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## Overview

- IKEA
- Large furniture franchise
- Stores in 37 countries
- 23 stores in US
- 2 major distribution centers in US
- US Business Plan
- Add 10 stores in 10 years
- Locations of 4 stores over next 2 years are known


## Project Scope

- 1 Distribution Center
- Elizabeth, NJ
- Currently supplies 9 IKEA stores
- Current Range
- New Haven, CT to Woodbridge, VA
- Addition of 2 stores over next 2 years
- Projected Range
- Stoughton, MA to Atlanta, GA


## Objectives

- Determine current fleet size required to meet demand at current stores
- Determine projected fleet size required to meet demand at projected stores
- Determine shipping patterns required to minimize backorders while maintaining current fleet size


## Data Collection

|  | Distance | Time |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Name | (miles) | (hours) |
| Baltimore, MD | 163.9 | 9.5 |
| College Park, MD | 205.5 | 10.9 |
| Conshohocken, PA | 85.4 | 6.8 |
| Long Island, NY | 44.4 | 5.5 |
| New Haven, CT | 94.2 | 7.1 |
| Paramus, NJ | 25.8 | 4.9 |
| Philadelphia, PA | 87.0 | 6.9 |
| Pittsburgh, PA | 373.7 | 16.5 |
| Woodbridge, VA | 246.3 | 12.2 |
| Atlanta, GA | 870.9 | 33.0 |
| Stoughton, MA | 232.5 | 11.8 |


| $\#$ | Name | Average <br> Weekly <br> Sales | \% of CP <br> Share |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | $(\$)$ | (\%) |
| 1 | Baltimore | 723435 | 0.51 |
| 2 | College Park | 1416900 | 1.00 |
| 3 | Conshohocken | 855169 | 0.60 |
| 4 | Elizabeth | 2288023 | 1.61 |
| 5 | Long Island | 1668408 | 1.18 |
| 6 | New Haven | 1479180 | 1.04 |
| 7 | Paramus | 1352761 | 0.95 |
| 8 | Philadelphia | 596127 | 0.42 |
| 9 | Pittsburgh | 545633 | 0.39 |
| 10 | Woodbridge | 1165350 | 0.82 |
| 11 | Atlanta | 1209099 | 0.85 |
| 12 | Stoughton | 1209099 | 0.85 |

## Data Collection

－ 39 products
－Data collected April 15 （Week 15）
－Avg．sales／week＝ total sales year to date／15
－Apply sales ratios

| Product Number | Average Per Week |  |  |  |  |  | $Q_{\substack{\text { S } \\ \text { E }}}^{\substack{\text { S}}}$ |  |  | 8is | な | ぶ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 51．1\％ | 100．0\％ | 60．4\％ | 117．8\％ | 104．4\％ | 95．5\％ | 42．1\％ | 38．5\％ | 82．2\％ | 85．0\％ | 85．0\％ |
| 1 | 602.7 | 308 | 603 | 364 | 710 | 630 | 576 | 254 | 233 | 496 | 513 | 513 |

## Simulation 1

- Goalk Determine current fleet size required to meet or exceed demand at current stores
- Constraints: Supply >= Demand (no backorders)
- Input: Pallet capacity, weekly sales, delivery hours


## Simulation 2

- Goal: Determine projected fleet size required to meet or exceed demand at projected stores
- Constraints: Supply >= Demand (no backorders)
- Input: Pallet capacity, weekly sales, delivery hours


## Results

- Simulation 1:
- Minimum required fleet size $=2$ trucks/week
- Simulation 2:
- Minimum required fleet size $=3$ trucks/week

■ Implications:

- Sample size $=39$, Population size $>14,000$
- Addition of over 350 trucks


## Optimization

- Scope
- Limited to one week
- Use average inventory over year
- Limited to one store at a time
- Pre-allocate trucks based on share of sales


## Optimization

- Objective function: Minimize backorders
- Constraints: Pallets shipped = Pallets allocated, integer
- Input: Average inventory, weekly demand, pallet capacity, allocated truck trips


## Results

| Store <br> Number | Store Name | Total <br> Backorders | \% Backordered |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$|$| 1 | Baltimore | 5 | 0.25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | College Park | 280 | 7.17 |
| 3 | Conshohocken | 58 | 2.45 |
| 4 | Long Island | 262 | 5.70 |
| 5 | New Haven | 345 | 8.46 |
| 6 | Paramus | 229 | 6.14 |
| 7 | Philadelphia | 58 | 3.51 |
| 8 | Pittsburgh | 100 | 6.60 |
| 9 | Woodbridge | 157 | 4.89 |
| 10 | Atlanta | 140 | 4.22 |
| 11 | Stoughton | 88 | 2.65 |
| Total |  | 1722 |  |
| Average |  | 156.545455 | 4.73 |

## Results

- If current fleet is not expanded, 5 of 11 stores do not meet 95\% of the demand.
- May be unacceptable in maintaining customer satisfaction


## Recommendations

- Based on meeting 95\% of demand, we would recommend expanding the fleet used to ship these 39 products by one truck.
- An optimal decision cannot be made without a cost-benefit analysis

