



HAL
open science

A portfolio model for component purchasing strategy and the case study of two South Korean elevator manufacturers

Dong Myung Lee, Paul R Drake

► **To cite this version:**

Dong Myung Lee, Paul R Drake. A portfolio model for component purchasing strategy and the case study of two South Korean elevator manufacturers. *International Journal of Production Research*, 2009, pp.1. 10.1080/00207540902897780 . hal-00543965

HAL Id: hal-00543965

<https://hal.science/hal-00543965>

Submitted on 7 Dec 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



A portfolio model for component purchasing strategy and the case study of two South Korean elevator manufacturers

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Production Research</i>
Manuscript ID:	TPRS-2008-IJPR-0926.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Feb-2009
Complete List of Authors:	Lee, Dong Myung; University of Liverpool, Management School Drake, Paul; University of Liverpool, Operations Management and e-Business Group
Keywords:	PURCHASING, PROCUREMENT, SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT
Keywords (user):	PURCHASING, PROCUREMENT



A portfolio model for component purchasing strategy and the case study of two South Korean elevator manufacturers.

Dong Myung Lee and Paul R. Drake*

Operations Management and e-Business Group
University of Liverpool Management School
Liverpool, L69 7ZH, UK

Abstract

A new approach to purchasing portfolio modelling, stemming from Kraljic's matrix, for developing purchasing strategies that are aligned with competitive priorities, is developed to address the weaknesses of existing approaches that are preventing widespread application, especially in SMEs. The importance of strategic purchasing to achieving competitive priorities and the need to align it with business strategy is argued through a literature review, which is also used to establish that purchasing portfolio modelling is an effective tool in achieving this alignment. The new approach is applied to two South Korean elevator manufacturers.

Keywords - Purchasing strategy, Portfolio model, SME, AHP

*Corresponding author: Dr Paul R Drake, Telephone: 0151-7953603, Email: drake@liverpool.ac.uk

A portfolio model for component purchasing strategy and the case study of two South Korean elevator manufacturers.

Abstract

A new approach to purchasing portfolio modelling, stemming from Kraljic's matrix, for developing purchasing strategies that are aligned with competitive priorities, is developed to address the weaknesses of existing approaches that are preventing widespread application, especially in SMEs. The importance of strategic purchasing to achieving competitive priorities and the need to align it with business strategy is argued through a literature review, which is also used to establish that purchasing portfolio modelling is an effective tool in achieving this alignment. The new approach is applied to two South Korean elevator manufacturers.

Keywords - Purchasing strategy, Portfolio model, SME, AHP

1. Introduction

Many manufacturers spend approximately 50% to 70% of each sales dollar on purchased materials and components (van Weele, 2005), so their success is heavily influenced by the performance of their suppliers and purchased components. Purchasing has become one of the most critical activities of a manufacturing business (Parikh and Joshi, 2005)(Sarkis and Talluri, 2002). It is a key strategic activity for achieving high quality, high variety, low cost and fast delivery of the end-product.

The purchasing function is largely responsible for specifying the characteristics of purchased materials, components and services, selecting suitable suppliers and managing the transaction so that purchases are delivered in a timely manner (Burt, 1989 cited in Krause et al., 2001). The buyer must determine and manage the purchasing strategy on the basis of its business strategy and a deep understanding of its products (Watts et al., 1995) (van Weele, 2005) to achieve “strategic purchasing”. For example, if the corporate strategy is concentrated on providing customers with high quality products, then both the manufacturing strategy and the purchasing strategy must also focus on quality. If the basis of competition is cost then the focus of both must be on reducing costs although qualifying levels of quality must be maintained.

A survey of 111 purchasing executives in the UK concluded that, “Strategic purchasing leads to improved supplier integration and socialisation mechanisms, giving overall improvements in buyer performance.” (Lawson et al, 2008). Chen and Paulraj (2004) placed strategic purchasing at the centre of their theoretical framework for supply chain management research, referring to the “imperative role” of strategic purchasing within

1
2
3
4
5 supply chain management. The widely cited Hayes and Wheelwright (1984) model of the
6
7 relationship between business strategy and functional strategy is unequivocal in that
8
9 functional strategies should support the business strategy and be internally consistent.
10
11 Based on a survey of 180 pairs of manufacturing and purchasing executives from
12
13 manufacturing firms in the USA, Pagell and Krause (2002) confirmed that higher levels
14
15 of consensus among internal functions regarding competitive priorities are associated
16
17 with higher levels of performance and competitive advantage.
18
19
20
21
22

23
24 Major manufacturers such as Motorola, Honda and Toyota have benefited from
25
26 strategically managing purchasing and relationships with their suppliers (Metty et al.,
27
28 2005)(Pressey et al., 2007), attaining higher quality, increased operational flexibility,
29
30 shorter lead-times and cost reductions as a result (Janda and Seshadri, 2001). Strategic
31
32 purchasing can also benefit small firms (Carr and Pearson, 2002). However, small and
33
34 medium size enterprises' (SMEs') use of portfolio models is much lower than that of
35
36 larger enterprises (Gelderman and van Weele, 2005). Instead, purchasing decisions in
37
38 small firms are generally made by the owner or a chosen few on the basis of intuition and
39
40 personal experience (Cagliano and Spina, 2002), or possibly misconception, and this can
41
42 lead naturally to poor performance. Moreover, small firms may find it difficult to gain
43
44 interest in development and collaboration from their suppliers because they have little
45
46 purchasing power (Quayle, 2002) (Gonzalez-Benito et al, 2003) and lack the management
47
48 resource to find and develop alternative suppliers and solutions (Gadde and Hakansson,
49
50 2001). Most previous research into purchasing strategy has been in the context of large
51
52 companies (Cagliano and Spina, 2002), so little has been reported on purchasing strategy
53
54 for SMEs in particular. This paper reports the development of a portfolio model for
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 developing purchasing strategy and applies it in two SMEs. The focus is on the
6
7 development of a practical approach that is simple enough for SMEs to implement with
8
9 their limited resources and limited access to quantitative supplier data (they have less
10
11 power), although the approach is still intended to be valid for all sizes of enterprises.
12
13

14
15
16 ABC inventory analysis has been used widely to classify the importance of components
17
18 by cost of consumption, i.e. unit-cost times units-consumed. This indicates priorities for
19
20 inventory management, but it does not provide any purchasing strategies for the
21
22 categories, it merely provides information on the concentration of purchase spend
23
24 (Gelderman and van Weele, 2005). ABC analysis is easy to understand and use, but it has
25
26 major weaknesses (Flores et al., 1992). It can over-emphasize items that have a high cost
27
28 of consumption but no critical effects on production operations or the quality of the end-
29
30 product, whilst it may under-emphasize items that have a low cost of consumption but are
31
32 critical to quality. The problem stems from ABC classification using a single measure,
33
34 cost of consumption, when there are other important criteria such as inventory cost,
35
36 obsolescence, durability and stock-out penalty (Ng, 2007)(Partovi and Anandarajan,
37
38 2002). When manufacturers buy components they should focus on the total overall cost
39
40 rather than simply the lowest price (Burt, 1989).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Kraljic (1983) introduced a portfolio approach to purchasing in which purchased items
51
52 are classified on the basis of two dimensions, importance of the purchase and complexity
53
54 of the supply market. Items are classified by evaluating and positioning them into one of
55
56 four quadrants of the two-dimensional portfolio model. The quadrants represent different
57
58 purchasing strategies. Gelderman (2003) defined a portfolio model as a tool that uses two
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 or more dimensions to define heterogeneous categories for which different strategic
6
7 recommendations are provided. Following on from Kraljic, others have developed similar
8
9 portfolio models based on a two-dimensional framework, for example see (Bensaou,
10
11 1999) and (Olsen and Ellram, 1997). Purchasing portfolio models enable a business to
12
13 identify the more important purchased items from the point of view of purchasing
14
15 strategy, helping it to achieve a sustainable competitive edge and high profitability
16
17 (Wagner and Johnson, 2004) through differentiated purchasing strategies (Gelderman and
18
19 van Weele, 2005).
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 Recently, purchasing portfolio models have received a great deal of attention in the
27
28 academic and business fields. They are easy to understand and give practical guidelines
29
30 on how to manage different purchased items, suppliers and supplier relationships (Dubois
31
32 and Pedersen, 2002). Surveys found that 74% of Dutch purchasers (Gelderman, 2003)
33
34 and 55% of French purchasers (Kibbeling, 2005) in the manufacturing and engineering
35
36 sectors use purchasing portfolio analysis. In a survey of 122 companies in the UK across
37
38 the manufacturing, service and other industry sectors, purchasing portfolio analysis was
39
40 found to be the second most used of 65 purchasing and supply tools, with vendor rating
41
42 coming first (Cox and Watson, 2004).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **2. Existing Portfolio Models**

51
52 Markowitz (1952) originally developed portfolio theory for financial investment
53
54 decision-making and it has been used widely in strategic planning and marketing. Kraljic
55
56 (1983) introduced the first portfolio matrix for purchasing and supply management
57
58 (Gelderman and van Weele, 2005), but until recently application within purchasing had
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 been limited (Nellore and Soderquist, 2000). Portfolio models have been applied in
6
7 related areas such as supplier involvement in product development (Wynstra and ten
8
9 Pierick, 2000), e-purchasing (Bartezzaghi and Ronchi, 2004), the specification process
10
11 (Nellore and Soderquist, 2000) and inter-organisational competence development (Moller
12
13 et al., 2000).
14
15

16
17
18 In Kraljic's portfolio matrix, purchased items are classified by two dimensions; the profit
19
20 impact of the purchase and the complexity of the supply market (supply risk). Profit
21
22 impact is defined in terms of the volume purchased, the percentage of the total cost of
23
24 purchases and the impact on product quality or competitive strategy. Supply risk is
25
26 assessed in terms of availability, the number of suppliers, competitive demand from
27
28 others for the supplied item, make-or-buy opportunities, storage risks and substitution
29
30 possibilities (alternatives). Each dimension spans the values high and low, so the
31
32 segmented (2 x 2) matrix in Figure 1 is used to classify purchases into four categories,
33
34 strategic, bottleneck, leverage and non-critical, that lay the foundations of the purchasing
35
36 strategy. A summary of the nature of the purchasing strategies implied by these
37
38 categories is synthesised below from (Kraljic, 1983) (de Boer et al., 2001) and
39
40 (Gelderman and van Weele, 2005).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Strategic purchases are critical to success and require close interactions between the
51
52 buyer and the supplier, they cannot be left to the vagaries of open-market based supply.
53
54 The purchasing strategy is to maintain a strategic partnership, so the manufacturer should
55
56 manage these purchases by regular information exchanges with suppliers, frequent visits
57
58 from both partners and long-term supply relationships, perhaps moving towards virtual
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 integration. A long-term relationship perspective increases the intensity of buyer–supplier
6
7 co-ordination (De Toni and Nassimbeni, 1999), which could extend to a manufacturer
8
9 involving a supplier in its product development.
10

11
12
13
14 Leverage purchases are easy to manage but have high strategic importance. They could
15
16 be obtained from various suppliers, so the general recommendation is to exploit
17
18 purchasing power, managing these purchases by supplier selection, product substitution
19
20 and targeted pricing negotiations. The purchasing strategy could be based upon the
21
22 principle of competitive bidding.
23
24

25
26
27
28 Bottleneck purchases are difficult to manage but have low strategic importance. They
29
30 cause significant problems and risks in their supply, possibly because suppliers are scarce
31
32 and/or too powerful. The core of the purchasing strategy is to ensure the volume of
33
34 components, so these purchases should be managed by supplier control, safety stock and
35
36 backup plans. Alternative suppliers could be found.
37
38

39
40
41
42 Non-critical purchases are easy to manage and have low strategic importance. They cause
43
44 only few technical or commercial problems from the point of view of purchasing.
45
46 However, they are ordered frequently from many suppliers, so their logistical and
47
48 administrative costs are high. Therefore, the focus of the purchasing strategy is to reduce
49
50 transaction costs through efficient processing, product standardisation and the
51
52 optimisation of order volumes and inventory levels. The number of suppliers could be
53
54 reduced through category management.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 There have been empirical studies to test and develop Kraljic's model (Caniels and
6 Gelderman, 2007) (Gelderman and van Weele, 2003) (Wagner and Johnson, 2004).

7
8
9 Whilst Gelderman (2003) argues that it is not clear why Kraljic selected the particular
10 dimensions used, endorsement is seen in their use by others and in the use of similar
11 dimensions in the literature reviewed below. This paper makes a contribution through the
12 interpretation, justification and subsequent development of these dimensions.
13
14
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 Based on the work of Kraljic (1983) and Fiocca (1982) and following on from
22 Narasimhan (1983), Olsen and Ellram (1997) proposed a portfolio model to assist in
23 managing different kinds of supplier relationships. They renamed the vertical and
24 horizontal dimensions in Figure 1, "strategic importance of the purchase" and "difficulty
25 of the purchasing situation" respectively, although in effect there is little change in
26 meaning. They assess strategic importance by three factors internal to the firm:
27 competence, economics and image. These factors have three, four and two measures
28 respectively, resulting in a total of nine measures. The difficulty of managing the
29 purchasing situation is assessed by three factors external to the company: product, supply
30 market and environmental characteristics. Each of these factors has two measures,
31 resulting in a total of six measures, so that overall Olsen and Ellram use fifteen measures,
32 as listed in Table 1. The dimensions make up a portfolio model with the same four
33 categories or matrix quadrants used by Kraljic. However, they have been criticised for not
34 testing their model empirically (Zolkiewski and Turnbull, 2000). Moller et al. (2000)
35 found the model impractical because it incorporates too many factors and measures.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 Bensaou (1999) developed a portfolio model using the two dimensions, buyers' specific
60

1
2
3
4
5 investments and suppliers' specific investments. These are broadly defined and can
6
7 include anything from tangible to intangible resources developed to meet the needs of
8
9 specific suppliers or customers. They are typically difficult or expensive to transfer to
10
11 another relationship and may lose their value when redeployed. Bensaou's model
12
13 classifies supplier relationships into four categories: strategic partnership, captive
14
15 supplier, captive buyer and market exchange - see Figure 2. Wasti et al. (2006) tested this
16
17 model on a case study taken from the automotive industry in Turkey, with the result that
18
19 no captive buyer relationships were identified. Comparing their findings with those of
20
21 Bensaou, the Turkish situation resembles that seen in Japan where there are few captive
22
23 buyer relationships and that seen in the USA where there are fewer market exchange
24
25 relationships than strategic partnerships. Since Bensaou's model has been developed
26
27 primarily for the automotive industry, there is insufficient guidance provided for practical
28
29 use in other industries, which can be quite different, so it has not seen widespread
30
31 application (Gelderman, 2003). Large automobile manufacturers sit at the top of their
32
33 supplier pyramids and their relationships with their major suppliers are generally closed
34
35 and involve contracts for long periods of time, so that the suppliers become very
36
37 dependent upon them. This is why the level of specific investments is important in
38
39 determining strategy in Bensaou's automotive model. In contrast, the model developed in
40
41 this paper is based on Kraljic's approach, which is not sector specific. A summary of the
42
43 dimensions of the models discussed above is given in Table 1.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The existing approaches to purchasing portfolio modelling show that a common problem
55
56 in defining dimensions is the synthesising of qualitative and quantitative measures
57
58 (Ahone and Salmi, 2003). If it is difficult discriminating between high and low on the
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 dimensions' scales then the classification of purchases will be arbitrary (Gelderman and
6
7 van Weele, 2003). The Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is a decision making tool that
8
9 can help in setting priorities and making the best decisions using both qualitative and
10
11 quantitative data. It scores or weights alternative courses of action based on the decision
12
13 makers' judgments of the relative importance of the criteria and the extent to which they
14
15 are met by each alternative (Nydick and Hill, 1992). For this reason, it is introduced in
16
17 the portfolio purchasing model presented in this paper. On the use of the Kraljic (1983)
18
19 matrix in the determination of purchasing strategy, Gelderman and van Weele (2003)
20
21 state, "In-depth discussions on the positions in the matrix are considered as the most
22
23 important phase of the analysis. Strategic discussions provide deeper in-sights and may
24
25 lead more easily to consensus-based decisions." The AHP can facilitate and encourage
26
27 such consensus reaching discussion as it makes the decision-making process very
28
29 transparent, highlighting misconceptions (Drake, 1998). As it synthesises the perspectives
30
31 of different people, counteracting the vested interests or restricted vision of individuals, it
32
33 provides the triangulation that is desired when dealing with qualitative data in particular.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **3. Development of the purchasing portfolio model**

44 ***3.1 The dimensions***

45
46 **The dimensions used for the portfolio model and the way in which they are**
47
48 **measured need to be defined. The authors propose the use of the 'component value'**
49
50 **and 'risk in the supply market' dimensions. This section gives a justification for**
51
52 **these and a practical but justified way in which they can be measured. This**
53
54 **discourse is an important contribution as the dimensions and measures used are at**
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 **the core of the proposed approach to purchasing strategy formulation and**
6
7 **weaknesses identified in existing approaches are addressed.**
8
9

10
11
12 Note, the application presented here concerns production-related items (raw materials and
13
14 components) used in manufacturing an end-product, i.e. strategic purchases. These have
15
16 different purchasing structures and strategies compared to non-production-related items
17
18 such as maintenance, repair and overhaul (MRO) items, i.e. non-strategic purchases
19
20 (Xideas and Moschuris, 1998).
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 It has been seen that the common form of a purchasing portfolio model has one
28
29 dimension related to the importance of a purchase and one related to the nature of the
30
31 supply. The importance of a purchase depends on the product in which it will reside; is
32
33 the purchase critical to the product's quality, competitive stance and profitability? The
34
35 supply dimension is fundamentally concerned with risk assessment and here it is labelled
36
37 'risk in the supply market'. It relates to the performance of the suppliers and factors
38
39 outside the control of the buyer. For example, a component that has only one supplier
40
41 who in turn is financially unstable is higher risk than a component that has numerous,
42
43 stable suppliers.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 ***3.2 Measuring the 'component value' dimension***

51
52 If purchasing strategy is to support business strategy, it follows that the importance of a
53
54 particular purchase is determined by the competitive priorities of the business. Hayes and
55
56 Wheelwright (1984) introduced the term "competitive priorities" and argued that
57
58 companies compete in the marketplace by virtue of one or more of the four, core
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 competitive priorities; cost, quality, delivery time and flexibility. Following their
6
7 research, there has been a consensus in the operations management literature that these
8
9 are the four main competitive priorities, for example see (Dangayach and Deshmukh,
10
11 2001) and (Krajewski and Ritzman, 2005). Any company, regardless of the industry in
12
13 which it operates, should improve its product quality and service (flexibility or
14
15 availability) and reduce lead times and cost simultaneously as illustrated in Figure 3
16
17 (Johansson et al., 1993), which portrays the calculation of the total value of the product to
18
19 the customer and gives insight into what is covered by each of the four priorities.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 According to Krause et al.'s (2001) empirical research, purchasing's competitive
27
28 priorities are conceptualised as being similar to the competitive priorities in operations
29
30 management. Manufacturers use materials and components sourced from external
31
32 suppliers, so their products and customer service are affected significantly by the
33
34 performance of their suppliers in terms of cost, quality, time and availability (Krause and
35
36 Scannell, 2002). These four competitive priorities are measured on the basis of the
37
38 importance of the factors in Table 2 to the process of purchasing components. These
39
40 factors are adopted here in measuring the importance dimension, which is labelled
41
42 'component value' in line with Johansson et al. (1993), as the fundamental importance of
43
44 a component is determined by its contribution to the value of the product to the customer.
45
46 Note, in the literature the words service, flexibility and availability are effectively used
47
48 interchangeably and availability is used from hereon in this paper.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 It has been argued that quality is the most important concern for strategic supplier
58
59 management (Chao and Scheuing, 1994). The assurance of an adequate supply of
60

1
2
3
4
5 materials and components is certainly one of the key elements of total quality
6
7 management (Gonzalez-Benito et al, 2003). The quality of purchased components is a
8
9 major determinant of the quality of the end-product (Gadde and Snehota, 2000). In this
10
11 paper, the importance of quality is measured on the basis of the importance of the
12
13 durability, reliability and innovation of the component. Quality is associated with
14
15 conformance to specifications and meeting the customers' expectations (Dangayach and
16
17 Deshmukh, 2001)(Miltenburg, 2005)(Slack and Lewis, 2002) and durability and
18
19 reliability in particular must conform (Chan and Chan, 2004). In general, these two
20
21 measures are often used as measures of quality (Krause et al., 2001)(MacKenzie and
22
23 Hardy, 1996)(Park and Hartley, 2002)(Shin et al., 2000). Innovation is included as a
24
25 measure of quality as it can be central to achieving competitive advantage, and high
26
27 innovation in purchased components is often the quickest and easiest way to improve the
28
29 quality of the end-product (Burt, 1989). Pagell and Krause (2002) included innovation as
30
31 a separate, 5th competitive priority. The method of analysis presented here could be
32
33 modified to do this, however, in the present analysis innovation is explicitly accounted
34
35 for within quality.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The importance of availability is measured on the basis of the importance of volume
46
47 flexibility, modification flexibility and technological capability. Volume flexibility
48
49 directly impacts customers' perceptions by preventing out of stock conditions of products
50
51 when demand is suddenly high and modification flexibility is a value-adding attribute
52
53 that is immediately visible to the customer (Vickery et al., 1999). Modification flexibility
54
55 relates to the ability to meet the demands of high variety and personalised products. If the
56
57 purchasing function of a firm can manage effectively its supplier capabilities, the result
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 could be an increase in manufacturing flexibility (Clark, 1989) (Narasimhan and Das,
6
7 1999). Technological change is one of the principal factors of competition (Porter, 1985)
8
9 and new technologies present opportunities to enter into the market with a new product
10
11 (Christensen and Bower, 1996). For these reasons, the technological capability of
12
13 suppliers has received focal attention as a supplier selection criterion (Katsikeas et al.,
14
15 2004).
16
17

18
19
20
21 The importance of cost is measured on the basis of the importance of purchasing cost,
22
23 inventory cost and quality cost. Purchasing cost is clearly one of the fundamental
24
25 measures in assessing the importance of overall cost (Kraljic, 1983) (Olsen and Ellram,
26
27 1997). Inventory cost is important in the wider context of supply chain management
28
29 (Childerhouse and Towill, 2000). The quality of components has substantial implications
30
31 for cost (Bowersox et al., 2002). Purchasing high quality components reduces the
32
33 inventory cost (Nicholas, 1998) and production costs by eliminating rework, scrap and
34
35 inspection in manufacturing processes (Pitts and Lei, 2000). A firm can improve its cost
36
37 position by ensuring that the quality of purchased components meets its requirements
38
39 (Porter, 1985) and if the cost of inspection of purchased items is reduced, then the quality
40
41 cost is reduced (van Weele, 2005).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 The importance of time is measured on the basis of the importance of delivery speed,
51
52 delivery reliability and development speed. These times can be crucial in determining the
53
54 success of a product (Christopher and Towill, 2000) and many businesses are gaining a
55
56 competitive advantage by purchasing from suppliers who offer a reduction in standard
57
58 delivery times (Lee and Billington, 1992).
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 As discussed earlier, to combine these measures to give an overall measure for
8
9
10 'component value' the AHP is used as described in Section 5. To achieve the aims and
11
12 objectives set by the business strategy one must focus on the strategic or competitive
13
14 priorities, i.e. that which contributes most, and 'priority' is a relative measure. This
15
16 means that 'component value' is a relative rather than absolute measure. For example, the
17
18 impact of a component on cost depends on its proportion of the overall cost of the end-
19
20 product, i.e. its costs relative to the cost of the other components. This makes the AHP
21
22 appropriate.
23
24
25
26
27

28 ***3.2 Measuring the 'risk in the supply market' dimension***

29
30
31 However, 'risk in the supply market' is quite different. If a component fails to be
32
33 delivered then the final product cannot be completed. High risk purchases must be
34
35 managed accordingly, irrespective of whether other components are more or less risky.
36
37 Consider for example the number of suppliers; having only one or two suppliers is high
38
39 risk. However, having many suppliers is low risk. If two components had (say) 20 and
40
41 100 potential suppliers respectively, then both are low risk on an absolute basis. If a
42
43 relative view was taken, 20 is much smaller than 100 so would be classed, incorrectly, as
44
45 high risk. Therefore, the AHP is not appropriate, as the risk associated with an individual
46
47 component should be measured independently or directly. This difference between how
48
49 'component value' and 'risk in the supply market' are measured (relative versus absolute)
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 is important to appreciate as it results in different treatments in the model presented here.

1
2
3
4
5 The dimension of 'risk in the supply market' is based on the similar dimensions used by
6
7 Kraljic (1983) and Olsen and Ellram (1997). Kraljic used the following factors in
8
9 measuring the "complexity of the supply market": availability; number of potential
10
11 suppliers; competitive demand; make-or-buy opportunities; storage risks; substitution
12
13 possibilities. Olsen and Ellram used three factors with seven sub-factors for measuring
14
15 "difficulty of the purchasing situation": product characteristics (sub-factors: novelty and
16
17 complexity); supply market characteristics (sub-factors: suppliers' power, suppliers'
18
19 technical and commercial competence); environmental characteristics (sub-factors: risk
20
21 and uncertainty). These measures require the acquisition of data external to the business.
22
23
24
25
26 It is not easy to get all the required data for either of these sets of factors using a
27
28 business's internal resources as much time and expense may be required. Rajagopal and
29
30 Sanchez (2005) argued that data is only available from the closest suppliers and even
31
32 when it is available, it can be incorrect due to reasons such as the commitment of the
33
34 supplier and the fundamental size and complexity of the task of data acquisition. It may
35
36 be particularly difficult for an SME to acquire accurate data from suppliers as SMEs do
37
38 not have the 'power' of large customers to command the attention of suppliers. In the
39
40 case study SMEs introduced in the following section, the staff reported that they certainly
41
42 did not have the data required. Furthermore, even though Olsen and Ellram used several
43
44 factors and sub-factors they still noted that the list was not comprehensive and it may
45
46 need to vary for individual businesses. It is reiterated that Moller et al. (2000) found
47
48 Olsen and Ellram's model to be impractical because it is too elaborated. The argument
49
50 subscribed to in this paper is that the over elaboration of the measurement of this
51
52 dimension is neither immediately helpful nor practical.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 It is proposed here that two simple factors can be used to assess ‘risk in the supply
6 market’. First, ‘size of supplier’ is a way of measuring the “supplier’s power” as used by
7 Olsen and Ellram, on the assumption that power is typically related to size. **Larson et al.**
8 **(2005) argue that small firms are dependent and in less powerful negotiating**
9 **positions in supply chain management. A buyer should assess ‘size of supplier’**
10 **relative to its own size rather than in absolute terms, as it is the relative size that**
11 **fundamentally determines power.** Second, the measure ‘monopoly conditions’ is used
12 to combine and simplify Olsen and Ellram’s use of “product characteristics” and
13 “environmental characteristics”. Looking at the sub-factors, if a purchase exhibits
14 “novelty” or “complexity” then it will typically be available from only one or very few
15 suppliers, which means that there are monopoly or at best oligopoly conditions creating
16 risk. The supply risk matrix in Figure 4 combines the two factors, ‘size of supplier’ and
17 ‘monopoly conditions’ to score the ‘risk in the supply market’ in the range 1 to 9. As
18 with the AHP, the supply risk matrix converts the qualitative measurement of the factors
19 into a quantitative measurement or score to use with the purchasing portfolio model.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

4. The Case Studies and Data Acquisition

43 Two South Korean, electric elevator manufacturers, Company-A and Company-B,
44 provide case studies. Their profiles are summarised in Table 3. As these are similar, the
45 companies provide a test to see how different or similar portfolio models may be
46 produced to meet the needs of ostensibly similar businesses.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 **An elevator is designed for a specific building, considering such factors as the height**
58 **of the building, the number of users on each floor and the expected usage periods.**
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 **The numbers of components varies with the number of stories and the complexity of**
6 **the design of the elevator. Customers provide functional requirements such as speed**
7 **and capacity, desired style options and the dimensions of the building. An**
8 **appropriate set of elevator components is specified and ordered from the component**
9 **suppliers. This is a high-variety, low-volume market in which competition is very**
10 **high. As the cost of in-house manufacturing of components is much higher than the**
11 **cost of outsourcing, elevator manufacturers focus on design, assembly, marketing**
12 **and sales and most in-house component manufacturing has ceased (van Weele,**
13 **2005). Discussions with several elevator manufacturers revealed that they spend**
14 **typically more than 70% of each sales dollar on purchased components, so they**
15 **should strive to improve not only availability but also to reduce costs. The key to**
16 **success in this industry is the ability to embrace both efficiency and customisation.**
17 **Elevator manufacturers are representative of many other manufacturers as they are**
18 **noticing the criticality of purchased components, supplier performance and,**
19 **therefore, purchasing strategy to competitiveness.**
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The data for the portfolio mapping exercise was gathered by questioning five of
44 Company-A's staff who are involved directly or indirectly with component purchasing;
45 two from the purchasing department, one from engineering, one from manufacturing
46 operations and one from accounting. In Company-B only three staff were available for
47 questioning. They came from purchasing, manufacturing operations and accounting; but
48 the member of staff from manufacturing operations was responsible for the engineering
49 function also. These samples give coverage of different functions and therefore
50 perspectives. Nicholas (1998) referred to purchasing, manufacturing operations,
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 engineering and accounting as the four key functions to have represented in a supplier
6
7 selection team. Interviews with the staff required visits to the companies to gather data
8
9 'face to face'. During each interview, the specific terminology of the decision criteria was
10
11 explained as necessary. Special care was taken to avoid the pitfall of using leading
12
13 questions when asking the staff for their evaluations.
14
15

16 17 18 19 **5. Applying the AHP to measure the 'component value' dimension**

20
21 The staff of Company-A and Company-B were the 'evaluators' for the purposes of the
22
23 AHP, which was implemented using the Expert Choice (2004) software. The AHP is
24
25 explained in detail by Saaty and Vargas (2001) and succinctly by Drake (1998). An
26
27 introduction in the context of purchasing strategy and the elevator application is given
28
29 here. In summary, it proceeds as follows:
30
31
32

- 33
34
35 i. Select the criteria and their sub-criteria (measures) according to which the
36
37 components are to be prioritized; these encapsulate the competitive priorities
38
39 of the business.
40
41
- 42
43 ii. Weight the relative importance of the criteria using pair-wise comparisons
44
45 based on a '1 to 9' relative importance scale as described below.
46
47
- 48
49 iii. Weight the relative importance of the sub-criteria within each criterion using
50
51 pair-wise comparisons and the '1 to 9' scale and multiply these weights by
52
53 their parent criterion weights to get overall sub-criterion weights.
54
55
- 56
57 iv. Score the impact of each component on each sub-criterion using the direct
58
59 rating scale described below and weight these scores using the sub-criterion
60
weights before summing to give an overall score for the component.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 To structure the problem, the goal is placed at Level 1 of the AHP hierarchy, as shown in
11 Figure 5. The goal in this application is the ranking or scoring of each component's
12 impact on the competitive priorities of the business. Level 2 of the hierarchy contains the
13 competitive priorities (ranking criteria) introduced above. Level 3 contains the sub-
14 criteria that are used to assess or 'measure' the criteria. The relative importance of the
15 competitive criteria and sub-criteria to the business and the parent criteria respectively are
16 rated using the basic AHP approach of pair-wise comparison. Level 4 of the hierarchy
17 contains the rating scale for assessing the impact of individual components of the elevator
18 on the sub-criteria. This is different from the usual AHP approach in that an absolute
19 measurement is assigned to each sub-criterion for each component to be purchased,
20 instead of pair-wise comparisons of the components on the basis of each sub-criterion.
21 This direct approach avoids the large number of pair-wise comparisons and has been used
22 in supplier selection (Chan and Chan, 2004)(Tam and Tummala, 2001). The last level of
23 the hierarchy consists of the components of the elevator's bill of materials (BOM) to be
24 evaluated.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The nine-point scale in Table 4, suggested by Saaty and Vargas (2001), is used in making the pair-wise comparisons of the criteria and sub-criteria. For example, if an evaluator decides that quality is moderately more important than time, then the former is rated '3' and the latter '1/3' in this pair-wise comparison. Within each criterion, the sub-criteria are compared pair-wise to establish their relative importance to their parent criterion. For example, if component durability is considered absolutely (maximally) more important in

determining quality compared to component reliability, then it is rated '9' and component reliability '1/9' in this pair-wise comparison. Matrices of pair-wise comparisons are obtained by the completion of all the pair-wise comparisons. Table 5 gives the five comparison matrices for Evaluator-1 for Company-A, one for the criteria and one for each of the four groups of sub-criteria within the criteria.

There is the possibility of inconsistency in the pair-wise comparisons. For example, an evaluator may rate quality as '7' against cost, cost as '7' against time and time as '7' against quality. This is inconsistent as the first two '7's imply that quality should be rated more highly than time. To understand Saaty's (1980) treatment of inconsistency, let a_{ij} denote the comparison of criterion i against criterion j , the element of the comparison matrix at row i , column j . A matrix is then called "consistent" if $a_{ik} = a_{ij}a_{jk}$, for all i, j, k . Based on this, Saaty then shows that for a pair-wise comparison matrix of size $(n \times n)$ to be "absolutely consistent", it must have one positive eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max} = n$, while all other eigenvalues equal zero. In the real world, human evaluators do not usually achieve absolute consistency; so to be pragmatic Saaty introduces the consistency index (C.I.) to measure the "closeness to absolute consistency":

$$\text{C.I.} = (\lambda_{\max} - n) / (n - 1) \quad (1)$$

Having measured the closeness to absolute consistency, there is then a need to interpret the level to determine if it is acceptable, i.e. sufficiently close enough to zero. Saaty's basis for making this decision starts with the premise that, if one has little or no information about the factors being compared, then judgments will appear to be random (Forman and Selly, 2001). Saaty then introduced the consistency ratio (C.R.) to assess whether a matrix is sufficiently consistent or not. This is

1
2
3
4
5 the ratio of the C.I. to the random index R.I., which is the C.I. of a matrix of comparisons
6
7 generated randomly:
8
9

$$C.R. = C.I. / R.I. \quad (2)$$

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 **C.R.= 0 indicates perfect consistency because C.I. = 0, but this is not expected in**
17 **practise. C.R.=1 indicates C.I. = R.I., which would be achieved if judgments were**
18 **made at random rather than intelligently. The closeness of C.R. to 0, relative to the**
19 **range 0 to 1, is used as a measure of the degree of consistency. The rule of thumb**
20 **that is applied by Saaty and generally by others is that C.I. should be less than 10%**
21 **of R.I. to be acceptable, i.e. C.R. < 0.01, see for example (Forman and Selly, 2001)**
22 **(Bhattacharya et al, 2005).**
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 **The value of R.I. will increase with n .** Random pair-wise comparisons have been
36 simulated to produce average random indices for different sized ($n \times n$) matrices. In Saaty
37 and Vargas (2001), for $n = 3$ to 10 the R.I. values given are 0.52, 0.89, 1.11, 1.25, 1.35,
38 1.40, 1.45 and 1.49 respectively. So for $n=3$, C.R. should be <0.05 and for $n=4$ it should
39 be <0.09 , applying the 10% criterion. Each pair-wise comparison matrix in Table 5 is
40 presented with its C.R. and these satisfy this consistency test. However, for another of
41 Company-A's staff C.R. >0.09 for the (4x4) criterion comparison matrix, so his data was
42 removed from the analysis; this was the representative of the accounting department. C.R.
43 values very close to 0.05 for his (3x3) cost and time comparison matrices provide further
44 support for this decision.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 As suggested by Saaty and Vargas (2001), the geometric mean (the n^{th} root of the product
6
7 of n items), rather than the arithmetic mean, is used to consolidate the pair-wise
8
9 comparison matrices of the individual evaluators. This yields the five 'consensus
10
11 matrices' in Table 6 for Company-A and Table 7 for Company-B. The next step is to
12
13 compute the 'priority vectors' to define the relative priorities of the criteria and sub-
14
15 criteria (the final columns of Tables 6 and 7). There are potentially many ways in which
16
17 this might be done. However, Saaty's consistency principle that $a_{ik} = a_{ij} \cdot a_{jk}$ and
18
19 subsequent argument for using the special case of the consistent matrix formed by
20
21 elements $a_{ij} = w_i/w_j$, where w_i and w_j are the elements of the priority weight vector
22
23 corresponding to criteria i and j (i.e. their priorities), leads to the following method that is
24
25 used here. In terms of matrix algebra, a priority vector is computed as the normalized,
26
27 principal (largest) eigenvector of the consensus matrix of pair-wise comparisons. The
28
29 calculation is complex and is normally executed using proprietary software. However,
30
31 there are simpler methods for calculating an approximate solution. **For example,**
32
33 **normalize the ratings in a consensus matrix by dividing each entry in a column by**
34
35 **the sum of all the entries in that column, so that the entries in the column add up to**
36
37 **one, and then average these normalized weights across the rows to give an average**
38
39 **priority weight for each criterion. The normalization down the columns makes it**
40
41 **statistically sound to compare and average scores across the columns to give row**
42
43 **averages. Drake (1998) has provided a detailed demonstration of this algorithm and**
44
45 **it can be implemented readily in a spreadsheet.**
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 The priority vectors in Tables 6 and 7 are used to produce the overall or global weights
58
59 for the sub-criteria in Table 8. The corresponding criterion and sub-criterion weights are
60

1
2
3
4
5 multiplied to give a global weight for each sub-criterion, so that the importance or weight
6
7 of a sub-criterion is measured by its importance to its parent criterion weighted by the
8
9 importance of the parent criterion to the business strategy. **For example, looking at**
10
11 **Table 8, Company-A has generated a weight of 0.21 for quality when rating it**
12
13 **against the other criteria (availability, cost and time). Within quality, a weight of**
14
15 **0.51 has been assigned to component durability when rating it against component**
16
17 **reliability and component innovation. So the overall or global weight for component**
18
19 **durability is $0.21 \times 0.51 = 0.11$. This is the weight given to this sub-criterion relative**
20
21 **to all the sub-criteria across all the criteria and the sum of all such global sub-**
22
23 **criterion weights is then 1.**
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 In the second stage, the evaluators used absolute measurement to rate the strength of the
32
33 impact of the individual elevator components on the sub-criteria using the five-point scale
34
35 (VH=very high; H=high; M=medium; L=low; VL=very low) suggested by Tam and
36
37 Tummala (2001). Table 9 gives the ratings of two example evaluators. Table 10 shows
38
39 the normalized weights calculated for the five-point scale using the AHP procedure
40
41 described above. Absolute or direct measurement is used because there would be an
42
43 intractable number of pair-wise comparisons to perform. There are 23 components to be
44
45 rated against the 12 measures in Table 2, resulting in ${}_{23}C_2 = 23!/2!(23-2)! = 253$ pair-wise
46
47 comparisons for each of the 12 measures, giving a total of $253 \times 12 = 3036$ comparisons.
48
49 Absolute measurement reduces this to $23 \times 12 = 276$ direct measurements. This
50
51
52 difference would grow very rapidly with increases in numbers of components. Tam and
53
54
55 Tummala (2001) and Chan and Chan (2004) also used direct measurement for this reason.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 For each component, the results obtained with the five-point rating scale are multiplied
6
7 by the global weights of the sub-criteria. **This process is illustrated in Table 11 for the**
8
9 **control panel component for Evaluator-1 in Company-A. For example, the global**
10
11 **weight for component durability is 0.11 (from Table 8) and the impact of the control**
12
13 **panel on durability has been assessed as high, which equates to weight of 0.26 from**
14
15 **Table 10. So the score for control panel in respect of durability is $0.11 \times 0.26 = 0.028$.**
16
17
18 The total score for each component is normalized by dividing by the sum of the total
19
20 scores across all the components, so that they sum to 1. **Looking at Table 11, the total**
21
22 **score for the control panel is $0.028 + 0.019 + \dots + 0.002 = 0.242$. The sum of the**
23
24 **total scores across all the components was calculated as 2.547. So the normalized**
25
26 **score for the control panel is $0.242/2.547 = 0.095$.** The normalized, total scores for each
27
28 component from each evaluator are then combined using the geometric mean to give the
29
30 results in the final two columns of Table 12.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 As the AHP is based on the 1 to 9 weighting scale the 'component value' scores are
39
40 transformed onto this scale for consistency using Equation (3). The scaled scores are used
41
42 in positioning the components in the purchasing portfolio matrix.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

$$Z_i = 8 (y_i - \text{Min}(y)) / (\text{Max}(y) - \text{Min}(y)) + 1 \quad (3)$$

50
51
52
53
54
55 where:

56
57
58
59
60 Z_i = transformed score of component i ;

y_i = normalised score of component i ;

$\text{Min}(y)$ = minimum normalised score across all components;

$\text{Max}(y)$ = maximum normalised score across all components.

For example, for Company-A in Table 12 the mean score for the brake $y_1 = 0.051$, $\text{Min}(y) = 0.021$ and $\text{Max}(y) = 0.097$. So, the transformed score for the brake on the 1 to 9 scale is $Z_1 = 8 (0.051 - 0.021) / (0.097 - 0.021) + 1 = 4.16$. This score is used as the 'component value' ordinate in Figure 6.

After scoring 'component value', the 'risk in the supply market' is scored by the evaluators using the supply risk scoring matrix in Figure 4, giving the results in Table 13.

Finally, the components are positioned in the purchasing portfolio matrix using their scores for 'component value' and 'risk in the supply market', as shown in Figure 6.

6. Analysis of results

The weights calculated for the competitive priorities are given in Tables 6 and 7 (final column, rows 1-4) for Company-A and Company-B respectively. In the case of Company-A, availability (0.39) is nearly twice as heavily weighted as quality (0.21) and over four times more heavily weighted than time (0.09). Since this elevator manufacturer has adopted the make-to-order (MTO) strategy, availability is naturally the supreme competitive priority. Cost (0.31) is the second priority, which is justified as Company-A spends more than 70% of each sales dollar on purchased materials and components. Quality still maintains a significant weight for safety reasons; elevators are built to strict

1
2
3
4
5 quality standards such as ASME A17 for the U.S.A. and the EN 81 series for Europe.
6
7 Time has the lowest weight due to the overriding importance of availability and cost,
8
9 agreeing with Quayle's (2003) survey, which found that the highest priority requirements
10
11 placed on suppliers by SMEs are pricing, quality and capability, while time to market and
12
13 procurement have lower importance.
14
15

16
17
18 Company-B's results are strikingly similar to Company-A's for availability and time,
19
20 underlining again the importance of availability to the MTO strategy. A difference seen is
21
22 that quality and cost are rated equally by Company-B, whereas Company-A rates cost
23
24 more highly. This difference is justified as Company-A targets the housing estate market,
25
26 which has a typical batch size of more than 10, whereas Company-B targets the market
27
28 for office buildings and flats, which has a typical batch size less than 5. Company-A's
29
30 customers expect a quantity discount as they are ordering in large batches, so cost is a
31
32 higher priority.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The weightings of the sub-criteria within each competitive priority seen in Tables 6 and 7
41
42 (final column, rows 5-16) show remarkably strong agreement between the companies for
43
44 quality and fairly strong agreement for cost. For availability and time there is a larger
45
46 difference in the weightings between the companies. However, the ranking of the sub-
47
48 criterion weights within each competitive priority is consistent across the companies. The
49
50 conclusion drawn here is that there is a fairly high level of consistency between the
51
52 companies' weighting and ranking of the sub-criteria.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The global weights for the sub-criteria, in Table 8, show consistency in the ranking of the
6 sub-criteria between the companies with only minor differences, but there are some
7 differences in their values. Most notably, Company-A yields higher global values for the
8 two biggest weights, modification flexibility and purchasing cost. As their parent criteria,
9 availability and cost respectively, are also more heavily weighted by Company-A, there is
10 the effect of multiplying 'peak' values, which amplifies differences.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 The rating of the strength of the impact of the components on the competitive priority
22 measures (the sub-criteria) is given in Table 9 for two example components and two
23 evaluators from Company-A and Company-B respectively. Where there are differences
24 between their evaluations they are small. Analysing the data across all the evaluators, this
25 high level of consistency was observed in general.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Table 11 gives the total score for the impact of the control panel for Evaluator-1 in
36 Company-A. As discussed above, Company-A has high weights for modification
37 flexibility and purchasing cost. As Evaluator-1 considers the control panel to have a high
38 impact on these measures, it follows that the overall score for the control panel in respect
39 of these measures is high.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Figure 6 shows the final result, the positioning of the components within the purchasing
51 portfolio. Company-B has a large number of components in the low value, low risk, non-
52 critical items category, whereas Company-A has moved several of these further along the
53 'risk in the supply market' dimension into the bottleneck category. Company-B has
54 placed more components into the high levels of 'component value'.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Company-A has a clear natural-break in its 'risk in the supply market' values in the
8 region of the middle value of 5. This is important because the use of this middle value as
9 the boundary between low and high has no real justification, whereas a natural-break in
10 the data is an intuitively more reasoned boundary between strategic groupings. Company-
11 A has two components just under 5 on the 'component value' scale, so there is not a
12 natural-break at 5. However, a natural-break does appear moving up the value scale
13 beyond 5 towards the position of the motor generator. Company-B has a natural-break in
14 its scores for 'risk in the supply market' and 'component value' in the region of 5. It is
15 also noted that the high scores for 'component value' break into two groups for both
16 companies – high and very high.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 Due to the differences noted above, differences exist in the implied purchasing strategies.
34 Both companies have a large cluster of non-critical items to be managed accordingly.
35 Company-A also has several low-value components to be managed on the basis of high
36 'risk in the supply market', i.e. bottleneck items, whereas Company-B has only one such
37 item. Company-B has more components classified as clearly high value.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

7. Recommendations to companies.

50 Company-A has many components with high 'risk in the supply market', so it should
51 focus on reducing this risk. For its many bottleneck items, it should develop supplier
52 control, use safety stocks and backup plans, and seek alternative suppliers. For the
53 strategic items it should ensure close relationships and frequent information exchange
54 with its suppliers, involving them in product and supply chain development. For its many
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 non-critical items it can continue with its underlying strategy of competing on price. This
6
7 can be done through efficient, low-cost transactions, product standardisation and
8
9 optimised inventory management. As Company-A has few components with high
10
11 'component value', it should consider more carefully which components have high
12
13 impact on achieving its competitive strategies in case some important impacts have been
14
15 underestimated.
16
17

18
19
20
21 As Company-B has many non-critical components, it has the opportunity to pursue lower
22
23 costs. It has been identified that Company-B attaches equally high weight to cost and
24
25 quality in its competitive priorities. However, the purchasing portfolio matrix is showing
26
27 that Company-B has a number of very high value components that need to be managed
28
29 for quality and a large number of non-critical components that need to be managed for
30
31 cost. This is what the equal importance of cost and quality mean, rather than every
32
33 component should be managed on the basis of high quality and cost. So whilst Company-
34
35 B should focus on close relationships with its suppliers of high value components to
36
37 achieve high quality, it should not ignore the opportunity to reduce the cost of its many
38
39 non-critical items by exploiting market-based supply. Generally, for its non-critical items
40
41 Company-B should aim to reduce transaction costs through efficient processing, product
42
43 standardisation and the optimisation of order volumes and inventory levels, whilst the
44
45 number of suppliers could be reduced through category management. Having seen
46
47 Company-A rate far more components as high 'risk in the supply market', Company-B
48
49 should consider whether it is being complacent in assessing its own risk as being lower or
50
51 reassure itself that its own risk is indeed lower.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

8. Conclusion

The case for aligning purchasing strategy with business strategy has been argued.

Purchasing portfolio models have received great attention in both the academic and business fields recently and the evidence suggests that they are effective tools for developing differentiated purchasing strategies that are aligned with business strategy.

However, their application still has some limitations, so this paper has presented a purchasing portfolio modelling approach to address some of these limitations.

Factors and their measures for defining competitive priorities in a tractable way have been identified and justified. Further interpretation and justification of the dimensions of Kraljic's purchasing portfolio model have been provided, as well as their further development into the pragmatic 'component value' and 'risk in the supply market' dimensions. The positioning of purchases on the 'component value' scale has been made systematic by the application of the AHP to consolidate the qualitative measures of the competitive priorities into a single quantitative measure of a component's impact on the value of the end-product. The positioning of purchases on the 'risk in the supply market' scale has been made simple by the use of the supply risk matrix which quantifies the risk based on a qualitative assessment of 'monopoly conditions' and the 'size of the supplier'. As justified in the paper, measurement is direct for each purchased component in respect of 'risk in the supply market' but relative to other components in respect of 'component value'. The use of methods based on the users' qualitative judgments rather than hard, quantitative data is of particular value to SMEs that lack the power and resource to acquire the large quantity of quantitative data required, which may in any case lack integrity.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The purchasing portfolio approach developed here has been applied to two South Korean
8 elevator manufacturers using face-to-face interviews with their staff. This has yielded
9
10 some notable differences in the positioning of their purchased components in the
11
12 purchasing portfolio matrix, even though these companies have ostensibly similar
13
14 situations. These differences have been analysed and related to the business strategies of
15
16 the companies so that recommendations have been made on the future purchasing
17
18 strategies of the companies. **It is acknowledged that the approach presented should**
19
20 **now be tested, exercised and, if necessary, refined on more industrial case studies.**
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 References

- 28
29
30 Ahone, P. and Salmi, A. (2003), "Portfolios in supply network management: An analysis
31 of a Finnish company in the electro technical industry", *Proceedings of the 19th IMP*
32 *Conference*, Lugano, Switzerland.
33
34
35 Bartezzaghi, E. and Ronchi, S. (2004), "A portfolio approach in the e-purchasing of
36 materials", *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 10(3), 117-126.
37
38 **Bhattacharya, A, Sarkar, B. and Mukherjee, S. K. (2005), "Integrating AHP with**
39 **QFD for robot selection under requirement perspective", *International Journal of***
40 ***Production Research*, 43(17), 3671–3685.**
41
42
43 Bensaou, M. (1999), "Portfolios of buyer-supplier relationships", *MIT Sloan*
44 *Management Review*, 40(4), 35-44.
45
46
47 de Boer, L., Labro, E. and Morlacchi, P. (2001), "A review of methods supporting
48 supplier selection", *European Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 7(2), pp.
49 75-89.
50
51
52 Bowersox, D.J., Closs D.J., and Cooper M.B. (2002), *Supply Chain Logistics*
53 *Management*, McGraw-Hill, London.
54
55
56 Burt, D.N., (1989), "Managing product quality through strategic purchasing", *Sloan*
57 *Management Review*, 30(1), pp. 39–47.
58
59
60 Cagliano, R. and Spina, G. (2002), "A comparison of practice-performance models
between small manufacturers and subcontractors", *International Journal of Operations*
and Production Management, 22(12), 1367-1388.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Caniels, M.C.J. and Gelderman, C.J. (2007), "Power and interdependence in buyer supplier relationships: A purchasing portfolio approach", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 34(2), 219-229.

Carr, A.S. and Pearson, J.N. (2002), "The impact of purchasing and supplier involvement on strategic purchasing and its impact on firm's performance", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 22(9), 1032-1053.

Chan, F.T.S. and Chan, H.J. (2004), "Development of the supplier selection model - a case study in the advanced technology industry", *Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, 218(12), 1807-1824.

Chao, C.N. and Scheuing, E.E. (1994), "Marketing services to professional purchasers", *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 2(2), 155-162.

Chen, I.J. and Paulraj, A. (2004), "Understanding supply chain management: critical research and a theoretical framework", *International Journal of Production Research*, 42(1), 131-163.

Childerhouse, P. and Towill, D.R. (2000), "Engineering supply chains to match customer requirements", *Logistics Information Management*, 13(6), 337-345.

Christensen, C.M. and Bower, J.L. (1996), "Customer power, strategic investment, and the failure of leading firms", *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(3), 197-218.

Christopher, M. and Towill, D.R. (2000), "Supply chain migration from lean and functional to agile and customised", *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 5(4), 206-213.

Clark, K.B. (1989), "What strategy can do for technology", *Harvard Business Review*, 67(6), 94-98.

Cox, A. and Watson, G. (2004), "Top tools: one hit wonders or lasting classics?", *Supply Management*, 4 November, 20-23.

Dangayach, G. and Deshmukh, S. (2001), "Manufacturing strategy: Literature review and some issues", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, 21(7), 884-932.

De Toni, A. and Nassimbeni, G. (1999), "Buyer-supplier operational practices, sourcing policies and plant performances: results of an empirical research", *International Journal of Production Research*, 37 (3), 597-619.

Drake, P.R. (1998), "Using the analytic hierarchy process in engineering education", *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 14(3), 191-196.

1
2
3
4
5 Dubois, A. and Pedersen, A-C. (2002), "Why relationships do not fit into purchasing
6 portfolio models; a comparison between the portfolio and industrial network approaches",
7 *European Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, 8(1), 35-42.
8

9
10 Expert Choice (2004), *Expert Choice 11: Quick Start Guide and Tutorials*, Expert Choice
11 Inc., Arlington.
12

13 Fiocca, R. (1982), "Account portfolio analysis for strategy development", *Industrial*
14 *Marketing Management*, 11(1), 53-62.
15

16
17 Flores, B.E., Olson, D.L. and Dorai, V.K. (1992) "Management of multicriteria inventory
18 classification", *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, Vol. 16, No. 12, pp. 71-82.
19

20
21 Forman E.H. and Selly M. A. (2001), *Decision by Objectives*, World Scientific,
22 Singapore
23

24
25 Gadde, L. and Hakansson, H. (2001), *Supply Network Strategies*, John Wiley and Sons,
26 Chichester, England.
27

28
29 Gadde, L. and Snehota, I. (2000), "Making the most of supplier relationships", *Industrial*
30 *Marketing Management*, 29(4), 305-316.
31

32 Gelderman, C.J. (2003), *A portfolio approach to the development of differentiated*
33 *purchasing strategies*. Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven.
34

35 Gelderman, C.J. and van Weele, A.J. (2003), "Handling measurement issues and strategic
36 directions in Kraljic's purchasing portfolio model", *Journal of Purchasing and Supply*
37 *Management*, 9(5), 207-216.
38

39
40 Gelderman, C.J. and van Weele, A.J. (2005), "Purchasing portfolio models: a critique and
41 update", *The Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 41(3), 19-28.
42

43 Gonzalez-Benito, J., Martinez-Lorente, A.R. and Dale, B.G. (2003), "A study of the
44 purchasing management system with respect to total quality management", *Industrial*
45 *Marketing Management*, 32(6), 443-454.
46
47

48 Hayes, R.H. and Wheelwright, S.C. (1984), *Restoring our competitive edge: Competing*
49 *through manufacturing*, John Wiley, New York.
50

51
52 Janda, S. and Seshadri, S. (2001), "The influence of purchasing strategies on
53 performance", *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 16(4), 294-306.
54

55
56 Johansson, H.J., Mchugh, P., Pendlebury, A.J. and Wheeler III, W.A. (1993), *Business*
57 *process reengineering*, John Willey and Sons, Chichester, England.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Katsikeas, C.S., Paparoidamis, N.G. and Katsikea, E. (2004), "Supply source selection
6 criteria: the impact of supplier performance on distributor performance", *Industrial*
7 *Marketing Management*, 33(8), 755-764.
8

9
10 Kibbeling, M.I. (2005), *An explorative study into the role of culture in the buyer-supplier*
11 *relationship: a Dutch-French comparison of differentiated purchasing portfolio*
12 *strategies*, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven.
13

14
15 Krajewski, L.J. and Ritzman, L.P. (2005), *Operations management; Processes and value*
16 *chains*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
17

18
19 Kraljic, P. (1983), "Purchasing must become supply management", *Harvard Business*
20 *Review*, 61(5), 109-117.
21

22
23 Krause, D.R., Pagell, M. and Curkovic, S. (2001), "Toward a measure of competitive
24 priorities for purchasing", *Journal of Operations Management*, 19(4), 497-512.
25

26
27 Krause, D.R. and Scannell, T.V. (2002), "Supplier development practices: product and
28 service based industry comparisons", *The Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 38(2),
29 13-21.
30

31
32 Larson, P.D., Carr, P. and Dhariwal K.S. (2005), "SCM Involving Small Versus Large
33 Suppliers: Relational Exchange and Electronic Communication Media", *The Journal of*
34 *Supply Chain Management*, 41(1), 18-29.
35

36
37 Lawson, B., Cousins, P.D., Handfield, R.B. and Petersen, K.J. (2008), "Strategic
38 purchasing, supply management practices and buyer performance improvement: an
39 empirical study of UK manufacturing organizations", *International Journal of*
40 *Production Research*, 1-19, iFirst, DOI: 10.1080/00207540701694313
41

42
43 Lee, H.L. and Billington, C. (1992), "Managing supply chain inventory", *MIT Sloan*
44 *Management Review*, 33(3), 65-73.
45

46
47 MacKenzie, H.F. and Hardy, K.G. (1996), "Manage your offering or manage your
48 relationship?", *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 11(6). pp. 20-37.
49

50
51 Markowitz, H. (1952), "Portfolio Selection", *The Journal of Finance*, 7(1), 77-91.
52

53
54 Metty, T., Harlan, R., Samelson, Q., Moore, T., Morris, T., Sorensen, R., Scheur, A.,
55 Raskina, O., Scheur, R., Kanner, J., Potts, K. and Robbins, J. (2005), "Reinventing the
56 supplier negotiation process at Motorola", *Interfaces*, 35(1), 7-23.
57

58
59 Miltenburg, J. (2005), *Manufacturing strategy: How to formulate and implement a*
60 *winning plan*, Productivity Press, New York.

1
2
3
4
5 Moller, M., Momme J. and Johansen, J. (2000), "Supplier segmentation in theory and
6 practice – towards a competence perspective", *Proceedings of the 9th International*
7 *IPSERA Conference*, London, Ontario, Canada, 24-27 May, 508-519.

8
9
10 Narasimhan, R. (1983). "An analytic approach to supplier selection", *Journal of*
11 *Purchasing and Materials Management*, Vol. 19, pp. 27-32.

12
13 Narasimhan, R. and Das, A. (1999), "An empirical investigation of the contribution of
14 strategic sourcing to manufacturing flexibilities and performance", *Decision Sciences*,
15 30(3), 683-718.

16
17
18 Nellore, R. and Soderquist, K. (2000), "Portfolio approaches to procurement analysing
19 the missing link to specifications", *Long Range Planning*, 33(2), 245-267.

20
21 Ng, W.L. (2007), "A simple classifier for multiple criteria ABC analysis", *European*
22 *Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 177, No.1 , pp. 344-353.

23
24
25 Nicholas, J.M. (1998), *Competitive manufacturing management: continuous*
26 *improvement, lean production, customer-focused quality*, McGraw-Hill, London

27
28 Nydick, R.L. and Hill, R.P. (1992), "Using the analytic hierarchy process to structure the
29 supplier selection procedure", *International Journal of Purchasing and Materials*
30 *Management*, 28(2), 31-36.

31
32
33 Olsen, R.F. and Ellram, L.M. (1997), "A portfolio approach to supplier relationships",
34 *Industrial Marketing Management*, 26(2), 101-113.

35
36
37 Pagell, M. and Krause, D.R. (2002), "Strategic consensus in the internal supply chain:
38 exploring the manufacturing-purchasing link", *International Journal of Production*
39 *Research*, 40(13), 3075-3092.

40
41
42 Parikh, M.A. and Joshi, K. (2005), "Purchasing process transformation: restructuring for
43 small purchases", *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*,
44 25(11), 1042-1061.

45
46
47 Park, S. and Hartley, J.L. (2002), "Exploring the Effect of Supplier Management on
48 Performance in the Korean Automotive Supply Chain", *The Journal of Supply Chain*
49 *Management*, 38(2), pp. 46-52.

50
51
52 Partovi, F.Y. and Anandarajan, M. (2002), "Classifying inventory using an artificial
53 neural network approach", *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, Vol. 41, No. 4, pp.
54 389-404.

55
56
57 Pitts, R.A. and Lei, D. (2000), *Strategic management: Building and sustaining*
58 *competitive advantage*, 2nd edition, South-Western College Publishing, Cincinnati, OH.

59
60
Porter, M.E. (1985), *Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior*
performance, Free Press, New York.

1
2
3
4
5
6 Pressey, A., Tzokas, N. and Winklhofer, H. (2007), "Strategic purchasing and the
7 evaluation of "problem" key supply relationships: what do key suppliers need to know?",
8 *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 22(5), 282-294.

9
10
11 Quayle, M. (2002), "Purchasing in small firms", *European Journal of Purchasing and*
12 *Supply Management*, 8(3), 151-159.

13
14 Quayle, M. (2003), "A study of supply chain management practice in UK industrial
15 SMEs", *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 8(1), pp. 79-86.

16
17
18 Rajagopal, S. and Sanchez, R. (2005), "Analysis of customer portfolio and relationship
19 management models: bridging managerial dimensions", *Journal of Business and*
20 *Industrial Marketing*, 20(6), 307-316.

21
22
23 Saaty, T.L. (1980), *The analytic hierarchy process: planning, priority setting, resource*
24 *allocation*, McGraw-Hill, London.

25
26 Saaty T.L. and Vargas, L.G. (2001), *Models, methods, concepts and applications of the*
27 *analytic hierarchy process*, Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

28
29
30 Sarkis, J. and Talluri, S. (2002), "A model for strategic supplier selection", *The Journal*
31 *of Supply Chain Management*, 38(1), 18-28.

32
33
34 Shin, H., Collier, D.A. and Wilson, D.D. (2000), "Supply management orientation and
35 supplier/buyer performance", *Journal of Operations Management*, 18(3), pp. 317-333.

36
37 Slack, N. and Lewis, M. (2002), *Operations Strategy*, Prentice Hall, UK.

38
39
40 Tam, M.C.Y. and Tummala, V.M.R. (2001), "An application of the AHP in vendor
41 selection of a telecommunication system", *Omega – The International Journal of*
42 *Management Science*, 29(2), 171-182.

43
44
45 Vickery, S., Calantone, R. and Droge, C. (1999), "Supply chain flexibility: an empirical
46 study", *The Journal of Supply Chain Management*, 35(3), 16-24.

47
48
49 Wagner, S.M. and Johnson, J.L. (2004), "Configuring and managing strategic supplier
50 portfolios", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 33(8), 717-730.

51
52
53 Wasti, S.N., Kozan, M.K. and Kuman, A. (2006), "Buyer-supplier relationships in the
54 Turkish automotive industry", *International Journal of Operations and Production*
55 *Management*, 26(9), 947-970.

56
57
58
59
60 Watts, C.A., Kim, Y.K. and Hahn, C. (1995), "Linking purchasing to corporate
competitive strategy", *International Journal of Purchasing and Materials Management*,
31(2), 2-8.

1
2
3
4
5 van Weele, A.J. (2005), *Purchasing and supply chain management; Analysis, strategy,*
6 *planning and practice*, Thomson Learning, London.
7

8
9 Wynstra, F. and ten Pierick, E. (2000), "Managing supplier involvement in new product
10 development: A portfolio approach", *European Journal of Purchasing and Supply*
11 *Management*, 6(1), 49-57.
12

13 Xideas, E. and Moschuris, S. (1998), "The influence of product type on the purchasing
14 structure", *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(11/12), 974-992.
15

16
17 Zolkiewski, J.M. and Turnbull, P.W. (2000), "Relationship portfolios - past, present and
18 future", *Proceedings of the 16th Annual IMP Conference*, Bath, UK.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 **Figure captions:**
6

7 **Figure 1: Kraljic's Purchasing Portfolio Model**
8
9

10 **Figure 2: Bensaou's Purchasing Portfolio Model**
11
12

13
14 **Figure 3: Calculating Value (Johansson et al., 1993)**
15
16

17
18 **Figure 4: Supply risk scoring matrix**
19
20

21 **Figure 5: AHP model for analysis of 'component value' for the elevator**
22
23 **manufacturer**
24
25

26
27 **Figure 6: Purchasing portfolio models for Company-A and Company-B**
28
29

30 **Table 1: Classification dimensions of purchasing portfolio models**
31
32

33
34 **Table 2: Factors influencing the 'component value'**
35
36

37
38 **Table 3: Summary of companies' profiles**
39
40

41
42 **Table 4: 1 to 9 scale for AHP preferences**
43
44

45 **Table 5: Pair-wise comparison matrices for Evaluator-1 for Company-A**
46
47

48 **Table 6: Geometric mean of pair-wise comparison matrices of all evaluators for**
49
50 **Company-A**
51
52

53
54 **Table 7: Geometric mean of pair-wise comparison matrices of all evaluators for**
55
56 **Company-B**
57
58

59 **Table 8: Combined criteria and sub-criteria weights in two elevator firms**
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60


Table 9: Absolute ratings given by Evaluator-1 of Company-A and Evaluator-1 of Company B to some of the components

Table 10: Pair-wise comparison judgment matrix for five-point rating scale

Table 11: Calculation of overall score for the *control panel* component for Evaluator-1 in Company-A

Table 12: Summary of normalized ‘component value’ scores

Table 13: Scores for ‘risk in the supply market’



Appendix

The Questionnaire

Part 1: Criteria and Sub-criteria; competitive priorities and their measures.

(1) Compare the criteria on a pair-wise basis, decide which is most important and circle the weight that indicates how much more important it is.

Criteria	Importance ← Equality → Importance																	Criteria
Quality	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Availability
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Cost
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Time
Availability	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Cost
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Time
Cost	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Time

(2) Compare the sub-criteria for measuring **quality** on a pair-wise basis, decide which is most important and circle the weight that indicates how much more important it is.

Sub-criteria	Importance ← Equality → Importance																	Sub-criteria
Component durability	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Component reliability
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Component innovation
Component reliability	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Component innovation

(3) Compare the sub-criteria for measuring **availability** on a pair-wise basis, decide which is most important and circle the weight that indicates how much more important it is.

Sub-criteria	← Equality →									← Equality →									Sub-criteria
Volume flexibility	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Modification flexibility	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Technological capability	
Modification flexibility	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Technological capability	

(4) Compare the sub-criteria for measuring **cost** on a pair-wise basis, decide which is most important and circle the weight that indicates how much more important it is.

Sub-criteria	← Equality →									← Equality →									Sub-criteria
Purchasing cost	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Inventory cost	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Quality cost	
Inventory cost	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Quality cost	

(5) Compare the sub-criteria for measuring **time** on a pair-wise basis, decide which is most important and circle the weight that indicates how much more important it is.

Sub-criteria	← Equality →									← Equality →									Sub-criteria
Delivery speed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Delivery reliability	
	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Development speed	
Delivery reliability	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Development speed	

Part 2: Component assessment to be completed for each component

(1) What is the name of component? _____

Rate the impact of the component on the following measures of the competitive priorities:

(2) Quality

(2.1) Durability
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(2.2) Reliability
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(2.3) Innovation
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(3) Availability

(3.1) Volume flexibility
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(3.2) Modification flexibility
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(3.3) Technological capability
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(4) Cost

(4.1) Purchasing cost
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(4.2) Inventory cost
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(4.3) Quality cost
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(5) Time

(5.1) Delivery speed
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(5.2) Delivery reliability
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

(5.3) Development speed
 _____ Very High _____ High _____ Moderate _____ Low _____ Very Low

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

(6) Supply Risk

(6.1) Circle the component's position in the matrix below to score its 'supply risk'.

Monopoly conditions (Number of suppliers)	few	5	7	9
	several	3	5	7
	many	1	3	5
		small	middle	large

Size of supplier

Review Only




Figure 1: Purchasing Portfolio Model Kraljic (1983)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3: Calculating Value (Johansson et al., 1993)




Figure 2: Purchasing Portfolio Model Bensaou (1999)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Monopoly conditions (Number of suppliers)	few	5	7	9
	several	3	5	7
	many	1	3	5
		small	middle	large

Size of supplier

Figure 4: Supply risk scoring matrix




Figure 5: AHP model for analysis of 'component value' for the elevator manufacturer

Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 6: Purchasing portfolio models for Company-A and Company-B


Portfolio models	Classification dimensions	
	Internal factors	External factors
Kraljic (1983)	<p>Importance of purchase</p> <p>- volume purchased, percentage of total purchase cost, impact on product quality and business growth</p>	<p>Complexity of supply market</p> <p>- availability, number of suppliers, competitive demand, make-or-buy opportunities, storage risks and substitution possibilities</p>
Olsen and Ellram (1997)	<p>Strategic importance of the purchase</p> <p>Competence factors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. extent to which the purchase of the firm's core competencies 2. purchase improves knowledge of buying organization 3. purchase improves technological strength of buying organization <p>Economic factors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. volume or monetary value of purchases 5. extent to which purchase is part of final product and value adding 6. extent to which purchase is part of a final product and profitable 7. criticality of purchase to get leverage with supplier for other purchases <p>Image factors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. supplier critical image/brand name 9. potential environmental/safety concerns 	<p>Difficulty of the purchasing situation</p> <p>Product characteristics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. novelty 11. complexity <p>Supply market characteristics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 12. suppliers' power 13. suppliers' technical and commercial competence <p>Environmental characteristics</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. risk 15. uncertainty
Bensaou (1999)	<p>Buyer's specific investments</p> <p>Tangible investments - buildings, tooling, equipment</p> <p>Intangible investments - people, time, effort, best practice, knowledge</p>	<p>Supplier's specific investments</p> <p>Tangible investments - plant or warehouse location or layout, specialized facilities, dies</p> <p>Intangible investments - sending guest engineers, developing information systems</p>

Table 1: Classification dimensions of purchasing portfolio models

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Quality factors
1. Component durability
2. Component reliability
3. Component innovation
Availability factors
1. Volume flexibility
2. Modification flexibility
3. Technological capability
Cost factors
1. Purchasing cost
2. Inventory cost
3. Quality cost
Time
1. Delivery speed
2. Delivery reliability
3. Development speed

Table 2: Factors influencing the ‘component value’



	Company A	Company B
Number of employees	53	47
Turnover (2005)	£5M	£4.5M
Product demand	Unpredictable	
Product life cycle	1 year to 2 years	
Profit margin on individual orders	20% to 50%	
Product variety	>100 variants	
Business strategy	Differentiation	
Manufacturing strategy	Make to order (MTO)	

Table 3: Summary of companies' profiles

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intensity of importance	Definition	Explanation
1	Equal importance	Two criteria contribute equally to the objective
3	Moderate importance	Experience and judgement slightly favour one over another
5	Strong importance	Experience and judgement strongly favour one over another
7	Very strong importance	A criterion is strongly favoured and its dominance is demonstrated in practice
9	Absolute importance	Importance of one over another affirmed on the highest possible order
2, 4, 6, 8	Intermediate values	Used to represent compromise between the priorities listed above
Reciprocals of above non-zero numbers	If criterion i has one of the above non-zero numbers assigned to it when compared with criterion j, then j has the reciprocal value when compared with i	

Table 4: 1 to 9 scale for AHP preferences

Competitive Priority	Quality	Availability	Cost	Time
Quality	1	1/2	1/2	2
Availability	2	1	2	3
Cost	2	1/2	1	2
Time	1/2	1/3	1/2	1
Consistency Ratio C.R. = 0.03				
Quality	Component durability	Component reliability	Component innovation	
Component durability	1	2	5	
Component reliability	1/2	1	3	
Component innovation	1/5	1/3	1	
C.R.=0.00				
Availability	Volume flexibility	Modification flexibility	Technological capability	
Volume flexibility	1	1/5	1/3	
Modification flexibility	5	1	2	
Technological capability	3	1/2	1	
C.R.=0.00				
Cost	Purchasing cost	Inventory cost	Quality cost	
Purchasing cost	1	7	4	
Inventory cost	1/7	1	1/2	
Quality cost	1/4	2	1	
C.R.=0.00				
Time	Delivery speed	Delivery reliability	Development speed	
Delivery speed	1	1/2	3	
Delivery reliability	2	1	8	
Development speed	1/3	1/8	1	
C.R.=0.01				

Table 5: Pair-wise comparison matrices for Evaluator-1 for Company-A

Competitive Priority	Quality	Availability	Cost	Time	Priority weight
Quality	1	0.5	0.5	2.9	0.21
Availability	2.1	1	1.4	3.5	0.39
Cost	1.9	0.7	1	3.1	0.31
Time	0.3	0.3	0.3	1	0.09
C.R.=0.02					
Quality	Component durability	Component reliability	Component innovation	Priority weight	
Component durability	1	1.4	3.9	0.51	
Component reliability	0.7	1	2.7	0.36	
Component innovation	0.3	0.4	1	0.13	
C.R. = 0.00					
Availability	Volume flexibility	Modification flexibility	Technological capability	Priority weight	
Volume flexibility	1	0.3	0.5	0.14	
Modification flexibility	3.9	1	2.4	0.59	
Technological capability	2.2	0.4	1	0.27	
C.R. = 0.01					
Cost	Purchasing cost	Inventory cost	Quality cost	Priority weight	
Purchasing cost	1	5.9	3.7	0.69	
Inventory cost	0.2	1	0.5	0.11	
Quality cost	0.3	2.0	1	0.20	
C.R. = 0.01					
Time	Delivery speed	Delivery reliability	Development speed	Priority weight	
Delivery speed	1	0.5	3.0	0.31	
Delivery reliability	1.9	1	6.3	0.59	
Development speed	0.3	0.2	1	0.10	
C.R. = 0.00					

Table 6: Geometric mean of pair-wise comparison matrices of all evaluators for Company-A

Competitive Priority	Quality	Cost	Availability	Time	Priority weight
Quality	1	0.6	1.0	2.6	0.26
Availability	1.6	1	1.6	2.9	0.37
Cost	1.0	0.6	1	2.6	0.26
Time	0.4	0.3	0.4	1	0.11
C.R.=0.01					
Quality	Component durability	Component reliability	Component innovation	Priority weight	
Component durability	1	1.6	3.3	0.51	
Component reliability	0.6	1	2.6	0.35	
Component innovation	0.3	0.4	1	0.14	
C.R.=0.01					
Availability	Volume flexibility	Modification flexibility	Technological capability	Priority weight	
Volume flexibility	1	0.4	0.5	0.19	
Modification flexibility	2.3	1	1.3	0.45	
Technological capability	2.0	0.8	1	0.36	
C.R.=0.00					
Cost	Purchasing cost	Inventory cost	Quality cost	Priority weight	
Purchasing cost	1	6.2	2.6	0.64	
Inventory cost	0.2	1	0.3	0.09	
Quality cost	0.4	3.1	1	0.27	
C.R.=0.01					
Time	Delivery speed	Delivery reliability	Development speed	Priority weight	
Delivery speed	1	0.8	2.6	0.39	
Delivery reliability	1.3	1	2.9	0.46	
Development speed	0.4	0.3	1	0.15	
C.R.=0.00					

Table 7: Geometric mean of pair-wise comparison matrices of all evaluators for Company-B

Company	Competitive priority	Local weight	Competitive priority measures	Local weight	Global weight	Rank
Company-A	Quality	0.21	Component durability	0.51	0.11	3=
			Component reliability	0.36	0.07	5
			Component innovation	0.13	0.03	9=
	Availability	0.39	Volume flexibility	0.14	0.05	8
			Modification flexibility	0.59	0.23	1
			Technological capability	0.27	0.11	3=
	Cost	0.31	Purchasing cost	0.69	0.21	2
			Inventory cost	0.11	0.03	9=
			Quality cost	0.20	0.06	6=
	Time	0.09	Delivery speed	0.31	0.03	9=
			Delivery reliability	0.59	0.06	6=
			Development speed	0.10	0.01	12
		Total	1.00	Total	1.00	
Company-B	Quality	0.26	Component durability	0.51	0.13	3=
			Component reliability	0.35	0.09	5
			Component innovation	0.14	0.04	9=
	Availability	0.37	Volume flexibility	0.19	0.07	6=
			Modification flexibility	0.45	0.17	1=
			Technological capability	0.36	0.13	3=
	Cost	0.26	Purchasing cost	0.64	0.17	1=
			Inventory cost	0.09	0.02	11=
			Quality cost	0.27	0.07	6=
	Time	0.11	Delivery speed	0.39	0.04	9=
			Delivery reliability	0.46	0.05	8
			Development speed	0.15	0.02	11=
		Total	1.00	Total	1.00	

Table 8: Combined criteria and sub-criteria weights in two elevator firms

Competitive priority	Competitive priority measures	Company-A Evaluator-1		Company-B Evaluator-1	
		Control panel	Governor	Control panel	Governor
Quality	Component durability	H	H	H	H
	Component reliability	H	H	H	H
	Component innovation	VH	H	VH	H
Availability	Volume flexibility	L	M	L	M
	Modification flexibility	H	M	H	M
	Technological capability	H	H	H	H
Cost	Purchasing cost	H	L	VH	M
	Inventory cost	VL	VL	VL	VL
	Quality cost	M	L	M	L
Time	Delivery speed	H	M	H	H
	Delivery reliability	H	M	H	H
	Development speed	H	L	H	M

VH=very high; H=high; M=medium; L=low; VL=very low

Table 9: Absolute ratings given by Evaluator-1 of Company-A and Evaluator-1 of Company B to some of the components

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Rating scale	VH	H	M	L	VL	Priority weight
Very high (VH)	1	3	5	7	9	0.51
High (H)	1/3	1	3	5	7	0.26
Moderate (M)	1/5	1/3	1	3	5	0.13
Low (L)	1/7	1/5	1/3	1	3	0.06
Very low (VL)	1/9	1/7	1/5	1/3	1	0.04

Table 10: Pair-wise comparison judgment matrix for five-point rating scale

Competitive priority measures	Global weight (from Table 8)	Control Panel Scoring		
		Rate	Rating weight (from Table 10)	Global weight x Rating weight
Quality				
Component durability	0.11	H	0.26	0.028
Component reliability	0.07	H	0.26	0.019
Component innovation	0.03	VH	0.51	0.014
Availability				
Volume flexibility	0.05	L	0.06	0.003
Modification flexibility	0.23	H	0.26	0.060
Technological capability	0.11	H	0.26	0.027
Cost				
Purchasing cost	0.21	H	0.26	0.056
Inventory cost	0.03	VL	0.04	0.001
Quality cost	0.06	M	0.13	0.008
Time				
Delivery speed	0.03	H	0.26	0.008
Delivery reliability	0.06	H	0.26	0.015
Development speed	0.01	H	0.26	0.002
Total score				0.242
Normalized score				0.095
= Total score / Sum of total score across all components				

Table 11: Calculation of overall score for the *control panel* component for Evaluator-1 in Company-A

Component	Company-A				Company-B	
	Evaluator-1 Score	Evaluator-2 Score	Evaluator-3 Score	Evaluator-4 Score	Mean Score	Mean Score
Brake	0.049	0.047	0.051	0.058	0.051	0.064
Buffers	0.024	0.019	0.018	0.025	0.021	0.024
Car Set	0.110	0.098	0.083	0.101	0.097	0.085
Compensating Chain	0.028	0.025	0.028	0.036	0.029	0.026
Control Panel	0.095	0.089	0.093	0.087	0.092	0.086
Counterweights	0.025	0.022	0.022	0.024	0.023	0.025
Door Operator	0.044	0.053	0.043	0.045	0.047	0.045
Door Safety Device	0.041	0.041	0.040	0.037	0.040	0.039
Governor	0.054	0.052	0.059	0.057	0.055	0.059
Guide Rails	0.043	0.050	0.035	0.045	0.043	0.041
Guide Shoes	0.026	0.029	0.026	0.028	0.027	0.027
Interlock Device	0.040	0.036	0.038	0.035	0.038	0.038
Limit Switch	0.025	0.029	0.026	0.027	0.027	0.027
Load Weighing Devices	0.023	0.031	0.025	0.026	0.026	0.025
Motor Generator	0.066	0.058	0.087	0.064	0.069	0.081
Operation Fixtures	0.059	0.053	0.059	0.061	0.057	0.061
Rail Brackets	0.024	0.029	0.026	0.027	0.026	0.027
Roller Guides	0.024	0.029	0.026	0.026	0.026	0.027
Rope Brake	0.029	0.033	0.026	0.028	0.029	0.029
Ropes	0.038	0.054	0.044	0.037	0.043	0.042
Safety Gear	0.025	0.029	0.026	0.027	0.027	0.027
Traction Machine	0.079	0.071	0.093	0.068	0.078	0.081
Travelling Cables	0.028	0.025	0.028	0.030	0.028	0.031
Total	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.000	1.000

Table 12: Summary of normalized ‘component value’ scores

Component	Company-A				Company-B	
	Evaluator-1 Score	Evaluator-2 Score	Evaluator-3 Score	Evaluator-4 Score	Mean Score	Mean Score
Car set	1	1	3	1	1.3	1.0
Control panel	7	9	7	7	7.5	7.6
Traction machine	7	7	7	9	7.5	6.8
Motor generator	3	3	3	5	3.4	4.2
Operation fixtures	5	3	5	3	3.9	3.6
Governor	5	5	5	7	5.4	4.2
Brake	7	7	7	9	7.5	7.6
Door operator	5	5	5	7	5.4	4.2
Guide Rails	5	5	3	3	3.9	3.6
Ropes	5	5	3	3	3.9	3.6
Door Safety Device	5	5	5	7	5.4	4.2
Interlock Device	5	5	5	7	5.4	4.2
Rope Brake	5	5	5	7	5.4	4.2
Compensating Chain	5	3	3	5	3.9	3.6
Guide Shoes	3	3	3	3	3.0	3.0
Travelling Cables	5	3	3	5	3.9	2.5
Limit Switch	5	5	5	7	5.4	4.2
Load Weighing Devices	3	3	3	3	3.0	3.6
Rail Brackets	3	1	3	1	1.7	1.0
Roller Guides	3	1	3	5	2.6	2.1
Safety Gear	7	7	7	7	7.0	5.6
Counterweights	3	3	3	3	3.0	2.1
Buffers	3	1	3	3	2.3	1.0

9=very high; 7=high; 5=medium; 3=low; 1=very low

Table 13: Scores for 'risk in the supply market'

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 2: Purchasing Portfolio Model Bensaou (1999)

Review Only