Statistics name	Value	Unit	405,100,000			Statistics name	Value	Unit	
	1	Other cost	18,213.5	USD	350,000,000		1	Customer orde	29,346.0	m²	
	2	Outbound pro	146,730.0	USD	300,000,000		2	Incoming repl	29,346.0	m³	
	3	Profit	173,818,296.44	USD	250,000,000		3	Items shipped	29,346.0	m" Order	
	4	Total cost	192.641.703.56	USD	200,000,000			Orders snipped	0,132.0	Order	
	6	Transportation	192,476,760.05	USD	150,000,000						
					100.000.000						
					50,000,000						
					33,000,000						
					0 -						

Figure 39: Redesigned supply chain with adapted green field analysis result.

Table 7: KPI	Comparison
--------------	------------

КРІ	AS-IS	Redesigned Supply Chain	Adapted GFA Result
Financial DC performance:			
Other cost, \$	14 563.49	20 038.5	18 213.5
Outbound processing cost, \$	146 730.0	146 730.0	146 730.0
Profit, \$	135 410 190.44	170 558 901.99	173 818 296.44
Revenue, \$	366 460 000.0	366 460 000.0	366 460 000.0
Total cost, \$	231 049 809.56	195 901 098.01	192 641 703.56

КРІ	AS-IS	Redesigned Supply Chain	Adapted GFA Result
Transportation cost, \$	230 888 516.06	195 734 329.5	192 476 760.06
Customer performance:			
Current backlog orders	0	0	0
Customer ordered items	29 346.0	29 346.0	29 346.0
Incoming replenishment items	29 346.0	29 346.0	29 346.0
Items shipped	29 346.0	29 346.0	29 346.0
Orders shipped	6 132.0	6 132.0	6 132.0
Outgoing replenishment or- ders	0	0	0

Figure 39 and Table 7 show the supply chain design that uses three current distribution centers and one new distribution center is even more efficient and profitable than the green field analysis result. You can see the explanation in the transportation policy (LTL) and expected lead time's effect on the number of deliveries and—by extension—the effect on transportation costs.

Are other improvements possible? If yes, where? If no, why? The fundamental problem with the green field analysis has been it only considers transportation costs during the facility location optimization only. The corresponding distribution center-related costs could be included in the simulation phase only.

As such, the green field analysis results are valid only for similar distribution center-related costs at different distribution centers. In the case the distribution center-related costs at different distribution centers are not equal, green field analysis results became sub-optimal and the search for supply chain design improvement is only possible on the "what happens if …" rule.

If we need to optimize supply chain design by considering transportation and distribution center-related costs, we need to use network optimization. We exemplify the network optimization and optimization-based simulation on an example of a smaller dimensionality to make our analysis more detailed.

Network Optimization Approach and Optimization-based Simulation

Case Study

We'll use a U.S.-based beverage distributor that has six demand regions and five distribution centers. As a first step, create a simulation experiment, add their six customers and five sites, and then name them as shown in Figure 40.

🔗 anyLogistix - New project				A Real Property lies	Section and a section of the	- N		and the second	- 0 <u>×</u>
File Extensions Settings Help				instance and in			and the second s		
gfa no sim + 🔄		r 😣 💿	🔘 🚯 🔛	abc	Casper	Sioux Falls	THE A	Milwaukee Hamilton Ro	Customers
GFA 1: Results 2	Data	omeniorio	13 Provent Age	CISP C		A LE	IOWA	Detroit Lake Ene	Sites 7
Copy of GFA 1: Results 2 1	Simulation				M	EBRASKA	Omaha Chicago	oFort Wayne	Suppliers
GFA 1: Results 1	Variation e:	Redding		9 Salt Lake City	Unit	ted	ILLINOIS	INDIANA	New York
1 GFA US Distribution network:	Compariso	Re	NEVADA	ИТАН	Sta	tes	Kansas City	Indianapolis Philac MARI	relphia
1 GFA US Distribution network:	Custom exp	· At			K2	KANSAS	MISSOURI	Louisville WEST Washin	gton
1 GFA US Distribution network:	External tal	San CALIFOR Francisco San José	NIA			Wichita		KENTUCKY	Virginia
NO (SIM)		OFr	Las Vegas			Children and		(Nashville Baleioh	Beach
			Bakersfield	- d	Ubuquerque	Oklanoma	in mphis	TENNESSEE Charlotte NORTH CAROLINA	
			S Angeles	IRIZONA NEW I	MEXICO	City	ANNANSAS	SOUTH	
			A Mexicali	Phoenix	-	Fort Worth	MISSISSIPPI A	ARAMA D	
		Sa	n Diego	Tucson	Ciudad irez o Midlar	nd a Da	lias	GEORGIA	
			× 11	^o Herpica	Yes -	TEXAS	LOUISIANA	Jacksonville	
				Caborca	la	9	Biouston New Orles	ns diat	
		Gu	adalupe	Hermosillo	oChihuahua	San Anton	•	FLORIDA Hutchinson Island / Orchid	
		2. 2. 19			Hidalgo del Parral	Nuevo Corpu Laredo Christ	s	Tampa	3
				Los Mochis	Torreón Mor	nterrey Baynosa	Gulfof	Miami	
		1. The second			Saltillo	e neynoso	Mexico	N N	assau
				o La Paz	oDurango	Victoria		Ciudad de La Habana Cuba	M
		12.30		Mazatláno	M	éxico Tampic		Great E	Island Caico
					Tepic OAguas	calientes		Cancin Santa Clara	and a start
Basic Advanced All 🤍	Add R	emove							
DCs and Factories	# Name	Туре І	Location	Initially Opened	Inclusion Type	Capacity	Capacity U Interests,	. Aggregate Additional	
Demand		тт	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	T	тт	T T	
Demand Forecast	1 Lancaster	DC v	Lancaster locatior •		Include v	0	m ³ v 0	O Additional	
Events	2 El Paso	DC v	El Paso location		Include v	0	m ³ v 0	Additional	
Facility Expenses	2 Dopuor	DC ×	Donver location		Include	0	m³ × 0		
Fleet Size	5 Deriver	DC +	Deriver location +		include v	0			
Groups	4 Memphis	DC V	memphis locatior *		include v	0	m* = 0	Additional	
Inventory	5 Colambus	DC v	Colambus locatio 🔻		Include 🔍	0	m ³ ~ 0	O Additional	

Figure 40: Distribution centers.

Now, create a new product ("Juice") and define each customer's periodic demand (Figure 41):

6.5												
Products	#	Name	Unit		Selling	Price Cost	Cost Unit					
Sale Batch		T		Ŧ		т	T T					
Site States Changes	1	luice	m ³		- 2,000	500	USD 🔻					
Sourcing												
4.4	1											
Demand	#	# Customer		Product		Demand Type	Parameters	Time Period		Expected Lead T	. Time Unit	Back
Demand Forecast			T.		Ŧ	Υ	T		т	T	T	
Events	1	Customer 1		Juice	∇	Periodic demand -	Period=10.0, Quantity=20.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	3	day	• Not
Facility Expenses	2	2 Customer 2		luice	Ŧ	Periodic demand v	Period=10.0. Ouantity=50.0	(All periods)	v	3	dav	v Not
Fleet Size								(p		-	,	
Groups	3	3 Customer 3		Juice	Ŧ	Periodic demand *	Period=10.0, Quantity=30.0	(All periods)	v	3	day	 Not
Inventory	4	Customer 4	Ŧ	Juice	Ŧ	Periodic demand v	Period=10.0, Quantity=40.0	(All periods)	V	3	day	• Not
Loading and Unloading Gates	5	5 Customer 5		Juice	Ŧ	Periodic demand •	Period=10.0, Quantity=50.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	3	day	• Not
Location Lists	e	6 Customer 6		Juice	v	Periodic demand v	Period=10.0, Quantity=20.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	3	day	- Not
Locations												

Figure 41: Customer demand and product data.

Define variable processing and fixed warehousing costs (Figure 42).

Facility Expenses	#	Facility		Expense	Туре	Value		Cost Unit		Time Unit	t	Product Uni	t	Time Period	
Fleet Size			т		T.		т		T.		T		T.		Ŧ
Groups	1	Colambus		▼ otherCo	st =	12		USD	Ŧ	day	Ŧ			(All periods)	Ŧ
Inventory	2	Denver		otherCo	t v	133			v	dav	V			(All periods)	×
Loading and Unloading Gates	-	Denver		othereo		10.0		050		uuy				(var periods)	
	3	El Paso		 otherCo 	st 🔻	10		USD	T	dav	Ψ.			(All periods)	T
Location Lists										,					
Locations	4	Lancaster		 otherCo 	st v	16.6		USD	V	day	T			(All periods)	V
Measurement Unit Conversion	s 5	Memphis		• otherCo	st =	14		USD	Ŧ	day	∇			(All periods)	∇
Measurement Units															
Processing Cost	# 5	ource	Prod	uct	Туре			Units		Cost		Cost Unit		Time Period	
Processing Time			T	т				T	3	·	T		T.		T
Product Groups	1	(All sites)	⊤ (All p	products)	Outbou	nd shipm	ent processing			v 5		USD	v	(All periods)	v
Production			• F				,								

Figure 42: Distribution center-related costs for the existing supply chain.

The additional inputs are:

- Sourcing policy: single sourcing (closest)
- Vehicle type: capacity 30 m³, speed 50 km/h
- Transportation costs: \$1.0 x volume x distance
- Inventory policy: unlimited

Simulation Experiment

Figure 43 shows the simulation's results.



Figure 43: Simulation result for five distribution centers.

The company's CEO reviews the simulation and notes only three of the five distribution centers are used. But is it the optimal supply chain design with minimal total costs? Knowing the CEO wants to select supply chain design with minimal total costs (the sum of fixed and variable costs), he runs an optimization experiment to determine the costs of alternative supply chain designs with varying numbers of distribution centers.

Optimization Experiment

To answer this question and determine the optimal supply chain design, we'll convert our simulation scenario to an NO scenario.

Change Inclusion type of all sites in the **DC** table and Factories to **Consider**.

Since our distribution centers don't produce products, we need to add a Supplier that will provide our sites with a regular scale of Juice. It doesn't matter where our Supplier is located on the map. We will not compute costs related with the distribution center's sided purchases, so put the following data to related tables:

- Create a group named DCs (activate all objects in the Sites column);
- Update the Linear Flow Constraint table
- Update the **Path** table

#	Source	Expand Sources	Destination	Expand Destinati	Product	Expand Products	Min throughput
		т	T	T	T	T	T
1	(All sites)	•	(All customers)		(All products)		0
2	Supplier 1	•	(All sites)		(All products)		0

Figure 44: The Linear Flow Constraint table

#	From		То	Cost Calculation	Cost Calculation	Cost Unit	Distance	Distance Unit	Straight	Vehicle	Time	Inclusion Ty
		Ŧ.	T	Υ.	T	т	т	T	Υ	т	T	T
1	DCs	Ŧ	(All locations) •	Volume&distance-based c. •	1.0 * amount (m³)	USD .	0	km •		Truck 🔻	(All p.▼	Include 🔹
2	Supplier 1	v	DCs 💌	Fixed delivery cost	0.0	USD .	0	km v		Truck 🔻	(All p.▼	Include 🔹

Figure 45: The Path table

🔥 anyLogistix - New project	the second se	And the other stream water proceedings and	A CONTRACTOR OF	- 0 -X
File Extensions Settings Help				
GFA NO SIM +				
Copy of NO (SIM) 1	Data NO experiment Custom experiment External tables	Start date: End date: 31.01.2017 • 01.01.2018 • Select demand variation type: Exact demand • Number of best solutions to find: Find N best • Number of best solutions to find: 10 Optimization time limit, sec. 600.0		
All Flows Details Sites Initial Sites Fix Working Sites Storage by Product Production cost Production flows Multiple Flows Constraints Multiple Flows Constraints	Flows Details	Sites initial	Sites Fix	0
Multiple Storages Constraints Demand Overall Stats Add new tab	Working Sites	Storage by Product	Production cost	

Figure 46: The Start dialog for the optimization experiment.

We run the optimization experiment (Figure 47).

🤌 anyLogistix - New project			ALC: NO. OF TAXABLE PARTY.	And and a second s	
File Extensions Settings Help			[
gfa <u>no</u> sim + E					
Copy of NO (SIM) 1	Data NO exper Result Custom e External t	riment ^ 1 experiment tables	Start date: End date: 01.01.2017 01.01.2018 Select demand variation type: Exact demand Vumber of best solutions to find: Find N best Number of best solutions to find: 10 Optimization time limit, sec.		
Ontimization results	#	Sites		Profit (NetOpt)	 Flows Amount
			Υ	T	
Flows Details	1	Iteration 0: Lancaste	r, Memphis, Colambus	6,346,324.319	15,372
Sites Initial	2	Iteration 1: Lancaste	er, El Paso, Memphis, Colambus	6,346,203.996	15,372
Sites Fix	3	Iteration 2: Lancaste	r, Denver, Memphis, Colambus	6,346,164.29	15,372
Working Sites	4	Iteration 3: Lancaste	r, El Paso, Denver, Memphis, Colambus	6,346,043.967	15,372
Storage by Product	5	Iteration 4: Lancaste	r, Memphis	5,782,941.108	15,372
Production cost	6	Iteration 5: Lancaste	r, El Paso, Memphis	5,782,820.785	15,372
Production flows	7	Iteration 6: Lancaste	r. Denver. Memphis	5.782.781.079	15.372
Multiple Flows Constraints	8	Iteration 7: Lancaste	er El Paso Denver Memohis	5 782 660 756	15 372
Demand	0	Iteration 7. Lancaste	n, El Dasa, Denver, Memphis	5,702,000,730	15,372
Overall Stats	9	iteration 8: Lancaste	si Paso, Deriver, Colambus	5,200,712.222	15,572
Add new tab	10	iteration 9: Lancaste	r, El Paso, Colambus	5,038,806.839	15,372



We can see our optimization result suggests three distribution centers—in Memphis, Columbus and Lancaster—would increase the supply chain's efficiency. Alexander will now use a simulation with three distribution centers to confirm these results.

Optimization-based Simulation Experiment

We'll use the results from our optimization experiment to perform a new simulation experiment that uses three distribution centers in Memphis, Columbus and Lancaster.

Convert the best NO experiment result to SIM scenario. In the scenario data under **DCs/Factories**, we need to change the **Inclusion Type** for Denver and El Paso from **consider** to **exclude**. Delete all rows in the **Inventory** table and add one record for All sites with **Unlimited Inventory Policy**.

Figure 48 and Table 8 show the simulation's results.

Dat	ta		Start date:	End date:		land.	2040	40.00.0	Beau	lort Sea		3	
Sin	ulation experir	ment	01.01.2017	01 01 2018	10.4	Jan 1	, 2018	12:00:0	IV AN			2	2m
Mar	intian aunarian		01.01.2017	01.01.2010	194	20.5							
Vdi	lation experime	ent				1.1.1					Sector Sector		
Cor	mparison exper	rimer	Configure s	tatistics		a final	100		1 9 hailes		Ibulion		
Cu	tom experime	nt	~~~ U								Labrador Sea	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Evt	ornal tables					Okh	otsk			199		- ist	
						Sea of Japan		No	rth Pacifi Ocean	ic (North Al MERICA O O O O O O O O O O O O O	Clantic Madam	a UT THAT
Othe	r cost, Outbour	nd processin	g cost, Profit, Rever Unit	nue,@t□ ELT	service lev	TRALI,	ns q-ty		501	ocean	cific Profit, Revenue, Total cost 16.632.000 g	South Atlantic Ocean	8
					-						14,000,000	·····	
1	Other cost	15,549.0	USD	1	.5-						12.000.000		
2	Outbound pro	37,800.0	050		-						10 000 000		
3	Pront	15 1 20 000 0	USD		1						10.000.000	and a second	
4	Total cort	5 112 758 61	USD								8,000,000		
6	Transportation	5,059,409.61	USD	0	.5						4,000,000		
				0	1						2,000,000		
					0 50	100	150 Di	200 250 ays	300	366	0 50 100 150	200 250 300 366 Days	

Figure 48: Simulation result for three distribution centers.

Note: In an optimization experiment, we compute optimal supply chain structure and minimum costs for a set of parameters. In a simulation experiment, we observe the structure's dynamic supply chain behavior and dynamics of different KPI over time.

Figure 45 shows EBIDTA increases from \$7,017,493.13 to \$7,558,944.8 (as compared to Figure 42) due to reduction of fixed warehousing costs (that is, **other costs** in the dashboard).

КРІ	AS-IS (Five DCs)	Three DCs
Financial DC performance:		
Other cost, \$	24 053.5	15 549.0
Outbound processing cost, \$	37 800.0	37 800.0
Profit, \$	9 998 736.88	10 007 241.39
Revenue, \$	15 120 000.0	15 120 000.0
Total cost, \$	5 121 263.11	5 112 758.61
Transportation cost, \$	5 059 409.61	5 059 409.61
Customer performance:		
Service level, %	100	100

Table 8: KPI Comparison

You can see in Table 8 that supply chain design with three distribution centers is more efficient and profitable. The lower fixed warehousing cost have increased the total supply chain's efficiency. This has proven that two distribution centers—one in El Paso, the other in Denver— have excess capacity in the supply chain.

Note: A **Comparison** experiment is a fast and convenient way to compare the KPI of supply chain designs with different policies and parameters. However, because this experiment compares scenarios, we would need to describe each design alternative as an individual scenario. We will learn how to use this option in Chapter 4, Risk Management.

This example of network optimization shows the advantages and limitations of simulation and optimization. It is also helpful to review the application areas of both methods.

Optimization seeks the best solution for an operations or supply chain problem. It works by representing problem choices as decision variables and seeking values that extremized objective functions of the decision variables subject to constraints on variable values expressing the limits on possible decision choice. The drawback is the difficulty in developing a model with the detail to represent complexity and uncertainty that is also simple enough to be solved.

What's more, most optimization models are deterministic and static. Unless there are mitigating circumstances, optimization is the preferred approach. However, most supply chain and operations problems are dynamic. Their mutually dependent parameters and variables are difficult to restrict to an optimization model.

Simulation imitates the dynamic behavior of one system with another. By changing the simulated supply chain, one expects to better understand the physical supply chain's dynamics. Rather than deriving a mathematical solution, you experiment by changing the system's parameters and studying the results. Another advantage of simulation is to visualize the processes and structures.

However, since simulation works on the "what happens if..?" principle, the questions of result extremity, completeness and consistency remain open. That's why simulation can be an ideal tool for analyzing the performance of a proposed supply chain design you derive from an optimization model. Optimization-based simulation is a promising area to support supply chain and operations managers.

Chapter 2. Three-stage Supply chain: Inventory Control and Transportation Policies

We haven't yet considered the effect of inventory control policies such as fixed period or reorder point policies or transportation policies such as full truck load (FTL) and low truck load (LTL). However, both types of policies can play a major role in a company's decisions about its supply chain.

Our Learning Objectives

Our learning objectives for this chapter are to:

- 1. Provide insight into the impact of inventory control and transportation policies on supply chain and logistics performance
- 2. Develop the anyLogistix skills you need to create three-stage supply chain models, perform experiments and measure their performance

Inventory Control Policies

Case Study: Distribution Centers with Storage

In an executive meeting, Davis (CEO), Marina (inventory manager), and Cheng (transportation manager) will use financial, customer and operational KPIs to analyze their company's supply chain. Afterward, they'll review their options for changing inventory control and transportation policies to improve their performance.

The following bullet points provide background information about this case study:

- Their supply chain is made up of six customers, two distribution centers and one supplier.
- Their supply chain offers three products (**PC**, **monitor** and **MFP**) and there are two customers for each product. The customer demand is fixed at 50 units a day.
- Their supply chain achieves a 90% customer service level (CSL) policy.
- The distribution centers for each product use a Min-max (that is, s,S) inventory control policy. The minimum level is 57 units subject to the customer service level of 90%. The maximum level is 113 units subject to the maximum storage area capacity for each product at each distribution center.
- The customer expects to receive their order within two days. The lead time from the supplier to the distribution centers is 0.7 days. The lead time from the distribution centers to customers varies from 1.7 to 1.95 days depending on the load-ing and unloading processes at the distribution centers.
- Trucks with a 60 m³ capacity transport products from the supplier to the distribution centers. Lorries with a capacity of 20 m³ transport products from the distribution centers to the customers.
- LTL shipments are used without minimum load restriction and order aggregation. A direct shipment distribution network is used.

Starting the Case Study

To start this case study, you need to import the Microsoft Excel template (8 SIM Distribution Network inside 4 Walls Models) you received with anyLogistix.

You can import the template by pointing to the **Help** menu and clicking **Import Example**. After the **Import Example** dialog box opens, click the scenario name to select it and then click **Import**.



Figure 49: Customers in the three-stage supply chain.

Figure 49 shows the six customer locations we'll use in this case study as well as the distribution centers in Berlin and Prague and the supplier in Leipzig.

Our case study uses three products: **PC**, **Monitor** and **MFP**. Figure 50 shows each product's selling price and cost.

#	Name	Unit		Selling Price		Cost		Cost Unit	
		т	т		т		т		T
1	PC	pcs	Ŧ	1,150		350		USD	v
2	Monitor	pcs	T	850		250		USD	T
3	MFP	pcs	v	700		200		USD	v

Figure 50: Products in our case study's supply chain.

With our products set, we need to convert each product's volume. Doing this will allow anyLogistix to determine the number of products a given vehicle can transport. You can use the **Measurement Unit Conversions** table to convert the user-defined weight and volume units you created in the **Measurement units** table.

#	Product	Amount	from Unit f	rom	Amount	to Unit to	
		T	T	T	T	T	т
1	MFP	▼ 1	pcs	=	0.1	m³	~
2	Monitor	▼ 1	pcs	=	0.1	m³	T
3	PC	v 1	pcs	=	0.1	m³	v

Figure 51: Measurement unit conversions.

Demand and Expected Lead Time

Figure 52 shows the demand type and expected lead time for each of the case study's six customers.

#	Customer		Product		Demand Type	Parameters	Time Period		Expected Lead Ti	Time Unit		Backorder Po	licy
	T		T		Υ	Υ		T	Υ		T		T
1	Hanover	∇	MFP	Ŧ	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=1.0, Quantity=50.0	(All periods)	v	2	day	Ŧ	Not allowed	∇
2	Nuremberg	∇	Monitor	Ŧ	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=1.0, Quantity=50.0	(All periods)	V	2	day	Ŧ	Not allowed	T
3	Munich	Ŧ	MFP	Ŧ	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=1.0, Quantity=50.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	2	day	Ŧ	Not allowed	Ŧ
4	Poznan	∇	PC	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=1.0, Quantity=50.0	(All periods)	T	2	day	v	Not allowed	v
5	Hamburg	Ŧ	Monitor	Ŧ	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=1.0, Quantity=50.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	2	day	Ψ.	Not allowed	Ŧ
6	Vienna	v	PC	v	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=1.0, Quantity=50.0	(All periods)	V	2	day	v	Not allowed	v

Figure 52: Customer demand and expected lead time.

Transportation Policy and Costs

We can use two types of vehicles (Figure 53).

#	Name	Ca	pacity	Capacity Unit		Speed		Speed Unit	
		т	T		T		т		т
1	Lorry	20		m³	Ŧ	50.0		km/h	Ŧ
2	Truck	60		m³	Ŧ	50.0		km/h	v

Figure 53: Vehicle types

Transportation costs and time computation are based on the rules you define in the **Paths** table (Figure 54). We can see transportation costs are calculated as \$1.0 x volume x distance. We then set the transportation time from our Leipzig-based supplier to both distribution centers to a fixed 0.7 days.





Entering a Fixed Value

Note: Numerical values can be fixed or stochastic (defined by probability distribution). The corresponding table cells provide the drop-down menu that allows you to set the desired value. You can also enter the value manually.



To enter a numerical value, do one of the following:

Option 1: Entering a value

- 1. Click the table cell to activate the edit box.
- 2. Click the arrow next to the cell value to open the drop-down menu.
- 3. Do one of the following:
 - To enter a fixed value, click the **Type** list and enter the desired value in the **Value** box.
 - To enter a stochastic value, click the **Type** list, choose the desired probability distribution, and then set the distribution parameters in the fields below the list.

Note: anyLogistix supports uniform, triangular, exponential, normal and lognormal probability distributions. The parameters you need to provide vary by the probability distribution type.

4. Save your changes by pressing Enter or clicking outside of the cell.

To discard your changes, press Escape.

Option 2: Manually entering a value:

- 1. Click the table cell to activate the edit box.
- 2. Enter the value:
 - To enter a fixed value, enter the desired numerical value.
 - To enter a stochastic value, use the following format to enter the value: *Distribution Type(Parameter 1, Parameter 2, ...)*.

Example: Uniform(5.0, 6.0).

Reviewing the Path Table's Parameters

You use the **Paths** table to set up the parameters listed in the table below.

Table 9: Parameter	s available in	the Paths	table.
--------------------	----------------	-----------	--------

Parameter	Purpose
From	Defines the path's origin location. This is the reference to the Lo- cations table.

Parameter	Purpose
То	Defines the path's target location. This is the reference to the Lo- cations table.
Cost Calculation	Defines the basis for transportation cost calculations:
	• Weight-based Cost: 0.0 * weight + 0.0 Formula parameters are weight and Add cost.
	• Volume-based Cost: 0.0 * volume + 0.0 Formula parameters are volume and Add cost.
	• Weight & Distance-based Cost: 0.0 * weight * distance Formula parameters are Cost per kg-km, weight and distance.
	• Volume & Distance-based Cost: 0.0 * volume * distance Formula parameters are Cost per m3-km, volume and dis- tance.
	Fixed Delivery Cost: 0.0 - Formula parameter is Cost.
	• Distance-based Cost: 0.0 * distance Formula parameters are Cost per km and distance.
Cost Calculation Parameters	Defines the parameters for cost calculation formulas
Distance	Defines the path length in km/miles. If set to zero, the path length is calculated based on GIS information
Transportation Time	Defines transportation time for the path in days. If set to zero time, the transportation time is calculated based on GIS information
Straight	Defines if anyLogistix should use straight paths between sites or real roads
Vehicle Type	Defines the vehicle type (previously defined vehicles in the Vehi- cle Types table) used for shipping products along the path
Transportation Policy	Regulates the handling of orders for the amount less than the se- lected vehicle's capacity
Min Load, ratio	In FTL transportation policy, it defines the minimum load ratio
Aggregate Orders	Defines whether the orders are accumulated during the time period defined in Aggregation Period, days
Aggregation period	The period during which the orders are aggregated
Inclusion Type	The path's status:
	Include - Vehicles can use it to get to their destination
	• Exclude - The scenario does not use the path

Grouping Supply Chain Elements

In the next step, we'll create four groups (**DCs**, **Customers Prague**, **All customers** and **Customers Berlin**) to make it easier for us to develop our model and analyze our results (Figure 55). Instead of creating individual paths for each customer, we'll create a path from the **DCs** group to the **Customers Prague** group.

#	Group	Description		Customers	Sites	Suppliers	Groups	
	7		т	Υ	Υ		T	т
1	DCs			D	[DC Prague, DC Berlin]			
2	Customers Pragu	e		[Munich, Vienna, Nuremberg]	0	0	D	
3	All customers			[Hanover, Munich, Vienna, Poznan, Hamburg, Nuremberg				
4	Customers Berlin			[Hanover, Hamburg, Poznan]	0	0	0	

Figure 55: Groups

Inventory Control Policy

The information in the **Policy Parameters** column shows us our example uses a (s, S) inventory control policy (Figure 56).

#	Facility		Product		Policy Type		Policy Parameters	Initial Stock, units	Periodic Check	Period	Policy Basis		Stock Calculation	Time Unit
		т		Т		Т	T	T	T	т		т	т	
1	DCs	v	(All products)	v	Min-max poli	cy 🦷	s=57, S=113	57	\bigcirc	0	Quantity	v	0	day

Figure 56: Inventory control policy

Note: anyLogistix uses the **Inventory** table to define an inventory policy's parameters. However, we use "Inventory control policy" throughout this guide to describe the parameters defined in the **Inventory** table.

We use the **Inventory** table to set up the following parameters:

Table 10	: Parameters	available in the	Inventor	y table.
----------	--------------	------------------	----------	----------

Parameter	Purpose
Facility	The facility or group of facilities for which an inventory policy is specified
Product	The product or group of products which the policy is applied to
Policy Type	The type of inventory control policy
Policy Parameters	The parameters for selected inventory control policy
Initial Stock	The initial quantity of products at the site(s)
Periodic Check	If inventory is checked periodically or after each change
Period	The number of days between inventory level checks
Policy Basis	Whether quantity or days of demand is the policy basis
Stock Calculation Window	The number of days to calculate the mean daily demand

Parameter	Purpose
Time Period	The period during which the inventory policy will be consid- ered
Inclusion Type	The status of given inventory policy

Sourcing Policy

Figure 57 shows our sourcing policy.

#	Delivery Destinat	Product		Туре	Parameters	Sources		Time Period		Inclusion Type	e
	T		т	T	T		т		т		т
1	DCs 🔹	(All products)	\overline{v}	Closest (Single s▼	No parameters	Leipzig	\overline{v}	(All periods)	∇	Include	Ŧ
2	Customers Berlin 🔻	(All products)	Ŧ	Closest (Single s •	No parameters	DC Berlin	Ŧ	(All periods)	∇	Include	T
3	Customers Pragu	(All products)	T	Closest (Single s▼	No parameters	DC Prague	Ŧ	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	Ŧ

Figure 57: Sourcing policy.

Defining Operational Costs at Distribution Centers

Finally, we use the **Facility Expenses** table to define the costs of operating the distribution centers. In addition to the cost of operating the distribution centers, our simulation includes interest rate (10%, expressed as 0.1) and inventory carrying costs per day per m^3 (\$0.01, expressed as 0.01) (Figure 58).

#	Name	Туре	Location	Initially Opened	Inclusion Type	Capacity	Capacity Unit	Interests, ratio per ye	ar Aggregate Ordei
	Т	T	Т	т	T	т	T	T	7
1	DC Prague	ExtendedDC 🔹	Prague 🔻		Include 🔹	34	m³ ▼	0.1	\bigcirc
2	DC Berlin	ExtendedDC 🔻	Berlin 🔻		Include 🔹	34	m³ v	0.1	\bigcirc
#	Facility	Expens	е Туре	Value	Cost Unit	1	Time Unit	Product Unit	Time Period
		T	т	Т		T	T	Υ	T
1	DCs	 carryir 	ngCost 🔹	0.01	USD	Ŧ	day	m ³	(All periods)

Figure 58: Inventory holding costs at distribution centers.

Creating a KPI Dashboard

We will define an extended KPI dashboard by creating the following three tabs:

- Financial and customer performance KPI
- Operational performance KPI
- Inventory and capacity dynamics

Tab 1: Financial and Customer Performance KPI

Our dashboard's **Financial and customer performance** tab will have six blocks to help us assess our supply chain's financial and customer performance (Figure 59).



Figure 59: The six blocks that make up our Financial and customer performance tab.

Note: For more information about the technical issues of KPI dashboard design, please review Chapter 1 in this guide.

Our dashboard's first block will display information about revenue, total costs, profit, carrying costs, opportunity costs and transportation costs (Figure 60).



Figure 60: Financial performance statistics.

The second block displays information about our service levels (Figure 61).



Figure 61: Service level metrics.

For a detailed analysis, we can review the service levels for each distribution center and each product (shown by item).

Our **Financial and customer performance** tab's third and fourth blocks will display a lead time analysis for each distribution center and for each customer. One of the blocks will be a line chart, the other will be a histogram chart (Figures 62 and 63).



Figure 62: Lead time statistics displayed in a line chart.



Figure 63: Lead time statistics displayed in a histogram chart.

Our **Financial and customer performance** tab's final two blocks display our financial performance (Figure 64) and our order fulfilment performance (Figure 65).

	Finances			rrying cost, Opp	ortunity cost,	Profit, Revenue,	Total cost, Tran	sportation cost
	Carrying cost Inbound processing Opportunity cost	g cost			Table	Line Bar chart	Histogram chart	
	Other cost Outbound processi	ing cost		Statistics name	Value	Unit		
	Production cost	Ŭ	1	Carnving cost	30 100 000 0	LISD		
	 Profit 		2	Opportunity c	579.04	USD		
	 Revenue 		3	Profit	-290.938.120.0	USD		
	Revenue from cust	omer	4	Revenue	11,550.0	USD		
	Total cost		5	Total cost	290,949,670.0	USD		
	Transportation cost	t	6	Transportation	126,000.0	USD		
	 Customer items arr Customer ordered 	rived items						
dditio	Incoming replenish Lost Items Maximum capacity anal settings	iment items						Daily 🔵 Accumul
dditio#	Incoming replenish Lost Items Maximum canacity onal settings Detail by	ment items						Daily 💿 Accumul
dditio #	Incoming replenish Lost Items Maximum canacity onal settings Detail by	Contains					Ŧ	Daily (Accumul Show
dditio # 1	Incoming replenish Lost Items Maximum constitu- onal settings Detail by Object	Contains T					Ÿ	Daily Accumul Show Total By item
dditio # 1 2	Incoming replenish Lost Items Maximum canacity onal settings Detail by Object Product	Contains All All					Ÿ	Daily Accumula Show Total • By item Only Total possible
dditio # 1 2 3	Incoming replenish Lost Items Maximum canacity anal settings Detail by Object Product Period	Contains Contains All All All					Ŧ	Daily Accumula Show Total By item Only Total possible Only Total possible

Figure 64: Our dashboard's fifth block displays our financial performance.

	Outgoing reple	nishment i	items	Cur	rent backlog or	ders, Custo	mer delayed order	rs, Customer in-t	ime orders	, Customer orders
	Produced					Table	Line Bar chart	Histogram chart		
	Alpha service le	evel, by or vel, by mor	ders q-ty ney		Statistics name	Value	Unit			
	ELT service lev	el, by item	s q-ty	1	Current backlo	3,000,0	Order			
	Orders bullwbi	ei, by orde n effect	is q-ty	2	Customer dela	510.0	Order			
	Products bullw	hip effect		3	Customer in-ti	510.0	Order			
4	Time			4	Customer orde	510.0	Order			
dditio	Current backlop Customer dela Customer drop Customer in-tri Customer orde Incoming reple Lost orders Outgoing reple	g orders yed orders ped orders rs rs arrived nishment o	s orders orders						Dail	y 💽 Accumul
#	Detail by		Contains						Show	
		т						Ŧ		Υ
	Туре		All						Total 🦲	By item
1										
1 2	Object		All						Total 🦲	🔵 By item

Figure 65: Our dashboard's final block displays our order fulfilment performance.

Tab 2: Operational Performance KPI

Our Operational Performance KPI dashboard will display a capacity and an inventory analysis for the supply chain (Figure 66).



Figure 66: A capacity and inventory analysis for the overall supply chain.

First, the program will display data for maximum distribution center capacity consumption as a histogram chart and as a line (Figures 67 and 68). This data will help us make informed decisions on distribution center capacities.


Figure 67: An analysis of maximum distribution center capacity consumption displayed as a histogram chart.



Figure 68: An analysis of maximum distribution center capacity consumption displayed as a line.

The program will present the dynamics of available inventory volume as a line (Figure 69).



Figure 69: Dynamics of available inventory volume in the supply chain displayed as a line.

Third, the program will display the dynamics of available inventory quantity for the overall supply chain as a line and as a histogram chart. It will display the objects and products as a line (Figures 70-71).



Figure 70: Dynamics of available inventory quantity in the supply chain as a line.



Figure 71: Dynamics of available inventory quantity at objects and for different products displayed as a line.



Figure 72: New screenshot goes here. This histogram chart displays the dynamics of the supply chain's available inventory quantity.

Inventory and Capacity Dynamics

This dashboard displays inventory and capacity dynamics at the object and product levels (Figure 73).



Figure 73: Dashboard for dynamics of inventory and capacity at the object and product levels.

The upper three blocks display the inventory dynamics at each distribution center for each of our three products: monitors, PC and MFP. The following image (Figure 74) displays the dynamics for our **monitor** product.



Figure 74: Inventory dynamics for the monitor product at each distribution center

The other dashboard blocks (on the bottom) display capacity dynamics for each distribution center as a line and as a histogram chart (Figures 75-76).



Figure 75: Capacity dynamics for each distribution center as a histogram chart.



Figure 76: Capacity dynamics for each distribution center as a line.

Experiment and Result Analysis

Experimental Results

In their first executive meeting, Davis (CEO), Marina (inventory manager), and Cheng (transportation manager) use financial, customer and operational KPIs to analyze their supply chain's performance. Afterward, they use the **8 SIM Distribution Network inside 4 Walls Models** scenario to run a new simulation experiment. Figures 77-81 display their results.



Figure 77: Financial and customer KPIs.

By looking at Figure 77, we can see the supply chain generates a revenue of \$98,280,000.0 and profit of \$63,344,372.18. Total lead time from the distribution centers to customers is 11.8 days, and there are no backlogged orders. Customers have placed 2,176 orders: 1,473 were fulfilled on time and 705 were delayed.

Note: You can view detailed costs and profit analyses by locating the **Additional Settings** area and then selecting **by item**. Figure 77 shows an example of the detailed view.

	Statistics name	Value	Unit		Statistics name	Object	Value	Un
1	Carrying cost	89.35	USD	1	Carrying cost	DC Berlin	43.78	USE
2	Opportunity c	7,993.23	USD	2	Carrying cost	DC Prague	45.57	USI
3	Profit	63,344,372.18	USD	3	Opportunity c	DC Berlin	3,996.62	USI
4	Revenue	98,280,000.0	USD	4	Opportunity c	DC Prague	3,996.62	USI
5	Total cost	34,935,627.82	USD	5	Profit	DC Berlin	33,025,633.53	USI
6	Transportation	5,760,238.47	USD	6	Profit	DC Prague	32,734,573.31	USE
				7	Profit	Leipzig	-2,415,834.65	USE
				8	Revenue	DC Berlin	49,140,000.0	US
				9	Revenue	DC Prague	49 140 000.0	US

	Statistics name	Object	Value	Unit
1	Carrying cost	DC Berlin	43.78	USD
2	Carrying cost	DC Prague	45.57	USD
3	Opportunity c	DC Berlin	3,996.62	USD
4	Opportunity c	DC Prague	3,996.62	USD
5	Profit	DC Berlin	33,025,633.53	USD
6	Profit	DC Prague	32,734,573.31	USD
7	Profit	Leipzig	-2,415,834.65	USD
8	Revenue	DC Berlin	49,140,000.0	USD
9	Revenue	DC Prague	49,140,000.0	USD
10	Total cost	DC Berlin	16,114,366.47	USD
11	Total cost	DC Prague	16,405,426.69	USD
12	Total cost	Leipzig	2,415,834.65	USD
13	Transportation	DC Berlin	1,526,672.69	USD
14	Transportation	DC Prague	1,817,731.13	USD
15	Transportation	Leipzig	2,415,834.65	USD

Figure 78: Costs and profit detailization.

Figure 78 shows revenue at DC Prague is \$49,140,000 and revenue at DC Berlin is \$49,140,000.00. Total costs at DC Prague is \$16,405,426.69 and total costs at DC Berlin is \$16,114,366.47.

We can also see data on transportation costs. Costs from the supplier in Leipzig to both distribution centers is \$2,415,834.65. The transportation from the distribution centers to the customers are \$1,817,731.13 (DC Prague) and \$1,526,672.69 (DC Berlin).

Note: Be careful with *total* costs, profit and revenue evaluation! In this case, anyLogix calculates total transportation costs for the complete supply chain (that is, the transportation costs across all stages, from suppliers to customers). However, the program calculates total costs, profit and revenue for the distribution centers.

You can use the same diagrams to compare distribution centers and customers. (Figure 79).



Figure 79: Detailed service level and lead time analysis for the Hamburg-based customer.



Next, we'll consider the overall supply chain's operational performance (Figure 80).

Figure 80: Operational performance for the overall supply chain.

The diagrams in Figure 80 show maximum capacity use at the distribution centers in Prague and Berlin has been 67.8 m³ in total or 33.9m³ for each distribution center. The available inventory of each product at each distribution center changed between 39 and 59 units (as set up in Min-Max policy) while the supply chain's total inventory was between 390 and 590 units.

Note: In the diagrams, inventory level does not drop to exactly 57 units (for all products in total) since we always replenish in advance.

The third and fourth dashboards—Inventory and Capacity Dynamics—display these results (Figure 81).



Figure 81: Inventory and Capacity Dynamics Analysis

Result Analysis

Davis, Marina and Cheng (the transportation manager) analyze the gained results. For example, they see the distribution center's total revenue was \$98,280,000. Their supply chain includes demand for three products of 50 units respectively, each of which is handled by two distribution centers.

Assuming 365 working days, the annual demand for each product is 3,630 units (36,300 m³). In other words, their supply chain allows them to meet their demand and receive the maximum possible revenue.

In the min-max inventory control policy, they set min = 57 and max = 113. With these parameters, total inventory costs (that is, opportunity costs) are \$7,993.23. Both distribution centers need to run at capacity of 40 m³. 2,176 customer orders have been generated for three products supplied from two distribution centers. In other words, every day a new customer order has been generated for each product.

Finally, we can see the LTL transportation policy, trucks with capacity of 60 m³ used for deliveries from the Leipzig-based supplier to distribution centers are used at 87.5% considering total volume of each delivery as 0.1 + 0.1 + 0.15 (total volume of three products) x 150 units = 52.5 m³. Two trucks are needed since two distribution centers need to be served. For lorries, we have six direct shipments each of which of 50 units. This results into average capacity utilization of 25% only since just 5% of 20 m³ is used.

These results support decision-making in many areas of supply chain management, including:

- Capacity design
- Lead time agreements
- Inventory control policy and its parameters
- Transportation policy (FTL/LTL)
- Replenishment planning
- Sales planning
- Budget planning

For example, we can use capacity usage dynamics diagrams to analyze the real distribution center productivity. This extends classical methods based on throughput capacity analysis or setting maximum capacity for some material flows.

By understanding real lead times, order fulfilment dynamics and service levels, we have a solid decision-support basis for our negotiations and contracts with suppliers and customers. Inventory dynamics analysis allows us to estimate and compare the effect of different inventory control policies and their parameters.

Impact of Inventory Control Policy

The standard anyLogistix settings offer ten inventory control policies (Figure 82).



Figure 82: Inventory control policy selection.

Table 11:	Inventory	control	policies.
-----------	-----------	---------	-----------

Policy	Details
Min-max policy Also named (s, S) inventory policy	Products are ordered when the inventory level falls below a fixed replenishment point (s). The ordered quantity is set to such a value that the resulting inventory quantity equals S.
Min-max policy with safety stock	The (s, S) inventory policy with safety stock. Products are ordered when the inven- tory level falls below a fixed replenishment point (s + safety stock). The ordered quan- tity is set to such a value that the resulting inventory quantity equals S + safety stock.

Policy	Details
RQ policy	(R, Q) inventory policy. Fixed replenishment point / fixed replenishment quantity policy. When the inventory level falls below a fixed replenishment point (R), the fixed replenish- ment quantity (Q) of products is ordered.
Unlimited inventory	Selected by default. By selecting the Unlim- ited inventory policy, we assume products are always in stock at any required quantity.
Inventory policy on demand	The distribution center does not keep prod- ucts in stock. The required number of prod- ucts is ordered only after receiving an order from a customer/factory or another distribu- tion center.
Material Requirements Planning	Schedules inventory replenishment based on safety stock level.
Regular policy [Periodic check option must be enabled]	Products are ordered every specified Period
No replenishment	The distribution center will not replenish its inventory. If certain initial stock is available, the distribution center will ship products until it runs out of stock.
My policy	A user defined policy. Use this option for policies you designed with AnyLogic.
XDock policy	Distribution center operated like a cross- docking facility. It does not have inventory, it only transfers products from one type of transport to another.

You can set up other inventory control policy parameters:

- Policy type: RQ Policy
- Policy type: R=57, Q=56

You can also define the policies based on the days of supply.

Experiment

In their next executive meeting, Davis, Marina and Cheng analyze the inventory control and transportation policies they can use to improve their supply chain's performance. Marina noticed the Min-level for inventory was calculated based on steady demand for all products—fixed at 50 units a day—and a lead time variation of between 1.7 and 1.95 days (that is, the lead time's standard deviation is 0.125 days).

Since the supply chain is running 90% CSL policy, safety stock was computed as

ss = z x σ_{LT} x d_{daily} = 1.28 x 0.125 x 50 = 8 units *

* see the theory on safety stock and reorder point computation in:

Ivanov D., Tsipoulanidis A., Supply chainhönberger J. (2017). Global Suppy Chain and Operations Management, Springer, 1st Edition.

Therefore, Min inventory level (that is, the reorder point) was set at 57 units. Marina reduced the safety stock from statistically computed 8 units to 7 units by her expert decision.

Marina now suggests they reduce safety stock. She has noticed demand is always close to the average and 90% CSL is high. She decides to reduce the reorder point to 53 units.

Later, they learn if they change their contract with the Leipzig-based supplier from a Min-Max contract to a fixed-order quantity contract, the supplier can reduce the product per-unit costs by 10%. Based on the required customer lead time of two days and fixed demand of 50 units a day, Marina and Alice set the target level (MAX) at 105 units.

They run the simulation experiment they created during their meeting. Figures 83-86 and Table 12 display the results:









Figure 84: Operational performance dashboard.

Figure 85: Inventory and capacity dashboard.

КРІ	Initial Supply Chain	New Inventory Control Policy
Financial distribution center perfor- mance:		
Carrying cost	89.35	188.28
Opportunity cost	7 993.23	7 988.03
Profit	63,344,372.18	63,365,215.85
Revenue	98,280,000.0	98,280,000.0
Total cost	34,935,627.82	34,914,784.15
Transportation cost	5,760,238.47	5,758,295.88
Customer performance:		
Maximum lead time, days	2.04	2.04
Min-Max Service level, %	10-100	40-100
Current backlog orders	0	0
Customer delayed orders	706.0	684.0
Customer in-time orders	1472.0	1494.0
Customer orders arrived	2175.0	2176.0

КРІ	Initial Supply Chain	New Inventory Control Policy
Operational performance:		
Maximum capacity usage in the supply chain, m ³	67.8	105.4
Maximum inventory in the supply chain, units	580	942.0

Results Analysis

The results above show us the new inventory policy increases the supply chain profit and improves both inventory management performance and the service level.

What else can they improve? Cheng suggests they think about order quantities and customer lead time requirements. An increase in order quantity and a transition from daily deliveries to twice-a-week deliveries would improve transportation capacity utilization. However, Marina points out limited warehouse capacity rules out an increase in order quantity.

Marina and Cheng will now use anyLogistix with embedded AnyLogic functionality to understand the effect warehouse processes will have over time.

Using AnyLogic to Extend anyLogistix

One of anyLogistix's advantages is the opportunity to use AnyLogic to extend an object. For example, you can use AnyLogic to extend the distribution center operations in a way that simulates internal processes such as forklift capacity utilization and loading times. (Figure 87).

Note: anyLogistix's Personal Learning Edition (PLE) does not allow you to create extensions.



Figure 87: Extensions to anyLogistix in AnyLogic

In anyLogistix's main menu, point to **Extensions** and then click **Run AnyLogic**. For more information about creating inventory control policies or distribution center operational models in AnyLogic, refer to:

- The book <u>AnyLogic in Three Days</u>
- The book Operations and Supply Chain Simulation with AnyLogic
- Sample models in AnyLogic such as **Distribution Center**, **Adaptive Supply chain**, **Supply chain** and **Wholesale Warehouse**.

In AnyLogic, we need to extend a template that describes a network object's behavior. After we implement the export as a library (C:\Users\User\.anyLogistix\Extensions\extension.jar), we need to restart anyLogistix.

For example, the sample Microsoft Excel workbook--8 SIM Distribution Network inside 4 Walls Models—embeds additional parameters into the distribution centers' activities:



You can watch the distribution center operation in the simulation run by clicking the **distribution center** icon (Figures 88-89).







Figure 89: Embedded AnyLogic model in the anyLogistix: process logic view.

The mutual, multi-facted extensions of AnyLogic and anyLogistix include the following issues:

- Customized supply chain model based on anyLogistix scenario data
- Additional data sources such as an external database, other files or Internet sources
- Data pre/post processing
- External solvers
- Your own optimization algorithms
- Heuristics
- Custom statistics
- Results: New anyLogistix scenarios (like GFA and NetOpt)

You can use these extensions with several anyLogistix elements, including **DC**, **Factory** or **Customer**. You can customize sourcing, inventory and transportation policies as well as the decision-making logic that takes factors such as shipment times, shipment grouping, source selection logic or route selection logic in account. You can also create custom experiments.

Impact of Transportation Policy

You use the **Vehicle Types** and **Paths** tables to manage transportation policy. In the **Vehicle Types** table, you can set the transportation mode, capacity and speed. The **Paths** table allows you to set up FTL or LTL policy, transportation costs and time computation schemes, minimum load and order aggregation parameters.

You can based your transportation cost computations on four rules:

- Weight x volume x distance
- Distance-based

- Fixed delivery costs
- Weight-based costs

The transportation time can be fixed or determined automatically based on real routes and transportation speed.

Experiment

In their next executive meeting, Davis, Marina, and Cheng review their options. Their goal is to change the transportation policy in a way that helps improve their supply chain's performance.

While Cheng has noticed the capacity utilization of lorries is very low (25%), there are ways to improve it. For example, the company might decide to change their schedule from daily deliveries to a delivery every four days based on the FTL policy. However, this would imply an order quantity of at least 200 units, an amount that exceeds the maximum storage capacity of 113 units. Davis tells the others a short-term capacity extension like this is impossible.

Cheng wants to try another option: replace the lorries that have a capacity of 20 m^3 with lorries that have a capacity of 7 m^3 . This would reduce transportation costs from \$1 for km and m³ to \$0.5 for km and m³. Afterward, they change the lead time from distribution centers to the customers to [0.7; 0.9]. Figure 90 and Table 13 display their results:



Figure 90: Financial and customer performance for changed transportation capacity.

KPIs	Initial Supply Chain	New Inven- tory Control Policy	New Inventory Control Policy + New Transporta- tion Policy
Financial distribution center perfor- mance:			
Carrying cost	89.35	188.28	188.25
Opportunity cost	7 993.23	7 988.03	7 988.03

Table 13: KPI comparison

KPIs	Initial Supply Chain	New Inven- tory Control Policy	New Inventory Control Policy + New Transporta- tion Policy
Profit	63,344,372.1 8	63,365,215.85	65,037,417.79
Revenue	98,280,000.0	98,280,000.0	98,280,000.0
Total cost	34,935,627.8 2	34,914,784.15	33,242,582.21
Transportation cost	5,760,238.47	5,758,295.88	4,086,093.97
Customer performance:			
Maximum lead time, days	2.04	2.04	0.95
Min-Max Service level, %	10-100	40-100	100
Current backlog orders	0	0	0
Customer delayed orders	706.0	684.0	0
Customer in-time orders	1472.0	1494.0	2184.0
Customer orders arrived	2175.0	2176.0	2184.0
Operational performance:			
Maximum capacity usage in the supply chain, m ³	67.8	105.4	105.4
Maximum inventory in the supply chain, units	580.0	942.0	942.0

Results Analysis

Table 9 shows us total profit has increased. This is evidence of the transportation capacity utilization impact on the supply chain costs.

Finally, Davis wants to estimate the effect of reducing lead time from two days to one day since this would increase supply chain competitiveness and might result in a sales increase. Reducing the lead time from two days to one day would likely result in lower inventories (good for Marina!) but higher transportation costs (a problem for Cheng!).

They change **Expected lead time** in the **Demand** table to **1** day, lead time from distribution centers to the customers to [0.6; 0.8], and transportation costs from the distribution centers to the customers to \$0.02.

Figure 91 and Table 14 display the simulation's results:



Figure 91: Financial and customer performance.

	T	able	14:	KPI	Com	parison
--	---	------	-----	-----	-----	---------

КРІ	Initial Supply Chain	New Inventory Control Policy	Lead Time = 1 Day
Financial distribution center perfor- mance:			
Carrying cost	89.35	188.28	188.24
Opportunity cost	7 993.23	7 988.03	7 988.03
Profit	63,344,372.18	63,365,215.85	66,040,738.88
Revenue	98,280,000.0	98,280,000.0	98,280,000.0
Total cost	34,935,627.82	34,914,784.15	32,239,261.12
Transportation cost	5,760,238.47	5,758,295.88	3,082,772.82
Customer performance:			
Maximum lead time, days	2.04	2.04	0.85
Min-Max Service level, %	10-100	40-100	100
Current backlog orders	0	0	0
Customer delayed orders	706.0	684.0	0
Customer in-time orders	1472.0	1494.0	2184.0
Customer orders arrived	2175.0	2176.0	2184.0
Operational performance:			

КРІ	Initial Supply Chain	New Inventory Control Policy	Lead Time = 1 Day
Maximum capacity usage in the supply chain, m ³	67.8	105.4	105.4
Maximum inventory in the supply chain, units	580.0	942.0	942.0

By comparing the results, we can see the reduced lead time has increased supply chain profit. It also improves inventory efficiency, order fulfilment rates and service levels, measures which can all strengthen the company's competitive position.

Our Learning Objectives

Our learning objectives for this chapter are to:

- 1. Gain insight into the impact of production and sourcing policies on supply chain and logistics performance
- 2. Develop the anyLogistix skills needed to create four-stage supply chain models, perform experiments and measure performance

Production Factories

Case Study: Smartphone Supply Chain

WHC is a supply chain for smartphone production and distribution (Figure 93).

The smartphone assembly process that takes place at the Chinese factory requires one display and two chips. The Chinese supplier delivers their displays by truck and the Tai-wanese supplier delivers their chips by ferry.

The factory delivers the smartphones by air to the distribution center in the U.S. From there, the distribution center ships them by air to the customers. The factory and distribution center are running Min-Max inventory control policy at a 1% interest rate.



Figure 93: WHC supply chain

We need to analyze two demand scenarios: a positive and a negative market for smartphones.

Assessment Questions:

• What strategies—production, distribution, sourcing and transportation—does this case study use?

• What other inventory control policies do you know?

Supply Chain Design

Multi-stage Supply Chain Design

In Figure 94, we start a new scenario and set up the supply chain design to match Figure 93.



Figure 94: Supply chain design.

We'll first rename the default Suppliers and Customers by their locations (**Supplier China**, **Supplier Taiwan**, **US**, **Brazil**, **South Africa**, **Italy** and **India**) and then rename Site 1 to **DC** and Site 2 to **Factory**.

Transportation, Sourcing and Inventory Policy

Afterward our renaming is complete, we then define the following model elements (Figures 95-100):

- products
- demand and lead time
- vehicle types
- sourcing policy
- the paths
- inventory control policy

#	Name	Unit		Selling Price	Со	st Cost	Unit
		T	т		т	T	т
1	Smartphone	pcs	T	600	20	0 USD	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$
2	Display	pcs	∇	30	10	USD	v
3	Chip	pcs	T	20	5	USD	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$

Figure 95: Products.

#	Product	Amount	from	Unit from			Amount to	Unit to	
		т	т		T	т		т	T
1	Smartphone	▼ 1		pcs	=		0.001	m³	T
2	Display	· 1		pcs	=		0.0005	m³	Ŧ
3	Chip	▼ 1		pcs	=		0.000001	m³	v

Figure 96: Measurement unit conversions.

#	Name	Capacity	Ca	apacity Unit	Speed		Speed Unit		
		T	т	T		т		Т	
1	Airplane	40	r	1 ³ v	800.0		km/h	v	
2	Truck	20	rr	1 ³ v	50.0		km/h	V	
3	Ship	2,000	m	1 ³ v	50.0		km/h	v	
4	Ferry	2,000	rr	٦ ³ ۷	50.0		km/h	V	

Figure 97: Vehicle types.

#	Delivery Destina	t	Product		Туре	Parameters	Sources	Time Period		Inclusion Type	e
	T			т	Т	T	T		т		т
1	Factory	Ŧ	Display	Ŧ	Closest (Single s 🔻	No parameters	Supplier China	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	Ŧ
2	Factory	Ŧ	Chip	Ŧ	Closest (Single s •	No parameters	Supplier Taiwan	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	v
3	DC	Ŧ	Smartphone	v	Closest (Single s▼	No parameters	Factory	(All periods)	∇	Include	Ŧ
4	(All customers)	v	Smartphone	v	Closest (Single s •	No parameters	DC	(All periods)	∇	Include	Ŧ

Figure 98: Sourcing policy.

#	From		То		Cost Calculation	Cost Calculation	Cost U	nit	Distance	Distance U	nit	Transport	Time	Unit	Straight	Vehicle Type		Transpor
	т		т		т	т	т		т	т		T		т	T		т	
1	Supplier China	Ŧ	Factory	v	Distance-based c. •	0.5 * distance	USD	Ŧ	0	km	Ŧ	0.0	day	Ŧ	\bigcirc	Truck	Ŧ	LTL
2	Supplier Taiwan	v	Factory	Ŧ	Distance-based c. $ abla$	0.8 * distance	USD	v	0	km	v	0.0	day	Ŧ	\bigcirc	Ferry	∇	LTL
3	Factory	Ŧ	DC	Ŧ	Volume&distanc*	0.01 * amount (m	USD	Ŧ	0	km	Ŧ	2.0	day	Ŧ		Airplane	Ŧ	LTL
4	DC	v	(All locations)	∇	Volume&distanc*	0.01 * amount (m	USD	Ŧ	0	km	\overline{v}	2.0	day	Ŧ		Airplane	∇	LTL

Figure 99: Paths.

#	Facility		Product		Policy Type	Policy Parameters	Initial Stock, units	Periodic Check	Period
		т		т	T.	T	T	T	
1	DC	Ŧ	Smartphone	Ŧ	Min-max policy 🔻	s=20, S=50	40	\bigcirc	0
2	Factory	∇	Smartphone	∇	Min-max policy 🔻	s=30, S=60	40	\bigcirc	0
3	Factory	∇	Chip	Ŧ	Unlimited invent.	Unlimited	00	\bigcirc	0
4	Factory	∇	Display	T	Unlimited invent.	Unlimited	00	\bigcirc	0

Figure 100: Inventory control policy.

Since our objective is to compare two scenarios with different customer demands, we rename our scenario to Four-Stage supply chain (Optimistic scenario), copy it and name the copy Four-Stage supply chain (Pessimistic scenario). We'll define the demand for both scenarios in the following way (Figure 101-102):

#	Customer		Product		Demand Type	Parameters	Time Period		Expected Lead Ti	Time Unit		Backorder Poli	icy
	T			T	Υ	Υ		т	T		т		T
1	US	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=35.0	(All periods)	∇	30	day	∇	Not allowed	∇
2	Brazil	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=15.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	30	day	Ŧ	Not allowed	T
3	South Africa	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=10.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	30	day	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	Not allowed	Ŧ
4	Italy	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=10.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	30	day	Ŧ	Not allowed	T
5	India	Ŧ	Smartphone	Ŧ	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=30.0	(All periods)	v	30	day	Ŧ	Not allowed	Ŧ

Figure 101: The optimistic scenario for positive market development.

#	Customer		Product		Demand Type	Parameters	Time Period		Expected Lead Ti	Time Unit		Backorder Pol	licy
	Т			т	т	Υ		т	т		Т		т
1	US	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=7.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	30	day	∇	Not allowed	∇
2	Brazil	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=3.0	(All periods)	V	30	day	∇	Not allowed	∇
3	South Africa	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=2.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	30	day	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	Not allowed	Ŧ
4	Italy	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=2.0	(All periods)	V	30	day	T	Not allowed	T
5	India	Ŧ	Smartphone	Ŧ	Periodic demand 🔻	Period=10.0, Quantity=6.0	(All periods)	Ŧ	30	day	Ŧ	Not allowed	Ŧ

Figure 102: The pessimistic scenario for negative market development.

Production Policy and Bill of Materials (BOM)

Because our example has a factory and two suppliers, we need to define the parameters for BOM (bill-of-material) and the Production policy (Figures 103-104):

#	Name		End Product		Quantity		Components	
		т		т		т		т
1	BOM 1		Smartphone	Ŧ	1		[Display:1.0, Chip:2.0]	

Figure 103: BOM (bill-of-materials).

#	Site	Product	Туре	Parameters	BOM	Production Cost	Cost Unit	Time Period	Inclusion Type	
	т	Υ	T	T	T	T	т	т	7	r.
1	Factory 🔻	Smartphone 🔻	Simple make pol. 🔻	Time = 0.01 (day)	BOM 1 .	50	USD 🔻	(All periods)	Include	Ŧ

Figure 104: Production policy.

Production and Sales Batches

You can use the main menus—**Production Batch** and **Sales Batch**—to set up production and sales batches as additional parameters. For simplicity, we will not consider these options in this example. For more information about these options, see Chapter 4, Sect. 6 "Bullwhip Effect".

AS-IS Simulation

Experiment Preparation and KPI Dashboard

Note: A good modeler tends to modify the existing models for similar problem statements instead of creating models from scratch each time.

Because we chose **pcs** as our product unit, we need to change the value in the **Product statistics unit** field. We do this by clicking **Configure statistics** and selecting **pcs** as shown in Figure 105.

Simulation experiment Variation experiment Comparison experime Custom experiment External tables	01.01.2017 🛛 - 01.01.2018 💭	Finance Product Time sta Distanc Select s	s statistics o statistics u atistics unit e statistics to o tatistics to o	unit: USD v nit: pcs v pcs unit: kg unit: kg ulatio	on:			
		#	Enabled	Name	Value type	Filters	Туре	
		1		Alpha service level	Ratio	0		
		2		Alpha service level	Ratio	0		
		3		Available inventory	Products	0		
		4		Available inventor	Products	0		
		5		Available inventor	Products	0		
		6		Available inventor	Products	0		
							ОК	Cancel

Figure 105: Product statistic unit.

We'll create a KPI dashboard for our example:

Financial and customer performance:

- Opportunity cost, Production cost, Profit, Revenue, Total cost, Transportation cost (table)
- ELT service level by orders (line)
- Lead-time (line)

Operational performance:

- Maximum capacity (line)
- Available inventory (line)

Production and Sourcing:

- Production cost, Transportation cost (table, "Object" show \rightarrow by item)
- Current backlog orders, Customer delayed orders, Customer dropped orders, Customer in-time orders, Customer orders, Customer orders arrived, Produced (table)

Experimental Result for Pessimistic Scenario

The simulation provides the following results for the pessimistic scenario with low demand (Figures 106-108).



Figure 106: Financial and customer performance.

Financial and customer performance	Maximum capacity		Available inventory	
Operational performance				
Production and Sourcing	40		1.5	
Add new tab	30		1	
	20			
	10		0.5	
	0 50 100 150 200 250 30	0 366	0 50 100 150 200 250 300	366
	Days		Days	

Figure 107: Operational performance.

Financial and customer performance	Produ	iction cost, Trai	nsportation	cost	Prod	uced, Current b	acklog orders	, Customer delayed	
Operational performance		Statistics name	Object	Value	Unit		Statistics name	Value	Unit
Production and Sourcing									
	1	Production cost	Factory	36,500.0	USD	1	Customer in-ti	180.0	Order
Add new tab	2	Transportation	DC	276.48	USD	2	Customer orders	180.0	Order
	3	Transportation	Factory	272.64	USD	3	Customer orde	180.0	Order
						4	Produced	730.0	pcs

Figure 108: Production and sourcing performance.

Why is the **Available inventory** histogram blank? To address this issue, we need to open the **Inventory** table and update our settings.

Experimental Result for Optimistic Scenario

The simulation provides the following results for the optimistic scenario with high demand (Figure 109 to Figure 111).



Figure 109: Financial and customer performance.



Figure 110: Operational performance.

Compare the data in the Available inventory histogram with our previous results.

Financial and customer performance	Produ	uction cost, Tra	nsportation	cost		Proc	luced, Customer	ed, Customer in-time orders, Customer orders 🕂 r 🛞			
Operational performance		Statistics name	Object	Value	Unit		Statistics name	Value	Unit		
Production and Sourcing											
	1	Production cost	Factory	90,750.0	USD	1	Current backlo	0.0	Order		
Add new tab	2	Transportation	DC	685.44	USD	2	Customer dro	109.0	Order		
	3	Transportation	Factory	689.28	USD	3	Customer in-ti	71.0	Order		
						4	Customer orders	180.0	Order		
						5	Customer orde	71.0	Order		
						6	Produced	1,815.0	pcs		

Figure 111: Production and sourcing performance.

Result Analysis

Table 15 shows the KPI from the pessimistic and optimistic scenarios.

Table	15:	KPI	comparison.
-------	-----	-----	-------------

КРІ	Pessimistic Scenario	Optimistic Scenario
Financial and customer performance:		
Opportunity cost, \$	0.0	0.0
Production cost, \$	36 500.0	90 750.0
Profit, \$	394 950.88	978 875.28
Revenue, \$	432 000.0	1 071 000.0
Total cost, \$	37 049.12	92 124.72
Transportation cost (distribution center), \$	276.48	685.44
Transportation cost (Factory), \$	272.64	689.28
Service level, %	100%	100%
Lead time, days	10	4
Operational performance:		
Maximum capacity usage in the supply chain, pcs	50	50
Maximum inventory in the supply chain (distribution center), pcs	50	50
Maximum inventory in the supply chain (Factory), pcs	60	60
Production and sourcing performance:		
Current backlog orders	0	0
Customer delayed orders	0	0

КРІ	Pessimistic Scenario	Optimistic Scenario
Customer dropped orders	0	109.0
Customer in-time orders	180.0	71.0
Customer orders	180.0	180.0
Customer orders arrived	180.0	71.0
Produced, pcs	730.0	1815.0

In Table 15, we can see higher demand has led to increased supply chain profit. At the same time, order fulfilment rates have fallen. This analysis shows the supply chain design's limits and provides evidence the company will need to redesign their supply chain if they believe the optimistic scenario is realistic.

Sourcing Policies

Our Case Study: Extended Supply Chain for Smartphones

WHC's supply chain manager suggests we analyze two options for improving the supply chain performance for a positive market development:

Option	Fixed Costs
Increase distribution center capacity and imply new Min- Max values 100-200 at distribution center and 120-240 at factory in the inventory control policy	\$10,000
Build a second distribution center in China and imply Dual Sourcing	\$50,000

Improvement Action: Single Distribution Center - Increased Capacity

Experimental Result

The simulation provides the following results for the optimistic scenario with high demand and supply chain redesign in the **single distribution center-increased capacity** option (Figures 112-114).

Financial and customer performance	Орро	ortunity cost, Pr	oduction cost	, Profit, Total cost, T	ELTS	servi	ice level,	, by order	's q-ty		E 6	3 🖸	Lead tir	ne					E	0 L
Operational performance		Statistics name	Value	Unit	2	1							11							
Production and Sourcing	1	Opportunity c	0.0	USD	1.9	-														
1 roduction and boarcing	2	Production cost	198,000.0	USD									8							
Add new tab	3	Profit	1,959,173.76	USD									6							
	4	Revenue	2,160,000.0	USD	1	tr							× :							
	5	Total cost	200,826.24	USD									4							
	6	Transportation	2,826.24	USD	0.5	5							1							
					0	0	50	100	150 200 Days	250	300	366	0 0	50	100	150	200 Days	250	300	366

Figure 112: Financial and customer performance.



Figure 113: Operational performance.

Financial and customer performance	Produ	iction cost, Trar	nsportation o	ost	1 1 1	Current backlog orders, Customer delayed orders, Cu 🙋									
		Statistics name	Object	Value	Unit			Statistics name	Value	Unit					
Operational performance															
Production and Sourcing	1	Production cost	Factory	198,000.0	USD		1	Current backlo	0.0	Order					
	2	Transportation	DC	1,382.4	USD		2	Customer in-ti	180.0	Order					
Add new tab	3	Transportation	Factory	1,443.84	USD		3	Customer orders	180.0	Order					
							4	Customer orde	180.0	Order					
							5	Produced	3,960.0	pcs					
	•				Þ										

Figure 114: Production and sourcing performance.

Result Analysis

Table 16 shows us the redesigned supply chain's impact on the KPI.

КРІ	Optimistic Scenario AS-IS Supply Chain Design	Optimistic Scenario Redesign "single distribution center - increased capacity"
Financial and customer performance:		
Opportunity cost, \$	0.0	0.0
Production cost, \$	90 750.0	198 000.0
Profit, \$	978 875.28	1 959 173.76
Revenue, \$	1 071 000.0	2 160 000.0
Total cost, \$	92 124.72	200 826.24
Transportation cost (distribution cen- ter), \$	685.44	1 382.4
Transportation cost (Factory), \$	689.28	1 443.84
Service level, %	100%	100%
Lead time, days	4	10
Operational performance:		
Maximum capacity usage in the supply chain, pcs	50	200
Maximum inventory in the supply chain (distribution center), pcs	50	200
Maximum inventory in the supply chain (Factory), pcs	60	240
Production and sourcing performance:		

КРІ	Optimistic Scenario AS-IS Supply Chain Design	Optimistic Scenario Redesign "single distribution center - increased capacity"
Current backlog orders	0	0
Customer delayed orders	0	0
Customer dropped orders	109.0	0
Customer in-time orders	71.0	180.0
Customer orders	180.0	180.0
Customer orders arrived	71.0	180.0
Produced, pcs	1815.0	3 960.0

Table 16 shows us the redesigned supply chain performs far better than the AS-IS supply chain design. Financial, customer, and operational performance have all improved and the WHC can almost double its total profit. The results also point to the maximum capacity the extended distribution center will need (200 pcs) as well as the required production capacity (3,960 units).

Improvement Action: New Distribution Center - Dual Sourcing

Changing the Scenario's Sourcing Policy

To perform an experiment that uses dual sourcing, we need to update our scenario. First, we need to go to **Sourcing** to change the single sourcing policy to multiple source policy for deliveries from the distribution centers to the customers. Do not forget to create the new distribution center in China! (Figure 115).



#	Delivery Destina	at	Product		Туре		Parameters	Sources		Time Period		Inclusion T	ype
	1	r.		T.		Ŧ.	Υ		T.		Ψ.		Ŧ
1	Factory		Display	Ŧ	Closest (Single source)	Ŧ	No parameters	Supplier China	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	
2	Factory	Y	Chip	Y	Closest (Single source)	Ŧ	No parameters	Supplier Taiwan	Ŧ	(All perio <mark>d</mark> s)	٧	Include	v
3	DC US	v	Smartphone	٣	Closest (Single source)	v	No parameters	Factory	v	(All periods)	v	Include	v
4	(All customers)		Smartphone	v	Closest (Multiple Sources) 🔻	No parameters	DC China, DC US		(All periods)	v	Include	Ψ.
5	DC China	Ŧ	Smartphone	v	Closest (Single source)	v	No parameters	Factory	Ŧ	(All periods)	v	Include	∇

Figure 115: Sourcing policy selection.

Second, we set up inventory control parameters (Figure 116).

Inventory	#	Facility		Product		Policy Type	Policy Parameters	Initial Stock, units	Periodic Check	Period	Policy Basis
Loading and Unloading Gates			T.		т	Υ	T	т	т	T	T
Location Lists	1	DC US	Ŧ	Smartphone	Ŧ	Min-max policy 🔻	s=20, S=50	40	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻 (
Locations	2	Factory	T	Smartphone	T	Min-max policy 🔻	s=120, S=240	150	0	0	Quantity = (
Measurement Unit Conversio	~	- decory				with the policy	5 120,5 210	150		-	Quantity
Measurement Units	3	Factory	Ŧ	Chip	T	Unlimited invent.	Unlimited	00	\bigcirc	0	Quantity • (
Milk Runs	4	Factory	Ŧ	Display	T	Unlimited invent.	Unlimited	00	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻 (
Ordering Rules	5	DC China	a .	Smartphone	Ŧ	Min-max policy 🔻	s=60, S=120	100	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻 (

Figure 116: Inventory control policy.

Third, we consider \$50,000 as fixed costs for opening the new distribution center in China (Figure 117).

Δ.																
Facility Expenses	#	Facility		Expense Type		Value		Cost Unit		Time Unit		Product Unit		Time Period		
Fleet Size			Ŧ		т		T		Ŧ		Ŧ		T.		т	
Groups	1	DC China		initialCost	Ŧ	50,000		USD						(All periods)	Ŧ	
Inventory																

Figure 117: Distribution center/factory settings.

Finally, we add paths to and from the new distribution center in China (Figure 118).

Δ.																
Paths	#	From		То		Cost Calculation	Cost Calculation	Cost Unit		Distance		Distance Unit		Transportation	Ti	Time Uni
Period Groups			T.		T	Υ	т		T.		T.		т		T.	
Periods	1	Supplier China	Ŧ	Factory	Ŧ	Distance-based c. •	0.5 * distance	USD	Ŧ	0		km	Ŧ	0.0		day
Processing Cost	2	Supplier Taiwar	n v	Factory	v	Distance-based c. v	0.8 * distance	USD	v	0		km	v	0.0		dav
Processing Time		anthe sector														,
Product Groups	3	Factory	Ŧ	DC US	Ŧ	Volume&distanc*	0.01 * amount (m	USD	Ŧ	0		km	Ŧ	2.0		day
Production	4	DC US	v	(All locations)	Ŧ	Volume&distanc*	0.01 * amount (m	USD	v	0		km	T	0.0		day
Production Batch	5	Factory	Ŧ	DC China	∇	Volume&distanc=	0.005 * amount (USD	Ŧ	0		km	Ŧ	0.0		day
Products	6	DC China	∇	(All locations)	∇	Volume&distanc*	0.005 * amount (USD	v	0		km	∇	0.0		day

Figure 118: Transportation policy.

Note: Inventory control policies immediately interact with production policy. Production is controlled by parameters of inventory policies.

Experimental Result

The simulation provides the results for the following optimistic scenario with high demand and supply chain redesign in the **new distribution center – dual sourcing** option (Figures 119-122).



Figure 119: Dual sourcing experiment.



Figure 120: Financial and customer performance.



Figure 121: Operational performance

Financial and customer performance	Produ	uction cost, Tra	nsportation	cost	® [.) C	Current backlog orders, Customer delayed orders, Custor 🖾 r 🗋						
interfect and customer performance		Statistics name	Object	Value	Unit			Statistics name	Value	Unit			
Operational performance													
Production and Sourcing	1	Production cost	Factory	180,250.0	USD		1	Customer dro	1.0	Order			
A data a succesta	2	Transportation	DC China	61.76	USD		2	Customer in-ti	179.0	Order			
Add new tab	3	Transportation	DC US	107.41	USD		3	Customer orders	180.0	Order			
	- 4	Transportation	Factory	692.89	USD		- 4	Customer orde	179.0	Order			
							5	Produced	3,605.0	pcs			
	•		m		•								

Figure 122: Production and sourcing performance

Result Analysis

Table 17 shows the redesigned supply chain's impact on the KPI.

Table 17: KPI comparison.

КРІ	Optimistic Sce- nario	Optimistic Sce- nario	Optimistic Scenario
	AS-IS Supply Chain Design	Supply Chain Re- design	Supply Chain Redesign
		"single distribu- tion center - in- creased capacity"	"new distribu- tion center – dual sourcing"
Financial and customer perfor- mance:			
Opportunity cost, \$	0.0	0.0	0.0
Production cost, \$	90 750.0	198 000.0	180 250.0
Profit, \$	978 875.28	1 959 173.76	1 969 887.94
Revenue, \$	1 071 000.0	2 160 000.0	2 151 000.0
Total cost, \$	92 124.72	200 826.24	181 112.06
Transportation cost (distribu- tion center US), \$	685.44	1 382.4	107.41
Transportation cost (distribu- tion center China), \$	-	-	61.75
Transportation cost (Factory), \$	689.28	1 443.84	692.89
Service level, %	100%	100%	100%
Lead time, days	4	10	2.09
Operational performance:			

КРІ	Optimistic Sce- nario AS-IS Supply Chain Design	Optimistic Sce- nario Supply Chain Re- design	Optimistic Scenario Supply Chain Redesign
		"single distribu- tion center - in- creased capacity"	"new distribu- tion center – dual sourcing"
Maximum capacity usage in the supply chain, pcs	50	200	170
Maximum inventory in the sup- ply chain (distribution center US), pcs	50	200	50
Maximum inventory in the sup- ply chain (distribution center China), pcs	-	-	70
Maximum inventory in the sup- ply chain (Factory), pcs	60	240	190
Production and sourcing per- formance:			
Current backlog orders	0	0	0
Customer delayed orders	0	0	0
Customer dropped orders	109.0	0	1.0
Customer in-time orders	71.0	180.0	179.0
Customer orders	180.0	180.0	180.0
Customer orders arrived	71.0	180.0	179.0
Produced, pcs	1815.0	3 960.0	3 605.0

Table 17 shows us the redesigned supply chain performs much better than the AS-IS supply chain design and the first supply chain redesign option. Financial, customer and operational performance have all improved, and the WHC can double its total profit compared to the first supply chain redesign option.

The results are also evidence of the maximum distribution center capacity that the new distribution center in China (170 m³) needs as well as the production capacity (3,605 units). For a more detailed analysis, you need to include warehousing costs for the second distribution center in China.

Comparison to New Distribution Center – Single Sourcing

To estimate whether a dual sourcing policy will perform better than a single sourcing policy, we simulate the same example but with single sourcing policy. The U.S.-based distribution center ships to customers in the U.S. and Brazil, and the China-based distribution center ships to all other customers (Figure 123).

anyLogistix - New project				<u> </u>				-			_				
e Extensions Settings Help									91						
FA NO SIM	$+$ \leq				🔶 🔶 🦉		D 🕕 💮 🔛	1	abc 🦂	the Sta					Cus
GFA 1: Results 2		Data			and the	Sec.		ġ.	2 1 43						-
Copy of GFA 1: Results 2 1		Simu	lation experim	ient			Iludion			5. 6 C					Su
GFA 1: Results 1		Varia	tion experime	nt				L	abrailer Sea	R ALS		AS	51'A		Seed
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 1		Comp	oarison experi	mer			NORTH		2	EUROPE		~ JX		22	Okholsk
GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 2		Custo	im experiment	1			AMERICA			- 0	The	AND	2		
GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 1 with	h new D(Exter	nal tables		North Pac Ocean	ific	1.00	N	orth Atlantic	Mediterenten	1	A A	23		
IO (SIM)							Godf of Manua		Ocean	2 Jak		1			The second
Copy of NO (SIM) 1 NO results					Bis		Cardderate		-	AFRICA		Arabian Sea Beng	1	South	
3 SIM Distribution Network inside 4 Walls Mode	ls						X	F	100 C			/	13	4	
our-Stage SC (Optimistic scenario)					1000		s	ay	тн	E. C		/		- 19 h	The
our-Stage SC (Pessimistic scenario)							A'M	ER	ACA .		/	Indian			Cent
our-Stage SC (Optimistic scenario, increased ca	pacity)				1	South	Pacific		South Atl	antic		Ocean		AUST	RALIA
Four-Stage SC (Optimistic scenario, dual sourcing	g)								Ocea						
Four-Stage SC (Optimistic scenario, single sourci	ing)														14.0
	-						A.					10.00			
asic Advanced All	9	Add	J Rem	ove											
eriod Groups		# 1	Delivery Desti	inat	Product		Туре		Parameters						
eriods										Sources		Time Period		Inclusion T	уре
rocessing Cost				T.		Ŧ	T		τ.	Sources	Ŧ	Time Period	Ŧ	Inclusion 1	ype T
rocessing Time		1	Factory	Υ v	Display	τ	T Closest (Single source)		۳ No parameters	Sources Supplier China	τ	Time Period (All periods)	τ. 	Inclusion T	ype T
roduct Groups		1	Factory Factory	Ψ Ψ Ψ	Display Chip	Υ. 	T Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	*	Y No parameters No parameters	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan	Ψ 	Time Period (All periods) (All periods)	Ψ. 	Inclusion T Include Include	ype Y v
		1 2 3	Factory Factory DC US	Ψ Ψ Ψ	Display Chip Smartphone	Ψ 	T Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	*	Y No parameters No parameters	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan	τ 	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	T T T	Inclusion T Include Include	ype T
roduction		1 2 3	Factory Factory DC US	Ψ 	Display Chip Smartphone	Ψ 	Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	*	T No parameters No parameters No parameters	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan Factory	τ 	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	τ 	Inclusion 1 Include Include Include	ype
roduction roduction Batch		1 2 3 4	Factory Factory DC US DC China	Ψ 	Display Chip Smartphone Smartphone	Ψ 	Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	•	Y No parameters No parameters No parameters	Supplier China Supplier Taiwan Factory Factory	Ψ 	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	Ψ 	Inclusion T Include Include Include	ype ¥ * * * *
oduction oduction Batch oducts		1 2 3 4 5	Factory Factory DC US DC China Brazil	Υ 	Display Chip Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone	Ψ 	T Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	*	Vo parameters No parameters No parameters No parameters No parameters	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan Factory Factory DC US	Ψ Ψ Ψ Ψ Ψ	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	τ 	Inclusion I Include Include Include Include	ype T
oduction oduction Batch oducts le Batch		1 2 3 4 5 6	Factory Factory DC US DC China Brazil India	Υ 	DIsplay Chip Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone	Ψ 	T Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	*	No parameters	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan Factory Factory DC US DC China	Ψ Ψ Ψ Ψ Ψ Ψ	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	Ψ 	Inclusion T Include Include Include Include Include	ype Y V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V
oduction oduction Batch oducts lle Batch te States Changes		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Factory Factory DC US DC China Brazil India Italy	Ψ 	Display Chip Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone	Ψ 	T Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	× × × ×	 No parameters 	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan Factory Factory DC US DC China DC China	Ψ - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4 - 4	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	* * * * *	Inclusion T Include Include Include Include Include Include	ype
roduction Batch roducts le Batch te States Changes surcing		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Factory Factory DC US DC China Brazil India Italy South Africa	Υ 	Display Chip Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone	* * * * *	T Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)	× × × ×	No parameters	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan Factory Factory DC US DC China DC China DC China	Ψ - Ψ - Ψ - Ψ - Ψ - Ψ - Ψ - Ψ -	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	T 	Inclusion 1 Include Include Include Include Include Include	ype
roduction roducts le Batch te States Changes purcing uppliers		1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Factory Factory DC US DC China Brazil India Italy South Africa US	Υ 	Display Chip Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone Smartphone	* * * * * *	T Closest (Single source) Closest (Single source)		v No parameters No parameters No parameters No parameters No parameters No parameters No parameters	Sources Supplier China Supplier Taiwan Factory DC US DC China DC China DC China DC China	¥ * * * * *	Time Period (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods) (All periods)	T 	Inclusion 1 Include Include Include Include Include Include Include	ype T T T T T T T T T T T T T

Figure 123: A supply chain design that uses a single sourcing policy with a second distribution center.

The simulation provides the following results for the optimistic scenario with high demand and supply chain redesign in the **new distribution center – single sourcing** option (Figures 124-126).



Figure 124: Financial and customer performance.



Figure 125: Operational performance.

Financial and customer performance	Production cost, Transportation cost 🛞 🔲							nt backlog orders, Cus	d orders, Custor 🞯r 🗋	
		Statistics name	Object	Value	Unit			Statistics name	Value	Unit
Operational performance										
Production and Sourcing	1	Production cost	Factory	180,250.0	USD		1	Customer dropped orders	1.0	Order
	2	Transportation	DC China	61.76	USD		2	Customer in-time orders	179.0	Order
Add new tab	3	Transportation	DC US	107.41	USD		3	Customer orders	180.0	Order
	4	Transportation	Factory	692.89	USD		4	Customer orders arrived	179.0	Order
							5	Produced	3,605.0	pcs

Figure 126: Production and sourcing performance.

Table 18 displays the results.

Table 1	8: KPI	comparis	son.
---------	--------	----------	------

КРІ	Optimistic Scenario Supply Chain Redesign "single distribution center - increased capacity"	Optimistic Scenario Supply Chain Redesign "new distribu- tion center – dual sourcing"	Optimistic Scenario Supply Chain Redesign "new distribu- tion center – single sourc- ing"
Financial and customer per- formance:			
Opportunity cost, \$	0.0	0.0	0.0
Production cost, \$	198 000.0	180 250.0	180 250.0
Profit, \$	1 959 173.76	1 969 887.94	1 969 887.94
Revenue, \$	2 160 000.0	2 151 000.0	2 151 000.0
Total cost, \$	200 826.24	181 112.06	181 112.06
Transportation cost (distribu- tion center US), \$	1 382.4	107.41	107.41
Transportation cost (distribu- tion center China), \$	-	61.75	61.76
Transportation cost (Fac- tory), \$	1 443.84	692.89	692.89
Service level, %	100%	100%	100%
Lead time, days	10	2.09	2.09
Operational performance:			
Maximum capacity usage in the supply chain, pcs	200	170	170
КРІ	Optimistic Scenario Supply Chain Redesign "single distribution center - increased capacity"	Optimistic Scenario Supply Chain Redesign "new distribu- tion center – dual sourcing"	Optimistic Scenario Supply Chain Redesign "new distribu- tion center – single sourc- ing"
---	---	---	--
Maximum inventory in the supply chain (distribution center US), pcs	200	50	50
Maximum inventory in the supply chain (distribution center China), pcs	-	70	70
Maximum inventory in the supply chain (Factory), pcs	240	190	190
Production and sourcing per- formance:			
Current backlog orders	0	0	0
Customer delayed orders	0	0	0
Customer dropped orders	0	1.0	1.0
Customer in-time orders	180.0	179.0	179.0
Customer orders	180.0	180.0	180.0
Customer orders arrived	180.0	179.0	179.0
Produced, pcs	3 960.0	3 605.0	3 605.0

Table 18 shows us the major impact of building a new distribution center is lower lead time. The SXC design with a new distribution center allows us to achieve the highest total profit with single and dual sourcing policy.

Comparing Sourcing Strategies

Before you decide how to design your supply chain, you should analyze some additional factors, including (Ivanov et al. 2017):

- Production cost
- Use of available resources
- Focusing on core competencies
- Cost restructuring
- Time-to-market
- Risk sharing

- Know-how sharing
- Quality issues
- Flexibility
- Taxes

By reducing your supplier base, you can order larger volumes from one supplier (single sourcing strategy) with the goal of generating volume bundling (supply chain) effects.

However, your dependence on a single supplier may be too high a risk. Recent disruptions have forced supply chain managers to rethink this lean sourcing strategy. In 2011, tsunamis and floods in Japan and Thailand affected many suppliers based in these countries. Many factories did not operate for months.

With that in mind, you may want to work with a second or third supplier who can provide a part or module. This supplier strategy—typically called dual sourcing—might even grow to be a multiple sourcing strategy which better balances the global flows of material and reduces risk.

This discussion above raises some critical issues we need to consider before we commit to a single, dual or multiple sourcing strategy. They include:

- Volume
- Product variety
- Demand uncertainty
- Lead time importance
- Disruption and other risks
- Transportation costs
- Manufacturing complexity
- Coordination complexity
- Post-sale issues

Single Sourcing Advantages

Some common advantages of single sourcing are:

- Long-term agreements
- Price stability
- The opportunity to include Suppliers in the product development process at a very early stage
- Low transactional costs
- Supply chain effects

Single Sourcing Disadvantages

Single sourcing also has several shortcomings:

- Inefficient price policy
- Lead time, quality and service issues
- Lack of collaboration with many suppliers.

For *global sourcing*, items of high volume, steady demand, and low transportation costs are most preferable. However, different *chances and risks* for costs, service, quality, and sustainability issues should be part of the analysis.

• Costs: labor, taxes, transportation, insurance, transshipment, duties and transactions.

- Quality: bill-of-materials, quality control, after-sales service and certifications.
- Service: on-time delivery, responsiveness, flexibility, technical equipment, image and reliability.
- Sustainability: political, economic and social issues.

Global sourcing offers many advantages, including access to the broadest available range of suppliers. But at the same time, the work required to establish relationships with global vendors or partners will increase, as they require certain language skills.

Global sourcing also requires time to travel to suppliers and for the transportation of goods. Topics such as currency risk or political stability are important considerations as well as different cultures, norms or standards.

Chapter 4. Risk Management in Supply Chains

Our Learning Objectives

Our learning objectives for this chapter are to:

- 1. Develop analytical and management skills to analyze bullwhip and ripple effects in the supply chain
- 2. Develop technical skills on batching, ordering rules and events
- 3. Performing variation and comparison experiments in AnyLogistix
- 4. Understand major trade-offs in supply chain risk management

In supply chain design and planning, we need to take uncertainty and risk into account as we develop problem statements and decision-oriented solutions. Recent literature suggests we need to consider recurrent or *operational* risks and *disruptive* risks.

Risks in supply chains appear at different times and have different performance impacts. High-frequency-low-impact disruptions are typically considered in bullwhip-effect and refer to demand and lead-time fluctuations. Bullwhip effect considers weekly/daily demand and lead-time fluctuations as primary drivers of the supply chain changes which take place at the parametric level and can be eliminated in a short-term perspective. In light of low-frequency-high-impact disruptions, ripple effect has been considered (Ivanov et al. 2014).

Bullwhip Effect in the Supply chain

Case Study

We consider a supply chain for beer production and distribution made up of a supplier, a brewery, a distribution center and a customer (Figure 127).



information flow material flow

Figure 127: Supply chain structure.

The customer demand (in units) fluctuates and is distributed over 36 days (Table 19).

1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36
4	4	9	7	11	14	8	9
4	4	7	8	9	8	11	
4	10	8	6	4	9	7	
2	11	6	10	11	6	9	
5	7	10	7	9	9	10	

Table 19: Demand distribution by periods

Experiment and Bullwhip Effect Analysis

Supply Chain Design and Policies

First, we create a new scenario (**BWE**) and set up the locations (Figure 128).



Figure 128: Our scenario's supply chain locations.

Our next step is to create a new product (**Beer**) and a new vehicle (**Truck**), and set up demand (**historic demand**), inventory control policy (**Min**=5; Max=20), and sourcing policy and production time (Figures 129-136).

#	Name		Unit		Selling Price	e	Cost		Cost Unit	
		Т		T		Т		т		T
1	Beer		pcs	Ŧ	2		1		USD	v
Fig	ure 129:	Prod	uct.							
#	Product	Am	ount from	Unit fro	om			Amount to	Unit to	
		Υ.	T		т		T		T	т
1	Beer	≖ 1		pcs		=		0.001	m³	∇

Figure 130: Unit Conversions.

#	Name		Capacity		Capacity Unit		Speed		Speed Unit	
		т		т		т		т		т
1	Truck		6		m³	Ŧ	50.0		km/h	Ŧ

Figure 131: Vehicle Type.

#	From		То		Cost Calculation	Cost Calculat	Cost	Unit	Distar	nce	Distance Un	it	Transportation Ti	Time	Unit	Straight	Vehicle 1	ype	Transportation
	T			r.	T	T		T	т		T		T		т	T		T	
1	Supplier 1	Ŧ	Site 1	Ŧ	Fixed delivery cos	0.0	USD	Ŧ	0		km -	Ŧ	3.0	day	v		Truck	Ŧ	LTL
2	Site 1	v	Site 2	v	Fixed delivery cos	0.0	USD	∇	0		km	v	2.0	day	∇		Truck	Ŧ	LTL
3	Site 2	Ŧ	Customer 1	Ŧ	Fixed delivery cos	0.0	USD	∇	0		km .	v	1.0	day	Ŧ		Truck	Ŧ	LTL

Figure 132: Transportation policy.

#	Delivery Destin	at	Product		Туре	Parameters	Sources		Time Period		Inclusion	Туре
		T.		T	т	T		т		T		т
1	Customer 1	Ŧ	Beer	∇	Closest (Single s▼	No parameters	Site 2	Ŧ	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	Ŧ
2	Site 2	∇	Beer	∇	Closest (Single s •	No parameters	Site 1	Ŧ	(All periods)	∇	Include	~
3	Site 1	Ŧ	Beer	∇	Closest (Single s▼	No parameters	Supplier 1	W	(All periods)	∇	Include	Ŧ

Figure 133: Sourcing policy.

#	Site	Product	Туре	Parameters	BOM	Production Cost	Cost Unit	Time Period	Inclusion Type
	т	т	Υ	T	т	T	т	T	T
1	Site 1 💌	Beer 💌	Simple make pol. 🔻	Time = 2.0 (day)	Ŧ	0	USD 🔻	(All periods)	Include 🔹

Figure 134: Production policy.

#	Facility	Product	Policy Type	Policy Parameters	Initial Stock,	Periodic Check	Period	Policy Basis	Stock Calculation	Time Unit	Time Period
	T	T	Υ	T	T	T	т	T	Υ.	т	т
1	(All sites) 🔻	Beer 🔻	Min-max policy 🔻	s=5, S=20	12	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻	0	day 🤻	(All periods)

Figure 135: Inventory control policy.



Figure 136: Demand data.

Note *backordering* is allowed in this case.

KPI Dashboard

For bullwhip effect analysis, we design the following two-part KPI dashboard (Figures 137 and 139).



Figure 137: KPI dashboard for bullwhip-effect analysis.

The **Daily Incoming Products / Daily Outgoing Products** diagrams will display the quantities of incoming and outgoing deliveries. The program's computation of the variation of incoming and outgoing deliveries allows us to compute the BWE (bullwhip-effect) index as shown in Figure 138 (based on Heizer and Render 2014).



Figure 138: BWE computation

The Products bullwhip effect diagram will use the BWE index. If the BWE measure is:

- > 1 Variance amplification is present
- = 1 No amplification is present
- < 1 Smoothing or dampening is occurring



Figure 139: Dashboard with customer and financial KPI.

Experiments and Result Analysis

We start a new simulation experiment for the data described in the case study. You'll find our results in Figures 140-142.



Figure 140: Customer and financial KPI.



Figure 141: KPI dashboard for bullwhip-effect analysis.



Figure 142: A detailed view of bullwhip-effect analysis.

We can see two things in Figure 140: our revenue was \$56 and our already-low service level is decreasing. The one to seven-day lead time for some orders is increasing both the number of delayed products and the backlog. We can see the production speed is very low compared to the incoming customer orders. Moreover, Figures 141 and 142 show us the supply chain does not display a bullwhip effect. The variability of delivered quantities is decreasing.

Note: The Products bullwhip effect diagram is cumulative.

The simulation shows our supply chain has two major problems: our inventory is too low and our production time is too long. We'll use the following parameters to conduct the next experiment:

- Production time is changed from 2 days to 0.1 day;
- Min-Max levels are changed from 5-20 to 20-40.

Figures 143-144 display our results:



Figure 143: Customer and financial KPI.



Figure 144: KPI dashboard for bullwhip-effect analysis.

Figure 143 shows us we received a revenue of more than \$500 (compared to \$54 in the initial supply chain), our service level is 100% and our lead time is 1 day. This results in 100% on-time delivered products and no backlog: we can see production speed is aligned with the incoming customer orders.

Moreover, Figure 144 shows the supply chain does not display a bullwhip effect. The variability of delivered quantities is decreasing. By comparing the results from the two experiments, you can see the second setting has reduced the BWE.

Batching and Ordering Rules

Knowing production, sales and transportation quantities can be batched, we'll review how to set up batching and ordering rules and analyze their effect on the bullwhip effect.

Transportation Batches

To aggregate transportation orders to a batch, we use the **Paths** table to set up the amount of time or a minimum load (Figure 145).

#	From		То		Cost Calcula	Cost	Cost Unit	Distance	Dista	Transpor	Time Unit	Straight	Vehicle Type	Transpo	Mi	Aggregate Ord	Aggregation Period
	T			T.	Υ	т	т	т	T.	T	т	т	T	T	т	T	T
1	Supplier 1	Ŧ	Site 1	Ŧ	Fixed delive.*	0.0	USD 🔻	0	km 🤻	3.0	day 🦷		Truck •	LTL v	0	\bigcirc	0
2	Site 1	v	Site 2	v	Fixed delive.	0.0	USD 🔻	0	km 🔻	2.0	day 🦷		Truck v	LTL -	0		5
3	Site 2	Ŧ	Customer 1	Ŧ	Fixed delive.*	0.0	USD .	0	km 🤻	1.0	day 🦷		Truck •	LTL v	0	\bigcirc	0

Figure 145: Transportation order aggregation

In Figure 145, we used the **Aggregation Period** column to set a five-day aggregation period for shipments from the factory to the distribution center. This means our simulation will batch five days of shipments. As an alternative, we could have used a batching rule that set the minimum load of trucks. As an example, we could enter 0.6 to set the minimum truck capacity to 60%. (cf. Sect. 1.6.3).

Sales and Production Batches

We need to set up the batch sizes in **Sales Batch** and **Production Batch**, respectively (Figures 146-147) to batch sales and production orders.

#	Source	Product	Туре	Batch Size	Step Size	Price (per unit)	Price (per batch)	Cost Unit
	т	т	т	т	т	T	T	Т
1	Site 2 💌	Beer 💌	Exact 💌	5	5	2	10	USD 🔻

Figure 146: Setting sales batch sizes.

#	Source	Product	Туре	Batch Size	Step Size	Production Cost (Production Cost (Cos	Production Time (Production Time (Time U	Jnit
	т	т	т	т	т	T	T	T	T	T	T	r -
1	Site 1 🔻	Beer 🔻	Exact 🔻	10	0	1	10	US[=	0.05	0.5	day	Ŧ

Figure 147: Setting sales batch sizes.

In Figure 146, we set up a sales batch with a size of 5 units and a size step (that is, the amount the batch can be increased) of 5 units. In Figure 147, we set up a production batch with a size of 10 units and a size step of 0.

Our production batch function uses the following rule:

- Inventory policy for finished goods warehouse tells how much to order (Q)
- If **Production batch** > Q, then nothing is produced
- If **Production batch** < Q, then the factory produces the closest number of products using the policies we defined for the batch but not more than Q.

Example 1: Batch: 100; Q=90 → Nothing produced

Example 2: Batch: 100, Size step: 100, Q: 290 \rightarrow factory will produce 200 and the rest 90 will be added to the next order

Ordering Rules

We use the **Ordering rules** table to set the batch size requirements (Figure 148).

#	Destination	Product	Rule	Limit, units	
		T	T	т	
1	Customer 1	 Beer 	 Can Increase 	▼ 5	
2	Customer 1	▼ Beer	 Can Decrease 	v 5	
3	(All sites)	▼ Beer	 Can Increase 	▼ 5	
4	(All sites)	 Beer 	 Can Decrease 	▼ 5	

Figure 148: Ordering rules.

- **Destination** defines the product destination
- **Product** defines the product
- Rule allows to choose an ordering rule Can Increase – allows an increase in order size up to the number in the Limit column Can Decrease – allows a decrease in order size up to the number in the Limit column
- Limit, units the number of units within the order size can be adjusted

In our example, we allow five-unit increases and decreases in batch size.

Impact of Batching and Ordering Rules on Bullwhip Effect

In this section, we'll perform a simulation experiment that uses the batching and ordering rules we described above. First, we aggregate transportation orders for five days.

Note: We increased the transportation quantity, but we also need to increase the inventory control policy's MAX-Level. If we do not, an insufficient warehouse capacity will stop our simulation experiment. We should also increase the MIN-level to account for the increased replenishment interval.

We change the inventory control policy parameters from 20-40 to 50-100. Figures 149 and 150 display our results:



Figure 149: KPI dashboard for bullwhip effect analysis.



Figure 150: Customer and financial KPI.

Figure 150 shows us we received more than \$500 of revenue and our service level is very low. With our lead time unequally distributed between 1 and 9 days, we can see the transportation batch rule is not aligned with the incoming customer orders, an issue which leads to a backlog and a reduced service level.

Moreover, Figure 149 shows the bullwhip effect in the supply chain started on day 10. The variability of delivered quantities increases from day 10 because the quantities of incoming products that arrive at the distribution center exceed the outgoing deliveries.

This experiment shows us batching can lead to bullwhip effect. But what will happen if we increase our maximum stock level from 100 to 200? Figures 151-152 display our simulation's results.



Figure 151: Customer and financial KPI.



Figure 152: KPI dashboard for bullwhip-effect analysis.

Figure 151 shows us our revenue hasn't changed and our service level is low. The lead time is unequally distributed between 1 and 13 days, which results in an increasing number of delayed products and a backlog. Our transportation batch and inventory control rules--that are not aligned with the incoming customer orders--has led to a backlog and a lower service level.

However, Figure 151 also shows us the bullwhip effect has reduced. The variability of incoming products to the distribution center is balanced with outgoing deliveries. This experiment show us an inventory increase leads to a reduced bullwhip effect.

Finally, we perform simulation experiment using sales and production batching and ordering (cf. Figures 146-148). There are no transportation batches and inventory MIN-MAX levels are 20-40, respectively. We copy the **BWE** scnenario and use the new **Copy of BWE** scenario for this simulation. Figures 153-154 show the results.



Figure 153: KPI dashboard for bullwhip-effect analysis.



Figure 154: Customer and financial KPI.

Figure 154 shows us we received less than \$500 of revenue and our service level is low. With lead time between 1 and 6 days, we can see our production speed aligns with the incoming six orders and our supply chain does not have a bullwhip effect. The variability of delivered quantities is decreasing.

Comparison Experiment

A convenient way to compare the KPI and statistics of experiments is the **Comparison** experiment that allows us to compare supply chain structures.

To perform a comparison, we need to select scenarios for our comparison and use the **Configure statistics** table to activate the respective KPI. Our comparison of the experiments (cf. Figures 143-144 and 152-154) gives us the following results (Figures 155-156).

Data Simulation experiment	Start date: End date:
Variation experiment Comparison experiment	Use replications:
Custom experiment	Select scenarios to compare:
External tables	GFA 1: Results 1 1 GFA US Distribution net 1 GFA US Distribution net 1 GFA US Distribution net NO (SIM) Copy of NO (SIM) 1 NO re 8 SIM Distribution Netwo 8 SIM Distribution Netwo 8 SIM Distribution Netwo BWE 1 Copy of BWE BWE
	🔅 Configure statistics

Figure 155: Selecting supply chain scenarios for our comparison experiment.

inance	es statistics u	nit: USD	V							
roduc	t statistics un	nit: m³	T							
lime st	tatistics unit:	day	v							
Distand	e statistics u	nit: km								
Select s	statistics to co	ollect during	simulation:							
#	Enabled 🔻	Name		Va	lue type		Filters			Туре
	т			т		T.			т	
1		ELT service	level, by item	s q-ty Rat	tio		0			
2		Products bu	Ilwhip effect	Rat	tio		0			
3		Revenue		Fin	ances		0			
4	\bigcirc	Alpha servio	e level, by ite	ms Rat	tio		0			
5	\bigcirc	Alpha servio	e level, by or	der Rat	tio		0			
6	\bigcirc	Available in	ventory	Pro	oducts		0			
								ОК		Cancel

Figure 156: Selecting statistics for our comparison experiment.

	Description		ELT service level, by it mean	em • Products bullwhip ef mean		• mean	Revenue	•
		т		т	T			T
1	BWE		1		0.02	554		
2	Copy of BWE		0.361		0.02	554		

Figure 157: A comparison for three KPI.

Figure 157 shows us the Comparison experiment is a useful tool for comparing the KPIs from different scenarios without running full simulations. In this case, we see batching (the **Copy of BWE** scenario) leads to a service level reduction from 100% to 36.1%.

Ripple Effect in the Supply Chain

Severe disruptions may ripple quickly through global supply chains and cause significant losses in revenue, sales, service level and total profits. These risks are a challenge for industries that face the *ripple effect* that arises from vulnerability, instability and disruptions in supply chains (Ivanov et al. 2014).

We can talk about ripple effect in a supply chain if a disruption at a supplier or a transportation link spreads to other parts of the supply chain. Unlike the well-known bullwhip effect that considers high-frequency-low-impact *operational risks*, the ripple effect studies low-frequency-high-impact *disruptive risks* (Table 20).

Feature	Ripple Effect	Bullwhip Effect
Risks	Disruptions (for example, an explosion)	Operational (for example, a de- mand fluctuation)
Affected ar- eas	Structures and critical parameters (such as supplier unavailability or lost sales)	Operational parameters such as lead-time and inventory
Recovery	Middle- and long-term; significant coor- dination efforts and investments	Short-term coordination to balance demand and supply
Decreased performance	Output performance such as annual sales or profits	Current performance such as stock-out/overage costs

Table 20: Bullwhip effect and ripple effect.

Ripple effect describes the impact of a disruption on supply chain performance, disruption propagation, and disruption-based scope of changes in the supply chain structures and parameters (Ivanov 2017). The ripple effect's scope and its impact on economic performance depends on the amount in reserve (for example, redundancies like inventory or capacity buffers), flexibility in products and processes, disruption duration, and speed and scale of recovery measures.

The ripple effect is a phenomenon of disruption propagations in the supply chain and their impact on output supply chain performance (for example, sales, on-time delivery and total profit). If a disruption occurs in the supply chain, three questions are important:

• What is the disruption's impact on operational and financial performance?

- What parts of the supply chain are affected by the disruption (that is, what is the scope of disruption propagation)?
- Is stabilization or recovery needed? If yes, what changes are necessary? When are those changes necessary?

Two basic approaches to hedging supply chain against the negative impacts of disruptions – *proactive* and *reactive*. A proactive approach creates certain protections and takes into account possible perturbations during the supply chain design. A reactive approach aims to adjust supply chain processes and structures in the presence of unexpected events.

It is natural to use *simulation* to study the disruption propagations and ripple effect in the supply chain considering time and length of disruptions and recovery policies.

Case Study: A Distribution Center Stops Working for a Month

The goal of this case study is to show you how you can use anyLogistix to perform a disruption risk analysis.

Consider the smartphone supply chain described in Sect. 5.1-5.2 and Figure 93. A fire disrupts a U.S.-based distribution center and prevents it from making or accepting deliveries during the one-month recovery time. The supply chain manager needs to estimate the disruption's impact on the supply chain performance for the following KPI:

- Products received (incoming orders)
- Products delivered (outgoing orders)
- Expected magnitude (that is, lost sales)
- Customer service level

Afterward, the supply chain manager needs to select the most efficient proactive and reactive strategies. He or she can use two proactive strategies: an inventory increase in the supply chain and a backup distribution center or two reactive strategies: fast and expensive distribution center recovery and slow and efficient distribution center recovery.

Events

We change the inventory policy at distribution center to s=100, S=200 and then use the **Event** option (Figure 158) to create a disruption in the supply chain simulation model.

🖄 anyLogistix - New project	
File Extensions Settings Help	
GFA NO SIM +	🛌 🕨 😣 🙆 🕘 🚱 🞇 abc
GFA 1: Results 2	Data Sites
Copy of GFA 1: Results 2 1	Simulation experiment Under Asta
GFA 1: Results 1	Variation experiment
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 1	Comparison experiment NORTH EUROPE
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 2	Custom experiment North Pacific AMERICA O THE THE CASE OF THE
1 GFA US Distribution network: GFA result 1 v	External tables Ocean National Ocean Ocean
NO (SIM)	AFRICA STATE
Copy of NO (SIM) 1 NO results	And a start and a start
8 SIM Distribution Network inside 4 Walls Mo	
8 SIM Distribution Network inside 4 Walls Mo	SAUTH
8 SIM Distribution Network inside 4 Walls Mo	Indian Course Ocean
BWE 1	South Pacific Ocean South Atlantic
Copy of BWE	Ocean Tomas Sa
BWE	
Four-Stage SC (Optimistic scenario)	
	Southen
	Ocean
Basic Advanced All	Add Remove
Events	# Name Object Type Object Event Type Value Occurrence Type Occurrence Time Trigger
Facility Expenses	T T T T T T T T T
Fleet Size	1 Fire SiteData * DCUS * ChangeState * O Date * 8/10/173:31 PM *
Groups	2 Full removany SiteData v DCUS v ChangeState v 🕜 Delay/dave) v 30 Fire v
Inventory	
Loading and Unloading Gates	
Location Lists	
Locations	
Milk Runs	
Ordering Rules	

Figure 158: Events as disruptions in the supply chain.

You use the **Events** table to dynamically open and close supply chain sites or change demand:

- Name the event's name
- **Object Type** to which object this event is related (demand or site)
- Object a site in the supply chain that works only if Object type is SiteData
- Event type define what the event does. Depends on Object type
- Value Value which event will assign. Depends on "Object type"
- Occurrence type defines when an event occurs
- > Date the specific date an event should occur
- Random event may occur randomly according to uniform distribution
- > Delay event happens after some delay (see trigger)
- Occurrence time define the date or delay
- Trigger a reference to another event which serves as a trigger

Events is a powerful function that allows us to model conditions such as:

- Seasonality
- Closing/opening sites
- Closing/opening paths
- Ex. Some paths may be available only during winter time
- Change the demand for a particular customer
- One Event may be triggered by another Event that allows you to model very complex behavior
- We may add their own Event through extension of anyLogistix with AnyLogic Professional Software

In our case, we created two events. The first event – **Fire** – takes place at a specific time: August 10, 2017. In the **Value** column, we switch off the distribution center on this date. The second event – **Full recovery** – switches on the distribution center after a 30-day delay triggered by the first event **Fire**.

Simulation Experiment for Ripple Effect

Let's analyze how the disruption at the distribution center will affect the following KPI:

- Products received (incoming orders)
- Products delivered (outgoing orders)
- Expected magnitude (that is, lost sales)
- Customer service level

First, we run the simulation experiment for the non-disruption case (that is, we switch on the **Value** column's slider for the event **Fire**), see Figure 159.



Figure 159: Simulation results for the non-disruption case.

We can see the opportunity to receive a profit of \$1,968,173.76 and total revenue of \$2,160,000.0. The service level is 100% and there is no interruption in replenishment and customer-in-time orders.

Second, we perform the simulation experiment for the disruption case (that is, we switch off the **Value** column's slider for the **Fire** event). see Figure 160.



Figure 160: Simulation results for the disruption case.

Figure 160 displays a profit of \$1,763,404.16 (instead of \$1,968,173.76) and total revenue of \$1,980,000.0 (instead of \$2,160,000.0) due to an interruption in replenishment and customer-in-time orders.

Analysis of Proactive and Reactive Policies

The supply chain manager needs to select the most efficient proactive and reactive strategies. They can opt for proactive strategies such as an inventory increase in the supply chain and a backup distribution center. They can also apply reactive strategies, including a fast and expensive distribution center recovery and a slow and efficient distribution center recovery.

Impact of Inventory Increase

We change the distribution center's inventory policy from s=100, S=200 to s=100, S=400. Figure 161 shows our simulation's results:



Figure 161: Impact of the change to the distribution center's inventory policy from s=100, S=200 to s=100, S=400.

Figure 161 shows the supply chain's performance could not be improved. In fact, higher opportunity costs have reduced our supply chain's performance. We can see inventory increase is sensible downstream but not at this point.

What would happen to the supply chain if the area within the distribution center that accepts incoming deliveries was destroyed? What effect would the inventory increase have if the distribution center's storage and outgoing areas operated normally? How would you simulate this in anyLogistix?

Impact of a Backup Distribution Center

We now add a backup distribution center near the main distribution center. This distribution center isn't part of our normal supply chain, but it's available should the need arise. We define this policy by new events 3 and 4 (Figure 162).

#	Name	Object Type		Object		Event Type		Value		Occurrence Ty	pe	Occurrence Time	Trigger	
	Υ		Ŧ.		т		т		т		T.	T		T.
1	Fire	Site	Ŧ	DC US	∇	Change state	v	\bigcirc		Date	V	8/10/17 3:31 PM		Ŧ
2	Full recovery	Site	T	DC US	∇	Change state	V			Delay (days)	T	30	Fire	∇
3	In back-up DC	Site	Ŧ	Back-Up DC	∇	Change state	Ŧ			Date	Ŧ	8/10/17 3:31 PM	Fire	Ŧ
4	Out back-up DC	Site	v	Back-Up DC	v	Change state	v	\bigcirc		Delay (days)	v	30	In back-up DC	v

Figure 162: New events for backup distribution center.

The capacity *flexibility* is costly: the backup distribution center creates initialization costs of \$40,000 (Figure 163).

#	Facility		Expense Type		Value		Cost Unit		Time Unit		Product Unit		Time Period	
		T.		T.		т		T.		т		т		т
1	Back-Up DC	w	Initial cost	∇	40,000		USD	∇					(All periods)	w

Figure 163: Data for backup distribution center.

We also need to extend the sourcing, inventory and transportation policies for the backup distribution center (Figures 164-166).

#	Delivery Destina	at	Product		Туре	Parameters	Sources		Time Period		Inclusion	Туре
		r		T	T	Υ		T		T		т
1	Factory	Ŧ	Display	∇	Closest (Multiple*	No parameters	Supplier China	∇	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	∇
2	Factory	Ŧ	Chip	V	Closest (Multiple	No parameters	Supplier Taiwan	V	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	T
3	DC US	Ŧ	Smartphone	∇	Closest (Multiple*	No parameters	Factory	∇	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	∇
4	(All customers)	Ŧ	Smartphone	Ŧ	Closest (Multiple	No parameters	Back-Up DC, DC US	v	(All periods)	Ŧ	Include	T
5	Back-Up DC	Ŧ	Smartphone	\overline{v}	Closest (Single s▼	No parameters	Factory	Ŧ	(All periods)	∇	Include	∇

Figure 164: Extended sourcing policy.

#	Facility		Product	Policy Type	Policy Parameters	Initial Stock,	Periodic Check	Period	Policy Basis	Stock Ca	Time Unit	Time Period
		T	т	т	т	Υ	т	T.	т	т	т	T
1	DC US	Ŧ	Smart	Min-max policy 🔻	s=100, S=200	150	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻	0	day 🔹	(All periods) 🔻
2	Factory	Ŧ	Smart	Min-max policy 🔻	s=30, S=60	40	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻	0	day 🔹	(All periods) 🔻
3	Factory	∇	Chip 🔻	Unlimited invent. •	Unlimited	00	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻	0	day 🔹	(All periods) 🔻
4	Factory	∇	Display	Unlimited invent.	Unlimited	00	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻	0	day 🦷	(All periods) 🔻
5	Back-Up DO	T.	Smart	Min-max policy 🔻	s=100, S=200	50	\bigcirc	0	Quantity 🔻	0	day 🔹	(All periods) 🔻

Figure 165: Extended inventory policy.

#	From	То	Cost Calcula	Cost	Cost Unit	Distance	Dista	Transpor	Time Unit	Straight	Vehicle Type	Transpo Mi	Aggregate Ord
	Т	т	T	T.	т	т	Т	т	т	т	т	ТТ	т
1	Supplier C •	Factory •	Distance-ba. 🔻	0.5	USD 🔻	0	km 🔻	0.0	day 💌	\bigcirc	Truck 🔹	LTL 🔻 0	\bigcirc
2	Supplier Ta. 🔻	Factory •	Distance-ba. 🔻	0.8	USD .	0	km 🔻	0.0	day 🔹	\bigcirc	Ferry •	LTL = 0	\bigcirc
3	Factory 🔹	DC US 🔹	Volume&di▼	0.01	USD 🔻	0	km 🤻	2.0	day 🔻		Airplane 🔻	LTL = 0	\bigcirc
4	DC US 🔹	(All locations)	Volume&di▼	0.01	USD 🔻	0	km 🔻	2.0	day 🦷		Airplane 🔻	LTL = 0	\bigcirc
5	Back-Up DC 🔻	(All locations) -	Volume&di 🔻	0.01	USD 🔻	0	km 🔻	2.0	day 🔻		Airplane 🔻	LTL = 0	\bigcirc

Figure 166: Extended transportation policy.

Figure 167 shows the simulation results.



Figure 167: The backup distribution center's impact on supply chain performance.

We compare this result with Figure 160. We can see Profit of \$1,973,716.0 (instead of \$1,763,404.16) and total revenue of \$2,160,000.0 (instead of \$1,980,000.0) can be achieved. The service level is 100% and both replenishment and customer-in-time orders are uninterrupted.

The supply chain manager needs to decide if they want to invest in the supply chain. Should they avoid investing to receive the highest possible profit in the case of the disruption-free scenario? Or should they make an investment (that is, invest in the backup distribution center)? If a disruption occurs, this investment would increase profits. But if nothing happens, it would reduce profits.

Impact of Recovery Strategies

Instead of or jointly with proactive actions, we can consider different recovery strategies and analyze their impact on performance. In our example, you can compare two reactive strategies: a fast and expensive distribution center recovery and a slow and efficient distribution center recovery.

Let's assume using the backup distribution center is referred to as the fast and expensive distribution center recovery (Sect. 8.4.2). We'll also assume a recovery in 30 days without any proactive strategy (Sect. 8.3) is referred to as the slow and efficient distribution center recovery. In this case, we follow the discussion about Figure 167 and find we can recommend the fast and expensive distribution center recovery strategy that uses the backup distribution center.

Variation Experiment

A simulation experiment runs the model once, but which experiment should you use if you want to do 20 iterations and look at minimums, maximums, means and standard deviations?

Our goal for this section is to show you how to use the **Variation** experiment and how you can use it to address problems. We will create a variation experiment, vary the backup distribution center's initialization costs, and measure the performance impact.

Create New Variation Experiment

We need to complete the following steps to create a variation experiment (Figures 168-170):

- 1. Create the experiment.
- 2. Replications number (anyLogistix's Personal Learning Edition limits you to 10 replications).
- 3. Configure statistics.
- 4. Select parameters to vary and the variation range and step.
- 5. Run the variation experiment.

Data Simulation experiment Statistics 1 Statistics 2 Statistics 3 Variation experiment Comparison experiment Custom experiment External tables	Start date: End date: 01.01.2017 01.01.2018 Use replications: • Replications per iteration: 20 Variable parameters: Object type: Object: • Object: • Parameter: • Variation parameters: OK Add Edit Add Edit Remove © Configure statistics

Figure 168: The general framework of the variation experiment.

Fina	ance	s statistics unit:	USD	Ŧ							
Pro	duct	statistics unit:	m³	Ŧ							
Tim	ne sta	atistics unit:	day	Ŧ							
Dist	tance	e statistics unit:	km	v							
Select statistics to collect during simulation:											
	#	Enabled Na	ime				Value type		Filters		Туре
		T pr	of			\times		T		т	
	1	Property of the second seco	ofit				Finances		0		
	2 O Profit (NetOpt)						Finances		0		

Figure 169: KPI selection.

Note: You can filter the **Enabled** column's contents according to the activated statistics by typing **True** in the field below the column name. This helps you find enabled statistics and avoid including unwanted statistics in the experiment results.

-						
Object type:	PathData	Ŧ				
Object:	Path: Factory-DC US	∇				
Parameter:	m3KmCost	v				
Variation:	NumberRange					
Variation para Min: 0.01	imeters:					
Max: 0.2						
Step: 0.01						
	ОК	Cancel				

Figure 170: Variation parameter and range selection.

Performing a Variation Experiment

We run the variation experiment to see the impact of the transportation costs. Figure 171 displays the results.

	Description		Profit		•
	Description		mean		
		Т		Ŧ	
1	m3KmCost: 0.01		1,973,716		
2	m3KmCost: 0.02		1,972,314.4		
3	m3KmCost: 0.03		1,970,912.8		
4	m3KmCost: 0.04		1,969,511.2		
5	m3KmCost: 0.05		1,968,109.6		
6	m3KmCost: 0.06		1,966,708		
7	m3KmCost: 0.07		1,965,306.4		
8	m3KmCost: 0.08		1,963,904.8		
9	m3KmCost: 0.09		1,962,503.2		
10	m3KmCost: 0.1		1,961,101.6		
11	m3KmCost: 0.11		1,959,700		
12	m3KmCost: 0.12		1,958,298.4		
13	m3KmCost: 0.13		1,956,896.8		
14	m3KmCost: 0.14		1,955,495.2		
15	m3KmCost: 0.15		1,954,093.6		
16	m3KmCost: 0.16		1,952,692		
17	m3KmCost: 0.17		1,951,290.4		
18	m3KmCost: 0.18		1,949,888.8		
19	m3KmCost: 0.19		1,948,487.2		
20	m3KmCost: 0.2		1,947,085.6		

Figure 171: Variation results

Figure 171 shows we have a linear relation between the transportation costs and profit.

Literature

Chopra S, Meindl P (2015) Supply chain Management. Strategy, planning and operation. 5/e

Heizer J., Render B. (2014) Principles of Operations Management, 9/e*, Pearson

Ivanov D. (2016). Operations and Supply chain Simulation with AnyLogic available at www.anylogic.com/books

Ivanov D., Tsipoulanidis A., Supply chainhönberger J. (2017). Global Suppy Chain and Operations Management. Springer, 1st edition.

Ivanov, D., Sokolov, B., Dolgui, A. (2014) The Ripple effect in supply chains: trade-off 'efficiency-flexibility-resilience' in disruption management, International Journal of Production Research, 52:7, 2154-2172.

Ivanov D. (2017) Simulation-based ripple effect modelling in the supply chain. International Journal of Production Research, 55(7), 2083-2101.

Summary and Discussion Questions

Chapter 1

In Chapter 1, we learned how to create a new supply chain model, design the KPI dashboard, and perform simulation, network optimization and simulation-based optimization experiments.

We learned how to create a scenario and define its customers, products, supply chain facility locations, sourcing and transportation policies. We used the created supply chain model for facility location planning and network optimization tasks. We learned how to apply anyLogistix to green field analysis for single and multiple warehouse locations and different objectives, that is, costs and service distance.

We extended our analysis to network optimization using mathematical programming models. We learned the similarities, differences and application areas of simulation and optimization methods in supply chain design. Using anyLogistix, we reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of different facilities, facility costs, transportation costs and response time.

Finally, we learned how to create new KPI dashboard, collect statistics, prepare and run simulation and network optimization experiments of supply chain design analysis improvement.

Discussion questions:

- Imagine you are selling lithium batteries for electric vehicles. How would you create a scenario for GFA analysis? What parameters do you need? What optimization criteria can you use?
- Now imagine you are responsible for reverse logistics and you need to design the closed-loop supply chain. You need to define optimal number and locations of the collection centers and then analyze the dynamics of the collection processes. How can you use anyLogistix for these decisions?
- If you want to build two distribution centers in the US and use a green field analysis experiment to find the suggested areas, will you get the same results for the following experiment settings?
 - ✓ Number of distribution centers -2
 - ✓ Service distance 2100 km (data about US: West to East –4200 km, North to South-2500 km)
- What is the difference between Network Optimization and Simulation-based Network Optimization experiments?
- What is the difference between alpha, beta and ELT service levels?
- When does it make sense to use simulation-based network optimization instead of analytical network optimization?
- How can you include capacity limitations in the analysis?

Chapter 2

In Chapter 2, we took several inventory control policies (for example, fixed period or reorder point policies) and transportation policies (for example, FTL – full truck load and LTL – low truck load) into consideration. In practice, inventory control and transportation policies often impact decisions on supply chain design and operations. In this chapter, we gained skills on impact of inventory control and transportation policies on supply chain and logistics performance.

We created a three-stage supply chain structure, performed experiments and measured performance. Using this model, we learned about the trade-offs among the various inventory control policies, transportation frequencies, and lead times. We also learned how to use AnyLogic to extend anyLogistix.

Discussion Questions:

- You need to increase the frequency of transportation from your suppliers to your distribution center to respond to customer demand changes. How would you model this situation in anyLogistix? What tradeoffs should you consider for inventory control and warehouse capacity?
- How can you use anyLogistix to analyze capacity utilization at your warehouse?
- Imagine we want to ship a product to the US from China. Which experiment should we use to decide which port is the best option?
- Imagine your chief asks you to analyze the impact of current inventory control policy on total supply chain costs. How would you model this in anyLogistix?
- Is there a difference in NetOpt results if you use LTL or FTL transportation policy?
- Let's assume you supply luxury goods and you want to analyze the service level you will be able to provide to your customers with the given supply chain structure. How could you estimate it with anyLogistix?

Chapter 3

In Chapter 3, we considered the effect of different production and sourcing policies. We used anyLogistix to create a four-stage supply chain structure, perform experiments and measure performance. Using this model, we learned about the trade-offs among single and multiple sourcing, production times, transportation frequencies, inventory control policies and lead time. We also learned how to create BOM (bill-of-materials) and how to include soft facts to move from a model-based result to a management decision.

Discussion Questions:

- Imagine increased demand requires you to increase the amount you ship from your factory to your distribution center. How would you model this situation in anyLogistix? What trade-offs should you consider for transportation policy, inventory control and warehouse capacity?
- How can you use anyLogistix to analyze lead time at your customers in dynamics?
- Imagine you want to ship a product to the US from China and from India. How would you decide if single or dual sourcing is more efficient?

• Imagine your manager asks you to analyze the impact of currently used sourcing policy on the lead time. How would you model this situation in anyLogistix?

Chapter 4

In Chapter 4, we considered anyLogistix applications to risk management and control in supply chains. Risks in supply chains are characterized by different frequency and performance impact.

High-frequency-low-impact disruptions are typically considered in light of bullwhip-effect and refer to demand and lead-time fluctuations. Bullwhip effect considers weekly/daily demand and lead-time fluctuations as primary drivers of the changes in the supply chain which occur at the parametric level and can be eliminated in a short-term perspective. In light of low-frequency-high-impact disruptions, we also considered ripple effect.

We learned how to use anyLogistix to model and quantify bullwhip effect and ripple effect. We developed technical skills on batching, ordering rules and events. Later, we learned how to prepare and run variation and comparison experiments.

Finally, we focused on understanding the major trade-offs in supply chain risk management and their effect on efficiency and resilience. We included proactive and reactive recovery strategies in analysis.

Discussion questions:

- What is the difference between bullwhip effect and ripple effect?
- How can you explain the meaning of the **Products Bullwhip Effect** statistics in anyLogistix?
- Imagine you need to increase the sales batch size because of transportation policy optimization. How might this decision affect other decisions or policies in the supply chain? How can you use anyLogistix to analyze them?
- What does BWE mean? Why does it allow to identify a bullwhip effect?
- What does it mean if BWE = 1?
- Does it make sense to measure BWE for a number of products?
- How does the BWE depend on the inventory control policy?
- Create three scenarios with different demand distributions and use the **Comparison** experiment to compare them
- What kinds of events can you add to your model?
- Imagine you need to analyze performance impacts of a strike at a transportation company, a fire at a distribution center, and an explosion at a factory. How would you model this in anyLogistix? Which experiments would you use?
- How can you analyze different ways an event may happen?
- If you want to vary the location of a factory how would you do this?
- How do you vary suppliers in sourcing policy?
- How do Variation and Comparison experiments differ?
- Which supply chain parameters can be varied and in what decisions?

Avoiding Typical Conceptual Mistakes

Number	Description	Possible Remedies
1	Your simulation experiment does not start; the supply chain objects are not connected on the map.	You need to define sourcing rules.
2	Your simulation experiment does not start or it starts, but ends quickly.	 Check maximum warehouse or factory capacity Too long production time or processing time Check the assignments of objects and products to groups You need to define Inventory policies need for all sites You need to define Paths for all stages in the supply chain
3	In the network optimization experi- ment, you cannot select some sites for optimization.	In Factory/distribution centers, the Inclu- sion type should be Consider.
4	After an order aggregation in transportation policy, your simula- tion experiment does not run.	Our decision to increase the transportation quantity means we also need to increase the inventory control policy's MAX-Level. If we don't increase the MAX-Level, the insufficient warehouse capacity will stop our simulation experiment. It's also a good idea to increase the MIN-level since the replenishment interval will be in- creased. or— Ensure the aggregation policy is aligned with
5	Your experiment with BOM does not show any activities between the suppliers and the assembly factory.	the inventory control policy's Max value. In Inventory, you need to define the inventory policy for all products of BOM, not only for the final product.
6	You cannot see the an experi- ment's complete results.	Click any other experiment or scenario and then return to your experiment. You should see the complete results.
7	In the experiment's results, you only see transportation costs for the connection between the cus- tomers and distribution center. You don't see costs for the con- nection between the distribution center and factory.	Activate transportation costs for the factory in your experiment's Configure statistics area.

Number	Description	Possible Remedies
8	In your simulation experiment, time is running but nothing is shipped.	Check demand parameters, backorder policy and initial inventory.
9	Orders are not shipped to custom- ers.	Check LTL and FTL policies and the corre- sponding minimum ratio, aggregation periods as well as product characteristics and trans- portation capacities.
10	Orders are not shipped to custom- ers.	The inventory policies, vehicle types and transportation policies are not compatible. For example, some large vehicles with a LTL policy of min. load 0.8 and an aggregation
		period of 10 days waste time waiting to load the vehicles.
		You can fulfill more customer orders by re- ducing the vehicle size and increasing your inventory policy's parameters.

Appendix 1: Examples of Case Study Problem Statements

Example 1: Consolidation Effects in the Retail Supply Chain

Our learning objective: students become familiar with model-based decision-making principles in supply chain management on the example of optimization and simulation application to analysis of a real-life location-allocation problem in a global retail supply chain.

Management Problem Statement

Object of Investigation

A global retail company comprises producers of fruits and vegetables and regional distributions centers (distribution center).

Investigation Process

We investigate the process of fruit and vegetable delivery from suppliers to regional distribution centers.

The Problem and its Relationship to the Literature

The products are shipped from suppliers to regional distribution centers directly using LTL policy with an average of 15 pallets per delivery. This causes high coordination complexity, low fleet capacity utilization, higher transportation costs and higher inventory holding costs.

The retail company wants to build central distribution centers between the suppliers and the regional distribution centers (Figure 1).





Figure 1: Initial and planned supply chain design.

The problem is how to determine the number of central distribution centers, their locations, and the allocation of regional distribution center demands to central distribution centers. It is to balance the distribution center capacities, transportation policy, sourcing policy and inventory control policy in the most efficient way subject to a predetermined customer service level.

This problem statement corresponds to the standard location-allocation problem in the literature.

Two scenarios need to be analyzed and compared subject to Figure 1:

- Direct shipments
- Shipments via central distribution centers

In addition, we need to account for future shifts in demand up to 30% to 50% at some regional distribution centers in regard to population growth forecasts and local farmer market development forecasts.

The Goal of Investigation

The goal of our investigation is to increase supply chain efficiency without decreasing the customer service level.

Our Main Decision

The main decision is to determine the number of central distribution centers, their locations, and the allocation of regional distribution centers to central distribution centers. In addition, we need to decide:

- what capacity we should use at the distribution centers
- our fleet size and transportation policy
- our inventory control policy and its parameters
- our sourcing policy
- our resilience policy

Research Question

The main research question is to analyze the impact of supply chain redesign on (i) location-allocation options, (ii) impact of transportation, sourcing, and inventory control policies as well as (iii) future capacity and demand changes on supply chain financial, customer, and operational performance.

Questions to be Answered to Make the Decision

- compare supply chain without central distribution centers and with central distribution centers on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- compare different location-allocation variants on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- compare the impact of LTL and FTL shipment policies on supply chain financial, customer, and operational performance
- compare inventory control policies on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- compare the impact of sourcing policies on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance

- analyze the impact of future demand changes on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- analyze the impact of capacity disruption risks on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- analyze the impact of distribution center capacity changes on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance

Financial Distribution Center Performance	Customer Performance
total profit (EBIDTA), \$	Maximum lead time, days
total revenue, \$	Min-Max Service level, %
opportunity costs, \$	OTD (on-time delivery), orders
production costs, \$	Total incoming orders from customers
inventory holding costs, \$	Total outgoing orders to customers
transportation costs at suppliers, \$	Total orders shipped to customers
transportation costs at distribution cen- ter, \$	Operational performance:
profit and lost statement, \$	Maximum capacity usage at distribution centers, m ³
total costs at distribution center, \$	Maximum inventory in the supply chain, units

Table 1.8: KPI to measure the results of investigation.

Data Needed to Solve Management Problem

The following data is needed to solve the problem described above:

Table 2.1: Demand at regional distribution centers.

Regional Distribu- tion Center	Forecasted Demand (Pallets per Day)	Initial Inventory (Pallets)
Bulgaria		
Hungary 1		
Hungary 2		
Romania 1		
Romania 2		
Romania 3		

Regional Distribu- tion Center	Forecasted Demand (Pallets per Day)	Initial Inventory (Pallets)
Croatia		
Slovakia 1		
Slovakia 2		
Czech Republic 1		
Czech Republic 2		
Czech Republic 3		
Czech Republic 4		
Czech Republic 5		
Poland		

Table 2.2: Supply to regional distribution centers in the initial supply chain with direct shipment

	B G 1	H 1	H 2	RO 1	RO 2	RO 3	C R	SK 1	SK 2	CZ 1	CZ 2	CZ 3	CZ 4	CZ 5	Р
Albania															
Argentina															
Austria															
Belgium															
Brazil															
Bulgaria															
Chile															
China															
Columbia															
Costa Rica															
Croatia															
Cyprus															
Czech Re- public															
	B G 1	H 1	H 2	RO 1	RO 2	RO 3	C R	SK 1	SK 2	CZ 1	CZ 2	CZ 3	CZ 4	CZ 5	Ρ
-------------------	-------------	--------	--------	---------	---------	---------	--------	----------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---
Ecuador															
Egypt															
France															
Germany															
Greece															
Honduras															
Hungary															
India															
Israel															
Italy															
Mexico															
Moldavia															
Morocco															
Nether- lands															
New Zea- land															
Overseas															
Panama															
Peru															
Poland															
Romania															
Senegal															
Serbia															
Slovenia															
South Af- rica															

	B G 1	H 1	H 2	RO 1	RO 2	RO 3	C R	SK 1	SK 2	CZ 1	CZ 2	CZ 3	CZ 4	CZ 5	Ρ
Spain															
Turkey															

Table 2.3: Costs and profits.

Costs and profits	\$
distribution center inbound operating costs	
distribution center outbound operating costs	
Initial costs for building distribution center	
Facility operating costs	
Opportunity costs	
Inventory carrying costs	
Fixed distribution center costs	
Transportation costs	
Sales price	

Table 2.4: Further estimations.

Parameters	
Lead time	
Transportation mean capacity	
Distribution center capacity	
Expected lead time	

Description of Experiments

Direct shipment analysis

It is to compute for initial scenario's financial, customer, and operational performance subject to KPI in §1.8 for:

- AS-IS parametric setting
- Changed parametric settings subject future shifts in demand up to 30% to 50% at some regional distribution centers in regard to population growth forecasts and local farmer market development forecasts
- Changed parametric settings subject to severe disruptions in supplier and regional distribution center capacities

Experiment used: Simulation (inventory control policy parameters can be computed analytically prior to simulation)

Central Distribution Center Shipment Analysis

We need to analyze the scenarios with central distribution centers:

- How many central distribution centers should we use?
- Where should we locate the distribution centers?
- How should we allocate regional distribution centers to central distribution centers?

Experiments: Analytical: Green Field Analysis and Network Optimization

- what capacity at the distribution centers should be used
- fleet size and transportation policy
- inventory control policy and its parameters
- sourcing policy
- resilience policy

Experiment: Simulation (inventory control policy parameters can be computed analytically prior to simulation)

Comparing Two Scenarios

You need to compare the financial, customer and operational performance of:

- A supply chain with and without central distribution centers
- Different location-allocation variants
- LTL and FTL shipment policies
- Inventory control policies
- compare the impact of sourcing policies on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- analyze the impact of future demand changes on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- analyze the impact of capacity disruption risks on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance
- analyze the impact of distribution center capacity changes on supply chain financial, customer and operational performance

Experiments: Comparison and Variation

Project report structure

- 1. Management problem statement (object of investigation, process of investigation, main goal of investigation, decision to be taken, sub-questions to be answered to take the decision, KPI to measure results of investigation)
- 2. Data needed to solve management problem
- Model description (objective function, constraints, parameters, variables; if optimization models: set of equations, if simulation model: process diagrams and themes)
- 4. Description of software
- 5. Implementation in software
- 6. Description of experiments
- 7. Presentation of computational results
- 8. Analysis of results
- 9. Recommendations on the solution of the management problem stated in 1) on main goal of investigation, decision to be taken, sub-questions we need to answer to make the decision, and KPI to measure the investigation's results.

Example 2

The demand for the ETC company's high-quality wines led them to build distribution centers in Europe, Asia, and North and South America. Now that demand is fluctuating, ETC's management wants to know:

- After taking all the available information into account—customer demand, the locations of their customers and the distances from their warehouses to their customers—where should ETC locate their distribution centers?
- Would closing ETC's South American distribution center make the company's supply chain more cost-effective?
- ETC's CEO wants to compare the important KPIs from scenario 1 (which uses 4 distribution centers) to those from scenario 2 (which uses 3 distribution centers). Which scenario's KPIs are better?

Example 3

ZSE is a Berlin-based e-commerce company that wants to be the European Union's most successful online shopping platform. To reach their goal, the company has developed a four-year strategy focused on fast product delivery, excellent customer service and an efficient supply chain.

To expand the business in Europe and meet the expected increase in demand, ZSE needs to decide whether they should open a new distribution center or expand their German distribution center.

If they decide to open a new distribution center, they'll need to determine the best location to help them minimize their supply chain costs and meet their minimum service level requirements.

Example 4

Pharmapacks ships everything you expect to find in a drug store. The company sells almost 25,000 different products, ships 570,000 orders each month, and has agreements with 16 suppliers.

Their pricing management software—"Master Mind"—has helped the company to dominate their market. It calculates the best price and manages their whole stock and sales/demand forecasts. They have increased their sales six fold in a year. Their revenue in 2016 amounted to \$160 million and from 2011 to 2013 they grew by 3,035 percent. When looking at the performance indicators, the delivery time is slow, which is caused by having only one warehouse, in New York City.



Does it make sense to open a second warehouse on the West coast to speed delivery to the Western United States and meet customer expectations?

Example 5

Matching production and distribution network design with disruption risk considerations

The case-study is based on a FMCG company that produces juices/beverages for four regional markets. The supply chain comprises four production plants and four regional distribution centers (DCs). So in each of four regions, there is a market, a plant, and a regional DC. Former supply chain manager of the company decided to close a production plant in one of the regions (and we have the highest demand in this region among all four regions!) and to supply the DC in this region from three other plants which are located quite distant from this DC. Just a couple of months after the plant closure, the DC in this region crashed due to construction quality problems. A huge amount of juice inventory has been destroyed.

As new supply chain manager of this company, you are now responsible to react to this disruptive event. You first estimate the immediate impact and time-to-recovery. The inventory in this DC was supposed to supply the regional market with the juices for three months. The re-construction of the DC will take about six months. You understand that a short-term and mid-term recovery policy is needed. You consider four options, i.e.;

- Increasing capacities of three other production plants in other, geographically distant regions. You understand that those capacities are limited (but some potential for an increase still exists) and these plants are far away from the regional market
- Using capacity of the milk producing plant of your company in the same region where the DC crashed. The technological process is quite similar, but some adaptations will be needed
- Using capacity of your other plants in neighborhood countries
- Finding a subcontractor

In addition, this disruption forces the CEO of your company to develop a business continuity plan. The supply chain contingency plan should become a part of this company business continuity plan. You need to suggest new supply chain design that contains proactive and reactive policies for making your supply chain resilient.

You will need the following data (but not limited to):

- 1. SC design: locations of SC elements (factories and DCs) and links in between them
- 2. Demand in the markets and its uncertainty

3. Parameters of SC elements (e.g., production capacities, throughputs, prices, costs) 4. Operating policies of SC elements (e.g., inventory control policy, production control policy, shipment control policy, sourcing control policy)

You will need to perform the following experiments:

1. Network optimization to determine how many plants and DCs you actually need and where they should be located, without disruption considerations

- 2. Simulation experiment with the DC disruption with and without the closed factory
- 3. Simulation experiments with four immediate recovery policies:
 - back-up contractors (you might want to use GFA and network optimization experiment to determine their optimal location)
 - capacity flexibility (capacities of milk producing plant)
 - increasing capacities at other plants in other regions
 - using capacity of your other plants in neighborhood countries

4. Network optimization and simulation experiments with two resilience policies for new supply chain design:

- new central DC that would be installed instead of or in addition to many regional DCs and serve as a hub in the normal mode and as a back-up in the disruption mode (you might want to use GFA and network optimization experiment to determine the optimal location)
- suggest another possible option for new resilient supply chain design

5. Variation experiment to validate your model by analyzing result sensitivity to changing some parameters

6. Comparison experiment to compare results obtained in 3) and 4). You may use as KPIs profits, costs, service level, lead time, etc.

Appendix 2: Methods in Facility Location Modelling

In this section, we provide another example of how to apply optimization and simulation methods to the supply chain facility location problem. The objective of this case study is to teach you how to apply simulation and optimization modelling to supply chain design decisions. Figures A1-A2 summarize the basic features of optimization and simulation methods.

- NetOpt is used to find:
 - Locations for facilities
 - Sourcing policies
 - Product flows
- To conduct the NetOpt experiment you must specify:
 - Locations the "Locations" table
 - Periods the "Periods" (basic period is used by default) table
 - Customers the "Customers" table
 - Products the "Products" table
 Demand the "Demand" table
 - Demand the Demand table
 Initial, outbound/inbound processing, other monthly costs the "DCs and Factories" and "Facility Expenses" tables
 - Supplier the "Suppliers" table
 - Storage constraints the "Linear Site Constraints" table
 - Flow constraints the "Linear Flow Constraints" table
 - Transportation cost and option to use real routes the "Path" table
- About NetOpt:
 - Optimization method: Mixed Integer Linear Programming
 - Criteria: solution cost = transportation cost + sites associated costs + penalties revenue
- NetOpt Results (Tables)
 - DCs and Factories the best sites have "inclusion type" included
 - Sourcing defines where and which product to buy
 - Inventory NetOpt creates and parameterizes "S" & "s" inventory policies
 s = average daily demand * lead time
 - s = average
 S = 2*s
 - Overview of solution costs, revenues
- Notes
 - NetOpt operates with flows

Figure A-1: Analytical framework summary NetOpt

- Analytical Optimization
 - To solve a particular problem you create the system of equations which are only relevant to this problem – analytical model
 - You can only consider aggregated flows
 - Optimization means minimization/maximization of an objective function meeting constraints, e.g.:
 - F(X1, X2, X3) -> MIN
 - X1 = X2 + X3
 - X2 = X1 + X3
 - X3 = X1 + X2
 - X1 < 120
 - X3 > 400
 - Criteria
 - As system of equations and inequalities is developed for a particular problem the criteria is also related to this particular problem

- Simulation Optimization
 - A Simulation model describes how the system works. It makes sense without the problem.
 - You can consider events, stochastics
- and changes of the system over time
 Optimization means a number of simulation runs with different input
 - parameters – Criteria
 - Everything that is measured by simulation model can be a criteria



Figure A-2: Application of simulation and optimization modeling.

Consider the following example: A German-based supply chain includes one Supplier, three distribution centers and ten Customers (Figure A-3).



Figure A-3: Supply chain structure.

We use the following input data (Fig A-4):

Path Selection Mode	#	Name		Start		End		Deman	d Coeffici								
Paths [1]			т		T		T		т								
Period Groups	1	First period		1/1/17		1/4/17		1									
Periods [3]	2	Second perio	d	1/5/17				1									
Processing Cost [3]	-	-	u	410/47													
Processing Time	3	Third period		1/9/17		1/1/18		1									
BOM (0)	#	Name Type	Loca	tion	Initia	ally Opene	d Inclusion	Туре	Capacity	Capacity Uni	Inte	rests, ratio	Aggreg	ate Orders	Additio	nal Param	
Customers (10)		ТТ		T		T		T	т	T		Т		Ŧ		т	
DCs and Factories (3)	1	Site 1 DC	 Site 	1 location	•		Consider	Ψ	0	m ³	0		\bigcirc		Addition	al parame	
Demand (10)	2	Site 2 DC	Site	2 location			Consider	v	0	m ³ v	0		\bigcirc		Addition	al parame	
Demand Forecast (0)	3	Site 3 DC	- Site	3 location			Consider	Ŧ	0	m ³ .	0		0		Addition	al parame	
Events (0)																	
Demand (10)	#	Customer		Product		Demand	Туре	Paramete	rs	Time Period		Expected Le	ad Ti	Time Unit		Backorder Poli	c y
Demand Forecast (0)			T		T		Ŧ		Ŧ		Ŧ		T		T		Ŧ
Events (0)	1	Hamburg	v	Water	v	Periodic	demand 🔻	Period=5.0), Quant	(All periods)	V	30		day	T	Allowed total	Ŧ
Facility Expenses (3)	2	Berlin	Ŧ	Water	v	Periodic	demand 🔻	Period=5.0), Quant	(All periods)	v	30		day	Ŧ	Allowed total	Ŧ
Freet Size (0)	3	Hannover	v	Water	∇	Periodic	demand =	Period=5.0), Quant	(All periods)	Ŧ	30		day	∇	Allowed total	∇
loventon(1)	4	Dresden	v	Water	∇	Periodic	demand 🔻	Period=5.0), Quant	(All periods)	v	30		day	v	Allowed total	v
Loading and Unloading Gates (0)	5	Frankfurt	Ŧ	Water	v	Periodic	demand 🔻	Period=5.0), Ouant	(All periods)	v	30		dav	v	Allowed total	Ŧ
Location Lists (0)	6	Frfurt	v	Water	v	Periodic	demand T	Period=5.0) Quant	(All periods)	v	30		dav	v	Allowed total	v
Locations (14)	7	Munchen		Water		Periodic	demand =	Period=5 (Quant	(All periods)		30		dav		Allowed total	
Milk Runs (0)	,	Stuttenet	-	Water	-	Deriodic	demand =	Deriod-E () Quant	(All periods)		30		day	_	Allowed total	~
Ordering Rules (0)	0	Stutigart		water		Periodic		Period-5.	, Quant	(All periods)		30		uay		Allowed total	
Path Selection Mode (0)	9	Cologne	v	vvater		Periodic	demand *	Period=5.0), Quant	(All periods)		30		day	v	Allowed total	×
Paths (1)	10	Nurnberg	Ŧ	Water	Ŧ	Periodic	demand 🔻	Period=5.0), Quant	(All periods)	V	30		day	T	Allowed total	T
Facility Expenses (3)	#	Facility		Expense Typ	e e	Value C	ost Unit Tir	ne Unit P	roduct Uni	t Time	Perio	d					
Fleet Size (0)			T		T	T	T	T		T		T					
Groups (1)	1	Site 1	Ŧ	Other costs	Ŧ	666 L	JSD 🔻 da	ay .		(All	period	s) 🔻					
inventory (1)	2	Site 2	v	Other costs	Ŧ	666 L	JSD 🔻 da	ay -		(All	period	s) =					
Location Lists (0)	3	Site 3	Ŧ	Other costs	Ŧ	666 L	JSD 🔻 da	ay =		(All	period	s) 🔻					

Ivanov D. (2018) Supply Chain Simulation and Optimization with anyLogistix

Inventory (1)	#	Facility	Produc	t Policy T	уре	Policy I	Paramete	rs Initial	St Pe	riodic Che	ck	Period	Policy Ba	sis Stoo	k Calc	. Tim	e Unit	Time	e Period	Inclusio	n Type
Location Lists (0)	1	(All sites) 🔻	Water	 Invento 	₹ oryPolicy	 Order of 	י on deman	d 100	C		Ŧ	0	Quantity	r v 0	Ÿ	day	т / т	(All	♥ periods)	 Include 	T
Paths (1)	#	From	Т	ō	Cost	Calculatio	on Cos	st Calculati	on C	ost Unit	Distar	nce Dist	tance Unit	Transpo	ortation	Ti	Time	Unit	Straight	Vehicle Ty	oe Transporta
Period Groups (0)			T	۲	r i		Υ.		т	т	T		T			Υ.		Υ.	T.	T	
Periods (3) Processing Cost (3)	1	(All locations)) – ((All locations)	▼ Dist	ance-based	d c.▼ 1.2	* distance	I	JSD 🔻	0	km	• •	0.0			day	V		Truck	▼ LTL
Processing Cost (3)	#	Source		Product	Туре		Units		Cost		Co	ost Unit		Time Pe	riod						
Processing Time (0)			т	т		т		T.			r i		т		,	T.					
Product Groups (0)	1	Site 1	Ŧ	Water 🔻	Outboun	d ship 🔻	m ³	v	20		U	ISD	v	(All peri	ods)	Ŧ					
Production (0)	2	Site 2	Ŧ	Water 🔻	Outboun	d ship 🔻	m ³	Ŧ	20		U	ISD	Ŧ	(All peri	ods)	Ŧ					
Production Batch (0) Products (1)	3	Site 3	Ŧ	Water 🔻	Outboun	d ship 🔻	m ³	v	20		U	ISD	v	(All peri	ods)	∇					
Products (1)	#	Name		Unit		Selling P	rice	Cost		Cos	t Unit										
Sale Batch (0)			т		т	0	Ŧ			T		т									
Site States Changes (0)	1	Water		m³	v	500		250		US	D		,								
Sourcing (2)																					
Due du ete (1)						_				-			-1 -				_				
Sale Batch (0)	#	Delivery Des	tinat	. Product		Туре		Parame	ters	Sou	rces		Time Pe	riod	Incl	usion	Туре				
Site States Changes (0)	1	Customore		Mater		Classet	Thread Co.	- No nava	matara	(All	citor)	1	(All part	r a da)	- Inc	luda					
Sourcing (2)	2	(All sites)		Water	·	Closest (Fixed So.	• No para	meters	(All	sites)		(All peri	ous)	* Inc	lude					
Suppliers (1)	2	(All Sites)		vvater	v	Closest (Fixed So.	• NO para	meters	Sup	plier	v	(All peri-	005)	+ Inc	lude		*			
Unit Conversions (0)	#	Name		Capacity		Capacity	Unit	Speed		Spe	ed Unit										
Units (0)			т		т		т			r		т									
Vehicle Types (1)	1	Truck		50		m³		* 80.0		km	/h	Ŧ									

Figure A-4: Input data.

First, we perform a simulation experiment for a supply chain design that uses three distribution centers. The result is shown in Figure A-5:



Figure A-5: The performance of a supply chain that has three distribution centers.

Then convert current simulation scenario to NO scenario and enter the following data into the **Demand** table:

153

Customer	Product	Demand Type	Time Pe- riod	Revenue	Down Penalty	Up Pe- nalty
Hamburg	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:10.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Berlin	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:12.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Hannover	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:8.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Dresden	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:8.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Frankfurt	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:10.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Erfurt	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:7.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Munchen	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:13.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Stuttgart	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:8.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Cologne	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:12.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Nurnberg	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:8.0]	First	500	5000	5000
Hamburg	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:13.0]	Second	500	5000	5000
Berlin	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:15.6]	Second	500	5000	5000
Hannover	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:10.4]	Second	500	5000	5000
Dresden	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:10.4]	Second	500	5000	5000
Frankfurt	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:13.0]	Second	500	5000	5000
Erfurt	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:9.1]	Second	500	5000	5000
Munchen	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:16.9]	Second	500	5000	5000

 Table 16: Demand distribution

Customer	Product	Demand Type	Time Pe- riod	Revenue	Down Penalty	Up Pe- nalty
Stuttgart	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:10.4]	Second	500	5000	5000
Cologne	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:15.6]	Second	500	5000	5000
Nurnberg	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:10.0]	Second	500	5000	5000
Hamburg	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:8.0]	Third	500	5000	5000
Berlin	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:9.6]	Third	500	5000	5000
Hannover	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:6.4]	Third	500	5000	5000
Dresden	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:6.4]	Third	500	5000	5000
Frankfurt	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:8.0]	Third	500	5000	5000
Erfurt	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:5.6]	Third	500	5000	5000
Munchen	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:10.4]	Third	500	5000	5000
Stuttgart	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:6.4]	Third	500	5000	5000
Cologne	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:9.6]	Third	500	5000	5000
Nurnberg	Water	PeriodicDemand [period:5.0;quantity:6.4]	Third	500	5000	5000

In the second step, network optimization experiment is run (Figure A-6).

👌 anyLogistix - New project		ALC: NO. INC. ADDRESS OF TAXABLE PARTY.	the second because the local	
File Extensions Settings Help				
GFA NO SIM $+$ \leftarrow				
Copy of Appendix	Data NO experiment Result 1 Custom experiment	Start date: End date: 01.01.2017 • 01.01.2018 • Select demand variation type:	v	
	External tables			
		Number of best solutions to find:		
			1	
		Number of best solutions to find:		
		10		
		Optimization time limit, sec.		
		600.0		
Optimization results	# Sites		Profit (NetOpt)	▼ Flows Amount
All		Ŧ	Ť	Ť
Flows Details	1 Iteration 0: Site 1		1,368,551.072	14,507.04
Sites Initial	2 Iteration 1: Site 2		1,358,870.675	14,507.04
Sites Fix	3 Iteration 2: Site 3		1,345,591.906	14,507.04
Working Sites	4 Iteration 3: Site 1, Site 2		1,128,879.302	14,507.04
Storage By Product	5 Iteration 4: Site 1, Site 3		1,127,135.223	14,507.04
Production Flows	6 Iteration 5: Site 2, Site 3		1,117,995.563	14,507.04
Multiple Flows Constraints	7 Iteration 6: Site 1, Site 2,	Site 3	886,691.541	14,507.04
Multiple Storages Constraints	8		-9,360,522.983	10,728.48
Demand Overall Stats Add new tab				
Comparison				

Figure A-6: Network optimization experiment.

Third, we use the best result of the network optimization that suggests using one distribution center is the most profitable supply chain design (profit of \$1,368,551.072). We convert it to the SIM scenario, change our input data (delete Supplier information and inventory policy) and run a simulation experiment with the optimal supply chain design subject to maximum profit (Figure A-7).



Figure A-7: Simulation experiment with optimal supply chain design.

We can see the sum of fixed warehousing costs is \$243,090.0 and variable transportation costs equals \$215,093.21.

We use a **Comparison** experiment to compare the supply chain design that uses three distribution centers (scenario Appendix) with the design that uses one distribution center (scenario Copy of Appendix 1 NO results) (Figure A-8).

📀 anyLogistix - New project			The Party of the P			Section 10	- 0 - X-
File Extensions Settings Help							
GFA NO SIM $+$ \leftarrow							
Appendix Copy of Appendix NO results	Data Simulation experiment Variation experiment Comparison experiment Result 1 Custom experiment External tables	Start date: End d 01.01.2017 01.0 Use replications: Replications: Replications per iteration Select scenarios to comp Image: Select scenarios to comp Appendix Image: Select scenarios to comp Copy of Appendix Ni Image: Copy of Appendix Select scenarios to comp Image: Copy of Appendix S	late: 1.2018 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Comparison results	Description	Other cost mean	 Outbound processing cost mean 	 Profit mean 	 Total cost mean 	 Transportation cost mean 	
Add new tab	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	
	1 Copy of Appendix NO results	243,090	144,760	1,206,516.79	2,412,483.21	215,093.21	
	2 Appendix	729,270	143,424	692,072.093	2,893,527.907	228,033.907	
Comparison							

Figure A-8: Comparison experiment.

Figure A-8 shows us the supply chain design that uses three distribution centers has lower transportation costs. However, the significant savings in fixed warehousing costs makes the design that uses one distribution center far more efficient and profitable.

Finally, we perform a variation analysis to analyze KPI sensitivity to the changes in transportation costs in range from \$0.2 to \$2.0 for a kilometer (Figures A9-A12).

Object to max	Dath Data	_
Object type:	PalnDala	Y
Object:	Path: DCs-Customers	Ŧ
Parameter:	kmCost	Ŧ
Variation:	NumberRange	w
Furnacioni punt	annecers.	
Min: 0.2	anicters.	
Min: 0.2	and cers.	
Min: 0.2 Max: 2 Step: 0.1		
Min: 0.2 Max: 2 Step: 0.1		

Figure A-9: Setting the range for parameter change.

Data Simulation experiment Variation experiment Comparison experiment Custom experiment External tables	Start date: End date: 01.01.2017 01.01.2018 Use replications: • Replications per iteration: 20 Variable parameters: PathData:Path: DCs-Customers, krr
	Add Edit Remove
	Configure statistics

Figure A-10: Setting the number of replications.

Finance	es statistics u	nit: LISD	~							
		. 050								
Produc	t statistics ur	nit: m³	T							
Time st	tatistics unit:	day	T							
Distand	ce statistics u	nit: km	T							
Select s	statistics to co	ollect durin	g sim	ulation:						
#	Enabled	Name			Value type		Filters			Туре
	Т			T		T			T	
1		ELT servic	e leve	l, by items q-ty	Ratio		0			
2		Profit			Finances		0			
3		Total cost			Finances		0			
4		Transport	ation	cost	Finances		0			\bigcirc
5	\bigcirc	Alpha serv	vice le	vel, by items	Ratio		0			
6	\bigcirc	Alpha serv	vice le	vel, by order	Ratio		0			
								OK		Cancel

Figure A-11: Configuring statistics.

🖄 anyLogistix - New project		ALC: NO TAXABLE PARTY.		1. Mar.		le le	- 0 ×
File Extensions Settings Help							
GFA NO SIM + 🔄							
Appendix Copy of Appendix NO results	Data Simulation experiment	Start date: End date:					
	Variation experiment ^ Result 1 Comparison experiment ^	Use replications: Replications per iteration: 20 Variable parameters:					
La cara da			ELT service level, by prod	Profit	 Total cost 	Transportation cost	•
Variation results	Description		mean	mean	mean	mean	
Page I		T	T	т	Ŧ	T	
Add new tab	1 kmCost: 0.2		1	1,385,761.132	2,233,238.868	35,848.868	
	2 kmCost: 0.3		1	1,367,836.697	2,251,163.303	53,773.303	
	3 kmCost: 0.4		1	1,349,912.263	2,269,087.737	71,697.737	
	4 kmCost: 0.5		1	1,331,987.829	2,287,012.171	89,622.171	
	5 kmCost: 0.6		1	1,314,063.395	2,304,936.605	107,546.605	
	6 kmCost: 0.7		1	1,296,138.961	2,322,861.039	125,471.039	
	7 kmCost: 0.8		1	1,278,214.527	2,340,785.473	143,395.473	
	8 kmCost: 0.9		1	1,260,290.092	2,358,709.908	161,319.908	
	9 kmCost: 1		1	1,242,365.658	2,376,634.342	179,244.342	
	10 kmCost: 1.1		1	1,224,441.224	2,394,558.776	197,168.776	
	11 kmCost: 1.2		1	1,206,516.79	2,412,483.21	215,093.21	
	12 kmCost: 1.3		1	1,188,592.356	2,430,407.644	233,017.644	
	13 kmCost: 1.4		1	1,170,667.922	2,448,332.078	250,942.078	
	14 kmCost: 1.5		1	1,152,743.487	2,466,256.513	268,866.513	
	15 kmCost: 1.6		1	1,134,819.053	2,484,180.947	286,790.947	
	16 kmCost: 1.7		1	1,116,894.619	2,502,105.381	304,715.381	
	17 kmCost: 1.8		1	1,098,970.185	2,520,029.815	322,639.815	
	18 kmCost: 1.9		1	1,081,045.751	2,537,954.249	340,564.249	
Comparison	19 kmCost: 2		1	1,063,121.317	2,555,878.683	358,488.683	

Figure A-12: Results of variation analysis.

Note: Figure A-13 displays the unfiltered results of the variation analysis. If you want to make it easier to display the results, you can filter the results such as the **Total costs** column.

With the help of variation analysis, we can observe the KPI change in dependence on the input parameter changes. This is helpful for sensitivity analysis.

Appendix 3. Advanced skills in CPLEX-based network optimization in anyLogistix

The objective of this Appendix is to explain the principles and techniques on supply chain design and planning analysis using the network optimization tool anyLogistix on the basis of CPLEX. This guide considers three problem statements:

- two-stage capacitated facility location planning,
- three-stage and four-stage supply chains, and
- supply chain-based risk management.

It presents optimization examples by describing how to develop and build models and evaluate KPI. It also discusses how to use these models and optimization results to improve management decision-making.

Optimization-based decision-making

An optimal decision is the best decision which can be made according to some goal, criteria or objectives. *Optimization* is an analysis method that determines the best possible option for solving a particular supply chain management problem. An optimization model comprises an objective function, a constraint system, and a set of decision variables and input parameters.

The optimization model-based decision-making process is shown in Fig. 1.



Fig. 1. Optimization model-based decision-making process (Ivanov et al. 2017)

We can observe that a *real management problem* is the initial point of the decision-making process. For example, this could be a facility location problem where we are given demand in some markets, possible locations and capacities of new facilities, fixed costs for having a facility in the supply chain, and transportation costs from each location to each market. We are trying to decide where to locate the facilities and which quantities should be shipped from the facilities to the markets.

The next step is to transform the real problem into a *mathematical model*. For this transformation, we need to reduce the *complexity* of reality. This inevitably results in simplification of reality. For example, we assume deterministic capacity in our facility location model instead of considering fluctuations in demand.

We simplify to make it possible to represent the management problem in the mathematical model in such a way that this model can be solved with the helped of existing *algorithms* in a reasonable time. In our example, we formulate the facility location problem as a mixed-integer linear programming model that can be solved with the help of simplex and branch&bound algorithms.

For implementation of the mathematical model, *software* is needed. The professional solver CPLEX is used in anyLogistix. Software will calculate the *solution*. In our example, the solution would include suggestions on where to open facility locations and which product quantities should

be shipped from each opened location to each of the markets so that total production and logistics costs are minimal.

Software calculates this solution. Now, the most important question is as follows: is this solution automatically our *decision*? NO! This is a solution to the mathematical problem. Management expertise is needed to transfer this mathematical solution into managerial decisions. First of all, the simplifications of reality should be reviewed. Second, so called *soft facts* such as risks, flexibility, etc. should be included in the analysis. This need for managerial expertise is why we call these models *decision-supporting quantitative methods*.

Note: The drawback of using optimization is the difficulty in developing a model that is sufficiently detailed and accurate in representing the complexity and uncertainty of the SCM, while keeping the model simple enough to be solved. Optimal decisions are "fragile" and presume certain problem dimensionality, fullness, and certainty of the model. In addition, the optimal solutions are usually very sensitive to deviations. Moreover, decision making is tightly interconnected with dynamics and should be considered as an adaptive tuning process and not as a "one-way" optimization.

Optimization can also be applied as a validation tool for simulation models which can be run using the optimization results (Figure 2).



Fig. 2. A pyramid of supply chain design and analysis problems

Analytical optimization methods are used to define the supply chain design with aggregate parameters such as annual capacities, demands, etc. Using a number of parameters such as transportation costs, real routes, and feasible facility locations, it becomes possible to perform network optimization.

By reducing the aggregation and abstraction level, we extend the analytical network optimization models through simulation. In comparison to analytical closed form analysis, simulation has the advantage that it can handle complex problem settings with situational behaviour changes in the system over time. The simulations in anyLogistix can be run using the optimization results and include additional, time-dependent inventory, production, transportation, and sourcing control policies which are difficult to implement at the network optimization level.

Three-stage, one-period supply network design

Problem statement

You are a supply chain manager at a company that produces beverages. Your task is to design a new supply chain with the highest possible profit. In the reports from different departments at the company you collected the following data:

- Potential locations of your distribution centers (DC) and factories
- Demand in the markets
- Factory production capacities
- Processing capacity at the DCs
- Product price
- Transportation, inventory holding and processing costs at the DCs

Parameter	Values
Demand in the markets, in m ³	730
Transportation distances and time in between supply chain facilities	Determined automati- cally by actual routes*
Maximum inbound DC processing capacity, in m ³ per day	3,000
Maximum outbound DC processing capacity, in m ³ per day	3,000
Maximum production capacity at own factory, in m ³ per year	3,800
Penalties for overutilization of production capacity, in \$	100,000
Unit price, in \$ for m ³	3,000
Fixed facility costs, in \$ per day	5,000
Transportation costs, in \$ per km, per m ³	0.1
Production costs at own factories, per product unit (m ³), in \$	250
Inbound processing costs at the DC, in \$, per m ³	150
Outbound processing costs at the DC, in \$, per m ³	100
Penalty for demand non-fulfillment, in \$, per m ³	5,000

Table 1 Input parameter

* Automated transportation distance and time determination are some advantages of anyLogistix. We do not need to determine a large-scale distance matrix. Both distances and times are determined automatically by the software using real routes and real truck speeds.

Input data

Customers and demand

Dia fataniana fini	lele								a	anyLogisti	x - New proje	ct		
File Extensions Settings H	Help						•			0-0	Ar	irum	Rügen (Insel)	
Nou conside 3	- 1 ET	Dat				*	3 0	ISIE OF MAN		i-∐ apc	Pel	igeoop	Gdańsk Rostock	10 5
Conv of Paper Perel	2	NO	experim	ent			Republic	•	05	neffield	Texel Son	Bremen	Szczech	
12 NO Warehourses	e and cross	Cus	tom exp	eriment		Anna Labora	of Ireland		Bin	mingham	Rotterdam	Hannover	Berlin Pognan Po	olska
Scenario 1	and cross	Exte	rnal tab	les			Cox	Bristol Channel	Bristol	Condon	L Belgique K	Deutschla	n d oDresden Wroctaw	rodi
Darva Paylov with ret	turns two						Celtic Sea	° Pry	mouth		Belgie / Kar Belgien	Frankfurt &	OPraha Roy	File
Paper Pensi 1 edited								Guernse	Y	RU	Luxembou	Stuttgart	Cesko	Kraka
Scenario 2 (upgraded	t)									FY	Paris	areburg Mo	Munich	lovensi
2 Pepsi 1 edited	*								e ^N	antes	1 .	thweiz	sterreich j	Buda
3 Pepsi 1_edited 1								Bayot		Fran	ce s s	vizzera Liechtens	ein cLjubljana	yaron
Pepsi edited 1with Re	ecovery '					35		Biscay		Bordeaux	Torin	o Venezia	Hrvatska (Ban)	altas e
Two stage, on period	NO						2	Gijón/Xixo	in	00	No.	7 Drenze	Korner Hercegov	vina Cr
						600	Vigos		ineau 2	Andorr	Golfe da [®] Marseil Lion	' Iti	alia Adriatic	S Pod
Basic All		Ad	d I	Remove			13, 14	Areney	*10.4	7.0100.11				1.00
Customers (10)			blama		Tune		Legation		la el cel					
DCs and Factories			Name		Type		Location		inclusi	ion Type				
Demand [11]				7		· ·								
Paths [1]		1	Berlin		Custom	er -	Berlin loc	ation*	Includ	le '				
Product Flows [1]		2	Paris		Custom	er -	Paris loca	ition *	Includ	le i				
Products (1)	1	3	Rome		Custom	er •	Rome loc	ation	Includ	le				
Suppliers		4	Prague		Custom	er •	Prague lo	cati*	includ	ie i				
		5	Londor	1	Custom	er v	London le	ocat*	Includ	ie '				
		6	wadrid		custom	er *	Madrid Ic	icati*	Includ	ie i				
		1	Hambu	ng	Custom	er v	Hamburg Viorses 1-	10C *	Includ	ie i				
		8	Vienna	50	Custom	er v	vienna lo	cau*	Includ	le la				
		10	Munich	50	Custom	er ·	Musich	ioc*	Includ	le la				
0		10	Wurner		Custom	ei	WILLINGTING	Adu.	incluc	le in			_	
File Extensions Settings H	Help								a	nyLogisti	K - New project	t		
GFA NO SIM	+ 🔄					*		0	D I	abc	Nor	ge	25	
New scenario 3		Data	1					-	100		Ost	o ⁰ Sverige _{o Sto}	ckholm E	
Copy of Paper Pepsi	2	NO	experim	ent							~	Sparen	aa	
12 NO Warehouses a	nd cross	Cust	om exp	eriment						United	North Sea	mark	Listu	
Scenario 1		Exte	rhai tabi	es						Kingdom		and the	Vilniu	
Darya Pavlov with ret	turns two								Republi	c of Birmingha	m Nederland	Berlin Pols	ka E	
Paper Pepsi 1_edited										100	Deuts	chland	2	
Scenario 2 (upgraded	i)									-	Schweiz /	Guncher B	ko udapest	
2 Pepsi 1_edited										Bary of	rance Suisse	Liubliana Liubliana	Rom	
3 Pepsi 1_edited 1									-	BOCAY	0	Cpl	Бија — В	
Pepsi edited 1with Re	ecovery '									Madrida	Barcelona	Tiranal	ica Stul	
Two stage, on period	NO							Lis	sboa	España	. 57 8	Napoli Shqip	ελλαδα	
										and the	العرائري	o Valletta		
Basic All		Add	i F	lemove										
Customers (10)		#	Name		Unit		Cash	,		- 14				
DCs and Factories		**	Name		Unit		Cost		LOST U	nit				
Demand [10]				7		· ·	50			Ŧ				
Paths [1]		1	Juice		m ³	Ť	50		USD					
Product Flows [1] Product Storages (1)														
Products [1]														
Cumilians														
File Extensions Settings Help	1					anyLog	stras estrone	Tan	Write Byor					
New scenario 3	Data			* 3	000		be manual	etytie			Early	efect total	Custo	omers ites
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2	NO experim	ent			United Kingdom	Dates		intern Hence		Morend married	1	desce	*** Supp	pliers
12 NO Warehouses and cross Scenario 1	External tab	les		Reput	and of Garageses	N=0	· Oolaka	Genapycu		**** ***	Company and	Actum		
Darya Pavlov with returns two						. O d	Alto Convertito	Yng	paina Den	and and are	THAN THE REAL PROPERTY OF			
Paper Pepsi 1_edited					Bay of	Solitaria (eterreich Budes	est medaaa	Opeca	and Springerst and Deep	Ka	азақстан	- Friendle	
2 Pepsi 1_edited					hine		College Lalia Podgerice	Noves	Black Sea	Adaalass - Adaalass -		Grante a	-America -	12
3 Pepsi 1_edited 1				Linter	twarp (earrobara Ber	P Traine heart" Shapparin	I bet a read		Acarba	Turkmania	Dabekiston Kuara	5100 - 10 - 10	
Two states on pariod NO					2	المرامي	avaleta	Abrice of	Türkiye Ass	and the Ares	a Auge	bet	hints	
Basic All Q	Add I	Remove	Expand.											
Customers (10) DCs and Factories (13)	# Custon	ner	Product	Dem	and Type P	arameters		Time Perio	od R	evenue	Down Penalty	Up Penalty		
Demand (10) Paths init	1 Berlin	, Y	luice	• Perio	vdic dem* P	eriod=5. Ou	antity=10	(All period	Y (5) Y 2	τ .000	5.000	5.000		
Product Flows (1)	2 Paris	,	Juice	 Perio 	odic dem* P	Period=5, Qu	antity=10	(All period	Is) 2	000	5,000	5,000		
Product Storages (1) Products (1)	3 Rome		Juice	• Perio	odic dem* P	Period=5, Qu	antity=10	(All period	(s) • 2,	000	5,000	5,000		
Suppliers	 Prague Londo 	n ·	Juice	 Perio 	odic dem* P	eriod=5, Qu	antity=10 antity=10	(All period	(s) 2	.000	5,000	5,000		
	6 Madrid	d ·	Juice	• Perio	odic dem* P	Period=5, Qu	antity=10	(All period	(s) · 2,	000	5,000	5,000		
	7 Hambi 8 Vienna	urg -	Juice	 Perio Perio 	odic dem* P	reriod=5, Qu	antity=10 antity=10	(All period (All period	(5) · 2.	000	5,000	5,000		
	9 Toulou	use -	Juice	• Perio	odic dem* P	eriod=5, Qu	antity=10	(All period	ls) + 2,	.000	5,000	5,000		
	10 Munici	h ·	Juice	 Period 	odic dem.," P	eriod=5, Qu	antity=10	(All period	ls) • 2,	000	5,000	5,000		
🔘 🚨 🖪 🚞	10	S	1	x] w]	1					dill.	15 9 8 8 1	Nicessay 4	• () DEU 07/	1023

Fig. 3. Input data for customers and demand

DCs and factories

8						anyLogis	tix - New project	
File Extensions Settings Help				1			o Stockholm	Петер
GFA NO SIM + LE					8 💿	🌐 🚱 🔛 ab	C Saaremaa	пск
New scenario 3	Data	3				North Sea	Latvija	ST
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2	Cus	tom experiment			King	dom Danmar	Vilniuso	инск
12 NO Warehouses and cross	Exte	rnal tables			Republic of Bir Ireland	mingham Nederlaurg	Sactory Polar Type:Factory	и усь
Scenario 1						8-ondon Dinhi		Київ
Darya Pavlov with returns two						e ^{aris} x	Slovensko	Україн
Paper Pepsi 1_edited						Schweiz / Suisse // Ös Svizzera	Erreich Budapest M	oldova
Scenario 2 (upgraded)					Bay o Biscay	5 💼 💼 an	Hrvatska	ak
2 Pepsi 1_edited					C Startin	It	alia Podgorica Българ	ești. ИЯ Bla
3 Pepsi 1_edited 1					Madride	Barcelona Roma	Tiranao Ista apoli ^o Shqipëria	Bursa O
Pepsi edited 1with Recovery '					Lisboa	dual	Ελλάδα Αθήν	o ^{lzmir} T
Two stage on period NO				1.200	Collog Port		o Valletta	o Antal Activitation
Basic All Q	Ad	d Remove						
Customers [10]	#	Name	Туре		Location	Initially Ope	n Inclusion Type	
Demand ratio		Ŧ		Ŧ		Ŧ	т	
Paths m	2	DC Nantes	DC	Ŧ	DC Nantes	loc▼ (_●	Consider	V
Product Flows [1]	3	DC Zaragosa	DC	Ŧ	DC Zaragos	sa lo. 🔹 🦲	Consider	v
Product Storages [1]	4	DC Milano	DC	Y	DC Milano	loca. 🔹 🦲	Consider	Ψ.
Products [1]	5	DC Stuttgart	DC		DC Stuttga	rt lo 🔹 🦲	Consider	Ŧ
Suppliers	6	DC Lyon	DC	Ŧ	DC Lyon lo	catior 🦲	Consider	Ŧ
	7	DC Dresden	DC	Ŧ	DC Dresde	n lo• 🦲	Consider	Ψ.
	8	DC Bremen	DC	Ŧ	DC Bremer	n loc* 🦲	Consider	Ψ.
	9	DC Essen	DC	Ŧ	DC Essen le	ocat 💽	Consider	Ŧ
	10	DC Nürnberg	DC		DC Nürnbe	erg I• 💽	Consider	w.
	11	Factory France	Factory	v	Factory Fra	ince . 🔹 🦲	Consider	Ψ.
	12	Factory Germa	Factory	v	Factory Ge	rma 🔹 🦲	Consider	v
	13	Factory Poland	Factory	v	Factory Pol	land• 💽	Consider	v
Ø							anyLogisti	x - New
File Extensions Settings Help								UTINE AC
GFA NO SIM +	÷					8 💼 🔳		Saar
New scenario 3		Data				1 500000	North Sag	1f
Conv of Paper Pensi 2	- 10	NO experime	nt			United	Danmark	
12 NO Warehouses and sr		Custom exper	iment			Kingdom		Y CON
	55	External table	S			Republic of Birmingham	Nederland	Ben
Scenario 1	- 11					8	ondon 🛄 hla	
Darya Pavlov with returns t	w						Saris X	Csko Slove
Paper Pepsi 1_edited	- 11						Suisse / Öster	reich
Scenario 2 (upgraded)	- 11					Bay of Biscay		Hrvats
2 Pepsi 1_edited	- 11					- mark	8	C Poda
3 Pepsi 1 edited 1	- 11					· · · · ·	Roma ⁸	Tirana
Pensi edited 1with Recover						Lisboa España	Napo	Shqi
Two stage on period NO	y					°	الجزائر	40
								• Valletta
Basic All	9	Add Re	emove					
Custom Constraints		# Group		Descr	iption	Customers	Sites	Suppli
Customers [10]			T		τ.	· · ·		
DCs and Factories [13]			4		I	T	r	
Demand [10]		1 DCs				0	[10 objects]	0
Facility Expenses		2 Factories	5			0	[Factory Franc	[]
Groups [3]		3 Custome	ers			[10 objects]	0	0
Indicator Constraints						L	i -	

Fig. 4. Setting sites and grouping them

Basic All	٩	Ade	d Remo	ve	Expand									
Customers [10]		#	Facility		Expense Type	Value	Cost Unit		Time Unit		Product Unit		Time Period	
Demand [10]				т	т	T		т		т		Ŧ	T	
Facility Expenses [3]		1	DCs	v	Other costs 🔹	5,000	USD	Ŧ	day	V			(All periods)	Ŧ
Groups [3]		2	DCs	∇	Carrying cost 🔹	10	USD	v	day	∇	m ³	∇	(All periods)	Ψ.
Indicator Constraints		3	Factories	Ŧ	Other costs	5,000	USD	Ŧ	day	V			(All periods)	Ŧ
Lipoor lippgor														
Basic All	Q	Ade	d Remo	ve	Expand									
Paths [1]		#	Source		Product	Туре	Units		Cost		Cost Unit		Time Period	
Period Groups				т	т	T		т		т		T.	T	
Periods [1]		1	DCs		(All products)	Outbound sh	m ³		100		USD		(All periods)	÷.
Processing Cost [2]		2	DCs	~	(All products)	Inhound shin	m3	v	150			v	(All periods)	v
Product Flows [2]		2	003		(An products)	moound ship			150		050		(All periods)	

Fig. 5. Costs settings

				12	March Contraction of the	1	lalcaric Sea			nenian		CHOSENSWIN (1300	Ankara	Erzutum	1	and the second
Basic All	Add	Remove	e Expa	nd														
Paths [1]	#	Site	Product	BOM	Production	Cost	Cost U	nit	Min throughput	Max throughput	•	Fixed	Fixed Value		Down Penalty	Up Penalty		Time Period
Period Groups		Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ		т		Ŧ	Ŧ		¥.	Ŧ		T.	Ŧ		Ŧ	Τ
Processing Cost [2]	1	Factories	Juice	· ·	500		USD	v	0	3,800		\bigcirc	0		100,000	100,000		(All periods)
Processing Time																		
Product Flows [2]																		
Product Groups																		
Product Storages [1]																		
Products [1]																		

Fig. 6. Production capacity and costs

In Fig. 6, we depict how to set up the production capacity restriction at factories. The production capacity maximum needs to be entered in the column "**Max Throughput**" (if you need to restrict the minimum capacity level, please use the respective column).

Note: In order to activate this constraint, you need to setup any large number in the columns "down penalty" and "up penalty".

Paths and flows

Dasic Pill	Ade	d Remove	E	xpand																		
Customers [10]	#	C_Name		Source		Expand Sou	rces	Destination		Expand	Destin	Prod	uct	Exp	and Produ	Mir	throughput	Max	c throughput	Fixe	ł	Fi
Demand [10]			Τ		Τ		т		٣		Τ		Ψ		Ψ		т		т		т	
Paths [1]	1			Factories	Ÿ			DCs	٣			(All p	products) *			0		0		0		0
Product Flows [2]	2			DCs	Y			Customers	Ψ			(All p	products) 🤟			0		0		0		0
Product Storages (1)																						
Basic All	Ade	d Remove	E	xpand																		
Paths [1]	#	From	То		Со	st Calculation	n		Cos	t Calculat	ion Para	me *	Cost Unit		Distance		Distance Ur	nit	Straight		Vehicle Type)
Period Groups		т		Ŧ				Ŧ				т		т		т		т		т		Ŧ
Processing Cost [2]	1	(All locations)	- (A	Il locations)	Vo	olume&distan	ice-ba	ased cost 🔹	0.1	* volume	(m³) * di	sta	USD	v	0		km	v	0			
Basic All	Ade	d Remove																				
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Processing Time	Ade #	d Remove	Ca	pacity	Ca	pacity Unit	Sp	eed	Spe	eed Unit												
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Processing Time Product Flows [2]	Ade #	d Remove Name	Ca	pacity T	Ca	pacity Unit	Sp	eed T	Spe	eed Unit	Ÿ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Processing Time Product Flows [2] Product Groups	Ada # 1	d Remove Name Truck	Ca	pacity T	Ca	pacity Unit ד	Sp	eed Ÿ	Sp kn	eed Unit	Ŧ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Processing Time Product Flows [2] Product Groups Product Storages [1]	Ado #	d Remove Name Truck	Ca 80	pacity T	Ca	pacity Unit ד י	Sp	eed T	Spr kn	eed Unit n/h	Ŧ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Processing Time Product Flows [2] Product Groups Product Storages [1] Production [1]	Add # 1	d Remove Name Truck	Ca 80	pacity T	Ca	pacity Unit T	Sp 80	eed T	Sp kn	eed Unit n/h	Ψ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Product Flows [2] Product Groups Product Storages [1] Production [1] Products [1]	Ado #	d Remove Name Truck	Ca 80	pacity T	Ca	pacity Unit T	Sp 80	eed T	Sp kn	eed Unit	Υ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Product Flows [2] Product Groups Product Groups Product Storages [1] Products [1] Products [1] Sale Batch	Add # 1	d Remove Name Truck	C a 80	pacity T	Ca	pacity Unit Ţ	Sp 80	eed T	Spr kn	eed Unit	Υ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Processing Time Product Flows [2] Product Groups Product Strages [1] Production [1] Production [1] Production [1] Sale Batch Site States Changes	Add #	d Remove Name Truck	Ca 80	pacity T	Ca	r pacity Unit ت	Sp 80	eed T	Spr	eed Unit	Υ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Processing Time Product Flows [2] Product Groups Product Groups Product Strages [1] Production [1] Production [1] Production [1] Sale Batch Site States Changes Suppliers Lucit Composition	Ada # 1	d Remove Name Truck	Ca 80	pacity T	Ca	r Unit ت	Spr 80	eed T	Spr kn	eed Unit	Ψ											
Basic All Q Processing Cost [2] Product Flows [2] Product Flows [2] Product Groups Product Groups Product or [1] Products [1] Sale Batch Site States Changes Suppliers Unit Conversions Units	Add # 1	d Remove Name Truck	Ca 80	pacity T	Ca	r ए	Sp 80	eed T	Spr kn	eed Unit	Υ											

Fig. 7. Path and flow settings

Network optimization experiments

In NO \rightarrow Experiment, we start the network optimization for the given data:

File Extensions Settings Help					
GFA NO SIM + 🗲					
New scenario 3 Copy of Paper Pepsi 2 12 NO Warehouses and cross Scenario 1 Darya Pavlov with returns two Paper Pepsi 1_edited Scenario 2 (upgraded) 2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1	Data NO experiment ^ Result 1 Result 2 Custom experiment External tables	Experiment duration: All periods Start date: 1/1/17 12/31/17 Select demand variation t Exact demand Select search type for N b Find N best	ype: v est solutions: v		
All Flows details Sites initial Sites fix Working sites Storage by product Production cost Production flows Multiple flow constraints Multiple storage constraints Demand	Flows details		Sites initial	® 🖾 Sites fix	
Vehicle flows Named expressions Objective Members Overall stats Add new tab	Working sites	0	Storage by product	Image: Second secon	0

Fig. 8. Start of network optimization experiment

The results are shown in Figs 9-12.

12		anyLog	istix - New project	
File Extensions Settings Help				
File Extensions Settings Help GFA NO SIM + C- New scenario 3 Copy of Paper Pepsi 2 12 NO Warehouses and cross: Scenario 1 Darya Pavlov with returns two Paper Pepsi 1_edited Scenario 2 (upgraded) 2 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pansi affield 1 With Recovery '	Data NO experiment Result 1 Result 2 Result 3 Custom experiment External tables	Celite s	Dublin isle of Man presard related brinophan Courney	Action Action
Two stage, on period NO		View	Libert Anarry Carly da Valadad Zarazza Barcelona España Bakaris an Valadad Anarry Lang España Santa Anarry Lang Materia Anarry Lang Materia Anarry Lang Materia Anarry Lang Materia Anarry Lang Materia Anarry Lang Materia	Narselle Funt Konst Crasi Gore Narselle Band Adritut Crasi Gore Roma Band Adritut Scient Mer Band Okapell Band Shapel International Scientific Crasi Gore Narselle Band Shapell Band Okapell Narselle Crasi Gore Narselle Band Scientific Crasi Gore Scientific Crasi Gore Scien
Optimization results	# Sites		Profit (NetOpt)	Flows amount
All			Ŧ	T
Flows details	1 Iteration 1: I	OC Nürnberg, Factory Germany, Factory Poland	10,031,999.143	14,600
Sites initial	2 Iteration 2: I	OC Luxemburg, Factory France, Factory Germany	10,030,775.888	14,600
Sites fix Working sites	3 Iteration 3: I	DC Dresden, Factory Germany, Factory Poland	9,987,337.035	14,600
Storage by product	4 Iteration 4: I	DC Stuttgart, Factory France, Factory Germany	9,978,485.095	14,600
Production cost	5 Iteration 5: I	DC Essen, Factory France, Factory Germany	9,954,748.374	14,600
Production flows	6 Iteration 6: I	DC Essen, Factory Germany, Factory Poland	9,942,877.87	14,600
Multiple flow constraints	7 Iteration 7: I	DC Nürnberg, Factory France, Factory Germany	9,939,468.798	14,600
Multiple storage constraints	8 Iteration 8: I	DC Stuttgart, Factory Germany, Factory Poland	9,924,072.956	14,600
vemanu	9 Iteration 9: I	DC Bremen, Factory Germany, Factory Poland	9,891,882.148	14,600
Comparison	10 Iteration 10:	DC Luxemburg, Factory Germany, Factory Poland	9,867,924.098	14,600

Fig. 9. Network optimization results

It can be observed in Fig. 9 that the supply chain design with two factories in Germany and Poland and a DC in Nuernberg earns the highest profit.

0					anyLog	istix - New proj	ect						- 6
File Extensions Settings Help													
gfa no sim + [£												
New scenario 3	Data		Experiment	duration:									
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2													
12 NO Warehouses and c	Flows details												
Comparie 1											^		
Scenario i	Iteration	Period	From	То	Product	Flow	Flow min	Flow max	Percentage	Flow Under Cost	Flow C		
Darya Pavlov with returns													
Paper Pepsi 1 edited	1 1	Basic period	Factory Germany	DC Nürnberg	Juice	3,800.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
Scepario 2 (upgraded)	2 1	Basic period	DC Nürnberg	London	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
Scenario 2 (upgraded)	3 1	Basic period	DC Nürnberg	Berlin	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
2 Pepsi 1_edited	4 1	Basic period	DC Nürnberg	Vienna	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
3 Pepsi 1_edited 1	5 1	Basic period	DC Nürnberg	Rome	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	*	_
n the second	6 1	Basic period	DC Nürnberg	Madrid	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	1	
	/ 1	Basic period	DC Nürnberg	Hamburg	Juice	/30.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
Optimization results	8 1	Basic period	Factory Poland	DC Numberg	Juice	3,500.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		H 1
All	9 1	Basic period	DC Numberg	Paris	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
Flows details	10 1	Basic period	DC Numberg	Toulouse	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	lost	Distance
Cites initial	11 1	Basic period	DC Numberg	Munich	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
Sites Initial	12 1	Basic period	DC Iveramburg	Prague	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		233.76
Sites fix	14 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	Hamburg	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		1,004.08
Working sites	15 2	Basic period	Eactory Germany	Pariburg DC luxomburg	Juice	2 900.0	0.0	0.0	10	0.0	0.0		427.05
Storage by product	16 2	Basic period	Factory Germany	DC Luxemburg	luice	3 500.0	0.0	0.0	-10	0.0	0.0		518.1
Production cost	17 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	Madrid	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		1,096.46
Production flows	18 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	Rome	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		1,970.5
Multiple flow constraints	19 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	Toulouse	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		601.01
wulluple now constraints	20 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	Berlin	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		666.56
Multiple storage constra	21 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	London	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		>
Demand	22 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	Prague	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0		
Vehicle flows	23 2	Basic period	DC Luxemburg	Munich	Juice	730.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0 ~		
Named expressions	<										>		
Objective Members													
Overall stats										C	lose		
Overall Stats										L			

Fig. 10. Optimal flows

In Fig. 10, supply chain material flows for the optimal and other possible design are presented.

le Extensions Settings Help																
gfa no sim + [÷															
New scenario 3	1.0)ata			Experimer	nt duration:										
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2								_								
12 NO Warehouses and c	Dema	nd														
cenario 1															^	
Denis Devlay with antiques		Iteration	Period	Customer	Product	Demand min	Demand max	Satisfied	Percentage	Revenue, per it	Revenue Total	Under Cost	Over Cost	Penalty		
arya Paviov with returns																
aper Pepsi 1_edited	1	1	Basic period	Vienna	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
cenario 2 (upgraded)	2		basic period	Berlin	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
Densi 1 edited	3	1	Basic period	Nome	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
2 repsi i_edited	4	1	Basic period	Toulours	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
Pepsi 1_edited 1	5	1	Basic period	London	Juice	730.0	720.0	730.0	100.0	2,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
and the second second	7	1	Basic period	Practure	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
	8	1	Rasic period	Paris	luice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
ptimization results	9	1	Basic period	Hamburg	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000,0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
l i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	10	1	Basic period	Munich	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3.000.0	2,190,000.0	5.000.0	5.000.0	0.0		
ows details	11	2	Basic period	Vienna	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3.000.0	2,190,000.0	5.000.0	5.000.0	0.0		Over Cost
tes initial	12	2	Basic period	Berlin	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5 000 0
tes fiv	13	2	Basic period	Rome	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000.0
tes lix	14	2	Basic period	Madrid	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000.0
orking sites	15	2	Basic period	Toulouse	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000.0
torage by product	16	2	Basic period	London	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000.0
roduction cost	17	2	Basic period	Prague	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000.0
roduction flows	18	2	Basic period	Paris	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000.0
lultiple flow constraints	19	2	Basic period	Hamburg	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000.0
Aultiple storage constra	20	2	Basic period	Munich	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		5,000,0
initiple storage consula	21	3	Basic period	Vienna	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		>
emano	22	3	Basic period	Berlin	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3,000.0	2,190,000.0	5,000.0	5,000.0	0.0		
ehicle flows	23	3	Basic period	Rome	Juice	730.0	730.0	730.0	100.0	3.000.0	2.190.000.0	5.000.0	5,000.0	0.0	× *	
amed expressions	× .														,	
bjective Members																
)verall stats															Close	

Fig. 11. Demand fulfillment analysis

Fig. 11 shows that the demands in all the markets are 100% covered in the optimal solution.

0							anyLogi	stix	- New project						
File Extensions Settings Help															
GFA NO SIM +	E														
New scenario 3		Data			Experiment	duration:									
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2															_
12 NO Warehouses and c	Ove	rall stats													
Scenario 1		Iteration	Transportation	Initial cost	Closure Cost	Other cost	Inhound proces		Outbound proc	1	Production	Revenue	Profit (NetOpt)		
Darya Pavlov with returns		rendered	ranoportation in	initial cost		outer cost	moound process		outoound procin		rioduction	nevenue	in the first of the top ty		
Paper Pepsi 1 edited	1	1	918,000.86	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 10,031,999.14		
Scopario 2 (upgraded)	ž	2	919,224.11	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 10,030,775.89		
Scenario 2 (upgraded)	3	3	962,662.97	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,987,337.03		
2 Pepsi 1_edited	4	4	971,514.9	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,978,485.1		
3 Pepsi 1 edited 1	5	5	995,251.63	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,954,748.37		
	(6	1,007,122.13	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,942,877.87		
	7	7	1,010,531.2	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,939,468.8		
Optimization results	8	8	1,025,927.04	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,924,072.96		
		9	1,058,117.85	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,891,882.15		
Flows datails	1	0 10	1,082,075.9	0.0	0.0	5,475,000.0	1,095,000.0		730,000.0		3,650,000.0	21,900,000.0	 9,867,924.1		
Flows details															
Sites initial															
Sites fix															
Working sites															
Storage by product															
Production cost															
Production flows															
N I I I I															
Multiple flow constraints															
Multiple storage constra															
Demand															
Vehicle flows															
Named expressions	<													>	
Objective Members															
Objective Members														Close	
Overall stats															

Fig. 12. Start of network optimization experiment

Finally, the financial performance report on the optimal and other possible supply chain designs is shown in Fig. 12.

How to analyze the optimization results and make a management decision

Is the mathematically optimal solution automatically the right decision?

The optimal solution to our problem is to open factories in Germany and Poland and a DC in Nuernberg. Imagine you need to report your results to the CEO. She may ask you some questions such as e.g.:

- is it possible to find a better supply chain design with an even higher profit?
- what happens if the demand in particular markets changes?
- what happens if facility costs grow and transportation costs decrease?
- what about disruption risks: if anything happens at the DC in Nuernberg, is there no second source or backup DC in the supply chain design?

Indeed, you would answer that, for the given set of parameters and their values, this is the best solution in terms of profit maximization. However, the changes in input parameters, e.g., in demand, fixed facility or variable transportation costs, or even in the production capacities may change the solution. For example, the solution changes if you assume a maximum production capacity of factories 8,000 m³ a year instead of 3,500 m³. The optimization result is shown in Fig. 13.



Fig. 13. Optimization result for new production capacity maximum

It can be observed in Fig. 13 that the new optimal solution is now a supply chain design with a factory in Germany and a DC in Nuernberg. This solution is even more profitable than the previous one. Why do you think this change occured? Using the optimization results, you might also quickly answer the CEO's question about what the highest profit is that could be achieved in a supply chain design with two DCs (risk management!), see Fig. 14.

D			any	Logistix - New project		
File Extensions Settings Help						- 1000 - 100
GFA NO SIM +			📆 abc	Dublin Isle of Man	Sheffield Terscheiling Ramburg	Rostock
New scenario 3	Data		Hide sourcing paths	Republic of Ireland	Birmingham Nederland Hannover	Barlin Poznan Torun Wa
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2	NO exp	eriment ^	Valentia Island	Cork ^o	BLondon Essen Dortmund Halle	Hingshaw Lodz
12 NO Warehouses and cross	Resul	it 1		Channel	Bergiene De schia	nd obresden
Scenario 1	Resul	it 2	C	eltic Sea	Beigien Contraction	Kraków
Darya Pavlov with returns two	Custom	experiment		ducinacy A	Paris	Cesko Slovensko oko
Paper Pepsi 1_edited	Externa	l tables			c Freiburg Muche	en Wien Budapest
Scenario 2 (upgraded)				Dealer St	France Schweiz Suisse / Liechten	And Magyarorszag
2 Pepsi 1_edited				Bay of	SVIZZERA CLE	e oLjubljana
3 Pepsi 1_edited 1				Biscay	Bordeaux Genova, San Merin	o Loshy OBanja Euka
Pepsi edited 1with Recovery '				Gijón/Xixón	Roulouse Nice Fireme	обр Komat Hercegovina Србиј
Two stage, on period NO				Bibao	Andorra Colfe du Marseille	alia Adriatic Podgorica
				Valladolid	Zaragoza Barcelona Roma	Barl Maken
				España	Balearic Sca Wa de Menorca Sc València/ o Palma	enian Orađakov ca
				Portugal	Valencia Mallorca Isola di San Cagliari	Кіркира
Optimization results	#	Sites		Profit (NetOpt)		Flows amount
All			Υ		т	
Flows details	20	Iteration 20: DC Bremen	, Factory France, Factory Poland	9,668,091.341		14,600
Sites initial	21	Iteration 21: DC Lyon, Fa	ctory France, Factory Poland	9,613,049.931		14,600
Sites fix	22	Iteration 22: DC Nantes,	Factory France, Factory Germany	9,602,154.835		14,600
Storage by product	23	Iteration 23: DC Milano,	Factory France, Factory Poland	9,528,959.066		14,600
Production cost	24	Iteration 24: DC Milano,	Factory Germany, Factory Poland	9,512,652.762		14,600
Production flows	25	Iteration 25: DC Lyon, Fa	ictory Germany, Factory Poland	9,433,352.996		14,600
Multiple flow constraints	26	Iteration 26: DC Nantes,	Factory France, Factory Poland	9,381,182.147		14,600
Multiple storage constraints	27	Iteration 27: DC Nantes,	Factory Germany, Factory Poland	9,136,560.701		14,600
Demand	28	Iteration 28: DC Zaragos	a, Factory France, Factory Germany	8,880,354.145		14,600
~	29	Iteration 29: DC Zaragos	a, Factory France, Factory Poland	8,641,918.77		14,600
Comparison	30	Iteration 30: DC Lyon, DC	C Nürnberg, Factory France, Facto	8,469,483.26		14,600

Fig. 14. Selection of the best result with two DCs

We can observe in Fig. 14 that the most profitable supply chain design with two DCs is the option with two factories in Germany and France and two DCs in France and Germany. However, the profit from this supply chain design would be lower than that of the optimal supply chain design. We call this the "costs of robustness" (Ivanov 2018).

Variation experiment

In order to answer the CEO's questions about what happens if demands change, facility costs grow and transportation costs decrease, you can run the variation experiment (see details in Ivanov 2017). You might want to let the transportation costs range from 0.05 to 0.5, the fixed facility costs range from 50 to 300, and demand be changed by 20% up or down.

Note: the variation experiment is possible in the SIM mode of anyLogistix. There you will need to define additional policies, e.g., the inventory control policy.

Four-stage, multi-period supply chain planning with capacity disruptions, inventory, and transportation constraints

Problem statement

Additional features that will be added in this Chapter:

- Limited transportation capacity
- Many periods
- Capacity disruptions

- Inventory holding costs
- Limited storage capacity

Assume the following problem statement based in Ivanov et al. (2014). We investigate a multi-stage distribution network (DN) that displays the following characteristics: (i) system performance depends on the ability to operate despite perturbations; (ii) some system elements may become unavailable due to disruptions in the DN, and (iii) the system experiences performance degradation if some of its elements fail.

Consider the following supply chain design (Fig. 15).



Fig. 15. Supply chain design (Ivanov et al. 2014)

The DN is composed of two seaports (nodes 1 and 6), a central distribution hub (node 4), two intermediate warehouses (nodes 2 and 3), an outsourced warehouse (node 7), and a regional distribution centre as a strategic inventory holding point (node 5). Execution in each of the nodes and transportation arcs is limited by maximal warehouse capacity, processing throughput, and transportation throughput, respectively.

The triangles represent warehouse capacity, and numbers on the arcs refer to maximal transportation throughput. Suppliers deliver certain order quantities at the beginning of each period at seaports 1 and 6. Then, the goods are processed in central distribution hub 4. The goods from hub 1 are additionally processed at intermediate terminals 2 and 3. From hub 4, the goods are moved to the regional distribution center 5, which has a demand in each of the periods (i.e., 100 units per period). We consider three periods. Inventory from previous periods may be used in the following periods. Profit is computed as revenue from goods delivered at node 5 minus the sum of sourcing, transportation, processing, fixed, and inventory holding costs which are assumed to be a linear function of the quantities.

The primary problem is to find the aggregate product flows to be moved from suppliers through the intermediate stages to the strategic inventory holding point subject to maximizing the service level and minimizing the total cost under (i) constrained capacities and processing rates and (ii) varying demand, supply, and DN structure for a multi-period case. In addition, the calculated plans should suggest ways to reconfigure product flows in the event of capacity disruptions. As shown in Fig. 15, in period 2, node 7 becomes unavailable, and in period 3 we have disruptions at seaport 1 and node 7.

Setting the management problem in anyLogistix Network Optimizer

In Figs 16-21, the input settings and parameters for the problem considered are defined.

a sector to the sector of the

Supply chain design

File Extensions Settings Help										anyı	LOGISTIA	New proj	cci	
GFA NO SIM + E					•	0				27	abc	2-1)		-
New scenario 3	Data	a				-	-	-	-			1352		-
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2	NO	experir	nent	^				4				Suomi		
12 NO Warehouses and cross	R	esult 1			1									
Scenario 1	Cus	tom ex	periment					T	Oslo	je	Sec. el	Helsinki	1	
Dania Paylov with returns two	Exte	rnal ta	oles							Sverig	Stockh	olm Eesti	петербурі	r
Darya Paviov with returns two							North	. Face	d		Jaaremaa	hatvija	CK	
Paper Pepsi T_edited						Unite	d	5eu	Dani	mark	/	Lietuv		MO
Scenario 2 (upgraded)					e.	lingdo	om		6			Vilnins Muhck	KA	177
2 Pepsi 1_edited					Ireland	of Birmir	ngham ol on de	Neder	land		Pols	велару	5PR	ОРЛ КУС
3 Pepsi 1_edited 1								De	utso	hland	~ //	5	Киів	Xa
Pepsi edited 1with Recovery '							0	Schu	veiz /	Munchen	Sloven ko	pest	окраїна	дніпр
Two stage, on period NO						Bay of	Fran	ce Sult Sviz	sse // zzera	Osterreich	ibljana	România	Одеса	
Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded					-	Biscay	Ser.		OM	lilano	Hrvatska Србија	Bucuresti		
					27		and the second		R	Italia	Podgorica	България	Black	Sea
					Ma	adrid _o	в	arcelona		Napoli	Shqiperia	a a	Bursa oAnka	ara
Basic All Q	Ad	d	Remove											
Customers [1]	#	Name		Туре		Loc	ation		1	Initially	Open	Inclusion	n Type	
DCs and Factories [7]			Ŧ		Ŧ			Ŧ			Ŧ		Ŧ	
Demand [1]	1	7		DC		71	ocation		*			Include		
Paths [17]	2	2		DC		21	ocation		~			Include		
Product Storages (11)	2	2		DC		210	ocation	1				Include	×.	
Products m	3	3		DC		310	ocation	1				Include		
Suppliers [2]	4	4		DC	1	410	ocation	1	¥			Include	T.	
	5	6		DC	2	61	ocation	1	v			Include	X	
	6	1		DC	3	11	ocation	1	v			Include	V	
	7	5		DC	3	510	ocatior	1	v			Include		
Pasic All Q	Δ	dd	Persove											
		uu	Kennove	-								_		
Lustomers [1]	#	Nan	пе	Туре		I	Locatio	on		Inclus	ion Typ	e		
Demand 141			T			т			T		,	T		
	1	Sup	olier 6	Suppl	ier	v	Suppli	er 6 lo	o	Includ	de	Ŧ		
roduct Flows (19)	2	Sup	olier 1	Suppl	ier	Ŧ	Suppli	er 1 lo	D ▼	Includ	le	V		
roduct Storages [11]														
roducts [1]														
Suppliers [2]														
Basic All		Q	Ado	l I	Remo	ve								
Customora														
Customers [1]			#	Name			Ту	pe			Loo	ation		
DCs and Factories [7]						Ŧ				т			T	
Demand [1]			4	Curte	-		~	- 4-			-		F 1	
D-+l			1	Custon	her 5		Cu	istor	mei	r '	• Cu	stomer	5 I	

Fig. 16. DN design

Note: In order to set up storage capacity at the customer, we define an auxiliary DC in the same location. This allows setup of storage capacity without any transportation costs or time. In order to setup the incoming flows to seaports 1 and 6 we set up auxiliary suppliers at the same locations as seaports 1 and 6.

Basic All Q	Add	Remo	ve Expand										
Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7]	# (Customer	Product	Dema	and Type	Parameter	S	Ŧ	Time Period	Revenue	Down Penalty	Up Penalty	T
Paths [20] Product Flows (24)	1	Customer 5	 Product 1 	• Perio	odic dem.	.▼ Period=36	i, Quanti	ty=100	(All periods) 🔻	1	10,000	0	
Basic All	۹	Add	Remove										
Demand [1]		# Na	me	Start		End							
Groups			т		т		т						
Indicator Constraints		1 Tin	ne period 1	1/1/17		12/31/17							
Linear Ranges		2 Tin	ne period 2	1/1/18		12/31/18							
Location Lists Locations [8] Objective Members Path Selection Mode Paths [10] Period Groups Periods [3]		3 Tin	ne period 3	1/1/19		12/31/19							

Demand and periods

Fig. 17. Demand and periods

Transportation capacities and disruptions

0							а	nyLogistix	- New	project							_ 🗇 🗙
File Extensions Settings Help																	
GFA NO SIM +				*	8	0 0		abc	Latvija		Morres		MAP EKOTO	ринбург	TIOM		Customers
New scenario 3	Data			K	ingd	lom			Viniuso		MOR	Новгород чи	и оКазань 7АТ УФА	лабинск	· · · · · · ·	нск онено Новосибирск	Sites
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2	NO exp	periment		A sepublic o	H Birm	engham	, H. 0.		Бел	арусь	000	TAN NEW	ан Самара ваш	55			Suppliers
	Resi	ult 1		Ireland		o Nei	derland	Pate			ere		OPE	100		ART	the state of the s
Basic All Q	Add	Ren	nove	Expand													
Customers [1]	#	Source	Expar	nd Destinatio	n	Expand	Product	Expand	. Min	. Max th	Fixed	Fixe	Product Unit	D	Up Penalty	Time Period	Inclusion Type
DCs and Factories [7]		Ŧ		T	τ.	т	T	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	т	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ
Demand [1]	1	3		4		-	(All pr =		0	20	൭	0	Product unit	- 0	100.000	(All periods)	Include
Product Flows (19)	2	2		4			(All pr*		0	50	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100.000	(All periods)	Include
Product Storages [11]	3	2 ,		5	÷.,		(All pr. *		0	30	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100.000	(All periods)	Include
Products [1]	4	4		5	1.4		(All pr		0	100	6	0	Product unit	- 0	100.000	(All periods)	Include
Suppliers (2)	5	5 ,		Customer	5 +		(All pr.,*		0	0		100	Product unit	- 0	0	(All periods)	Include
	6	Supp		1			(All pr*		0	0		100	Product unit	- 0	0	Time period 1: 2017	Include
	7	Supp		6			(All pr*		0	0		50	Product unit	- 0	0	Time period 1: 2017*	Include
	8	1		2			(All pr*		0	50	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100,000	Time period 1: 2017	Include
	9	1 .		3			(All pr		0	30	\bigcirc	0	Product unit	- 0	100,000	Time period 1: 2017	Include
	10	4		7			(All pr*		0	40	0	0	Product unit	0	100,000	Time period 1: 2017	Include
	11	7	. 💿	5			(All pr		0	40	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100,000	Time period 1: 2017*	Include
	12	6		4			(All pr*		0	50	0	0	Product unit	0	100,000	Time period 1: 2017	Include
	13	Supp		1	1.9		(All pr*		0	0		50	Product unit	- 0	0	Time period 2: 2018	Include
	14	Supp		6	1.7		(All pr*		0	0		60	Product unit	0	0	Time period 2: 2018	Include
	15	1 .		2			(All pr	•	0	50	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100,000	Time period 2: 2018	Include
	16	1 1		3			(All pr*		0	30	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100,000	Time period 2: 2018	Include
	17	6	•	4			(All pr*		0	50	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100,000	Time period 2: 2018	Include
	18	Supp		6	1.4		(All pr*		0	0		50	Product unit	- 0	0	Time period 3: 2019	Include
	19	6		4			(All pr*		0	50	0	0	Product unit	- 0	100,000	Time period 3: 2019	Include

Fig. 18. Product flows

In "**Product flows**," we set up the constraint on the limited transportation throughput in the column "**Max Throughput**." Moreover, here we also set up the conditions of the incoming flows from suppliers at seaports 1 and 6. Finally, the disruptions in the supply chain are set up here by explicitly entering and not entering product flows in different periods.

Note: the constraints are activated by setting the **Up Penalty** as a large number. If the penalty is not set up, then two situations are possible:

- Max >= min and min > 0, down penalty = up penalty = 0, then max throughput is considered fixed, i.e., the flows will exactly equal the value in the column "max throughput". Fixed is the value that cannot be violated.
- 2. Max >= min and min = 0, down penalty = up penalty = 0, then the throughput constraint is ignored.

Note: In "**Product Storages**," you need to define data separately for "DCs" and "Factories"; do not use the default setting "All sites". Do not forget to activate "**Expand sources.**" Do not use penalties if min and max throughputs are not defined.

0							anyLo	gistix -	New projec	t								
File Extensions Settings Help																		
GFA NO SIM +	÷.					r 🙁 🙆	🛯 🕙 🔛	abc	atvija		Morana	MAP		Екат	еринбур	TROM		1
New scenario 3	Da	ata				Kingdom	-	V	letuv Ininso suure		ноя Новгород	ra oKa:	ланы гат о ^у	фа: Ч	елябинск	CHP DOMCK	о кам Новрембирся	1
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2	NO	D expo Resul	erim It 1	ent	^	epublic of Birmingham	Hederland Regerer		Беларусь		а ряз у оря дан тан пен ус	Ab CA	амара ба м орг		SP	. mark	ANT	100
Basic All	9 A	dd	F	Remove	Expand	d												
Customers [1]	#	Fre	om	То		Cost Calculation	Cost Calculation Pa	rame	Cost Unit	Di	. Distance Unit	S	traight		Tr	Time Period	Inclusion	Туре
Demand m			Ŧ		т	т		τ.	τ	Υ.	T		Ŧ		T.	T.		Ψ
Paths [17]	1	Su	ıp∗	1		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	* (Ψ.	LT×	0 Time period 1: 20.	Include	÷.
Product Flows [19]	2	Su		6	Ŧ	Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	* (Ψ.	LT^{ν}	0 Time period 1: 20.	Include	7
Product Storages [11]	3	1	Ŧ	2	*	Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- (Ŧ	LT -	0 Time period 1: 20.	Include	v
Products [1]	4	1		3	y.	Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m3)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- (Ψ.	LT -	0 Time period 1: 20.	Include	Υ.
Suppliers [2]	5	3		4		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- (•	Ψ.	LT -	0 (All periods)	Include	
	6	2		4		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km			.90	LT+	0 (All periods)	Include	Υ.
	7	6	×	4		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	* (v.	LT -	0 (All periods)	Include	¥.
	8	2	÷	5		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	+ (LT^{ν}	0 (All periods)	Include	Ψ.
	9	4	×	5		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	* (٣	LT -	0 (All periods)	Include	×
	10) 4	Ŧ	7		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- (٧	LTT	0 Time period 1: 20.	Include	Ŧ
	11	7		5	Ŧ	Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- (Ŧ	LT -	0 Time period 1: 20.	Include	*
	12	2 Su	ip	1	Ξ.	Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- ((π)	LT =	0 Time period 2: 20.	Include	T.
	13	S Su		6		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	* (•		LT -	0 Time period 2: 20.	Include	Υ.
	14	1 1	Ŧ	2	Ψ.	Volume-based .*	0.01 * volume (m3)	+ 0	USD	0	km	7 (Ψ.	LT+	0 Time period 2: 20.	Include	v
	15	5 1	÷	3		Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- (•	Ψ.	LT-	0 Time period 2: 20.	Include	÷
	16	i Su	ıp	6	Ŧ	Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	7 (ų.	LT -	0 Time period 3: 20.	Include	Ŧ
	17	5	Ŧ	Custome	r5 =	Volume-based . *	0.01 * volume (m ³)	+ 0	USD	0	km	- (•	Ŧ	LT -	0 (All periods)	Include	÷

In Fig. 19, paths setting is illustrated.

Fig. 19. Paths

Warehouse storage capacities

<u>@</u>						anyLo	gistix - Nev	w project							🗖 🗙
File Extensions Settings Help								0.001							
GFA NO SIM + 🔄				¥ (🗅 🚯 🞇	abc							C	ustomers
New scenario 3 Copy of Paper Pepi 2 12 NO Warehouses and cross Scenario 1 Darya Pavlov with returns two Paper Pepsi 1_edited Scenario 2 (upgraded) 2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Peosi edited 1with Recoverv '	Data NO exp Resu Custor Extern	perimen ult 1 m experi al tables	t ment	Cun Ring Prosteric of the Ring	North Se ted our oLondon	Norge Olio Sverige Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar Demar	o Stockholm Ee Caremaa Davida Vinida Vinida Davida	неталь Онесон ал україна Минек сларусь Київ Україна Моїдича па	۵۵۸ ۵۲ ۵۲ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶ ۵۶	кан Ман Мауча обан 19 19 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	лал Е анц ахт убаз оне "	аларанур тай чаларанур тай чаларание ча караларание Казақста	one GOAC One gana a H	s Ale entrico	Sites uppliers
Basic All Q	Add	Rer	nove	Expand			Constant	Contam.	- antana						
Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7]	#	Facility	y Expa.	Product	Expan	Initial Stock, u	Min St	Safety St	Max Stock	Fixed	Fixed	Stock Down P	Stock Safety P	Stock Up Pena	. Product
Demand [1]		Ŧ	T	т	Ŧ	Ŧ	Υ.	Ŧ	٣	T	۲	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ŧ	
Paths [17]	1	2	• •	(All products)		0	0	0	20	\bigcirc	0	0	0	10,000	Product
Product Flows [19]	2	3	• 💽	(All products)		0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
Product Storages [11]	3	4	• •	(All products)		0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
Products [1]	4	5	• 💽	(All products)		0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
Suppliers [2]	5	7	• •	(All products)		0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
	6	1	• 💽	(All products)		0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
	7	1	• •	(All products)		0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
	8	1	• 💽	(All products)		0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
	9	6	• •	(All products) =		0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product
	10	6	•	(All products)		0	0	0	10	\bigcirc	0	0	0	10,000	Product
	11	6	• •	(All products) *		0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	10,000	Product

Fig. 20. Storage capacity setup

Costs and profits

Basic All	٩	Add	Ren	nove											
Customers [1]		#	Name		Unit		Cost		Cost	Unit					
DCs and Factories [7]				т		т		т			т				
Demand [1]			D. J. M		2		0.4		LICD						
Paths [10]		1	Product 1		m³	v	0.4		USD)	Ŧ				
Product Flows [12]															
Product Storages [7]															
Products [1]															
Suppliers															
0								any	Logistix	- New p	roject				
File Extensions Settings Help	1										THE COLOR	(
GFA NO SIM + L					-	8		🌚 🔛	abc					2. 6	
New scenario 3	Da	ta			kjavík _o	and a suble									
Copy of Paper Pepsi 2	NC) experi	ment									Suc	mi	Al	PX
12 NO Warehouses and cross	Cu	stom ex	periment					1/1		APAN (
Scenario 1	EXI	lernai ta	IDIG2							Norge Osloo		° _H	elsinki	5 Lustomer 5 ^{вол}	
Darya Pavlov with returns two								1		No No	verige o St	Eest	ii ilet	ербург	roc
Paper Pepsi 1_edited									losth Can	4	Saure	atvija	пск		RE.
Scenario 2 (upgraded)								United	vorin seu	Danmark		Lietuv	pro-	Москва ни моя Но	о ижний чув вгород
								Kingdom			6	Vilnius	Минск	KA.8. P.83	y,n
2 Pepsi 1_edited							Repub	lic of Birmingham		Harrig		A Abe.	парусь	EDG OPA AND TAN	
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1							Irela	ind of	Nede	rland	erin Pok			KYC	ПЕН
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery '							Irela	oL	ondon 1 2	erland eutschla Luxembourg	Cesko	15	Ки	ив бел вор Харків	DEH CAF BOT
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO							Irela	ord of or	ondon 1 2 2 5 5 5 5 5	erland Eutschla Luxembourg	Cesko Unchen	kc7 Jdapest	ки Укра	кус БВ БЕЛ ВОР Харків вор Дніпропетровсью Рос	BOT CAP
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded							Irela	and o oL	ance St	erland putschla Luxembourg hweiz / often rizzera	Cesko Unchen Ljubljana	key Jaapest Român	оки Укра Moldova	кус БВ Харків вор 11На одніпропетровськ ростов Донуростов Донуростов Оростов Дону	DEN CAF BOT BOT BONTOT
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded							Irela	nnd OL Bay of Biscay	Nede ondon 1 2 2 3 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	o Milano	errin Pok Cesko Sloven unchen Ljubljana Hrvatsk	kcq idapest Român 64ja - Bucu	Ku Ykpa Moldova Ila	кус Барків вор Лніпропетровсью ростов Пону Арасна Арасн	пен сар вог вог волгог ста ста
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded							frela	Bay of Biscay	ance Sv	outschla Luxembourg hweiz / o ^M lisse / Oste lizzera oMilano Ita Roma	enin pol od Cesko unchen Sloven unchen Sloven unchen Sloven trreich Ujubljana Hrvatsk Cp Iia Podgo	кс7 Idapest Român бија – Виси гіса Бълга	ки Укра Moldova IIa rresti. В рия tanbul	кус в бёл арр Дніпропетровськ рос Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Росто Дону Манаронетровська Сараб	САР ВОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОГ « ВОЛГОГ » « ВОЛГОТ » « ВОПСОТ » «
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All	A	dd	Remove	Expar	nd		Irela	nnd OL Bay of Biscay	Nede	ertand eutschla Luxembourg hweiz / Oste izzera oMilano Ita Roma	rreich Lubbjana Hrvatsk Ceg unchen Lubbjana Hrvatsk Cp Lia Podgo Tirana	kcy Jidapest Român Gwja – Bucc Trica Gwjra Jis	Ки Укра Moldova on ia resti вия tanbul,	кус в бел вор Харків вор іна адніпропетровсь росто Дону Iack Sea Samsun Ир	тен сар вот « о ^{Волгог} « о ^{Волгог} « о ^{Волгог} « о ^{Сар} « о ^{Волгог} « о ^{Сар} « о ^{Волгог}
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints	A	dd	Remove	Expar	nd	Malua	2	Ind OL Bay of Biscay	Nede andon 1 5 2 3 3 5 5 3 3 5 5 9 3 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	offiand outschla Luxembourg hweiz / offic issee / Oste issee / Oste	Cesko unchen Sloven sreich Ljubljana Hrvatsk Cp lia Podgo Tirana	kc7 Idapest a Român 64ja - Bucci rrica Sълга is	Ки Укра Moldova nia Presti врия tanbul _n	кус 18 Харнів вой Анпропетровська сака саказин lack Sca Samsun ир	сар вот о Волгог нна- аст ста г- а г- а г-
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM	A(dd Facili	Remove	Expar Expen	nd	Value	Treia	And Cost Unit	Nede ondon 1 D 5cl ance St Bereaton	Annu Contraction C	Cesko unchen Sloven streich ujubljana Hrvatik Dia Podgo Tirano	Român Guja Bucc Irica Guna Is Product	Ku Ykpa Moldova Ila Presti Bpan Banbula tanbula	Annonetpoese isa Annonetpoese ees Poer Alack Sea Assaur Samun Ap	тен вог « волгог « волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог » волгог « волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог » волгог « волгог»» волгог » волгог волгот вост волгот волгот волот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волотот волототот волототот волотототототототототототототототототото
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints	A(dd Facili	Remove ty T	Expar Expen	nd se Type	Value	Trela	Cost Unit	Nede modon 1 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	omilano disso in disso in diss	Han por ord Cesko unchen Slover arreich Ubl/jana Hrvatsk Tirana	Român Român Bucc rrica Eseraria	Ku Ykpa Moldova Ila Presti Bpya B Bya B t Unit	in Carlos and Angels a	тен сан вот « волгог нна- аст ста ста
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1]	A(dd Facili 2	Remove ty T	Expan Expension Other	se Type costs	Value 0.02	T	And Column Bay of Biscay Cost Unit USD	Nede modon 1 b sciance 50 Baccalae	hveiz / o ^M hveiz / o ^M oMiano itaa Roma ^C Time Ut	Ann Pol- od Cesko unchen Sloven irreich (in i lubilano Tirrana nit Tirrana	reg Idapest Român Guja - Bucu rica Esura Is	Moldova nia resti. Bpss B tanbul,	in a construction of the c	тен сан вог саволог ста ста ста ста ста ста
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7]	Ac # 1 2	dd Facili 2 3	Remove ty T	Expan Expension Other Other	nd se Type v costs v	Value 0.02 0.02	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD	Nede modon 1 B sci ance Sv 0 Barraton	ortine Un day day day	Ann pol- de Cesko unchen Storen irreich Liubijan Hrvatsk Tirrana nit	Român Seija Bucu Irica Buru Product	vku Укра Moldova ila Presti Ianbuln tunit	in a series of the series of t	тен сан вог сан вог сан ста ста ста ста ста ста ста
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1]	A(# 1 2 3	dd Facili 2 3 4	Remove ty T	Expan Expension Other Other	nd se Type costs costs	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD	• Nede moden 1 • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	Time U day day day day	Ann port Cesko unchen Citybijan Citybijan Hrvatsk Tirana	rica Idapest Român Guia Guia Is Product	Ku V Kpa Prosti ia Prosti ia Prosti ianbul _n	and an and a set of a	САР САР САР САР САР САР САР САР
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8]	Ad # 1 2 3 4	dd Facili 2 3 4 7	Remove ty T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	Expense Expense Other Other Other	se Type costs costs cost	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD	neden noden 1 s ance Sy ♥ ascention	Time U day day day day day	trans	Român Român Burria Burria Is	Ku V Kpa Moldova Gan Testl Banbuln E Unit	and an and a set of the set of th	тен сан вог « Волгог ста ста кссар Алг Кссар Алг
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups	Add # 1 2 3 4 5	dd Facili 2 3 4 7 2	Remove ty v v	Expension Expension Other Other Other Other Carryi	se Type costs v costs v costs v costs v costs v costs v	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD	ance su	Time Un day day day day day day day	trans	Român Gaja Bucc rrea Bucc rrea Bucc Product	Ka Ykpa Oresti Ia Presti Banbula tunit	Autorities autori	тем авот сал авот сал оболгог ста ста ста ста ста ста ста ста ста ста
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges	A(4) # 1 2 3 4 5 6	dd Facili 2 3 4 7 2 3	Remove ty v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	Expan Expension Other Other Other Carryi Carryi	costs v costs v costs v costs v costs v	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD	• exercise • exer	Time Un day day day day day day day day	mit view of the second	Român Gaja Bucc rica Guna Product M ³ M ³	Ka Y Kpa Oresti Ia Presti Banbun S Unit	Autorities and an antiparticle and antiparticle antipart	CAA CAA BOT CAA BOT CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CA
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges Location Lists	A(# 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	dd Facili 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 3 4	Remove ty v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	Expar Expen Other Other Other Carryi Carryi	costs v costs v costs v costs v costs v ng cost v ng cost v	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD USD		Time Un day day day day day day day day day day	mit view of the second	m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³	Kur Ykpa Moldova esti. B ianbu, t Unit Y	Autorities and a second and a s	CAA CAA BOT CAA BOT CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CAA CA
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges Location Lists Locations [8]	Add # 1 1 2 3 3 4 5 6 6 7 7 8	dd 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7	Remove ty v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	Expan Expen Other Other Other Carryi Carryi Carryi	costs v costs v costs v costs v costs v ng cost v ng cost v ng cost v	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0	Trea	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD		Time Un day day day day day day day day day day	mit view of the second	m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³	Kur Ykpa Moldova uia Pesti B tunbu, tunit Y	Autority and Autor	сала вот вот нав. аст ста ста истон ч ч ч ч ч ч ч ч ч ч ч ч ч
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges Location Lists Locations [8] Objective Members	A(# 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	dd 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7	Remove	Expan Expension Other Other Other Carryi Carryi	se Type se Type costs costs costs ng cost ng cost ng cost costs	Value O.02 O.02 O.02 O.02 O.02 O.02 O.02 O.02	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD		Time Un day day day day day day day day day day	mit view of the second	m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³	Kur Ykpa Moldova Ia Pesti B I Unit T	Autority and Autor	сала сала вог савот саболого соста
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q. Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges Location Lists Locations [8] Objective Members	Ad # 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8	dd 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8	Remove ty v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	Expar Expen Other Other Carryi Carryi Carryi Carryi	nd se Type costs costs costs costs ng cost ng cost ng cost	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.001 0.001 0.001	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD		Time Un day day day day day day day day day day	mile in pole cesko unchen Surreich of Unbland Podgo Trrans nit T nit	m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³	Ku V k pa V k pa Presti pan anbula t Unit	Alemontorecore A	сан алл алл алл алл алл алл алл а
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges Location Lists Locations [8] Ohiertive Memberc Basic All Q Customers [1]	Ad # 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 Add	dd 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 7 8 reciliu 2 3 4 7 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8 7 8	Remove ty v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	Expan Expen Other Other Carryi Carryi Carryi Carryi	nd se Type v costs costs costs ng cost ng cost ng cost ng cost v ng cost	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.001 0.001 0.001	Ţ	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD		Time Un day day day day day day day day	millian politication of the second se	m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³	Kur V k pa Moldova Presti Banbula t Unit	Alenponeroorea Alenponeroorea Alenponeroorea Alenponeroorea Alenponeroorea Poneroorea Alenponeroorea Poneroorea Alenponeroorea Poneroorea	CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q. Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges Location Lists Locations [8] Objective Members Basic All Q. Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7]	Add # 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 Add # # C	dd 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 7 2 8 7 7 7 8 7 7 7 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Remove ty v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	Expan Expen Other Other Carryi Carryi Carryi Carryi aand	nd se Type costs costs costs ng cost ng cost ng cost ng cost ng cost	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.0	T	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD	The second secon	Time Un day day day day day day day day day day	evenue	m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³	Kur V k pa Presti Banbul t Unit T	 Additional and the second secon	CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL CALL
2 Pepsi 1_edited 3 Pepsi 1_edited 1 Pepsi edited 1with Recovery ' Two stage, on period NO Copy of Scenario 2 (upgraded Basic All Q. Assets Constraints BOM Custom Constraints Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1] Facility Expenses [8] Groups Indicator Constraints Linear Ranges Location Lists Locations [8] Objective Members Basic All Q Customers [1] DCs and Factories [7] Demand [1]	Add # 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 Add # C	dd 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 2 3 4 7 7 8 7 7 8 7 8 7 7 8 7 8 7 7 8 7 8 7	Remove ty v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v	Expan Expen Other Other Carryi Carryi Carryi Carryi aand	nd se Type v costs v costs v ng cost v cost v cost v cost v cost v cost v cost v cost v cost	Value 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.0	T	Cost Unit USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD USD	The second secon	Time United and a second a sec	Cesko C	m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³ m ³	wun Penalt	 Additional and the second secon	r men sor sor sor sor sor created as created as sort version v

Fig. 21. Costs and profits

Network optimization results

Fig. 22 presents network optimization results.

L.,																				
	. Period	From		То	Product	Flow	Flow min	Flow max	Percentage	Flo	Flow Over Cost	Distance	_ 0	Trar	sportation Trans	portation I.	. I	Flow Cost, per i.	. Penalty	
1	Time period 1	5		Customer 5	Product 1	100.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0 0.01	1.0			0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	4		5	Product 1	90.0	0.0	100.0	90.0	0.0	100,000.0	1,019.26	0	0 0.01	0.9			0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	2		4	Product 1	20.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	0.0	100,000.0	1,200.56	0	0 0.01	0.2		-	0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	3		4	Product 1	20.0	0.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	517.53	0	0 0.01	0.2			0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	Supplie	r1	1	Product 1	100.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0 0.01	1.0		-	0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	1		2	Product 1	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	305.51	0.	0 0.01	0.5		-	0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	6		4	Product 1	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	764.61	0	0 0.01	0.5		-	0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	Z	- 6	5	Product 1	30.0	0.0	30.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	2,020.77	0	0 0.01	0.3		-	0.01	0.0	
1	Time period 1	1	10	3	Product 1	30.0	0.0	30.0	100.0	0.0	100,000,0	928.16		0 0.01	0.3		-	0.01	0.0	
1 1	Time period 2	3		4	Product 1	20.0	0.0	20.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	517.53	_ 0	0 0.01	0.2		-	0.01	0.0	
2 1	Time period 2	4		5	Product 1	90.0	0.0	100.0	90.0	0.0	100,000.0	1,019.26	0	0 0.01	0.9		-	0.01	0.0	
3 1	Time period 2	Supplie	r 1	1	Product 1	50.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0 0.01	0.5		-	0.01	0.0	
4 1	Time period 2	Supplie	r 6	6	Product 1	60.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0 0.01	0.6			0.01	0.0	
5 1	Time period 2	5		Customer 5	Product 1	100.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0 0.01	1.0		-	0.01	0.0	
5 1	Time period 2	6		4	Product 1	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	764.61	0.	0 0.01	0.5			0.01	0.0	
7 1	Time period 2	1		2	Product 1	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	305.51	0	0 0.01	0.5		-	0.01	0.0	
B 1	Time period 2	2		5	Product 1	30.0	0.0	30.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	2,020.77	0	0 0.01	0.3			0.01	0.0	
	Time period 2	1		3	Product 1	20.0	0.0	50.0	40.0	0.0	100,000.0	928.10		0 0.01	0.2		-	0.01	0.0	
1 1	Time period 2	3		4	Product 1	10.0	0.0	20.0	50.0	0.0	100,000.0	517.53	0	0 0.01	0.2			0.01	0.0	
2 1	Time period 3	Supplie	r 6	6	Product 1	50.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	_ 0	0 0.01	0.5		-	0.01	0.0	
3 1	Time period 3	6		4	Product 1	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	100,000.0	764.61	0	0 0.01	0.5			0.01	0.0	
4 1	Time period 3	5		Customer 5	Product 1	100.0	0.0	0.0	-1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.	0 0.01	1.0		-	0.01	0.0	
5 1	Time period 3	4		5	Product 1	60.0	0.0	100.0	60.0	0.0	100,000.0	1,019.26	0	0 0.01	0.6		-	0.01	0.0	
ings	sites		3	1	Time period 3	Customer	5 Pror	duct 1	100.0		100.0	100.0	100.0		1.0	100.0		10,000.0	0.0	
ucuu	on cost																			
uctio ple f ple s and tle flo	on cost on flows flow constrai storage const ows	nts traints	٢	Overall	stats															
uctio iple f and cle flo es fi: rkin	on flows flow constrai storage const ows x ng sites	nts traints	<	Overall	stats	ion cost		Other cost	L.	Carr	ving cost	Inventory	purch	Re	evenue	Penalties		Objective	e custo	Profit
uctio iple f iple s and cle flo rkin rage	on flows flow constrai storage const ows ows x ng sites e by produ	nts traints	¢	Overall	stats	ion cost	<u> </u>	Other cost	I	Carr	ying cost	Inventory	purch	Re	venue	Penalties		Objective	e custo	Profit
uctio ple f ple s and de flo rkin rage duc	on flows flow constrai flow constrai storage const ows ows x ag sites e by produ ction cost	nts traints	¢	Overall	stats Transportati 13.0	ion cost		Other cost 87.6	I	Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	evenue	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
ictio ple f ple s and le flo s fix kin age duc	on flows flow constrai storage consi ows x ng sites e by produ ction cost	nts traints ICt	¢	Overall	stats Transportati 13.0	ion cost	I 0	Other cost 87.6		Carr	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re 30	evenue 0.0	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
action ple f ple s and le flo rkin rage duc duc tipl	on flows flow constrai storage consi ows ag sites e by produ- ction cost ction flows le flow cor	nts traints ICt strain	ts	Overall	stats Transportati 13.0	ion cost	- I 0 	Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re 30	evenue	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
uctio ple f ple s and cle flo rs fit rage duc duc duc	n flows no flows flow constrai storage const ows x ng sites e by produ ttion cost ttion flows le flow cor	nts iraints ict	ts	Overall	stats Transportati 13.0	ion cost	- <u>L.</u> (Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re 30	venue 0.0	Penalties		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
uctio iple f iple s and cle flo es fix rkin rage duc duc ltipl	nn flows nn flows flow constrai storage const ows x x ng sites e by produ- ttion cost ction flows le flow cor le storage	nts iraints ict strain consti	< ts raints	Overall	stats Transportati 13.0	ion cost	- <u>I</u> (Other cost 87.6	 	Carr 7.3	ying cost 	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	ivenue 0.0	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
uctio iple f iple s and cle flo rkin rage duc duc ltipl ltipl	n cost no n flows low constrai storage const ows x ng sites e by produ- tition cost tition cost tition flows le flow cor le storage nd	nts traints ICt strain constr	ts	Overall	stats Transportati 13.0	ion cost	. I V	Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	evenue 0.0	Penalties		Objectiva 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
uctio iple f iple s and cle fic es fix rkin rage duc duc ltipl ltipl mar	n cost no now no now low constrai ows ows x g sites e by produ- ction cost ction cost ction cost ction cost e flows o flows	nts traints ICt istrain constr	ts	Overall	stats Transportati 13.0	ion cost	- I	Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	evenue 0.0	Penalties		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
uctio iple f iple s and cle flo es fix rkin rage duc duc duc ltipl ltipl mar nicle	n cost no now low constrai cows w g sites e by produ- tion cost tion cost tion flows e flow cor e storage d e flows	nts traints ICt strain constr	ts	Overall	stats Transportat 13.0	ion cost	I	Other cost 87.6	I 	Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	o.0	Penalties		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
uctio ple f ple s and cle fle cs fix rkin rage duc duc duc ltipl ltipl mar icle	n cost no norm norm storage const ows x ag sites e by produ- tion cost tion cost tion cost tion cost e flow cor e flows d expression d expression	nts traints ict strain constr	ts	Overall 1 1	stats Transportat 13.0	ion cost	- h a a 1	Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	evenue 0.0	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
and ple f ple s and le fle s fix rage duc tipl tipl nar icle nec	n loss no norm low constrai storage const ows x g sites e by produ- tion cost tion cost tion cost tion flows le flow cor- le storage nd d expression d expression ive Memb	nts traints ict strain constr ons ers	ts	Overall	stats Transportat 13.0	ion cost		Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	ivenue	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
action ple f ple s and le fle s fix rkin rage duc tipl tipl nar icle nection	In Cost In More In Rows In Row	nts traints ict strain constr ons ers	ts	Overall	stats Transportat 13.0	ion cost		Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	o.0	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit 68.1
action iple f iple s and cle flo s fiz rkin rage duc duc duc ltipl ltipl icle nec ecti sral	n fows no flows low constrai storage const ows x mg sites e by produ- tion cost tion cost tion cost tion flows e flow cor e flows d e storage nd flows d expression d expression ive Memb ll stats	nts iraints ict istrain constr ons ers	ts	Overall	stats Transportat 13.0	ion cost		Other cost 87.6		Carr 7.3	ying cost	Inventory 124.0	purch	Re	o.0	Penalties 0.0		Objective 0.0	e custo	Profit (68.1

Fig. 22. Network optimization results

It can be observed from Fig. 22 that a total profit of 68.1 monetary units can be achieved whereby the demand is 100% met. The network optimal distribution plan has also been computed subject to the considered disruption scenario. This plan can be used as a contingency/recovery plan in the event of the real disruptions.

Additional features

In the given example, we applied some of the network optimization functionality of anyLogistix. Indeed, anyLogistix network optimizer can do much more. For example, you may extend the problem statements by adding new parameters or constraints in terms of processing time and costs at the DCs, considering demand and lead times not as fixed parameters but rather as stochastic variables, or by including sales batches. For more advanced application, custom constraints, indicator constraints, and linear ranges can be used to develop specific control policies, e.g., return flows in the supply chain. Moreover, it is always possible to customize the factory, warehouse, supplier, and customer agents in Any Logic and create any kind of network optimization model.

References

- 1. *Ivanov D., Sokolov B., Pavlov A.* (2014) Optimal distribution (re)planning in a centralized multi-stage network under conditions of ripple effect and structure dynamics, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 237(2), 758-770.
- 2. Ivanov D., Tsipoulanidis, A., Schönberger, J. (2017) *Global Supply Chain and Operations Management: A decision-oriented introduction into the creation of value*, Springer, ISBN 978-3-319-24217-0.
- 3. Ivanov D. (2017) *Supply Chain Simulation and Optimization with anyLogistix*. HWR Berlin, available at <u>https://www.anylogistix.com/upload/alx-book.pdf</u> and <u>https://blog.hwr-berlin.de/ivanov</u>
- 4. Ivanov D. (2018). *Structural Dynamics and Resilience in Supply Chain Risk Management*. Springer, New York.