



ADMINISTRAÇÃO DE ESTOQUES

HIGH ECCENTRICITY EOQ TOTAL COST FUNCTION YIELDS JIT RESULTS

ALTA EXCENTRICIDADE NA FUNÇÃO CUSTO TOTAL DA QUANTIDADE DO LOTE ECONÔMICO LEVA A RESULTADOS DO TIPO JUST IN TIME.

Willian Roach
Washburn University

Professor da Washburn University in Topeka, Kansas. USA.
PhD pela University of Michigan.
Endereço profissional
1700 SW College Ave.
Topeka, KS 66621 – USA
Fone : +1 (785) 670 – 1748 Fax: +1 (785) 670 – 1063
Homepage: www.washburn.edu/sobu
Email: william.roach@gmail.com

Data de submissão: 20 maio 2009 . **Data de aprovação:** 15 abr. 2010 . **Sistema de avaliação:** Double blind review
. Universidade FUMEC / FACE . Prof. Dr. Cid Gonçalves Filho
. Prof. Dr. Luiz Cláudio Vieira de Oliveira . Prof. Dr. Mário Teixeira Reis Neto

RESUMO

No estoque de bens perecíveis, o custo de armazenamento H é muito maior do que o previsto na fórmula clássica do lote econômico do pedido (EOQ). Para bens perecíveis, a função custo total no EOQ é um pico e não uma reta horizontal. Esta forma pontiaguda leva o modelo EOQ a produzir entregas just in time (JIT) - resultados semelhantes. O efeito pontiagudo (excentricidade) da curva de custo total do lote econômico EOQ depende apenas do custo de armazenamento (H) e não da demanda anual (D) ou do custo do pedido (S). D e S determinam o nível (altura) da curva de custo total do estoque (TC), mas não a forma.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Excentricidade. Quantidade do lote econômico. Estoque de bens perecíveis.

ABSTRACT

For perishable inventory, the holding cost H is much larger than anticipated by the classical economic order quantity (EOQ) formula, orders of magnitude larger. For perishable inventory, the EOQ total cost function is pointed rather than flat. This pointed-ness logically

causes the EOQ model to yield just in time (JIT) - like results. The pointed-ness (eccentricity) of the EOQ total cost curve depends solely on holding cost H and not annual demand D or batch cost S . D and S determine the level of the TC curve but not the shape.

KEYWORDS

Eccentricity. Economic Order Quantity (EOQ). Perishable inventory.

INTRODUCTION

Rafaat's (1991) classic survey of the literature on perishable inventory EOQ models concludes with the observation:

Future models could be developed by incorporating the effect of constant decay into the variety of existing inventory models. More complicated deterioration functions do not seem to be useful or practical; except in the paper by Tadikamalla" they do not seem to have provided any additional insights. Generally, almost all of the reviewed papers provide complicated equations for determining the optimal values for order quantity, Q , inventory cycle time, T , and replenishment policy. Except for the basic model, no simple decision rules are given. Simpler heuristics or approximations are needed in this regard...

This paper responds to Rafaat's suggestions by deriving some perishable inventory results in terms of the simplest version of the EOQ model (Harris, 1913).

The results demonstrated in this paper include:

The usual formula for demonstrating the flatness of the EOQ total cost curve does not measure flatness in a useful manner.

The pointed-ness (opposite of flatness) of the EOQ total cost curve is dependent on only one EOQ parameter, H , the holding cost. Annual demand D and S order cost determine the level of the TC curve but not the shape of the TC curve.

The holding cost H can be much larger than the cost of the item C . This occurs for perishable items

like prepared food and produce, high technology products like anti-virus software or some PC components, etc. In the context of a very large H

The eccentricity e of the EOQ total cost curve is an appropriate measure of the pointed-ness (eccentricity) of the curve, and good approximations of e are available

For perishable inventory, the traditional EOQ formula will yield JIT-like results.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Zipkin (2000) contains a good summary of the development of the theory of inventory management. The literature on perishable inventory or inventory subject to rapid obsolescence is not large (KATZENBERG, 2007; RAAFAT, 1991). Nahamias (1982) gives an early summary of the literature. Goyal and Giri (2001) update this survey. A significant fraction of that literature deals with the management of blood banks; Hajeima (2008) contains a fairly current summary of this literature. Ferguson (2007) reviews the literature in a more general context and demonstrates that significant improvements in profitability (40%) result from more appropriate modeling of the costs associated with perishable inventory. This literature includes more sophisticated modeling of the holding cost for perishable inventory and decision theoretic dynamic pricing of that inventory. If consumers supply the dynamic of this kind of inventory, it follows a LIFO discipline. If the supplier can control the dynamic of this kind of inventory, it follows a FIFO discipline. Both the LIFO and FIFO disciplines

require suppliers to account for inventory in age layers, a more sophisticated requirement than contemplated by much inventory theory. For the purpose of pricing, it is important to understand the origin of the demand for fresh product and the nature of the “deterioration” process.

Supply Chains for perishable inventory tend to be relatively flat – a minimal number of echelons. Local supply chains are electronically integrated with neighboring supply chains so that shortages can be accommodated. Batch sizes are close to current usage, and there is significant pressure to keep lead times very short.

CONTEMPORARY EOQ MODELING

The contemporary literature assumes that holding cost H is much higher than the level assumed by the initial proponents of the EOQ model, that is Harris (1913), Camp (1922), and Wilson (1934). Wilson’s calculations, for example,

assumed that $h = .07$, many contemporary authors think the EOQ formula is not relevant to modern inventory management. However, the EOQ model maintains its place in the OM curriculum because its pedagogical value. The EOQ model provides a clear illustration of the concept of cost tradeoff. The textbooks are quick to note that this particular cost tradeoff is of little practical value because the EOQ total cost function TC is flat in the neighborhood of the optimal order quantity Q^* . Fogarty (1991) gives the classical illustration of the flatness of the EOQ total cost function.

$$(1) \quad TC' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{Q'}{Q^*} + \frac{Q^*}{Q'} \right) * TC^*$$

Equation (1) can be used to illustrate that the absolute value of the percentage change in Q is frequently significantly larger than the percentage change in TC .

$$(2) \quad \left| \frac{Q'}{Q^*} - 1 \right| \gg \left| \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{Q'}{Q^*} + \frac{Q^*}{Q'} \right) - 1 \right|$$

TABLE 1

Q'/Q^*	Percent Change in $Q = (Q'/Q^*) - 1$	Percent Change in $TC = (1/2) * ((Q'/Q^*) + (Q^*/Q')) - 1$
0.1	-90%	405%
0.2	-80%	160%
0.3	-70%	82%
0.4	-60%	45%
0.5	-50%	25%
0.6	-40%	13%
0.7	-30%	6%
0.8	-20%	2%
0.9	-10%	1%

There are several anomalies in this analysis:

- equation (1) is dependent only on the form of the cost function; it is not dependent on any of the parameters of the total cost function: holding cost H , order cost S , and annual demand D .; according to this analysis all EOQ TC functions are equally flat near the optimal lot size Q^* ;
- under JIT batch sizes can be 1/10 or 1/100 of the usual batch size; this is a much larger change than is usually illustrated with equation (2);

- perusal of the graph of the EOQ total cost function suggests that the cost function

becomes more pointed as holding cost H increases (See below).




FIGURE 1 - Pointed-ness rather than Flatness

The normal formulation of the EOQ total cost function is:

$$(3) \quad TC = D * C + \frac{S * D}{Q} + \frac{Q * h * C}{2}$$

where:

TC = Total Cost of the Inventory System in dollars per unit time (year)

Q = Order Quantity (pieces per order)

C = Cost per unit in dollars

h = Inventory holding cost in dollars per dollar per unit time (year)

H = Annual holding costs in dollars per item per year, $H = h * C$

S = Order cost in dollars per order or batch

D = Demand rate pieces per unit time (year)

A simpler version of the EOQ model assumes no volume discounts so the $C * D$ term is ignored and the model is

$$(4) \quad TC = \frac{S * D}{Q} + \frac{Q * H}{2}$$

or

$$(5) \quad TC = \frac{S * D}{Q} + \frac{Q * H}{2}$$

Since the analysis above raised questions about the traditional measure of the flatness of the TC curve, a measure of the pointed-ness of the TC curve, that is, the opposite of flatness, is derived in Appendix A. The TC function is reduced to that of a hyperbola in standard form by rotating the coordinate system. While the major properties of the hyperbola (vertex, eccentricity, axes) are invariant under rotation, the minimum is not. Eccentricity is a measure of the pointed-ness (eccentricity) of a hyperbola. The minimum value is $e = 1$, for rectangular hyperbolas. The TC function would be a rectangular if there were no holding cost H. More pointed hyperbolas have higher eccentricities. Appendix A gives two approximate formulas for eccentricity, one for very large H (perishable inventory, for example) and another for very small H:

$$(6) \quad \text{for very large } H, e = H \quad \text{for example when } H \geq 5$$

$$\text{for very small } H, e = \sqrt{1 + \frac{1 + H/2}{1 - H/2}} \quad H \leq 1$$

While the large H version of equation (5) does not seem especially profound; it says just

what one can observe from Figure 1, that is, the higher the holding cost, the more pointed the total cost function TC. Remember, however, that the conventional wisdom (Equations (1) and (2)) is that the TC curve is flat and that flatness does not depend on any of the TC parameters.

The implications of e , the eccentricity measure, are more significant if one looks at perishable inventory. Holding cost $H = h \cdot C$ where C is the cost of the item and h is the holding cost as a percent of the cost of the item. Operations management texts used to suggest that companies commonly used values of h between 25% and 55%. These values of h were based on costs derived from

conventional cost accounting practices applied in a variety of settings. In this context, h includes:

- the cost of capital
- the cost of handling items in the inventory
- rent, insurance, and taxes

Those companies practicing Just-In-Time, JIT, would sometimes double the conventional h to get a smaller batch size. Contemporary supply chain management texts (CHOPRA, 2006) suggest much higher values of h (200% and greater) because of perishability, style obsolescence or technological obsolescence, and / or opportunity cost.

TABLE 2

Valueless in	Value of h
1 day	36,500%
1 month	1,200%
6 months	200%

A change of model does not indicate the previous model has declined in value to zero, but

50 % to 60 % of its original value seems like an appropriate assumption.

TABLE 3

Industry	Model Changes Per Year
Aircraft	2
Computers	4
Tax software	12
Anti-viral software	600-750

These examples are not extreme, Takeda (2002) considers the implications of the

perishability of food sold as "fresh food" in Japan.

TABLE 4

Time Period	Example
0 to 2 hours	Sushimi, precut vegetables and fruits
0 to 6 hours	Deep fried food, deli baked food
0 to 12 hours	Morning harvested vegetables, fish
0 to 24 hours	Fresh produce, cut flowers, freshly processed food

With the high values of h found in these settings, conventional EOQ analysis yields

results similar to JIT practice. Consider the following:

A quick shop sells cooked hotdogs along with gasoline, tobacco products, snack foods, etc. It sells 96 cooked hot dogs per day, 365 days per year. The hotdogs are pre-cooked, but they are placed on a rotisserie grill to heat them up. After 4 hours on the rotisserie grill, the hotdogs are no longer considered "fresh" and must be thrown away. Hotdogs come 8 to a package and can be opened a half package at a time. The price of a cooked hotdog is \$1.00. A pound package contains 8 hotdogs or two half packages of 4. The holding cost h is $365 \times 6 = 219,000$ percent. If we adjust h for the conventionally accounting measured holding cost, h is 219,055 percent. The conventional cost affects only the fifth significant figure; thus it is virtually irrelevant. The EOQ is 4.0 half packs or two pounds of hot dogs. If the quick shop wants to go to batch size of one pound, the set up cost must be \$.00022, virtually zero. Alternatively, if the standard of freshness allows only two hours on the grill, the EOQ goes to 3 half packs or a pound and a half.

The results of conventional EOQ analysis with higher (more appropriate) h values are surprisingly like JIT practice. Even with a low value product, H is high enough (\$2,920) for the total cost function

TC to be quite pointed. H is a very accurate approximation of the eccentricity e for this problem. The significance of this result is fourfold:

- The usual formula (1) for demonstrating the flatness of the EOQ total cost curve does not measure flatness in an appropriate manner.
- The pointed-ness (eccentricity) of the EOQ total cost curve is dependent on only one EOQ parameter, H , the holding cost.
- The eccentricity e of the EOQ total cost curve is an appropriate measure of the pointed-ness (eccentricity) of the curve, and good approximations are available.
- The analysis suggests that when H is large enough, the traditional EOQ formula will yield JIT results.
- The classical EOQ formula with its linear holding cost continues to work for perishable inventory if one uses holding costs much higher than those usually considered.

APPENDIX A

The simplest version of the EOQ model assumes no volume discounts so the C^*R term is ignored and the model is

$$(A-1) \quad TC = \frac{S * D}{Q} + \frac{Q * h * C}{2}$$

or

$$(A-2) \quad TC = \frac{S * D}{Q} + \frac{Q * H}{2}$$

The first term summarizes the batch costs: (D/Q) is the number of batches. The second term summarizes the unit costs; Q is the number of units in a batch, and Q/2 is the average number of units in an inventory cycle.

The optimal Q, the Economic Order Quantity Q* is given by

$$(A-3) \quad Q^* = \sqrt{\frac{2 * D * S}{H}}$$

This can be derived by calculus or by setting the batch costs equal to the unit costs and solving for Q. The originators of the formula, Kelvin (1881) and Harris (1913), did not use calculus in their derivations of it.

This article uses numerical examples based on an example given by Fogarty (1991, p 211):

A ball bearing distributor has an item that has an annual demand [D] of 60,000 units at a relatively constant rate throughout the year. Preparation costs [S] are \$45 each time an order is placed; the carrying cost [H] is \$.30 per dollar of inventory per year; and the units cost [C] \$2.00 each.

Then the total cost function is

$$(A-4) \quad TC = \frac{2,700,000}{Q} + .30 * Q$$

The reader might note that the TC function appears to be the sum of a hyperbolic term ((S*R)/Q) and a linear term (Q/2)*K; however, reflection yields that equation (3) is the equation of an hyperbola in a rotated coordinate system.

Multiplying through by Q gives

$$(A-5) \quad \frac{H}{2} * Q^2 - TC * Q + D * S = 0$$

which yields for the ball bearing example,

$$0.30 * Q^2 - TC * Q + 2,700,000 = 0$$

a quadratic form in TC and Q with a cross product term. The cross product term indicates a rotated coordinate system. To remove the cross product term rotate the coordinate system through an angle θ . The point (Q, TC) will be rotated into the point (Q', TC') which points are related as follows:

$$(A-6) \quad Q' = Q * \cos(\theta) - TC * \sin(\theta)$$

$$TC' = Q * \sin(\theta) + TC * \cos(\theta)$$

or inversely

$$(A-7) \quad Q = Q' * \cos(\theta) + TC' * \sin(\theta)$$

$$TC = -Q' * \sin(\theta) + TC' * \cos(\theta)$$

Substitute this second set of equations (A-7) into the quadratic form (A-5) to derive the new quadratic form in terms of Q' and TC'

Coefficient of Q'^2

$$(A-8) \quad \frac{H}{2} * \cos^2(\theta) + \cos(\theta) * \sin(\theta)$$

Coefficient of $Q' * TC'$

(A-9)

$$H * \cos(\theta) * \sin(\theta) - \cos^2(\theta) * \sin^2(\theta) + \sin^2(\theta)$$

Coefficient of TC'^2

$$(A-10) \quad \frac{H}{2} * \sin^2(\theta) - \cos(\theta) * \sin(\theta)$$

If the coefficient of $(Q')TC'$ is to be zero then the angle of rotation is

$$(A-11) \quad \theta = \arctan\left(\frac{2}{H}\right) / 2$$

For the ball bearing example, the rotation calculates to about 36.65 degrees and

$$6.72E-01 * Q'^2 + -3.72E-01 * TC'^2 + 2,700,000 = 0$$

With no holding cost (an eccentricity of 1), the rotation would have been 45 degrees.

HYPERBOLA IN STANDARD FORM

Then the equation of the hyperbola can be given in standard form:

$$(A-12) \quad -\frac{Q^2}{a^2} + \frac{TC^2}{b^2} = 1$$

$$-2.49E-07 * Q^2 + 1.37783E-07 * TC^2 = 1$$

where

$$(A-13) \quad a^2 = \frac{(D * S)}{\frac{H}{2} * \cos(\theta)^2 + \cos(\theta) * \sin(\theta)}$$

$$(A-14) \quad b^2 = \frac{-(D * S)}{\frac{H}{2} * \sin(\theta)^2 - \cos(\theta) * \sin(\theta)}$$

$$(A-15) \quad c^2 = a^2 + b^2$$

ECCENTRICITY

The eccentricity of a hyperbola in standard form is given by

$$(A-16) \quad e = \sqrt{1 + \frac{b^2}{a^2}}$$

Dividing b^2 by a^2 causes the R*S terms to cancel out.

$$(A-17)$$

$$e^2 = 1 - \frac{(H/2) * \cos^2(\theta) + \cos(\theta) * \sin(\theta)}{(H/2) * \sin^2(\theta) - \cos(\theta) * \sin(\theta)}$$

The flat e approximation was derived by noting that for e close to 1, $\theta = 45$ degrees, and equation (A-17) reduces to

$$e = \sqrt{1 + \frac{1 + H/2}{1 - H/2}}$$

When H is very large, θ is almost zero. The approximation of e for large H is

$$e = H$$

This result was observed empirically. It was not derived analytically. For the ball bearing example, the exact value of e is 1.68 the low H approximation is 1.69. For the hot dog example, the exact value of e is 2190.55, while the high H approximation of e is 2190.55.

APPENDIX B: QUICK SHOP HOT DOG

Rework of conic sections example in a context with very high holding cost.

D	8,760	units per year	
S	\$2.00	per batch	
h	219055%		
C	\$1.00		
H	\$ 2,190.55		sin-theta 0.000457
			cos-theta 1
Theta	0.00	radians	0.03

If the rotation is positive, that should mean that the hyperbola opens up
 This should mean that the coefficient of the Q^2 is negative and the coefficient of TC^2 is positive

$H/2 \cdot \cos^2 + \sin \cdot \cos$	1,095.28	a^2	16	a	4.00
$H/2 \sin^2 - \cos \cdot \sin$	(0.00)	b^2	76,756,888	bw	8,761.10
e			2190.55		
		c^2	76,756,904		
e approx	2190.55	%error	-0.00003%		
eapprox2	2190.550228	%error	0.0%		

Roach, William L is a professor of Business Administration at Washburn University in Topeka, KA. He earned his Ph.D. at the University of Michigan. He has previously published articles in Journal of Financial Education, International Journal of Critical Infrastructure, International Journal of Management History, Journal of Insurance Regulation, Journal of Insurance Issues and Practices, and the Journal of Risk and Insurance. ➤

REFERÊNCIAS

- CAMP, W. E. Determining the production order quantity. **Management Engineering**, [S. l.], v. 2, p. 17-18, 1922.
- FERGUSON, M. J.; JAYARAMAN, K.; SOUZA, G. Note: An Application of the EOQ Model with Non-linear Holding Cost to Inventory Management of Perishables. **European Journal of Operational Research**, [S. l.], v. 180, p. 485-490, 2007.
- FOGARTY, D. W.; BLACKSTONE, J. H. JR.; HOFFMANN, T. R. **Production Inventory Management**. 2nd ed. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Co., 1991. 203-242.
- GOYAL, S. K.; GIRI, B. C. Recent trends in modeling of deteriorating inventory. **European Journal of Operational Research**, [S. l.], v. 134, p. 1-16, 2001.
- HAJEIMA, R. **Solving Large Structure Markov Decision Problems for Perishable Inventory Management and Traffic Control Tinbergen Institute** (Research Series, University of Amsterdam. 2008. Available at <<http://dare.uva.nl/document/122294>>.
- HARRIS, F. W. How Many Parts to Make at Once. **Management Science**, [S. l.], n. 38, p. 947-950, 1990 (Originally published in **Factory, The Magazine of Management**, v. 10, n. 2, Feb. 1913, p. 135-136, 152).
- KATZENBERG, M.; FERGUSON, M. Managing Slow Moving Perishables in the Grocery Industry. **Georgia Institute of Technology Working Paper Series**, [S. l.], v. 13, Feb. 2007.
- NAHMIAS, S. Perishable Inventory Theory: a Review. **Operations Research**, [S. l.], v. 30, n. 4, p. 680-708, July/Aug. 1982.
- RAAFAT, Fred. Survey of Literature on Continuously Deteriorating Inventory Models. **Journal of Operations Research Society**, [S. l.], v. 42, n. 1, p. 27-37, 1991.
- TAKEDA, Y.; HIRAFUMI, M. ECR: a "fresh" look from Japan. **ECR Journal**, [S. l.], v. 2, n. 2, 2002.
- WILSON, R. H. A Scientific Routine For Stock Control. **Harvard Business Review**, [S. l.], v. 13, n.1, p. 116-128, 1934.
- ZIPKIN, P. **Foundations of Inventory Management**. New York: McGraw-Hill, 2000.