Logistics Strategy – Balancing Cost, Service and Resilience

Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple.

Foreword – The Hidden Cost of Getting Logistics Wrong

Logistics management poses a deceptively simple commercial question: how can an organisation deliver the right products to the right places at the right time without allowing operating expenditure to erode profitability? Transport, warehousing, inventory and customer service function as one integrated system, yet they are frequently managed through separate departmental budgets. Decisions that look attractive within a single activity can therefore raise total expenditure, disappoint customers and quietly weaken operational resilience.

The cheapest transport arrangement rarely delivers the lowest overall cost. Cutting delivery frequency may reduce freight bills while increasing inventory, lengthening replenishment cycles and adding storage expenditure. Trimming warehouse capacity can improve short-term results but leaves operations exposed during seasonal peaks or unexpected disruption. Genuine logistics efficiency comes from understanding how these activities interact, rather than pursuing isolated savings without examining where the displaced costs will eventually resurface.

The stakes across the United Kingdom (UK) are considerable. Manufacturing, retailing, healthcare and essential public services all rely on extensive transport and distribution networks, and the consequences of their failure rarely stay within a logistics budget. When essential components become unavailable, critical deliveries miss their slots or infrastructure fails, lost production, emergency expenditure and customer dissatisfaction can rapidly outweigh whatever savings justified the original decision in the first place, often many times over.

Effective logistics strategy therefore balances cost efficiency, dependable service, inventory availability, operational capacity and resilience. Organisations must understand what customers genuinely require, evaluate the total cost of distribution and identify which risks warrant additional investment. The objective is neither maximum service regardless of expense nor minimum expense regardless of consequences, but commercially sustainable performance achieved through coordinated decisions, informed judgement and proportionate, well-tested operational safeguards.

Logistics should ultimately be judged by the value it contributes to the whole organisation rather than the apparent efficiency of individual activities. A more expensive transport service may reduce inventory investment, while additional warehouse capacity may prevent costly service interruptions. Equally, unnecessary contingency spending can weaken profitability without delivering meaningful protection. The strongest strategies recognise these trade-offs, ensuring that financial discipline, customer service and resilience reinforce rather than undermine one another.

What Is a Logistics Strategy?

A logistics strategy sets out how an organisation will plan, coordinate, and control the movement, storage, and distribution of goods to achieve its wider business objectives. It determines where inventory is held, how products are transported, which facilities are required and what service standards customers can expect. Crucially, an effective strategy connects these choices, recognising that transport, warehousing, inventory and customer service form a single interdependent system rather than separate activities.

Logistics sits within the broader discipline of supply chain management, which also encompasses procurement, production, supplier relationships and the flow of information between organisations. While supply chain management coordinates the entire network, logistics focuses on physical flows, storage, and the information that accompanies them. Strategic decisions shape the network's long-term structure, while operational management deploys available resources to meet each day's requirements efficiently and reliably.

The scale involved is striking. According to the Department for Transport (DfT), Great Britain-registered heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) moved 162 billion tonne-kilometres of freight within the UK during 2025, lifting approximately 1.53 billion tonnes of goods. Those vehicles travelled around 19 billion kilometres, and both tonnage and distance fell slightly compared with 2024. Each of those journeys reflects earlier decisions about network design, vehicle utilisation, and the cost of serving customers.

Strategic logistics planning differs fundamentally from deciding which vehicle should make tomorrow's deliveries or which operative should pick a particular order. Those operational decisions are taken within an established framework. Strategy determines whether facilities should be centralised, whether transport should be outsourced, how much capacity to maintain and which service commitments are commercially sustainable. Successful organisations revisit these assumptions regularly as customer expectations, technology and economic conditions evolve.

What Should an Effective Logistics Strategy Achieve?

An effective logistics strategy should deliver products at an appropriate total cost while maintaining the availability, reliability and responsiveness that customers require. Its objectives extend well beyond reducing transport expenditure or raising warehouse productivity. Inventory must be available when needed, capacity must accommodate demand, and operations must remain flexible enough to absorb disruption. Each objective requires measurable performance standards, supported by sound financial information and clear lines of management accountability.

Cost efficiency remains essential but should be assessed alongside service quality, not pursued as an independent goal. A distributor might lower transport costs through fewer deliveries, yet face higher stockholding, longer replenishment periods and declining customer satisfaction as a result. Conversely, a premium delivery service may be entirely justified where product value, contractual commitments or the financial consequences of delay comfortably outweigh the additional transportation expenditure involved.

Capacity utilisation presents a further challenge, because maximum utilisation rarely equates to maximum efficiency. Warehouses operating near their practical limits tend to suffer congestion, higher handling costs, and slower order processing. Transport operations with little spare capacity may struggle during seasonal peaks or unexpected disruption. Effective logistics management therefore balances productive resource use with operational flexibility and the financial cost of maintaining sensible contingency arrangements.

Sustainability and resilience should also shape strategic objectives. Consolidating deliveries can reduce vehicle movements, fuel consumption and emissions, although excessive consolidation may lengthen lead times or increase inventory. Alternative transport

arrangements and additional storage capacity protect against disruption but introduce further expenditure. The commercial challenge lies in identifying which measures create genuine long-term value while satisfying environmental obligations, regulatory requirements and the expectations of increasingly demanding customers.

Performance should ultimately be judged through a balanced combination of total logistics expenditure, delivery reliability, inventory availability, capacity utilisation, environmental performance and recovery from disruption. An organisation achieving excellent transport productivity while repeatedly failing customer deliveries cannot reasonably claim strategic success. Equally, exceptional service delivered through uncontrolled expenditure is unlikely to prove sustainable. The right priorities depend on each organisation's business model, financial resources and operational risks.

Logistics Strategy Must Support Business Strategy

Logistics requirements differ considerably between manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, public bodies, and service providers because their commercial objectives and customer obligations differ. Manufacturers typically prioritise material availability and production continuity, wholesalers focus on inventory turnover and delivery coverage, and retailers balance availability against replenishment frequency, convenience and seasonal demand. Consequently, identical logistics arrangements seldom deliver equivalent value across different sectors, even where the products involved appear broadly similar.

Greggs illustrates how logistics capacity must anticipate business growth rather than follow it. The bakery chain ended 2025 with 2,739 shops after 121 net openings, while total sales rose 6.8% to £2.151 billion. Total capital expenditure reached £287.5 million during the year, encompassing investment across the business, including new national distribution centres in Derby and Kettering. These facilities form part of the infrastructure being developed to support 3,500 shops.

Public sector logistics introduces different priorities because service continuity and public value can outweigh straightforward profitability. The National Health Service (NHS) Supply Chain handles more than eight million orders each year across over 16,000 delivery locations, drawing on more than 1,100 suppliers. The National Audit Office (NAO) reported in January 2024 that it managed £4.5 billion of annual NHS procurement spend, illustrating why healthcare logistics must combine purchasing efficiency with clinical availability and traceability.

Market positioning also shapes the right balance between cost and service. Discount retailers may favour consolidated transport and standardised distribution, while premium retailers accept higher fulfilment costs to support convenience and availability. Time-critical manufacturers may need rapid emergency replenishment to avoid production stoppages. A successful logistics strategy does not impose a universal operating model; it translates each organisation's competitive position, customer commitments and financial priorities into practical distribution arrangements.

The Total Cost of Logistics – Looking Beyond Individual Budgets

The total cost of logistics extends well beyond the invoices received from transport providers. It includes warehouse accommodation, inventory financing, handling equipment, labour, packaging, order processing, information systems, administration and the financial consequences of service failure. Because each element influences the others, isolated budget reductions can be seriously misleading. An effective assessment therefore considers the combined expenditure needed to deliver products to the required standard throughout the entire distribution network.

Consider a distributor spending £2 million annually on transport, £1 million on warehousing and £500,000 on inventory holding. A transport initiative cutting freight costs by £200,000 looks attractive, representing a 10% improvement within that budget. However, if reduced

delivery frequency adds £150,000 to inventory costs and £100,000 to emergency distribution, total logistics expenditure rises by £50,000. These illustrative figures show why departmental savings always require wider financial validation.

Inventory financing deserves particular attention because stock consumes working capital before any storage or handling cost arises. An organisation holding £10 million of average inventory at an illustrative annual financing rate of 8% incurs £800,000 in financing costs alone. This represents the assumed financing component only; total inventory carrying costs may be substantially higher once storage, insurance, handling, deterioration and obsolescence are included in the calculation.

Administrative expenditure can also be substantial where purchasing, transport and warehouse systems operate independently. Duplicate data entry, invoice discrepancies, manual reconciliation and avoidable emergency orders consume resources without improving customer outcomes. The NAO noted that NHS Supply Chain's catalogue exceeds 600,000 products, a scale at which weak data quickly becomes expensive. Integrated systems and consistent product information reduce rework, shorten payment cycles and release capacity for more valuable activity.

Management reporting should therefore combine operational performance with comprehensive financial assessment. Transport cost per delivery, warehouse cost per order and inventory turnover remain useful measures, but must be read alongside customer service, stock availability and total expenditure. Activity-based costing can reveal the resources consumed by particular products, customers or delivery arrangements. The aim is to remove unnecessary expenditure without simply transferring higher costs into another operational activity.

Why the Lowest Transport Cost Is Not Always the Best Value

Transport attracts management attention because freight rates, fuel surcharges and vehicle costs are visible, measurable and comparatively easy to negotiate. Yet the lowest quoted rate does not necessarily produce the lowest delivered cost. Cheaper arrangements may involve longer transit times, restricted delivery windows, weaker tracking or less reliable service. Those consequences can increase inventory requirements, disrupt production schedules and damage customer relationships when service commitments can no longer be maintained.

The DfT reported that Great Britain-registered HGVs travelled 5.9 billion kilometres empty during 2025, equivalent to 31% of their total distance and up from 30% in 2024. Some empty running is unavoidable, particularly for specialist vehicles or single-direction flows. Nevertheless, the figures highlight genuine opportunities in backloading, collaborative distribution and route planning, where removing unnecessary vehicle movements can reduce cost without any corresponding loss of customer service.

Delivery frequency introduces another commercial trade-off. Consolidating five weekly deliveries into two may improve vehicle utilisation and reduce transport expenditure, but customers then need additional storage space and greater inventory cover. Where demand is unpredictable, less frequent deliveries also increase the risk of stockouts. Conversely, frequent small deliveries support lean inventory while generating excessive freight costs, particularly where vehicles regularly operate well below their practical carrying capacity.

Transport strategy must also reflect operational and legal constraints. Depending on vehicle weight, journey type and any applicable exemptions, goods vehicle drivers are subject to statutory driving-time, rest-period and tachograph rules, which the Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency explains in its published guidance. Schedules built on unrealistic journey times or inadequate driver availability cannot generate sustainable savings, no matter how attractive the initial freight quotation may have appeared at contract award.

Inventory – The Cost of Holding Too Much or Too Little

Inventory absorbs the differences between supply and demand, allowing organisations to

maintain service despite fluctuations in orders, production schedules and delivery performance. Excessive stock, however, ties up working capital, occupies valuable warehouse space and increases exposure to deterioration or obsolescence. Insufficient stock creates different costs, including emergency purchases, production interruptions and lost sales. Appropriate stock levels therefore depend on commercial importance, demand variability and the reliability of replenishment.

The relationship between inventory and replenishment frequency can be illustrated through a distributor consuming 1,000 units each week. Ordering 4,000 units every four weeks creates average cycle stock of around 2,000 units, assuming steady demand and immediate receipt. Ordering 1,000 units weekly reduces average cycle stock to about 500 units. At £50 per unit, the difference releases £75,000 of inventory investment, before additional transport costs or safety stock are considered.

Stockholding costs also vary with product characteristics and commercial risk. Perishable food requires temperature control and careful rotation, while electronics lose value through technological obsolescence. Spare parts may sit unused for years yet become critical the moment equipment fails. Healthcare products demand controlled storage, traceability and dependable availability. Organisations should therefore segment inventory rather than apply identical replenishment rules and stockholding targets across every product category.

NHS Supply Chain's inventory management programme demonstrates how improved visibility can reduce stockholding expenditure while supporting clinical operations. By April 2026, participating trusts had reported cumulative savings of £15.3 million through reductions in waste, excess stock and obsolescence. The programme involved 19 NHS trusts across 83 locations, with reported improvements in clinical time availability and patient safety. These outcomes show the potential value of integrating inventory control with operational requirements.

Barts Health NHS Trust offers further evidence at the individual-trust level. Its supply chain team, which manages around 95% of hospital consumables across four sites in north-east London, reported preventing £480,000 of stock from expiring over six months, an achievement recognised with a national award in November 2025. The result shows why effective inventory management depends on accurate information, disciplined replenishment and close coordination with clinical users.

Warehousing and Distribution – Efficiency Versus Responsiveness

Warehouse location and network design directly influence transport expenditure, inventory availability, delivery lead times and resilience. Centralising inventory in fewer facilities can reduce duplicated stock, simplify management and generate economies of scale. Serving customers across greater distances, however, may increase transport costs and reduce responsiveness. Decentralised distribution offers shorter delivery routes and local flexibility, although multiple facilities add accommodation, staffing and inventory costs that must be justified commercially.

Automation can raise warehouse productivity where order volumes are substantial, and product flows predictable. Mechanised handling, automated storage and advanced picking systems increase throughput, improve accuracy and reduce repetitive manual work. Investment decisions must nevertheless account for installation, maintenance, energy consumption, flexibility and equipment reliability. Expensive automation can deliver disappointing returns where throughput proves insufficient, or where product characteristics and customer ordering patterns change significantly over the asset's working life.

NEXT shows how quickly distribution capacity can become a strategic constraint. Its online warehouse complex at Elmsall in West Yorkshire reached 87% utilisation at peak, against a planned 69%, and the retailer forecast 94% if online growth reached 8%. In March 2026, it outlined £48 million of investment to add a further 10% of capacity in 2027/28, which it estimated could support around £1.5 billion of additional full-price online sales.

NEXT has also secured planning consent for a fourth building on an adjacent 84-acre plot, a 1.2 million square foot warehouse that would add at least 50% to the site's capacity. Construction could begin by 2028, with automated picking available as early as 2030. The lead times involved underline a central point: warehouse capacity must be planned years ahead, because demand can outgrow infrastructure far faster than new facilities can be built.

When Cost Reduction Becomes Cost Displacement

Cost displacement occurs when expenditure removed from one activity reappears elsewhere, often under a different departmental budget or accounting classification. Logistics is particularly vulnerable because transport, inventory, warehousing and customer service are so closely connected. Reducing delivery frequency may lower freight expenditure while increasing stockholding. Closing a warehouse may eliminate accommodation costs but extend delivery distances. Cutting labour can improve payroll figures but may create overtime, delays, and service failures.

Consider an organisation spending £600,000 annually on transport to make five weekly deliveries to its principal customers. Reducing frequency to three deliveries a week might lower transport expenditure by an illustrative £120,000. Suppose, however, that customers subsequently require £2 million of additional average inventory, financed at 8% annually. The resulting £160,000 financing cost exceeds the freight saving by £40,000, before considering any additional handling, storage, or service disruption.

Capacity reductions can produce similar outcomes. A distribution centre employing 40 warehouse operatives might remove four positions to achieve illustrative annual payroll savings of £140,000, including employment-related costs. If the remaining employees then require £65,000 in overtime, temporary labour adds £45,000 and additional transport reaches £40,000, the apparent saving becomes a £10,000 annual cost increase. The calculation excludes further consequences for employee wellbeing, order accuracy and customer satisfaction.

Excessive inventory reduction creates another form of cost displacement. Suppose a distributor reduces average stockholding by £1 million, generating an annual financing saving of £80,000 at an assumed rate of 8%. If the reduction triggers £55,000 of emergency transport, £35,000 of additional supplier charges and £60,000 of lost contribution from unavailable products, the overall financial position deteriorates by £70,000 annually. These figures are illustrative, not actual company results.

The central management lesson is that logistics savings should be validated across the entire operating system, not accepted simply because one budget improves. Financial assessments must include direct expenditure, working capital, service consequences, capacity requirements and the probability of disruption. Genuine efficiency removes unnecessary cost while protecting operational performance. Cost displacement merely changes where expenditure appears, sometimes concealing a deterioration in business performance until its consequences become substantial.

Customer Service – Defining What the Business Must Deliver

Customer service is a fundamental measure of logistics effectiveness because distribution exists to make products available where and when customers need them. Expectations generally concern availability, delivery speed, order accuracy, consistency and effective communication, yet these requirements vary considerably between customers, industries and products. An effective logistics strategy therefore establishes clearly defined service standards rather than assuming that every customer requires the fastest possible delivery at any price.

Service standards should reflect each customer's commercial value, the importance of their requirements and the financial consequences of failure. A hospital awaiting essential medical supplies has very different priorities from a retailer replenishing routine merchandise, and an automotive manufacturer relying on scheduled component deliveries may lose substantial

production following a short delay. Sensible service differentiation protects critical requirements without imposing unnecessarily expensive arrangements on every transaction across the customer base.

Royal Mail demonstrates the importance of credible service commitments. During 2025/26, only 75.7% of First-Class letters arrived the next working day against a 93% target, while Second-Class reached 90.2% against 98.5%. These were the targets applicable during the 2025/26 reporting period; revised national targets of 90% for First-Class and 95% for Second-Class took effect from 1 April 2026. The Office of Communications (Ofcom) opened an investigation in June 2026.

Service standards should consequently set realistic delivery windows, accuracy requirements, communication arrangements and procedures for resolving failures. Useful measures include the proportion of orders delivered On Time In Full (OTIF), delivery complaints, order accuracy and customer retention. Organisations should also calculate the cost of improving service. Raising delivery reliability from 95% to 99% may justify substantial expenditure for critical products, but considerably less for routine replenishment of readily available goods.

Lead Time – The Relationship Between Speed, Cost and Reliability

Lead time is the elapsed period between a defined starting event, such as order placement, and the completion of an activity, such as customer delivery. It includes order processing, picking, packing, dispatch, transport, and the waiting time between them, along with procurement and production lead times when suppliers replenish distribution centres. Understanding these components helps managers identify real delays, rather than automatically buying faster, more expensive transport services.

Predictability is often as valuable as speed. Consider a manufacturer consuming £50,000 of components daily. Dependable five-day replenishment requires £250,000 of lead-time cover under simplified assumptions. If unreliable performance forces it to hold three extra days of protection, another £150,000 becomes tied up in stock, costing £12,000 a year at an illustrative 8% financing rate before storage. A consistent four-day service may therefore outperform a frequently broken two-day promise.

Managers should measure both average lead time and its variability, identifying whether delays originate with suppliers, administration, warehouse processes or transport. Digital order processing, accurate stock records and advance shipment information can improve reliability without necessarily increasing delivery expenditure. Network design also matters, because facilities closer to demand shorten replenishment periods. The objective is dependable service at an economically justified speed, not speed pursued regardless of its cost.

Capacity Planning – Balancing Utilisation and Flexibility

Capacity planning determines whether warehouses, transport fleets, equipment, labour and supporting infrastructure can accommodate anticipated workloads. Underused resources create unnecessary fixed expenditure, while insufficient capacity causes congestion, delays and expensive emergency measures. Effective planning considers normal activity, seasonal fluctuations, promotional demand and exceptional conditions. Managers must also distinguish theoretical maximum capacity from practical capacity, which allows for maintenance, workforce availability, operational variability and necessary recovery periods.

The 2021 HGV driver shortage showed how a single constrained resource can disrupt an entire distribution system. The Road Haulage Association estimated a shortfall of around 100,000 drivers, and by late September some fuel forecourts had run dry while others rationed purchases. On 26 September 2021, the Government announced up to 5,000 temporary visas for fuel tanker and food haulage drivers, along with measures to accelerate testing and training for new drivers.

Operating permanently at maximum utilisation undermines performance because even small

disruptions can create substantial queues and backlogs. A warehouse designed to process 10,000 orders daily has little recovery capacity if its normal workload consistently reaches that figure. Equipment breakdowns, employee absence or delayed inbound deliveries then cascade into subsequent operations. Reasonable operational headroom may appear inefficient within departmental accounts, but it protects service reliability and avoids expensive recovery measures.

Seasonal planning is particularly important in retail distribution, where Christmas trading, promotional campaigns and changing consumer behaviour concentrate workload into short periods. Businesses should compare temporary labour, flexible transport contracts, extended operating hours and additional storage against the cost of permanent infrastructure. Scenario modelling can establish when supplementary resources become necessary, combining accurate demand forecasting with flexible operating arrangements and sufficient contingency capacity to accommodate foreseeable variation.

Capacity decisions should also consider the quality of available resources, not simply their quantity. Additional warehouse employees cannot compensate for insufficient loading bays, unsuitable handling equipment or ineffective information systems. Similarly, extra vehicles provide little benefit without qualified drivers and achievable delivery schedules, as the 2021 shortage made painfully clear. Effective capacity planning identifies the actual operational constraint and directs investment towards resolving it, rather than spreading expenditure across activities with adequate capability.

Transport Strategy – Choosing the Right Distribution Model

Transport strategy determines how goods move between suppliers, production facilities, distribution centres and customers. Road freight provides extensive geographical coverage and operational flexibility, while rail offers advantages for suitable high-volume movements along established corridors. Sea freight dominates international trade in large consignments, whereas air freight supports urgent or high-value deliveries. Mode selection should reflect total delivered cost, shipment characteristics, required lead times and the reliability each option can realistically sustain.

Rail freight remains a significant, if smaller, contributor to national distribution. The DfT's Rail Trends 2025 reported 16.5 billion net tonne-kilometres moved during 2024/25, up 5.0% from the previous year, driven mainly by intermodal maritime and construction traffic. The figure nonetheless remains well below the 2013/14 peak of 22.7 billion, and road haulage by HGVs still moves almost ten times as much freight measured in tonne-kilometres.

Dedicated fleets give organisations direct control over vehicle availability, branding, driver standards and delivery schedules. That control also brings substantial financial and management commitments, including vehicle acquisition or leasing, maintenance, compliance, recruitment, and training. Dedicated operations work best where volumes are stable, delivery requirements are specialised, and service quality is central to the customer proposition. Where demand fluctuates heavily, fixed fleet costs can quickly become a burden during quieter trading periods.

Outsourced transport provides access to specialist equipment, wider geographical coverage and flexible resources without equivalent capital investment. Shared distribution arrangements can improve utilisation further by combining compatible deliveries from different organisations onto the same vehicles. However, outsourcing and collaboration introduce contractual dependencies, coordination requirements and exposure to third-party performance failures. Hence, service specifications, performance reporting and exit arrangements require careful attention from the outset of any contract.

Multimodal transport combines different methods of movement within a single distribution arrangement. Containers arriving by sea may transfer to rail for inland movement before completing their journey by road. Such arrangements can reduce long-distance road mileage and support environmental objectives, although additional handling and coordination increase

complexity. Transport managers must assess terminal availability, journey reliability, cargo characteristics and the consequences of missed connections before selecting the most appropriate combination.

Financial comparison should extend beyond freight quotations to include loading, unloading, insurance, storage, administration, inventory financing and potential service failures. An illustrative road distribution arrangement costing £500,000 annually might be replaced by a combined rail and road solution costing £450,000 in transport charges. If terminal handling then adds £30,000 and additional inventory financing costs £25,000, total expenditure rises by £5,000, and the apparent saving disappears entirely.

Centralisation Versus Decentralisation – Finding the Right Balance

Centralisation concentrates logistics activities within fewer facilities, potentially reducing duplicated inventory, management overheads and investment in warehouse infrastructure. Larger distribution centres may justify automation, improve purchasing coordination and allocate stock more efficiently. However, serving geographically dispersed customers from a limited number of locations increases delivery distances and dependence on transport. The commercial case must therefore weigh infrastructure and inventory savings against additional distribution costs and potential service limitations.

Decentralisation places inventory and operational capacity closer to customers, improving delivery responsiveness and shortening final delivery distances. Regional distribution centres can support time-critical services and provide alternative operating locations when an individual facility is disrupted. Nevertheless, multiple sites usually require additional accommodation, staffing, equipment and management. Inventory also becomes fragmented, increasing the risk of surplus stock accumulating in one location while shortages arise somewhere else in the network.

The square root law provides a theoretical starting point for assessing inventory consolidation. Under simplifying assumptions of independent and comparable demand variability, consistent replenishment conditions, and unchanged service requirements, consolidating four equivalent warehouses into one could reduce aggregate safety stock by about 50%. If the original facilities collectively hold £4 million in safety stock, the theoretical reduction could release £2 million, although actual savings may be considerably smaller.

Transport effects pull in the opposite direction. Suppose releasing that £2 million saves £160,000 in annual financing at 8%, and closing three sites removes £900,000 of property and staffing costs. If longer outbound journeys add £700,000 in delivery costs and £150,000 in additional trunking, the centralised option still saves £210,000 annually. However, if next-day coverage falls from 98% to 92%, lost business could quickly erase that illustrative saving.

Concentrated infrastructure also increases exposure to local disruption. A single national distribution centre may operate efficiently under normal conditions yet create significant vulnerability after fire, flooding, equipment failure or prolonged power loss. Regional facilities provide potential alternatives, although they cannot automatically replace specialist operations elsewhere. Managers should therefore evaluate centralisation through network modelling that captures delivery costs, stockholding, capacity constraints, customer locations and the financial consequences of losing a critical facility.

The Cost of Service Failure – What Traditional Budgets Miss

Service failure creates costs that conventional logistics budgets rarely identify clearly. Failed deliveries generate extra journeys, administration and customer enquiries, while incorrect orders require investigation, replacement and sometimes reverse logistics. Late deliveries may trigger emergency shipments, contractual deductions or lost business. The consequences extend well beyond the immediate transaction, because repeated failures undermine customer confidence, raise operating costs and weaken the commercial relationships on which future revenue ultimately depends.

Royal Mail provides a documented example of the price of sustained underperformance. In October 2025, Ofcom imposed a £21 million penalty after First-Class performance reached 77% and Second-Class 92.5% during 2024/25. Earlier penalties of £10.5 million and £5.6 million brought total fines for delivery failures to more than £37 million. These sanctions arose from specific regulatory obligations rather than commercial contracts, but show how persistent service failure eventually acquires a financial cost.

Consider a distributor making 200,000 deliveries a year with a 3% failure rate, producing 6,000 unsuccessful deliveries. At an illustrative average recovery cost of £25, direct expenditure reaches £150,000. Reducing failures to 1% would eliminate 4,000 incidents and save £100,000 annually, before counting improved customer retention or protected contribution. The example shows why investment in accuracy, visibility and dependable operations can create more value than further transport rate reductions.

In manufacturing, the consequences can be more severe because missing components may halt production rather than delay an individual order. A supplier delivering inexpensive parts can therefore expose its customer to substantial losses if those parts are essential to assembly. Logistics managers should distinguish minor service failures from incidents affecting production continuity, safety or contractual commitments, allowing preventive spending to be prioritised according to the true financial and operational consequences.

Logistics Resilience – Preparing for Disruption

Logistics resilience is a distribution system's ability to anticipate, withstand, respond to and recover from disruption while maintaining essential operations. Threats include transport interruptions, labour shortages, extreme weather, infrastructure failure, supplier insolvency, cyberattacks and geopolitical instability. Resilience does not require every service to continue unaffected in all circumstances. Instead, organisations must identify critical activities, set acceptable disruption thresholds and develop practical measures to maintain or restore essential supply.

The Port of Dover illustrates the significance of infrastructure concentration. It handled 2,119,030 road haulage vehicles in 2025, and the port states that it carries 33% of the UK's trade in goods with the European Union, worth £144 billion. Disruption at such a gateway can affect delivery schedules, vehicle availability and replenishment across numerous industries simultaneously, so resilience planning should consider credible alternative routes and the capacity available through them.

Cybersecurity has become equally important because logistics now depends on connected ordering, tracking, inventory and transport management systems. The cyberattack on Jaguar Land Rover (JLR) in September 2025 halted vehicle production for weeks and spread rapidly through its supplier network. The independent Cyber Monitoring Centre estimated the incident's UK economic impact at approximately £1.9 billion, within a modelled range of £1.6 billion to £2.1 billion, potentially affecting more than 5,000 organisations. The Centre described the incident as appearing to be the UK's most economically damaging cyber event, while acknowledging uncertainty surrounding production recovery and the eventual scale of the financial losses.

The Cabinet Office's National Risk Register 2026, published in July 2026, reinforces the importance of assessing threats to critical infrastructure, economic activity and essential services. For logistics organisations, effective resilience planning requires mapping dependencies between facilities, suppliers, technology, transport networks and personnel. Assessments should weigh both the probability and severity of disruption, paying particular attention to failures that can affect several activities at once.

Supplier and carrier failure deserve equal attention. An organisation may hold adequate stock and robust systems, yet still lose supply if a sole-source manufacturer becomes insolvent or a principal haulier withdraws capacity. Monitoring supplier financial health, maintaining approved alternatives for critical items and understanding where suppliers themselves share

facilities or subcontractors can reveal hidden concentration. Resilience ultimately depends on the weakest dependency, not the strongest individual safeguard in the network.

Efficiency Versus Resilience – The Problem with Removing Every Buffer

Lean logistics seeks to minimise unnecessary inventory, waiting time, movement and other activities that consume resources without creating customer value. Implemented properly, it improves productivity and reduces waste. Difficulties arise when organisations interpret efficiency as eliminating every operational buffer. Safety stock, spare equipment, alternative suppliers and unused capacity can appear wasteful during normal operations, yet provide essential protection when circumstances change unexpectedly, and normal supply arrangements fail.

The financial attraction of reduced inventory is straightforward. An organisation holding £5 million of average stock may save £160,000 annually by reducing inventory by £2 million, assuming an illustrative financing cost of 8%. Those savings must be weighed against the additional disruption exposure created. A single production interruption costing £250,000 could outweigh more than a year's financing benefit, although the likelihood, duration and recoverability of such losses require careful assessment.

Interconnection magnifies the problem. JLR's experience showed that even carefully planned physical inventory and transport arrangements offer limited protection when shared information systems fail, because suppliers operating on tightly synchronised schedules have little room to absorb a sudden stop. Resilience assessments should therefore examine the assumptions underpinning lean operations, including information availability, supplier reliability and recovery capability, before treating any remaining buffer as genuinely surplus to requirements.

Organisations should distinguish unnecessary surplus from strategically justified protection. Safety stock may be appropriate for critical materials with uncertain replenishment, while alternative transport capacity may protect customers facing substantial disruption costs. Conversely, holding excessive stock of products with stable demand and readily available substitutes wastes working capital. The objective is proportionate, evidence-based resilience, not indiscriminate inventory accumulation or an inflexible commitment to minimum operating expenditure.

Building Contingency into Logistics Operations

Contingency planning translates identified risks into practical arrangements for maintaining essential services during disruption. Measures may include alternative carriers, secondary suppliers, emergency inventory, backup storage, additional delivery routes and temporary operating capacity. Identifying alternatives is insufficient, however, unless their capabilities have been verified. Managers should confirm that substitute providers possess the equipment, resources, contractual permissions and available capacity needed to deliver acceptable service when normal arrangements fail.

Alternative carriers provide flexibility when transport networks suffer congestion, equipment shortages or unexpected interruptions. Maintaining several transport contracts, however, can add administration and dilute purchasing leverage. Organisations should establish which providers can genuinely support emergency requirements, including geographical coverage, vehicle specifications and mobilisation times. Periodic testing is valuable because a carrier theoretically available during normal trading may have little spare capacity when disruption affects the entire industry.

The closure of Heathrow Airport on 21 March 2025 provides a vivid example of concentrated infrastructure risk. A fire at a nearby electrical substation cut power to the airport, which closed for most of the day and affected more than 1,300 flights. For organisations dependent on time-sensitive air cargo, the incident underlined the importance of evaluating alternative airports, onward transport routes and realistic recovery arrangements well before any emergency

occurs.

Effective contingency planning must also define responsibilities, escalation procedures and communication arrangements. Business continuity plans should identify critical products, maximum tolerable interruption periods, authorised emergency expenditure and alternative operating procedures. Regular exercises expose weaknesses before an actual emergency occurs, and post-incident reviews ensure that lessons are captured rather than forgotten. Plans that exist only on paper rarely survive first contact with a genuine disruption affecting multiple sites.

Management should also review supplier dependencies and contractual arrangements, recognising that a contingency provider may face the same disruption as the principal supplier when both rely on shared infrastructure, power supplies or technology platforms. Two carriers operating from the same congested port, or two suppliers using the same software provider, offer less protection than their separate contracts suggest. Genuine contingency requires independence, not merely duplication.

The Financial Case for Logistics Resilience

Investment in resilience should be evaluated with the same commercial discipline applied to other logistics expenditure. Managers must establish the cost of preventive measures, the likelihood of disruption, the potential financial consequences and the effectiveness of proposed controls. Relevant losses may include emergency freight, production interruptions, spoilage, customer compensation, contractual liabilities and lost contribution. Appraisal should distinguish predictable annual expenditure from exceptional losses that may arise only occasionally.

A simplified example illustrates the calculation. Suppose a distribution operation faces an estimated 10% annual probability of a major disruption costing £1 million, giving an expected annual loss of £100,000. An alternative arrangement costing £45,000 annually that reduced the probability to 2% would lower expected losses to £20,000. The combined annual cost would become £65,000, suggesting an illustrative risk-adjusted benefit of £35,000 before other considerations.

Probability-based calculations are useful but should never be mistaken for certainty. Disruption estimates often rely on limited historical data, and unusually severe events can produce losses far exceeding normal expectations. Financial assessments should therefore include sensitivity analysis and realistic scenarios covering different durations, recovery costs and demand conditions. Particular care is necessary where failures could threaten essential public services, employee safety, regulatory compliance or the organisation's ability to continue trading.

Insurance and contractual arrangements transfer only part of an organisation's logistics exposure. Business interruption insurance may contain waiting periods, exclusions and financial limits. Under the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road, compensation for cargo loss is generally limited to 8.33 Special Drawing Rights per kilogram of gross weight lost, subject to applicable exceptions, including declared values and circumstances where statutory liability limitations cannot be relied upon.

Excessive contingency expenditure also deserves scrutiny, and public sector experience offers a relevant warning. In November 2024, the Department of Health and Social Care told Parliament that storing personal protective equipment unsuitable for NHS use was costing approximately £200,000 a week. Although the stock reflected exceptional pandemic procurement pressures, the figure shows how protective inventory becomes a financial burden when quantities, suitability and ongoing requirements are not regularly reassessed.

Logistics resilience should ultimately be proportionate to the consequences of failure rather than set as a fixed percentage of operating expenditure. Critical medical supplies, essential production components and time-sensitive deliveries may justify substantial protection, while

readily replaceable goods require considerably less. Effective management combines financial analysis with operational judgement, periodic testing and clear accountability, balancing efficient everyday performance with the capacity to withstand disruption without unacceptable consequences.

Sustainability – Reconciling Environmental and Commercial Objectives

Environmental sustainability has become a central consideration in logistics strategy because transport, warehousing, packaging and distribution consume substantial resources and generate emissions. The DfT reports that domestic transport produced 110.4 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent (MtCO2e) during 2024, around 30% of total UK domestic greenhouse gas emissions. HGVs accounted for 18.4 MtCO2e and vans for 18.6 MtCO2e, each representing roughly 17% of the transport total.

Vehicle utilisation offers an opportunity to improve environmental and commercial performance at the same time. The empty running levels described earlier represent fuel burned, emissions produced and driver hours consumed without any revenue-earning purpose. Improved backloading, delivery consolidation, collaborative transport arrangements, and better route planning can reduce unnecessary journeys, fuel consumption, and vehicle operating costs, while leaving established customer service commitments intact and often improving delivery predictability as well.

Tesco demonstrates how alternative technologies are being incorporated into established networks. Its 2025/26 sustainability reporting recorded 1,249 electric home delivery vans, around 21% of a UK fleet of approximately 6,000, and the 2,000th electric van entered service in September 2026 as the retailer pursues full electrification by 2030. Tesco has also introduced 42 biomethane-powered trucks in Scotland, with estimated annual greenhouse gas emissions savings of up to 6,473 tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent.

Sustainable logistics also requires attention to packaging, returns and network design. The UK's Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) arrangements for packaging impose financial obligations on qualifying producers, with published 2025/26 base fees including £196 per tonne for paper and card, £423 for plastic and £461 for fibre-based composites. Reverse logistics can recover reusable materials and reduce waste, but commercial benefits must account for collection, sorting, and processing costs.

Environmental improvements do not invariably produce immediate savings. Electric vehicles can involve higher purchase costs, charging infrastructure, grid connections and changes to operating schedules, while alternative fuels may carry price premiums or face availability constraints. An effective strategy therefore evaluates lifecycle costs, emissions reductions, infrastructure requirements and service reliability before committing resources, treating sustainability as part of total logistics value rather than a separate reporting exercise.

Understanding Demand – The Foundation of Logistics Planning

Demand forecasting underpins logistics planning because transport capacity, inventory investment, warehouse resources and delivery schedules must all reflect anticipated customer requirements. Forecasting draws on historical sales, ordering patterns, seasonal fluctuations, promotional activity and wider economic conditions. Demand rarely follows a perfectly predictable pattern, so organisations must distinguish underlying consumption from temporary spikes, exceptional orders and changes caused by product availability or shifting customer purchasing behaviour.

Inaccurate forecasts create substantial financial consequences across the network. Overestimating demand inflates inventory investment, storage expenditure and the risk of obsolescence, while underestimating it causes stockouts, emergency transport and lost sales. A distributor forecasting annual demand of 120,000 units but selling only 100,000 may accumulate 20,000 surplus units. At £40 each, that represents £800,000 of additional inventory before any financing or storage costs are added.

Seasonal and geographical patterns add further complexity. Christmas trading, summer holidays, promotions and agricultural harvests concentrate orders into short periods, so capacity planned around average demand may prove inadequate, while resourcing for peak weeks all year wastes money. Customers are also rarely evenly distributed, and remote locations demand longer journeys and higher costs per order. Forecasts should therefore be built by product, customer, location and delivery period.

Demand variability should directly shape safety stock and contingency arrangements. Products with stable consumption and reliable replenishment need relatively modest protection, while unpredictable or strategically critical items justify greater attention. Managers should measure forecast accuracy, identify systematic bias and compare outcomes against planning assumptions. Collaborative forecasting with customers and suppliers improves visibility, but forecasts remain estimates requiring continuous adjustment as commercial circumstances change over time.

Logistics Network Design – Putting Facilities in the Right Places

Logistics network design determines the location, number, size and responsibilities of the facilities used to receive, store, process and distribute goods. Decisions about warehouses, distribution centres, manufacturing sites and transport connections can shape operating expenditure for decades. Sound design considers customer geography, product characteristics, delivery requirements, transport infrastructure and future growth. Facilities that appear inexpensive individually may create substantial additional costs across the wider distribution system.

Network modelling enables organisations to compare alternative configurations before committing capital or entering long-term property agreements. Models can incorporate customer demand, transport distances, storage capacity, replenishment frequency and operating costs to estimate the financial implications of each option. Scenario analysis extends the assessment by testing changes in demand, fuel prices, service commitments or infrastructure availability, identifying arrangements that remain robust rather than those that merely appear cheapest today.

DP World's London Gateway shows how infrastructure can reshape distribution networks. The port handled more than three million twenty-foot equivalent units (TEUs) during 2025, a record and an increase of over 52% on the 1.9 million TEUs handled in 2024. Growth was driven by a newly operational fourth berth and new Asia-Europe shipping services, showing how quickly freight flows can shift to well-connected gateways once capacity becomes available.

The operator is undertaking a £1 billion expansion that will add two further all-electric berths, bringing the total to six, and a second rail terminal began operating at the site in 2025. A further £170 million automated container handling system is also planned. Combining deep-sea port capacity, rail connections, warehousing and road access allows importers to locate distribution close to the point of entry and reduce inland transport requirements.

Effective network design must also consider resilience and the consequences of concentrating operations in a limited number of locations. A central distribution centre may reduce duplicated inventory yet create dependence on particular roads, equipment and information systems. Alternative configurations should therefore be tested against service continuity requirements and credible disruption scenarios, balancing capital expenditure, recurring operating costs, customer responsiveness, and recovery capability before choosing the final structure.

Make or Buy – In-House Logistics Versus Outsourcing

Deciding whether logistics activities should remain in-house or be outsourced is a strategic choice that affects cost, control, and long-term flexibility. In-house operations give direct authority over employees, equipment, service standards and investment priorities, but require substantial management resources and financial commitment. Outsourcing provides access to specialist expertise, established networks and flexible capacity without equivalent capital

investment, although it introduces contractual dependencies and potential limits on direct operational control.

Third-party logistics (3PL) providers typically handle transport, warehousing, fulfilment, and inventory management on behalf of customers. Fourth-party logistics (4PL) arrangements generally involve broader coordination and management of entire logistics networks, often integrating several specialist providers. These distinctions concern the scope of responsibility rather than an automatic progression in service quality. Organisations should assess the required capabilities, commercial benefits, retained management responsibilities, and contractual arrangements before selecting either approach.

The NHS illustrates the public sector's reliance on specialist supply chain arrangements. NHS Supply Chain combines central procurement responsibilities with contracted warehousing and distribution services, delivering to hospitals and other care settings nationwide. Healthcare distribution shows why outsourcing decisions cannot rest on price alone, because product availability, clinical requirements, traceability and continuity of supply directly affect patient care and the delivery of essential public services every single day.

KFC's 2018 distribution crisis shows what can happen when an outsourcing transition goes wrong. The restaurant chain moved its UK distribution contract from Bidvest Logistics to DHL, and within days, deliveries were incomplete or delayed. On 19 February 2018, 562 of its roughly 900 UK restaurants were closed for lack of chicken, an episode that attracted national headlines and lasting reputational commentary across the hospitality sector.

In March 2018, KFC returned deliveries for up to 350 restaurants in the north of the UK to Bidvest, while DHL retained the remainder. The lessons are directly relevant to any logistics procurement: realistic mobilisation periods, proven capacity before go-live, phased transition rather than a single switchover, and contingency arrangements that remain available until the new provider has demonstrated stable performance under live trading conditions.

Outsourcing agreements should define service levels, reporting requirements, operational responsibilities, liability allocation and remedies for persistent underperformance. Relevant measures include delivery reliability, order accuracy, inventory integrity, responsiveness and the cost of additional services. Organisations must also plan how to maintain performance when relationships change, or contracts terminate. Poorly managed outsourcing can replace internal operating costs with unexpected contract variations, administration expenses and reduced flexibility.

The financial assessment should compare the complete cost of internal operations with every charge associated with outsourcing. An illustrative warehouse costing £1.2 million annually might be replaced by an outsourced arrangement priced at £1 million. However, systems integration costing £60,000 a year, contract management costing £50,000, and variable handling charges of £100,000 would raise total expenditure to £1.21 million, exceeding the original cost before considering any service differences.

Technology and Data – Improving Logistics Decisions

Technology increasingly shapes logistics strategy by improving visibility across transport, inventory, warehousing and fulfilment. Transport management systems (TMS) support route planning, carrier selection and shipment monitoring, while warehouse management systems (WMS) coordinate stock locations, handling and order processing. Enterprise resource planning (ERP) systems connect logistics information with purchasing, finance and other business functions. Effective integration reduces duplicated administration and provides more dependable information for both operational and strategic decisions.

Real-time tracking enables organisations to identify delayed shipments, monitor delivery progress and communicate more accurately with customers. Visibility does not, however, prevent disruption or remove underlying operational weaknesses. A tracking system may reveal that a vehicle will arrive late without providing an alternative. Management must

therefore establish procedures for responding to exceptions, reallocating resources and communicating revised commitments, ensuring that better information leads directly to better practical decisions.

Ocado provides a strong example of technology-driven logistics productivity. Its full-year 2025 results reported around 72 million orders shipped worldwide through facilities using its technology, with orders at Ocado Retail rising by 13.1%. Productivity in Ocado Retail's automated customer fulfilment centres, measured in units picked per hour, improved by 8%. The figures show how automation can increase processing capacity, although substantial investment and operational complexity demand rigorous financial evaluation.

Artificial intelligence (AI) and predictive analytics can support demand forecasting, route optimisation, maintenance planning and inventory allocation by identifying patterns within large datasets. Their effectiveness depends on reliable information, appropriate configuration and active management oversight. Inaccurate product records, incomplete customer data or unrepresentative history can produce misleading recommendations. Decisions affecting safety, customer commitments and substantial expenditure should therefore remain subject to appropriate human judgement and clear accountability.

Investment appraisal must cover acquisition, implementation, integration, cybersecurity, employee training and continuing support costs. A system costing £500,000 initially and £100,000 annually to operate requires measurable benefits sufficient to justify its full lifecycle expenditure, such as higher throughput, reduced inventory, fewer errors or lower transport costs. Successful digital transformation should be judged by operational and financial improvement rather than by the sophistication of the technology introduced.

Measuring Logistics Performance – Beyond Cost Per Delivery

Logistics performance measurement should establish whether operations achieve the required balance between expenditure, customer service, inventory availability, resource utilisation and resilience. Individual indicators provide useful information but rarely reveal the complete commercial position. Reducing transport cost per delivery may look successful while inventory expenditure rises or service deteriorates. Effective measurement therefore requires a balanced set of key performance indicators (KPIs), supported by consistent definitions, reliable data and regular management review.

Total logistics cost as a percentage of sales gives a broad indication of how resources are distributed relative to revenue. It should include transport, warehousing, inventory holding, handling, administration and service recovery costs. An organisation generating £50 million in annual sales with logistics expenditure of £4 million records a ratio of 8%. Comparisons between organisations must nevertheless account for differences in product characteristics, customer geography, and operating models before concluding.

OTIF performance measures whether orders arrive within the agreed delivery period and contain the correct quantities. Combining the two requirements prevents weaknesses from being concealed when each is measured independently. A distributor achieving 98% on-time delivery and 97% complete delivery cannot simply multiply the figures and claim 95.06% OTIF without examining the underlying orders. The true combined result depends on which individual deliveries actually satisfied both conditions.

Order fulfilment accuracy complements OTIF by examining whether customers receive the correct products, quantities and associated documentation. Errors create returns, emergency replacements, additional administration and customer dissatisfaction. A warehouse processing 500,000 orders annually at 99% accuracy still generates around 5,000 incorrect orders. If each costs an illustrative £30 to resolve, annual recovery expenditure reaches £150,000, showing why apparently small accuracy improvements can produce meaningful savings.

Inventory turnover measures how frequently average inventory is consumed or sold during a

defined period. It is commonly calculated by dividing the cost of goods sold by average inventory value, using consistent valuation methods throughout. A distributor with annual cost of goods sold of £24 million and average inventory of £4 million achieves six inventory turns, equivalent to about 61 days of stock on a 365-day year.

Inventory performance must nevertheless be interpreted alongside availability and the characteristics of individual products. Higher turnover may indicate efficient stock management, but it can also reflect insufficient inventory when customers regularly experience shortages. Slow-moving spare parts may be economically justified when their absence would interrupt critical machinery. Managers should evaluate turnover, availability, obsolescence and replenishment reliability together, rather than imposing identical targets across every product category or operational requirement.

Transport cost per order, delivery or unit provides useful insight into distribution efficiency, provided measurement boundaries are applied consistently. Vehicle utilisation should capture both carrying capacity used and the proportion of distance travelled without a load, given the scale of empty running across the national HGV fleet. Tracking these measures by route, customer and carrier highlights where backloading, consolidation or revised delivery schedules could reduce cost without weakening service.

Warehouse performance should incorporate storage occupancy, throughput, picking productivity, equipment availability and labour utilisation. Maximum occupancy, however, reduces flexibility and increases congestion, while aggressive productivity targets can compromise accuracy or safety. A warehouse operating consistently close to its practical storage capacity may report impressive utilisation figures yet struggle with replenishment, stock movements and seasonal peaks, particularly where handling space and operational flexibility are constrained. Efficiency indicators must therefore be monitored alongside growth, service requirements, safety and operating expenditure.

Lead-time measurement should assess both average duration and variability, because predictable replenishment reduces safety stock requirements and improves planning. A supplier that consistently delivers within five days may cause less disruption than one that averages four days but frequently takes far longer. Organisations should monitor delivery-time distributions, missed commitments and the underlying causes of delay, applying similar discipline to recovery times and the restoration of essential services after disruption.

Resilience indicators should measure how quickly critical operations recover after disruption, the availability of alternative capacity and the proportion of essential services maintained during incidents. An organisation restoring distribution within eight hours may perform significantly better than one requiring three days, depending on customer requirements. Contingency testing, incident analysis and periodic reviews of supplier and infrastructure dependencies should support these measures, rather than reliance on untested theoretical recovery plans.

Performance measurement should ultimately support decisions rather than produce management reports. Targets require clear ownership, appropriate review periods and investigation whenever indicators move in conflicting directions. A fall in delivery expenditure, accompanied by declining OTIF performance, rising inventory, and additional emergency shipments, should trigger a broader assessment. The objective is continuous improvement across the entire logistics system, ensuring local efficiencies deliver measurable commercial and operational value.

Managing Trade-Offs – Making Decisions Based on Total Business Value

Effective logistics strategy requires management to evaluate competing objectives rather than assume that reducing expenditure automatically improves performance. Transport, inventory, warehousing, capacity and customer service are interconnected, so improvement in one activity can create disadvantages elsewhere. Decisions should begin with a clear understanding of business requirements, followed by an assessment of total cost, service

consequences and operational risk. The preferred solution delivers the greatest sustainable business value.

Total cost analysis should identify every significant financial consequence of a proposed decision, including transport charges, warehouse expenditure, inventory financing, handling, administration, implementation and the potential cost of service failure. Reducing annual transport expenditure by £150,000 appears beneficial, but becomes commercially unattractive if additional inventory costs £90,000 and emergency deliveries add £80,000. The resulting £20,000 deterioration demonstrates why comprehensive financial appraisal must always precede approval.

Service requirements should then establish the minimum acceptable performance for each customer category, product group and operational activity. Critical manufacturing components may justify more expensive transport than readily available consumables, while healthcare products demand particularly dependable replenishment. Managers should distinguish essential service commitments from preferences that add little commercial value, preventing organisations from overinvesting in delivery speed or availability where customers would gain little meaningful benefit.

Risk assessment adds a further dimension, because apparently efficient arrangements may expose the organisation to unacceptable disruption. A single warehouse might minimise operating expenditure while concentrating inventory and operational dependency in one location. Appraisal should therefore consider disruption probability, potential losses and recovery capability. Scenario testing lets managers examine changes in demand, transport availability, supplier performance, and infrastructure reliability before accepting the lowest-cost arrangement.

A practical comparison illustrates how these elements combine. The table below sets out three hypothetical distribution networks for an organisation that requires at least 97% OTIF performance. The table presents annual logistics cost alongside service performance, average lead time, and estimated annual disruption loss, calculated as probability multiplied by impact. These are hypothetical figures, not actual business results, but they reflect the structure of a genuine network appraisal.

Illustrative measure	***Centralised***	***Regional***	***Hybrid***
Annual logistics cost	*£2.4m*	*£2.8m*	*£2.6m*
OTIF performance	*94%*	*98%*	*97%*
Average delivery lead time	*3.5 days*	*1.5 days*	*2 days*
Estimated annual disruption loss	*£150k*	*£50k*	*£70k*
Cost plus expected disruption loss	***£2.55m***	***£2.85m***	***£2.67m***

Hypothetical figures for illustration only; not actual business results.

The centralised network offers the lowest combined cost of £2.55 million, but its 94% OTIF performance fails the organisation's service requirement and therefore cannot be selected. The regional network comfortably exceeds the requirement but costs £2.85 million. The hybrid arrangement meets the 97% threshold at £2.67 million, making it the lower-cost qualifying alternative. The lowest-cost network is not automatically the preferred choice once service obligations are respected.

Net Present Value (NPV) analysis can compare the long-term financial consequences of alternative networks by discounting future cash flows, including capital expenditure, operating costs, working capital and measurable benefits. Service modelling and risk assessment should complement this analysis, ensuring the preferred arrangement consistently meets operational requirements while delivering sustainable commercial value over the full life of the facilities, contracts, and systems involved, not just in the first year of operation.

Logistics Strategy in Practice – UK Business Case Studies

Marks & Spencer demonstrates how logistics investment can support long-term retail strategy rather than merely reduce immediate operating expenditure. In August 2025, the retailer announced a £340 million automated food distribution centre in Northamptonshire, its largest supply chain investment to date. Construction began in May 2026 on the 1.3 million square foot facility, due to open in 2029, serve more than 200 food stores, and create over 1,000 jobs.

The strategic significance extends beyond the capital involved. Marks & Spencer expects the site, equipped with pallet cranes, high-speed shuttles, and automated picking, to increase capacity, improve product availability, and reduce long-term costs as it pursues its ambition to double the size of its food business. These are planned benefits rather than independently verified savings, but the case shows the value of investing ahead of demand.

JLR provides a contrasting example of disruption and supply chain dependency. Following the September 2025 cyberattack, the Government highlighted that the manufacturer employs around 34,000 people directly in the UK, with a further 120,000 employed across its UK supply chain, much of it made up of smaller businesses. Those suppliers, operating on tightly synchronised schedules, faced severe cash-flow pressure as production stopped and orders evaporated almost overnight.

On 28 September 2025, the Government announced a loan guarantee, provided through UK Export Finance, intended to unlock up to £1.5 billion of commercial financing repayable over five years. It aimed to strengthen liquidity and support supply chain recovery, not to compensate for an established loss of that amount. The wider lesson is that efficient production networks remain vulnerable when critical information systems or tightly coupled suppliers suddenly become unavailable.

These examples illustrate different dimensions of strategic logistics management rather than identical outcomes. Marks & Spencer and Greggs show planned capacity investment ahead of growth, JLR highlights the systemic exposure created by interconnected operations, and KFC demonstrates the risks of an inadequately tested provider transition. None establishes that a particular model is universally superior. Each organisation must interpret such evidence within its own commercial circumstances, operational requirements and risk appetite.

Building a Logistics Strategy – A Practical Management Framework

Developing an effective logistics strategy begins with a reliable understanding of current performance. Management should examine transport expenditure, warehouse productivity, inventory availability, delivery reliability, capacity utilisation and customer complaints. Financial information must be reconciled with operational records to expose costs hidden within departmental budgets. The assessment should also consider existing contracts, infrastructure constraints and exposure to disruption, creating a factual baseline against which proposed improvements can be measured.

The next stage translates business objectives into clearly defined logistics requirements. Customer segmentation helps distinguish essential delivery commitments from services offering limited additional value. Manufacturers may prioritise production continuity, retailers product availability and public bodies the dependable provision of essential supplies. Management should then establish performance standards for each category, considering delivery frequency, lead time, inventory requirements and the financial consequences of failing to meet expectations.

Cost analysis should evaluate transport, warehousing, inventory financing, handling, administration and service recovery as interconnected activities. An organisation spending £5 million annually on logistics might identify £300,000 of potential transport savings, but should not accept them without assessing wider consequences. If the changes increase stockholding, delay deliveries, or add handling, the overall benefit may disappear. Appraisal should therefore compare complete operating arrangements rather than isolated expenditure categories.

Capacity and network evaluation should determine whether facilities, equipment, vehicles and employees can accommodate current demand and anticipated growth. Scenario modelling can compare centralised, regional and hybrid arrangements under different operating conditions, including seasonal peaks, supplier dependencies, infrastructure reliability and contingency capability. Organisations must establish whether proposed arrangements remain commercially acceptable when demand changes, or critical resources become temporarily unavailable during foreseeable disruptions or periods of rapid growth.

Implementation requires clear management responsibility, realistic timescales and coordinated involvement from procurement, finance, operations, technology and customer-facing functions. Documented responsibilities, financial controls and measurable objectives should govern changes to facilities, transport contracts or information systems. Employees and external providers must understand new procedures, service commitments and escalation arrangements. Phased implementation and operational testing reduce the likelihood of disruption during the transition between old and new arrangements.

Performance review completes the framework by comparing actual results with the original business case. Measures should include total logistics cost, OTIF delivery, inventory turnover, order accuracy, capacity utilisation and disruption recovery. Unexpected results require investigation, not automatic acceptance of departmental explanations. Strategy should remain adaptable as demand, technology, regulation and commercial circumstances change, ensuring that investment decisions continue to support business objectives over time.

Common Logistics Strategy Mistakes – Why Apparently Sensible Decisions Fail

One of the most common mistakes is concentrating on transport rates without considering wider financial consequences. Competitive freight procurement can deliver genuine savings, but reduced delivery frequency, slower services or limited carrier capacity may increase inventory and emergency distribution costs. A contract negotiated purely around the lowest quotation can therefore prove more expensive in practice. Managers should evaluate total delivered cost, operational capability and contractual performance before awarding business.

Unrealistic service commitments create another difficulty, because organisations sometimes promise delivery standards their infrastructure cannot consistently support. Express services, guaranteed delivery windows and extensive availability may attract customers, but require sufficient capacity and dependable systems. Royal Mail's repeated regulatory penalties show how a service promise that operations cannot sustain eventually becomes a financial and reputational liability. Commitments should be tested against realistic capacity before making them.

Poor inventory planning can undermine otherwise effective operations. Excessive stock consumes working capital and warehouse space, while aggressive reductions increase vulnerability to shortages and supplier delays. The problem becomes particularly serious when targets are set without considering demand variability, lead times and product criticality. Organisations should avoid uniform stockholding policies where product characteristics differ significantly, and instead establish replenishment arrangements that balance availability, cost, and foreseeable operational risk.

Outsourcing mistakes frequently arise when organisations transfer logistics responsibilities without retaining adequate management capability. A third-party provider may offer expertise and economies of scale, but contract terms cannot remove the customer's responsibility for understanding performance and commercial exposure. Inadequate specifications, poorly

structured pricing and weak contingency provisions create expensive disputes or dependency, and rushed transitions, as KFC discovered, can disrupt an entire estate within days.

Insufficient management information conceals these problems until their financial consequences become substantial. Organisations may report improving warehouse productivity while delivery accuracy deteriorates, or celebrate lower transport costs while emergency shipments multiply. Effective governance requires consistent data, credible forecasts and managers willing to challenge apparently favourable results. The central mistake is treating logistics activities independently, rather than recognising that successful distribution depends on coordinated decisions across the entire operating system.

Summary – Optimising the Whole Logistics System

Logistics strategy succeeds when transport, inventory, warehousing, capacity and customer service operate as a coordinated system supporting wider business objectives. Reducing expenditure within one activity does not necessarily improve overall efficiency, particularly where savings create additional costs elsewhere. The objective is dependable service at a sustainable total cost, supported by appropriate operational flexibility and proportionate protection against disruption throughout the distribution network, from inbound supply to final delivery.

The experience of UK organisations illustrates the different pressures involved. Investment by Marks & Spencer, Greggs and NEXT reflects the need to build capacity ahead of growth, while NHS Supply Chain's inventory programme shows the value of better stock visibility. JLR's disruption exposed the vulnerability of interconnected manufacturing, and Royal Mail's difficulties illustrate the consequences of making service commitments that day-to-day operations cannot consistently meet.

Management must consequently evaluate logistics decisions through comprehensive financial appraisal, clearly defined customer requirements, reliable performance information and realistic scenario testing. Investment in technology, additional capacity or contingency arrangements should generate benefits that justify its cost. Equally, organisations should challenge cost reductions that increase inventory, reduce responsiveness, or threaten service continuity, establish clear accountability, and reassess distribution arrangements regularly as commercial and operational circumstances change.

Ultimately, the strongest logistics strategy is not necessarily the cheapest, fastest or most technologically advanced. It is the arrangement that consistently delivers appropriate customer service, controls total expenditure, uses resources productively and withstands foreseeable disruption. Achieving that balance requires informed management judgement rather than isolated performance targets. When every logistics decision supports the wider business, efficiency and resilience become complementary objectives rather than competing ambitions.

Additional articles can be found at Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple. This site looks at procurement and supply chain management issues to assist organisations and people in increasing the quality, efficiency, and effectiveness of their product and service supply to the customers' delight. © Procurement and Supply Chain Management Made Simple. All rights reserved.

Further Reading

The sources below support the statistics and case studies cited throughout, grouped by type for ease of verification.

Government and Regulatory Sources

- *Department for Transport – Domestic Road Freight Statistics, United Kingdom 2025*
- *Department for Transport – Rail Trends 2025*

- *Department for Transport – Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Transport in 2024*
- *Driver and Vehicle Standards Agency – Drivers' Hours Guidance*
- *Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs – Extended Producer Responsibility for Packaging: 2025 Base Fees*
- *Ofcom – Royal Mail Fined £21 Million for Missing 2024/25 Delivery Targets (October 2025)*
- *Ofcom – Investigation into Royal Mail's 2025/26 Delivery Performance (June 2026)*
- *Cabinet Office – National Risk Register 2026*
- *Department for Business and Trade – Government Backs Jaguar Land Rover with £1.5 Billion Loan Guarantee (September 2025)*
- *UK Government – Package of Measures to Ease HGV Driver Shortages (September 2021)*

Corporate Reports and Case Studies

- *Marks & Spencer – Construction Begins on £340 Million Automated Food Distribution Centre (May 2026)*
- *Greggs – Preliminary Results for 2025 (March 2026)*
- *NEXT – Results for the Year Ended January 2026*
- *NEXT – Annual Report and Accounts, January 2026*
- *Ocado Group – Full Year Results 2025*
- *Tesco – 2,000th Electric Delivery Van Announcement, September 2026*
- *Tesco – Sustainability Report 2026*
- *DP World – London Gateway Container Volumes Set New Annual Record (January 2026)*
- *Port of Dover – Key Facts and Annual Traffic Statistics*
- *Cyber Monitoring Centre – Jaguar Land Rover Incident Assessment, October 2025*
- *ITV News – Heathrow Closed All Day Following Substation Fire (March 2025)*
- *Fortune – KFC Restaurants Closed by Chicken Shortage (February 2018)*
- *Bloomberg – KFC Strips DHL of Some UK Deliveries (March 2018)*

Healthcare and Public Sector Evidence

- *NHS Supply Chain – In-Trust Inventory Management Systems Programme (April 2026 update)*
- *Barts Health NHS Trust – Supply Chain Team Wins National Award (November 2025)*
- *National Audit Office – NHS Supply Chain and Efficiencies in Procurement (January 2024)*
- *Health Business – Transforming NHS Inventory Management*
- *Parliamentary Written Answer – Storage Costs for Protective Equipment (November 2024)*