## Pre-Positioning and Local-Purchasing for Emergency Operations Under Budget and Supply Uncertainty

Mahyar Eftekhar, Carey School of Business, ASU

Joint with Jeannette Song (Duke) and Scott Webster (ASU) February 28, 2023

MIT Center for Transportation & Logistics

Background



#### 2/45

## Background







The frequency, the intensity and the severity of disasters are in a fast-growing trend.

Effective response to rapid-onset disasters (e.g., earthquake) is extremely challenging due to the **unknowns**; when? where? how many?

## Background



**Immediate relief period** is the most critical stage of response operations.

## Background



**Primary goals:** (i) quick response, and (ii) securing enough supply of life-saving items (e.g., water, sanitation, and food). International HOs typically adopt two policies to fulfill the demand: proactive or reactive.

### **Background: Common Practice**

**Proactive policy**: Prepositioning inventory at strategic locations e.g., World Vision International (4 sites), UN Humanitarian Response Depot (6 sites).



Advantages: Enough time to buy and store the selected relief items, at a low purchase price with assurance of quality.



Challenges: Demand uncertainty, ignoring political, economic, demographic and environmental realities of the affected areas.



## **Background: Common Practice**

#### Reactive policy: Using local supply aftermath of a disaster



Advantages: More precise demand estimation, culturally accepted products, and stimulation of the local economy



Challenges: Supply uncertainty due to e.g., collapsing the banking system, or competition among HOs.





Optimal level of prepo, if prioritizing reactive supply?





- US-based international HO operating in 110 countries
- 5,000 employees around the world, revenue  $\sim$  \$1 billion
- contributes in development programs
- provides relief in emergencies
- at time of disaster, CRS distributes a subset of 20 commodities e.g., blankets, jerrycans, hygiene kits, household/kitchen kits, and prepackaged food kits.
- CRS stores its inventories in 2 strategically located warehouses; Philippines and Madagascar, as well as UNHRD's Dubai, Panama and Accra sites.
- informed us that almost no HO has a guideline to determine prepo level.





- US-based international HO operating in 110 countries
- 5,000 employees around the world, revenue  $\sim$  \$1 billion
- contributes in development programs
- · provides relief in emergencies
- at time of disaster, CRS distributes a subset of 20 commodities e.g., blankets, jerrycans, hygiene kits, household/kitchen kits, and prepackaged food kits.
- CRS stores its inventories in 2 strategically located warehouses; Philippines and Madagascar, as well as UNHRD's Dubai, Panama and Accra sites.
- informed us that almost no HO has a guideline to determine prepo level.





- US-based international HO operating in 110 countries
- 5,000 employees around the world, revenue  $\sim$  \$1 billion
- contributes in development programs
- provides relief in emergencies
- at time of disaster, CRS distributes a subset of 20 commodities e.g., blankets, jerrycans, hygiene kits, household/kitchen kits, and prepackaged food kits.
- CRS stores its inventories in 2 strategically located warehouses; Philippines and Madagascar, as well as UNHRD's Dubai, Panama and Accra sites.
- informed us that almost no HO has a guideline to determine prepo level.





- US-based international HO operating in 110 countries
- 5,000 employees around the world, revenue  $\sim$  \$1 billion
- contributes in development programs
- provides relief in emergencies
- at time of disaster, CRS distributes a subset of 20 commodities e.g., blankets, jerrycans, hygiene kits, household/kitchen kits, and prepackaged food kits.
- CRS stores its inventories in 2 strategically located warehouses; Philippines and Madagascar, as well as UNHRD's Dubai, Panama and Accra sites.
- informed us that almost no HO has a guideline to determine prepo level.

#### Internal audit of four HOs (CRS, CARE, Mercy Corps, and WVI) shows:



Donors are less interested in providing funds for inventory in advance of a disaster.

# **Existing Moldes**

**Location-allocation models:** determining the location of major (or temporary) DCs and prepositioned inventory levels at various warehouses.

**Recent examples:** Duran et al. 2011; Chakravarty 2014; Charles et al. 2016; Paul and MacDonald 2016; Jahre et al. 2016; Noham and Tzur 2017; Ni et al. 2018; Tofighi et al. 2016; Erbeyoğlu and Bilge 2020; Simchi-Levi et al. 2019; Ye et al. 2020.

**Network design and LMD:** proposing models to improve material flow, and so consider reliability of transportation network, vehicle routing, and aspects of equity.

**Few examples:** Barbarosoglu and Arda (2004); Balcik et al. (2008); Huang et al. (2012); Afshar and Haghani (2012); Noyan et al. (2016); Vanajakumari et al. (2016); Dalal and Üster (2017); Mills et al. (2018).

the first stage decisions are made before the realization of random variables, and the second stage recourse variables are determined after realization of the random variables.

- 1 ignore local supply (and its uncertainty) as well as budget uncertainty
- 2 too complex and data-intensive
- 3 require data that is available after disaster strikes
- 4 scenario-based stochastic models lack a realistic base
- 5 all insights are based on numerical illustrations

the first stage decisions are made before the realization of random variables, and the second stage recourse variables are determined after realization of the random variables.

### 1 ignore local supply (and its uncertainty) as well as budget uncertainty

- 2 too complex and data-intensive
- 3 require data that is available after disaster strikes
- 4 scenario-based stochastic models lack a realistic base
- 5 all insights are based on numerical illustrations

the first stage decisions are made before the realization of random variables, and the second stage recourse variables are determined after realization of the random variables.

#### 1 ignore local supply (and its uncertainty) as well as budget uncertainty

- 2 too complex and data-intensive
- 3 require data that is available after disaster strikes
- 4 scenario-based stochastic models lack a realistic base
- 5 all insights are based on numerical illustrations

the first stage decisions are made before the realization of random variables, and the second stage recourse variables are determined after realization of the random variables.

- 1 ignore local supply (and its uncertainty) as well as budget uncertainty
- 2 too complex and data-intensive
- 3 require data that is available after disaster strikes

#### 4 scenario-based stochastic models lack a realistic base

5 all insights are based on numerical illustrations

the first stage decisions are made before the realization of random variables, and the second stage recourse variables are determined after realization of the random variables.

- 1 ignore local supply (and its uncertainty) as well as budget uncertainty
- 2 too complex and data-intensive
- 3 require data that is available after disaster strikes
- 4 scenario-based stochastic models lack a realistic base
- 5 all insights are based on numerical illustrations

What is an optimal level of prepo stock of a single- (and multi-)relief items, in recognition of uncertainty in

demand,

local supply,

time to next disaster, and

funds for local spend?

And, what if we have access to limited data?

## Model

General assumptions and notation:

- *c* is the unit purchasing and transportation cost of prepo.
- Prepo item is more expensive  $(c \ge \alpha c)$ , and we normalize c = 1.



- The time between two events (*T*) is random.
- Demand (*D*), and supply (*Q*) are random, independent of time, and uncorrelated.



- The time between two events (*T*) is random.
- Demand (*D*), and supply (*Q*) are random, independent of time, and uncorrelated.



• The time between two events (*T*) is random.

• Demand (*D*), and supply (*Q*) are random, independent of time, and uncorrelated.



- b includes carryover prepo stock from previous cycle converted into money value.
- Inflow of funds  $(\gamma)$  is at a fixed rate per period, during each cycle.
- Random emergency fund is received right after disaster occurs (*R*).



- *b* includes carryover prepo stock from previous cycle converted into money value.
- Inflow of funds  $(\gamma)$  is at a fixed rate per period, during each cycle.
- Random emergency fund is received right after disaster occurs (*R*).
## Setting



- Available local budget  $(\hat{b}(x, R, T))$  includes the sum of initial budget, cash inflow, and emergency fund minus prepo cost.
- The random local purchase quantity is  $L(x) = \min\{D, Q, \hat{b}(x, R, T)/\alpha\}$ .

## Setting



- Available local budget  $(\hat{b}(x, R, T))$  includes the sum of initial budget, cash inflow, and emergency fund minus prepo cost.
- The random local purchase quantity is  $L(x) = \min\{D, Q, \hat{b}(x, R, T)/\alpha\}$ .

### Expected cost during a cycle is

$$C(x) = E\left[\underbrace{\alpha \min\left\{D, Q, \frac{\hat{b}(x, R, T)}{\alpha}\right\}}_{\text{re-active purchases}} + \underbrace{\min\{x, S(x)\}}_{\text{min}\{x, S(x)\}} + \underbrace{ixT}_{\text{global shortage cost}} + \underbrace{v(S(x) - x)^+}_{\text{global shortage cost}}\right]$$

Expected cost during a cycle is

$$C(x) = E\left[\underbrace{\alpha \min\left\{D, Q, \frac{\hat{b}(x, R, T)}{\alpha}\right\}}_{\text{re-active purchases}} + \underbrace{\min\{x, S(x)\}}_{\text{min}\{x, S(x)\}} + \underbrace{ixT}_{\text{global shortage cost}} + \underbrace{v(S(x) - x)^+}_{\text{global shortage cost}}\right]$$

Uncertain local shortage is

$$S(x) = \left(D - \min\left\{Q, \frac{\hat{b}(x, R, T)}{\alpha}\right\}\right)^+$$

The problem to solve is

$$\min_{x \ge 0} C(x) = \alpha \mu_D + i x \mu_T + (1 - \alpha) E[S(x)] + (v - 1) E[(S(x) - x)^+]$$
  
$$x \le b.$$

#### Three events:

### $\Omega_1\,$ both demand and supply are more than available local budget.

- $\Omega_2$  demand is larger than the sum of local budget and prepo, and supply is more than local budget (i.e., insufficient budget and prepo).
- Ω<sub>3</sub> demand is more than the sum of local supply and prepo, and supply is less than local budget (i.e., insufficient local supply).

#### Three events:

- $\Omega_1\,$  both demand and supply are more than available local budget.
- $\Omega_2$  demand is larger than the sum of local budget and prepo, and supply is more than local budget (i.e., insufficient budget and prepo).
- Ω<sub>3</sub> demand is more than the sum of local supply and prepo, and supply is less than local budget (i.e., insufficient local supply).

#### Three events:

- $\Omega_1\,$  both demand and supply are more than available local budget.
- $\Omega_2$  demand is larger than the sum of local budget and prepo, and supply is more than local budget (i.e., insufficient budget and prepo).
- $\Omega_3$  demand is more than the sum of local supply and prepo, and supply is less than local budget (i.e., insufficient local supply).

C(x) is convex, and optimal prepo stock is

$$x^* = \min\left\{(x^\circ)^+, b\right\}$$

where  $x^{\circ}$  is the optimal unconstrained prepo stock obtained from a unique solution to first-order condition.

The core tradeoff relies on marginal cost vs. marginal saving, which depend on marginal local shortage  $(\frac{1}{\alpha}P[\Omega_1(x)])$  and marginal global shortage  $(\frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}P[\Omega_2(x)] - P[\Omega_3(x)])$ .

- marginal local shortage: the rate at which local shortage increases per unit increase in prepo (under event Ω<sub>1</sub>).
- marginal global shortage: the rate at which global shortage increases per unit increase in prepo (under event Ω<sub>2</sub>), and per unit decrease in prepo (under event Ω<sub>3</sub>).

## **Comparative Statics**

Directional impact of [variable, if increasing]	Sufficient budget	Insufficient budget
Disaster frequency	X	メメ
Shortage cost	X	X
Holding cost	×	X
Average local supply	×	×
Uncertainty of emergency funds	Unaffected	メメ
Average emergency funds	Unaffected	メメ
Volatility of disaster frequency	Unaffected	メメ
Cash inflow	Unaffected	×
Cost of local supply	Unaffected	X X
Initial budget	X	X
Cost per unit of prepo	×	X
Demand or supply uncertainty	🗡 If critical, 🔪 otherwise	X
Average demand	X	メメ
Effective approximate solution	We found simple appr	roximate solution.

A relief item is labeled critical if the optimal unconstrained prepo stock (x<sub>+</sub>) exceeds the expected mismatch between demand and local supply (i.e.,  $x_+ > \mu_D - \mu_Q$ ). 23/45

Example: For a given *b*, there is a threshold cash inflow  $(\gamma_{\tau})$  above which FOC shows a Newsvendor-type tradeoff:

4-dimensional tradeoff		2-dimensional tradeoff	
↑: the cost of insufficient prepo : the cost of excess local fund		↑: the cost of insufficient prepo	
: the cost of excess prepo the cost of insufficient local fund		$\downarrow$ : the cost of excess prepo	
low cash inflow rate	$\gamma_{ au}$	high cash inflow rate	γ

### Why can't we have a determined direction when budget is limited?



When budget is limited, HOs need more information or a clear strategy to determine optimal prepo level.

Consider an auxiliary model where *local budget* constraint is relaxed i.e.,  $\min \{Q, \frac{\hat{b}(x,R,T)}{\alpha}\}$  is replaced with Q, in S(x) (i.e., only limited by the local supply.) Then, the cost function is

$$C_a(x) = lpha \mu_D + i \mu_T x + (1-lpha) E\left[(D-Q)^+
ight] + (v-1) E\left[(D-Q-x)^+
ight],$$

which conforms to the classic Newsvendor structure.

If sufficient local budget is available:

$$\bar{x}^* = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{x \le b} \left\{ C_a(x) = \min\{(x_+)^+, b\} \right\}$$

where,

- $\star$  x<sub>+</sub> balances the cost of inventory against the relative shortage.
- \* The same insights gained from NV problem apply with random D is replaced by the net demand (D Q).
- $\star\,$  UB is exact when the budget is above a threshold.

The lower bound is

$$\underline{\mathbf{x}}^* = \min\{\mathbf{x}_+, \mathbf{b}\}$$

where,

$$x_+ = \max\{\bar{m}_c(x) - \underline{m}_s(x) \ge 0, x \ge 0\}$$

 $\bar{m}_c(x)$ : the upper-bound of marginal cost when increasing prepo,  $\underline{m}_s(x)$ : the lower bound of the marginal savings when increasing prepo

# **Numerical Experiments**

## Based on CRS & Synthetic Data



- Facility in Lipa city
- Serving Laos, Indonesia, Guinea, Philippines, Myanmar, Bangladesh, Vietnam, and Cambodia
- June 2006 June 2018
- Date, type, magnitude (no. of people affected), and location of disaster
- 66 rapid-onset disasters that affected >1,000 people
- Hygiene kit \$35  $\rightarrow$  \$50 with transportation, required for every 5 people
- Stochastic optimization with 100,000 trials per simulation via Analytic Solver Platform
- Over 6,000 numerical experiments

Basic patterns in prepo and expected cost curves are relatively stable across changes in shortage cost rate, and local supply cost ratio.

Basic patterns in prepo and expected cost curves are relatively stable across changes in shortage cost rate, and local supply cost ratio.

We find higher marginal value of budget for the items with higher shortage cost, and diminishing return to increases in budget.

## Exact vs. Approximate



Optimal prepo and LB/UB are larger, and the difference between LB and UB is less if item is more critical.

## Exact vs. Approximate



Optimal prepo and LB/UB are larger, and the difference between LB and UB is less if D and Q are negatively correlated.

Optimal prepo tends to be much closer to LB for independent Q-D, and somewhat closer to UB for negatively correlated Q-D.

	High loc	cal price	Low local price				
	High shortage cost		High shortage cost	Low shortage cost			
Low emergency fund	Close to UB	Close to UB if D-Q correlated	Close to LB if D-Q indep if corr	endent, but close to UB elated			
High emergency fund		Close	to UB				

### When is emergency fund more useful?

- In general: as emergency funds increase  $\Rightarrow$  prepo  $\Uparrow$  and expected cost  $\Downarrow.$
- Additional dollar in the emergency fund is valuable as it aligns with demand; It generates more value for independent D-Q.

### The value of emergency funds decreases when budget increases.



Additional dollar in the initial budget provides more flexibility, and in practice, relying on emergency fund is too risky.



Whether an increase in emergency fund adds more or less value depends on parameters value; neither funding source dominates the other.

### Quick remark

- $\rightarrow\,$  If reactive, emergency fund might be efficient in some conditions.
- $\rightarrow\,$  If proactive, emergency fund is almost always less efficient than pre-disaster investment.

## **Contribution to Practice**

Results have been shared with a number of large HOs.

												- 🙂		
ile Home Insert Draw Page Li	yout Formul-	is Data	Review V	iev A	dd-ins H	slp Ana	lytic Solve	r Data Mi	ving 3	Search			🖻 Share	Comme
	1000 PT-	Carls.	TTD:			- 1			Lorn					
i 🗈 📖				- W	<b>V</b> I	00	27 🖬			22	60	68		
Indel Distributions Correlations Results	Decisions Constrai	nts Objective	Parameters	Simulate	Optimize C	ivente Re	ports Cha	rts Tools	Get Date	Options	License	Help		
					~ /	pp v								
Ended Encloses Madel	Outputseter	a de la de la			Calue Antine		Read and a		0.00	Orderer	Linear a	11.00		
A		8	c	D		F	G	н			K	L	M N	0
we assume random innow or cash at the time	or assauser is prop	iorsonal to d	emand, i.e., it = r	lon where	OD is the 101	ar bemand i	n terms or r	the cost of der	sand in loca	suppry 5, at	90 K IS 114 113	tion of the	coemand	
received in donarsons.														
To solve for a single item, set the min and may	demand for 1 its	n hou 0 and 0	0001 li e minist	da damar	d will be mail	I not have a	where and a	all not affect a	(utu)					
to perfer the programmer performance interesting														
Parameter values					Sensitivity	sersit	ivity inputs							
loc loc	m number	1	2	Total	functions	min	min	base case						
Initial	budget (b)	100	200	100	100	100	4300	200	b	se case can	be any numb	er or your I	best guess but	it is fer docu
Cash inf	ow rate (7)	100	200	100	100	100	400	400						
Carrying cost rate (pe	r S-year) (i)	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	9	ings that you	want to be f	ix should n	ot change fro	n min to max
Prepo to local co	et ratio (o)	0.95	0.50											
Shorts	ege cost (v)	2.00	7.00											
Distaster frequency (#/	rear) (1/µ-)	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00						
Disaster cash as a % of c	semand (ŋ)	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90						
D-5.2-point or uniform (low, high) parameters i	(fneeded)													
	w demand	14	4											
	all descent of	20000	2000			Sete:								
14	en cemane													
Hi Pidem	and = high)	42%	40%			for uniform	& perfect r	egative corre	ation, supp	y for realize	d demand is g	iven below	c	
Hy P[dem	and = high) low supply	40%	40% 0			for uniform	& perfect r	regative corre	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is g	iven below	c	
Hij Pjdem	and = high) low supply ligh supply	42% 0 6650	40% 0 3000			$Q_i + \left(\frac{D_i}{D_i}\right)$	$\frac{d_i}{d_i}$ $(\bar{O},$	egative correl	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is p	iven below	c	
Hig Pjdem Pjsup Pjsup	and = high) (ow supply figh supply ply = high)	42% 0 6650 60%	40% 0 2000 60%			for uniform $Q_i + \left(\frac{D_i}{D_i}\right)$	$\frac{d_i}{d_j}$ $\left(\bar{Q}_i\right)$	egative correl	ation, supp	y for realize	d demand is g	wen below	C	
Hij Pjdem H Pjse Full correlated uniform (1 = ys	and = high) .ow supply figh supply sply = high) s, 0 = no)?	42% 0 6650 60%	40% 0 2000 60%			$Q_i + \left(\frac{D_i}{D_i}\right)$	$\frac{d_i}{D_i} (\overline{Q}_i)$	egative correl - Q.)	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is p	iven below	C	
Hig P[dem P] P[se Full correlated uniform [1 = ye D.5 moment parameters (if needed)	and = high) .aw supply figh supply syly = high) *s, 0 = na)?	42% 0 6650 60%	40% 0 2000 60%	0		$Q_{i} + \left(\frac{D_{i}}{D_{i}}\right)^{2}$ a. $\beta_{i}^{i} - \min$	$\frac{d}{d_i} \text{ perfect } i$ $\frac{d_i}{D_i} (\overline{O}, i)$	egative correl - Q.) - U.1	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is p	iven below		
ing Pjdem I Full correlated uniform (1 = ys P-5 moment parameters (if needed) Mean di	and = high) .ow supply figh supply syly = high) ts, 0 = no)? mand (a <sub>p</sub> )	42% 0 6650 60% 30.00	40% 0 2000 60%	0		$Q_{i} + \left(\frac{D_{i}}{D_{i}}\right)$ a. $\beta'_{j} = \min$	$\frac{\delta}{\delta} \text{ perfect r}$ $-\frac{d_j}{D_j} (\overline{O}, \frac{i}{(1/\mu_T)(\tau)})$	- Q, ) - Q, ) , - 1), 1	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is p	iven below		
i Pij Pijdem Fijde Full correlated uniform (1 + yr P.5 moment parameter (if needel) Mean & Oranad var	and = high) Low supply ligh supply ligh supply style = high) st, 0 = no)? mand (a <sub>0</sub> ) lance (n <sub>0</sub> <sup>2</sup> )	40% 0 6650 60% 50.00 4.00	40% 0 2000 60% 10.00 4.00	0		for uniform $Q_i + \left(\frac{D_i}{D_i}\right)$ a. $\beta'_j = \min$	$\frac{a}{b}$ perfect $r$ $\left[\frac{-d_{j}}{-D_{j}}\right](\overline{O}, \frac{i}{(1/\mu_{T})(\tau)})$	- Q, ) - Q, ) , - I), I	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is p	iven below	с	
ing P (dem I P Put correlated uniform (1 + y Put correlated uniform (2 + y Put correlated uniform (2 + y Put correlated uniform) Permand vus Mean total Mean total	procession and = high) (low supply figh supply sply = high) H, 0 = no]? Hnand (p <sub>0</sub> ) iance (n <sub>0</sub> <sup>-2</sup> ) Hupply (p <sub>1</sub> )	40% 0 6650 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00	40% 0 1000 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00	0	Ĩ	for uniform $Q_i + \left(\frac{D_j}{D_j}\right)^{-1}$ a. $\beta'_j = \min$ Demand-ing	& perfect $r$ $-\frac{d_1}{D_2}\left(\overline{O}_r - \frac{1}{D_2}\right)\left(\overline{O}_r - \frac{1}{(1 / \mu_T)(\tau)}\right)$	regative correl $-Q_{,}$ ) $\overline{(-1)}$ ,1 ation matrix	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is g	iven below	E	
i Pi Piden Full correlated unitorn (1 + v D.5.moment garanten (if neddel) Mean (o Demand va Mean (oct Mean (oct Local supply va	procession and = high] (low supply figh supply gity = high) H, 0 = no]? Hance (n <sub>0</sub> <sup>2</sup> ) Sance (n <sub>0</sub> <sup>2</sup> ) Sance (n <sub>1</sub> <sup>2</sup> ) Sance (n <sub>1</sub> <sup>2</sup> )	40% 0 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	40% 0 2000 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	0	1	for uniform $Q_i + \left(\frac{D_j}{D_j}\right)^{-1}$ a. $\beta'_j = \min$ Demand-sign	& perfect $r$ $-\frac{d_j}{D_j}\left(\bar{O}, \frac{i}{(1/\mu_T)(\tau)}\right)$ ( $\frac{1}{(1/\mu_T)(\tau)}$	regative corre - @ ) ) .1) ation matrix D2	ation, supp	ly for realize	d demand is p	iven below	E	
i ing Franc Full correlated uniform 5.5 moment parameters (if needed) 0.5 moment parameters (if needed) Demand van Mean local Local supply van Prepo quantity constraint	get demand and a high) Low supply tigh supply tigh supply tigh or no)? emand ( $\mu_0$ ) iance ( $\sigma_0^{-1}$ ) iance ( $\sigma_1^{-1}$ ) iance ( $\sigma_1^{-1}$ )	40% 0 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	40% 0 2000 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	0	1	for uniform $Q_i + \left(\frac{D_j}{D_j}\right)$ a. $\beta'_j = \min$ Demand its D1	& perfect $r$ $-\frac{d_j}{D_j}\left(\overline{Q}, \frac{i}{(1/\mu_f)(r)}\right)$ $\left(\frac{1}{(1/\mu_f)(r)}\right)$ ply correls D1 1.00	egative correl - Q.) ) etion matrix D2 0.00	stion, supp 51 -1.00	52 0.00	d demand is p	iven below	с	
in in Pferen Fuit Fuit correlated unations (1 - yr D 5 moment agramters (8 neddel) D 6 moment uw Mean local Local supply up Prepo quantify constraint Initial budget Initia o	promise and = high) Low supply ligh supply gity = high) is, 0 = no)? imand $(\mu_0)$ iance $(\sigma_0^{-1})$ iance $(\sigma_1^{-1})$ i prepo (b)	42% 0 6650 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	40% 0 2000 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	0	1	for uniform $Q_i + \left(\frac{D_j}{D_j}\right)$ a. $\beta'_j = \min$ Demand - $\log$ D1 D2	& perfect $r$ $-\frac{d_j}{D_j}\left(\overline{Q}, \frac{i}{(1/\mu_f)(r)}\right)$ ( $\frac{1}{(1/\mu_f)(r)}$ ply correls D1 1.00 0.00	egative corre - @, ) 1),1} etion matrix D2 0.00 1.00	stion, supp 51 -1.00 0.00	52 0.00 0.00	d demand is p	iven below	С	
in Fifem Ful constant of form 0.5.moments assessed 0.5.moments assessed 0.6.moments Constanting Consta	promise and = high Low supply ligh supply sity = high $H_{1,0} = no]?$ meand $(n_0)$ iance $(n_0^2)$ iance $(n_1^2)$ iance $(n_1^2)$ iance $(n_1^2)$	42% 0 6650 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	40% 0 2000 60% 10.00 4.00 6.00 2.00	0		for uniform $Q_i + \left(\frac{D_j}{D_j}\right)$ a. $\beta'_j = \min$ Demand ing D1 D2 S1	$\frac{\delta}{h}$ perfect $r = \frac{d_j}{D_j} (Q_j - \frac{1}{(1/\mu_T)}) (\tau)$ $\left[ \frac{i}{(1/\mu_T)} (\tau) (\tau) + \frac{1}{(1/\mu_T)} (\tau) \right]$ ply correlation 0.00 0.00 -1.00	- Q.) - D.) - 1).1 etion matrix D2 0.00 1.00 0.00	51 -1.00 1.00	52 0.00 0.00	d demand is g	iven below	C	

We also created a simple Excel-based calculator, and are developing a widget.

## Extensions



- \* If inflow cash is too small or too large, the static and dynamic cases are equivalent; set prepo at the beginning and leave it fixed.
- \* Otherwise, for a given budget, dynamic prepo level is dominated by static prepo level, and is nondecreasing in review period length.
- All of the directional effects identified continue to hold for the dynamic model.



- \* If inflow cash is too small or too large, the static and dynamic cases are equivalent; set prepo at the beginning and leave it fixed.
- \* Otherwise, for a given budget, dynamic prepo level is dominated by static prepo level, and is nondecreasing in review period length.
- \* All of the directional effects identified continue to hold for the dynamic model.



- \* If inflow cash is too small or too large, the static and dynamic cases are equivalent; set prepo at the beginning and leave it fixed.
- \* Otherwise, for a given budget, dynamic prepo level is dominated by static prepo level, and is nondecreasing in review period length.
- All of the directional effects identified continue to hold for the dynamic model.



- \* If inflow cash is too small or too large, the static and dynamic cases are equivalent; set prepo at the beginning and leave it fixed.
- \* Otherwise, for a given budget, dynamic prepo level is dominated by static prepo level, and is nondecreasing in review period length.
- $\star\,$  All of the directional effects identified continue to hold for the dynamic model.
## Prepo Landing Price is Lower (Proactive Model)



"Everyone needed the same things (disinfectant, thermometers, etc.), leading to a significant supply shortage and price surge in the field. It was cheaper to buy it internationally compared to the local market." Objective cost function will be different but there are some similarities in results:

- the cost function is convex in prepo
- similar budget threshold that delineates a structural change in the prepo optimization problem

Directional impact of [variable, if increasing]	Local supply is cheaper		Prepo is cheaper	
	Sufficient budget	Insufficient budget	Sufficient budget	Insufficient budget
Disaster frequency	X	メメ	X	メメ
Shortage cost	X	X	X	×
Holding cost	×	×	×	×
Average local supply	×	×	×	×
Uncertainty of emergency funds	Unaffected	メメ	Unaffected	メメ
Average emergency funds	Unaffected	メメ	Unaffected	メメ
Volatility of disaster frequency	Unaffected	メメ	Unaffected	メメ
Cash inflow	Unaffected	X	Unaffected	メト
Cost of local supply	Unaffected	メメ	X	メメ
Initial budget	X	X	K	メメ
Cost per unit of prepo	×	×	×	メメ
Demand or supply uncertainty	X	メス	X	× K
Effective approximate solution	We found simple approximate solution.		We have not been able to find it.	

Differences:

- the marginal value of prepo is nonmonotonic when  $\alpha>1$ 
  - 1~ the simpler LB/UB cannot be found
  - 2 some unexpected comparative statics are concluded

Example:  $b \uparrow \Rightarrow x^* \uparrow \text{ or } x^* \downarrow$ 

Why prepo decreases? The value of additional prepo is linked to the value of replacing a unit of more expensive reactive stock and the value of reducing very costly unsatisfied demand. When budget increases, the likelihood of unsatisfied demand decreases, so prepo decreases. This is for cases when you have large local supply.

## DANISH REFUGEE COUNCIL

- Multiple item when some are cheaper if prepo
- Price volatility for all items
- Supply, demand, budget uncertainty
- We drive structural properties of optimal solutions

## Thank you for your attention!