Alternatives To Holding Inventories

Posted on September 5, 2019

Introduction

Inventory protects a business from uncertain demand, supply disruption, production imbalance, and long replenishment times, but it also ties up cash and creates storage, insurance, handling, obsolescence, damage, shrinkage, and expiry costs. The original essay correctly identifies drop shipping and par levels as methods for reducing stock. It overstates the idea that the disadvantages of inventory always exceed the benefits and describes all holding cost as something a company should eliminate completely. Zero inventory is rarely realistic. A hospital, manufacturer, retailer, and spare-parts supplier face different consequences when stock is unavailable. The strategic goal is to reduce unnecessary inventory while preserving service, continuity, quality, and resilience. Alternatives include postponement, make-to-order production, vendor-managed inventory, consignment, cross-docking, collaborative planning, capacity flexibility, repair and remanufacturing, and digital products. (Axsäter)

Why Businesses Hold Inventory

Cycle stock supports normal demand between replenishment orders. Safety stock protects against forecast and lead-time variability. Seasonal stock is accumulated before a predictable peak, while pipeline inventory is moving through transport or production. Decoupling stock allows one process to continue when another stops. (Silver)

These categories should be separated because the correct alternative depends on the reason the stock exists. Reducing cycle stock through smaller orders does not necessarily reduce safety stock caused by an unreliable supplier. (Womack)

The Total Cost of Inventory

Inventory cost includes more than warehouse rent. Capital has an opportunity cost because cash in stock cannot fund another investment. Products require labor, systems, insurance, security, energy, and space. Some deteriorate physically; others become obsolete through fashion, regulation, technology, or model change. Unsold goods may be discounted, returned, recycled, or discarded.

Stockouts also have costs: lost margin, production downtime, emergency freight, penalties, and damaged customer trust. Decisions should compare both sides rather than celebrate the lowest quantity.

Demand Forecasting and Segmentation

Forecast improvement can reduce uncertainty, but no forecast eliminates it. Businesses should segment items by value, demand variability, criticality, shelf life, and lead time. Stable high-volume items can use different policies from intermittent spare parts or perishable goods.

ABC analysis ranks items by financial importance, while XYZ or variability classifications add demand behavior. A combined system prevents management effort from being distributed equally across items with very different risk.

Make to Order

In a make-to-order system, production begins after a customer commits to purchase. This reduces finished-goods inventory and supports customization. It is suitable when customers tolerate lead time and when production capacity can respond reliably.

The method shifts pressure toward raw materials, components, capacity, and scheduling. It can fail when buyers expect immediate delivery or when every order requires lengthy engineering.

Engineer to Order

Engineer-to-order businesses design and build complex products after receiving a contract. Construction equipment, industrial systems, and customized facilities may follow this model. The company avoids speculative finished products but must manage project risk, supplier lead times, and change requests.

Standard modules and design libraries can reduce engineering time without converting the product into mass inventory.

Postponement

Postponement delays final differentiation until demand is clearer. A company may hold a common base product and add color, language, packaging, software, or accessories after receiving regional or customer information. This pools risk across variants.

Postponement requires product and process design that permits late customization. It can reduce the wrong stock while increasing the need for flexible final operations.

Drop Shipping

Drop shipping allows a retailer to sell an item that a supplier ships directly to the customer. The retailer reduces warehouse and handling requirements and can offer a broader assortment. The supplier holds the inventory risk.

The model also reduces control over packaging, delivery, returns, and product availability. Long shipping times, counterfeit goods, inconsistent tracking, and thin margins can damage the retailer's brand. Supplier integration and clear service agreements are essential.

Vendor-Managed Inventory

Under vendor-managed inventory, the supplier receives demand and stock data and takes responsibility for replenishing agreed locations. The approach can reduce bullwhip effects and administrative delay because the supplier sees consumption directly.

It requires trust, data quality, agreed minimum and maximum levels, ownership rules, and performance measures. A vendor may otherwise optimize its shipments rather than the customer's total cost.

Consignment Inventory

With consignment, stock is physically located at the customer or retailer but remains owned by the supplier until it is consumed or sold. The customer reduces working-capital investment and gains availability.

The supplier carries financial risk and needs accurate usage records. Contracts must address damage, insurance, slow-moving stock, returns, and reconciliation.

Cross-Docking

Cross-docking moves goods from inbound transport to outbound shipment with little or no storage. It is effective for predictable high-volume flows, preallocated store orders, or products requiring rapid movement. It reduces handling and dwell time.

The method depends on synchronized schedules, accurate labeling, transport reliability, and information systems. A disruption can create congestion because the facility has limited buffer.

Just in Time and Lean Replenishment

Just-in-time systems reduce inventory by improving flow, quality, setup time, and supplier coordination. They are not simply a demand to deliver parts at the last moment. Lean production seeks to expose problems rather than hide them behind excessive buffers.

Very low stock can make a network vulnerable when lead times are long or disruption is correlated across suppliers. Strategic buffers and dual sourcing can coexist with lean principles.

Par Levels and Reorder Points

A par level is a target quantity used to trigger replenishment. More formally, a reorder point combines expected demand during lead time with safety stock. Setting it requires actual consumption, lead-time variation, service goals, and review frequency.

A fixed par level becomes inaccurate when demand or supply changes. Automated alerts help only when inventory records and parameters are maintained.

Collaborative Planning and Information Sharing

Retailers and suppliers can share forecasts, promotions, point-of-sale data, capacity, and exceptions through collaborative planning, forecasting, and replenishment. Visibility reduces duplicated buffers caused by each party guessing what the other will do.

Information sharing cannot eliminate biased forecasts or commercial conflict. Partners need rules for data use, accountability, and how promotional risk is divided.

Flexible Capacity

A business can respond to peaks through overtime, temporary labor, subcontracting, flexible shifts, or multipurpose equipment instead of building inventory far in advance. Service businesses often rely principally on capacity because their output cannot be stored.

Flexibility has limits. Excessive overtime creates fatigue, temporary labor requires training, and subcontractors can introduce quality and labor risks.

Shorter and More Reliable Lead Times

Reducing supplier and internal lead time lowers the amount of demand that must be forecast before replenishment arrives. Process simplification, local sourcing, faster approval, smaller batches, and reliable transport can reduce inventory structurally.

A nominally short average is insufficient if variability is high. Reliability often reduces safety stock more effectively than shaving a small amount from the average.

Multiple Sourcing and Supplier Development

Dual or multiple sourcing can reduce dependence on one supplier and permit faster recovery, although splitting volume may reduce scale economies. Supplier development improves quality, capacity, planning, and problem solving so less protective stock is needed.

Geographic diversity should consider shared upstream dependencies. Two suppliers may rely on the same factory, port, or raw material.

Digital and Service Substitution

Some physical inventory can be replaced by digital delivery, remote service, or access models. Software downloads replace packaged media, predictive maintenance can prevent spare-parts demand, and product-as-a-service models allow a provider to pool assets across customers.

Digital substitution creates cybersecurity, licensing, connectivity, and customer-acceptance issues. It is an option only when the underlying value can genuinely be delivered without the physical item.

Repair, Reuse, and Remanufacturing

Repair and remanufacturing can replace some new-product or spare-parts inventory by returning used assets to service. Modular design and harvested components improve recovery. A closed-loop system can reduce material cost and disposal.

Quality testing, warranties, reverse logistics, and traceability are necessary so reused parts do not create safety or reputational problems.

Shared Inventory and Risk Pooling

Organizations can pool inventory across stores, hospitals, service centers, or companies and transfer it when demand emerges. Centralization reduces variability relative to separate local buffers but may increase delivery time.

An effective network decides which critical items need local availability and which can be held centrally. Emergency mutual-aid agreements can extend pooling across organizations.

Backorders and Customer Choice

A firm may accept backorders, reservations, preorders, or customer-selected delivery dates instead of holding every item for immediate service. Transparent lead times can convert uncertain demand into committed demand.

This method is unsuitable when delay creates safety risk or customers can switch easily. Compensation and communication should be designed before shortages occur.

Choosing the Best Alternative

The decision should consider service target, contribution margin, demand pattern, lead time, shelf life, criticality, substitution, minimum order, supply risk, and customer tolerance. A portfolio usually combines methods. High-volume staples may use lean replenishment; configurable products may use postponement; long-tail items may be drop-shipped; critical spares may retain safety stock. (Chopra)

Performance should be measured through total cost, fill rate, lead time, forecast bias, obsolete stock, cash conversion, and disruption recovery rather than inventory turns alone.

Conclusion

Alternatives to holding inventory do not remove the need to balance supply and demand; they relocate or reduce the buffer through information, capacity, contracts, product design, and time. Drop shipping, make-to-order production, postponement, vendor-managed and consignment stock, cross-docking, lead-time reduction, flexible capacity, pooling, and repair can all reduce unnecessary holdings. Each introduces new dependencies and service risks. The best inventory strategy does not pursue zero stock as an ideology. It holds the smallest economically and operationally justified buffer while designing the network to learn, replenish, adapt, and recover. (Wang)

Bibliography

Axsäter, Sven. *Inventory Control*. 3rd ed., Springer, 2015.

Chopra, Sunil, and Peter Meindl. *Supply Chain Management*. Pearson, 2022.

Silver, Edward A., David F. Pyke, and Douglas J. Thomas. *Inventory and Production Management in Supply Chains*. CRC Press, 2017.

Womack, James P., and Daniel T. Jones. *Lean Thinking*. Simon & Schuster, 2003.

Wang, H., et al. “Inventory Commitment and Prioritized Backlogging Clearance.” *Production and Operations Management*, vol. 23, no. 7, 2014, pp. 1227–1242.