

**Frontiers in Supply Chain
Finance and Risk
Management**

Other titles in Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management

Sequential Decision Analytics and Modeling: Modeling with Python

Warren B. Powell

ISBN: 978-1-63828-082-8

The Interface of Finance, Operations, and Risk Management

Volodymyr Babich and John R. Birge

ISBN: 978-1-68083-796-4

AI and Business Models: The Good, The Bad and The Ugly

Vania Sena and Manuela Nocker

ISBN: 978-1-68083-794-0

The Business of Electric Vehicles: A Platform Perspective

Jonas Boehm, Hemant K. Bhargava and Geoffrey G. Parker

ISBN: 978-1-68083-762-9

Advances in Supply Chain Finance and FinTech Innovations Overview

Panos Kouvelis, Ling Dong and Danko Turcic

ISBN: 978-1-68083-722-3

Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management

Edited by

Panos Kouvelis

Emerson Distinguished Professor of
Supply Chain, Operations, and Technology
Director of The Boeing Center for
Supply Chain Innovation

Ling Dong

Professor of Supply Chain, Operations, and Technology
Frahm Family Chair of Supply Chain
Operations, and Technology

now

the essence of knowledge

Boston — Delft

Foundations and Trends[®] in Technology, Information and Operations Management

Published, sold and distributed by:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 1024
Hanover, MA 02339
United States
Tel. +1-781-985-4510
www.nowpublishers.com
sales@nowpublishers.com

Outside North America:

now Publishers Inc.
PO Box 179
2600 AD Delft
The Netherlands
Tel. +31-6-51115274

The content of the book was originally published in Foundations and Trends[®] in Technology, Information and Operations Management, vol. 16, no. 3–4.

ISBN: 978-1-63828-249-5
© 2023 Now Publishers Inc

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the publishers.

Photocopying. In the USA: This journal is registered at the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923. Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by now Publishers Inc for users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC). The 'services' for users can be found on the internet at: www.copyright.com

For those organizations that have been granted a photocopy license, a separate system of payment has been arranged. Authorization does not extend to other kinds of copying, such as that for general distribution, for advertising or promotional purposes, for creating new collective works, or for resale. In the rest of the world: Permission to photocopy must be obtained from the copyright owner. Please apply to now Publishers Inc., PO Box 1024, Hanover, MA 02339, USA; Tel. +1 781 871 0245; www.nowpublishers.com; sales@nowpublishers.com

now Publishers Inc. has an exclusive license to publish this material worldwide. Permission to use this content must be obtained from the copyright license holder. Please apply to now Publishers, PO Box 179, 2600 AD Delft, The Netherlands, www.nowpublishers.com; e-mail: sales@nowpublishers.com

**Foundations and Trends[®] in Technology,
Information and Operations Management**
Volume 16, Issue 3–4, 2023
Editorial Board

Editor-in-Chief

Panos Kouvelis
Washington University St. Louis
USA

Editors

Charles Corbett
UCLA, USA

Uday Karmarkar
UCLA, USA

Editors

Onur Bayabatlı
*Singapore Management University,
Singapore*

Li Chen
Cornell University, USA

Nesim Erkip
Bilkent University, Turkey

Jan Fransoo
Tilburg University, The Netherlands

Bardia Kamrad
Georgetown University, USA

Chuck Munson
Washington State University, USA

Nicholas Petrucci
Pennsylvania State University, USA

Guillaume Roels
INSEAD, France

Nicola Secomandi
Rice University, USA

Zuo-Jun Max Shen
University of California, Berkeley, USA

George Tagaras
*Aristotle University of Thessaloniki,
Greece*

Sherri Xiaole Wu
Fudan University, China

Y. Karen Zheng
MIT, USA

Editorial Scope

Topics

Foundations and Trends[®] in Technology, Information and Operations Management publishes survey and tutorial articles in the following topics:

- B2B Commerce
- Business Process Engineering and Design
- Business Process Outsourcing
- Capacity Planning
- Competitive Operations
- Contracting in Supply Chains
- E-Commerce and E-Business Models
- Electronic markets, auctions and exchanges
- Enterprise Management Systems
- Facility Location
- Information Chain Structure and Competition
- International Operations
- Marketing/Manufacturing Interfaces
- Multi-location inventory theory
- New Product & Service Design
- Queuing Networks
- Reverse Logistics
- Service Logistics and Product Support
- Supply Chain Management
- Technology Management and Strategy
- Technology, Information and Operations in:
 - Automotive Industries
 - Electronics manufacturing
 - Financial Services
 - Health Care
 - Media and Entertainment
 - Process Industries
 - Retailing
 - Telecommunications

Information for Librarians

Foundations and Trends[®] in Technology, Information and Operations Management, 2023, Volume 16, 4 issues. ISSN paper version 1571-9545. ISSN online version 1571-9553. Also available as a combined paper and online subscription.

Contents

Disruption Mitigation and Pricing Flexibility	1
<i>Oben Ceryan and Florian Lücker</i>	
Optimal Newsvendor IRM with Downside Risk	17
<i>Paolo Guiotto and Andrea Roncoroni</i>	
Competitive Forward and Spot Trading Under Yield Uncertainty	38
<i>Lusheng Shao, Derui Wang and Xiaole Wu</i>	
The Impact of Commodity Price Uncertainty on the Economic Value of Waste-to-Energy Conversion in Agricultural Processing	53
<i>Bin Li, Onur Boyabatlı and Buket Avcı</i>	
Corporate Renewable Procurement	74
<i>Selvaprabu Nadarajah</i>	
Blockchain-Based Digital Payment Obligations for Trade Finance	91
<i>Jing Hou, Burak Kazaz and Fasheng Xu</i>	

Long-term Service Agreement in Power Systems	112
<i>Panos Kouvelis, Hirofumi Matsuo, Yixuan Xiao and Quan Yuan</i>	
The Bullwhip Effect in Servicized Manufacturers	128
<i>Jiang Shenyang, Jiang Zhibin, Niu Yimeng and Wu Jing</i>	
Acknowledgements	142

Disruption Mitigation and Pricing Flexibility

Oben Ceryan and Florian Lücker

Bayes Business School, City, University of London, UK

ABSTRACT

We study a firm that is exposed to random supply chain disruptions while producing a single product. During a disruption, the firm may use reserve inventory and/or reserve capacity to serve customer demand. As supply in the form of reserve inventory and reserve capacity is often lower than demand during a disruption, the firm may choose to increase the price of the product during the disruption. An increase in price reduces demand during the disruption, which may help better match supply and demand during the disruption. We find that pricing flexibility (i.e., the ability to increase the price during a disruption) may complement or substitute the operational mitigation levers of holding reserve inventory or reserve capacity. Specifically, when a firm has pricing flexibility, it may be economical to increase or decrease the use of reserve inventory or reserve capacity relative to a setting without pricing flexibility.

This monograph is a short version of the following working paper: Ceryan, O. and Lücker, F. Disruption Mitigation and Pricing Flexibility, working paper, Bayes Business School, City, University of London.

Oben Ceryan and Florian Lücker (2023), “Disruption Mitigation and Pricing Flexibility”, Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management: Vol. 16, No. 3–4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 177–192. DOI: 10.1561/0200000106-1.

©2023 O. Ceryan and F. Lücker

References

- Chopra, S., G. Reinhardt, and U. Mohan (2007). “The importance of decoupling recurrent and disruption risks in a supply chain”. *Naval Research Logistics*. 54(5): 544–555.
- Dong, L., G. Xiao, and N. Yang (2023). “Supply diversification under random yield: The impact of price postponement”. *Production and Operations Management*. 32(4): 1112–1132.
- Kouvelis, P., G. Xiao, and N. Yang (2021). “Role of risk aversion in price postponement under supply random yield”. *Management Science*. 67(8): 4826–4844.
- Li, T., S. P. Sethi, and J. Zhang (2013). “Supply diversification with responsive pricing”. *Production and Operations Management*. 22(2): 447–458.
- Li, T., S. P. Sethi, and J. Zhang (2017). “Mitigating supply uncertainty: The interplay between diversification and pricing”. *Production and Operations Management*. 26(3): 369–388.
- Qi, L. (2013). “A continuous-review inventory model with random disruptions at the primary supplier”. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 225: 59–74.
- Qi, L. and K. Lee (2015). “Supply chain risk mitigations with expedited shipping”. *Omega*. 57: 98–113.

- Tang, C. S. and R. Yin (2007). “Responsive pricing under supply uncertainty”. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 182(1): 239–255.
- Tomlin, B. (2006). “On the value of mitigation and contingency strategies for managing supply chain disruption risks”. *Management Science*. 52(5): 639–657.
- Van Mieghem, J. A. and M. Dada (1999). “Price versus production postponement: Capacity and competition”. *Management Science*. 45(12): 1639–1649.

Optimal Newsvendor IRM with Downside Risk

Paolo Guiotto¹ and Andrea Roncoroni²

¹*University of Padua, Italy; paolo.guiotto@unipd.it*

²*ESSEC Business School, France; roncoroni@essec.edu*

ABSTRACT

We analyze the way behavioral preferences featuring downside risk aversion influence the optimal integrated risk management (IRM) of newsvendor revenues. Under the stylized assumption of perfectly correlated demand with financial hedge's underlying, we show two remarkable facts. First, the simultaneous presence of a standard and a downside risk aversion blurs the relevance of an integrated approach to risk management under a conventional expected utility framework. Second, a generalized disappointment aversion utility represents an appropriate decision making setup for devising IRM strategies whose financial hedging component exhibits a relevant effect on the operational handling term.

Paolo Guiotto and Andrea Roncoroni (2023), "Optimal Newsvendor IRM with Downside Risk", Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management: Vol. 16, No. 3–4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 193–213. DOI: 10.1561/0200000106-2.

©2023 P. Guiotto and A. Roncoroni

References

- Bell, D. E. (1985). “Disappointment in decision making under uncertainty”. *Operations Research*. 33(1): 1–27. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.33.1.1>.
- Chen, X., M. Sim, D. Simchi-Levi, and P. Sun (2007). “Risk aversion in inventory management”. *Operations Research*. 55(5): 828–842. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25147125>.
- Chod, J., N. Rudi, and J. A. Van Mieghem (2010). “Operational flexibility and financial hedging: Complements or substitutes?” *Management Science*. 56(6): 1030–1045. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.1090.1137>.
- Dahlquist, M., A. Farago, and R. Tédongap (2016). “Asymmetries and portfolio choice”. *The Review of Financial Studies*. 30(2): 667–702. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhw091>.
- Ding, Q., L. Dong, and P. Kouvelis (2007). “On the integration of production and financial hedging decisions in global markets”. *Operations Research*. 55(3): 470–489. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.1070.0364>.
- Donohue, K., Ö. Özer, and Y. Zheng (2020). “Behavioral operations: Past, present, and future”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 22(1): 191–202. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/msom.2019.0828>.

- Eeckhoudt, L., C. Gollier, and H. Schlesinger (1995). “The risk-averse (and prudent) newsboy”. *Management Science*. 41(5): 786–794. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.41.5.786>.
- Guiotto, P. and A. Roncoroni (2022). “Combined custom hedging: Optimal design, noninsurable exposure, and operational risk management”. *Operations Research*. 70(1): 38–54. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2021.2133>.
- Guiotto, P. and A. Roncoroni (2023). “Disappointment averse preference optimization”. *Working Paper*, ESSEC Business School.
- Gul, F. (1991). “A theory of disappointment aversion”. *Econometrica*. 59(3): 667–686. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2938223>.
- Jorion, P. (2006). *Value at Risk: The New Benchmark for Managing Financial Risk* (3rd Edn). McGraw-Hill Education.
- Kahneman, D. and A. Tversky (1979). “Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk”. *Econometrica*. 47(2): 263–291. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1914185>.
- Kouvelis, P. and R. Li (2019). “Integrated risk management for newsvendors with value-at-risk constraints”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 21(4): 816–832.
- Ritchken, P. H. and C. S. Tapiero (1986). “Contingent claims contracting for purchasing decisions in inventory management”. *Operations Research*. 34(6): 864–870. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.34.6.864>.
- Routledge, B. R. and S. E. Zin (2010). “Generalized disappointment aversion and asset prices”. *The Journal of Finance*. 65(4): 1303–1332. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40864912>.
- Schweitzer, M. E. and G. P. Cachon (2000). “Decision bias in the newsvendor problem with a known demand distribution: Experimental evidence”. *Management Science*. 46(3): 404–420. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.3.404.12070>.
- Wang, L., J. Yao, and X. Zhang (2022). “How does risk hedging impact operations? Insights from a price-setting newsvendor model”. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4000593.

- Zhao, L. and A. Huchzermeier (2017). “Integrated operational and financial hedging with capacity reshoring”. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 260(2): 557–570. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221716310700>.

Competitive Forward and Spot Trading Under Yield Uncertainty

Lusheng Shao¹, Derui Wang² and Xiaole Wu³

¹*Faculty of Business and Economics, The University of Melbourne, Australia; lusheng.shao@unimelb.edu.au*

²*School of Management, Fudan University, China; drwang19@fudan.edu.cn*

³*School of Management, Fudan University, China; wuxiaole@fudan.edu.cn*

ABSTRACT

Agricultural producers face significant yield uncertainty which can cause unpredictable outputs and volatile prices of agricultural commodities. They usually trade those commodities not only in a spot market but also in a forward market to manage price uncertainty. In this section, we develop a game theoretical model to study competing firms' production decisions in the planting season and trading behaviors in the forward and spot markets. The model also allows us to examine the impact of yield uncertainty and the existence of the forward market on the equilibrium outcomes. We find some counterintuitive results that an increase in yield risk may increase firms' equilibrium profits and decrease the spot price volatility. A comparison between the models with and without a forward market reveals that the firms' profits decrease but the spot price volatility increases when there is a forward market. Finally we show that a higher yield risk mitigates the role of the forward market but a higher yield correlation enhances it.

Lusheng Shao, Derui Wang and Xiaole Wu (2023), "Competitive Forward and Spot Trading Under Yield Uncertainty", *Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management*: Vol. 16, No. 3–4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 214–228. DOI: 10.1561/02000000106-3.

©2023 L. Shao *et al.*

References

- Albert, M., A. Filipa, and R. Guillaume (2013). “Research on regulating agricultural derivatives markets”. *Tech. rep.* European Parliament’s Directorate-General for Internal Policies. URL: [https://www.europa.europa.eu/thinktank/mt/document/IPOL-AGRI_DV\(2013\)513989](https://www.europa.europa.eu/thinktank/mt/document/IPOL-AGRI_DV(2013)513989) (accessed on 10/13/2022).
- Anderson, E., B. Chen, and L. Shao (2017). “Supplier competition with option contracts for discrete blocks of capacity”. *Operations Research*. 65(4): 952–967.
- Bellemare, M. F. and Y. N. Lee (2016). “Attitudes to price risk and uncertainty: The earnest search for identification and policy relevance”. *Canadian Journal of Agricultural Economics/Revue Canadienne d’agroeconomie*. 64(4): 599–612.
- Bohl, M. T. and P. M. Stephan (2013). “Does futures speculation destabilize spot prices? New evidence for commodity markets”. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. 45(4): 595–616.
- Danthine, J. P. (1978). “Information, futures prices, and stabilizing speculation”. *Journal of Economic Theory*. 17(1): 79–98.

- David, P. A., L. O. Joe, L. B. Henry, W. R. James, P. E. David, R. J. Marc, W. J. Mark, M. K. George, K. H. Brian, and S. A. Marc (2008). “The effects of ethanol on Texas food and feed”. *Tech. rep.* Agricultural and Food Policy Center, Texas A&M University. URL: <https://www.afpc.tamu.edu/research/publications/515/RR-08-01.pdf> (accessed on 10/13/2022).
- Davis, T., G. Patrick, K. Coble, T. Knight, and A. Baquet (2005). “Forward pricing behavior of corn and soybean producers”. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. 37(1): 145–160.
- Deo, S. and C. J. Corbett (2009). “Cournot competition under yield uncertainty: The case of the US influenza vaccine market”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 11(4): 563–576.
- Dong, L. and H. Liu (2007). “Equilibrium forward contracts on non-storable commodities in the presence of market power”. *Operations Research*. 55(1): 128–145.
- Etienne, X. L., M. L. Mallory, and S. H. Irwin (2017). “Estimating the cost of pre-harvest forward contracting corn and soybeans in Illinois before and after 2007”. *Agribusiness*. 33(3): 358–377.
- FAO (2014). “Food and nutrition in numbers 2014”. *Tech. rep.* Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. URL: <https://www.fao.org/publications/card/en/c/9f31999d-be2d-4f20-a645-a849dd84a03e/> (accessed on 10/13/2022).
- Gilbert, C. L. and C. W. Morgan (2010). “Food price volatility”. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 365(1554): 3023–3034.
- Goodwin, B. K. and T. C. Schroeder (1994). “Human capital, producer education programs, and the adoption of forward-pricing methods”. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*. 76(4): 936–947.
- GRDC (2010). “Grain market lingo: What does it all mean?” *Tech. rep.* Grains Research and Development Corporation. URL: <https://farmtable.com.au/build/grain-market-lingo-what-does-it-all-mean/> (accessed on 11/13/2022).
- Harwood, J. L. (1999). *Managing Risk in Farming: Concepts, Research, and Analysis*. No. 774. US Department of Agriculture, ERS.

- Madre, Y. and P. Devuyt (2016). “How to tackle price and income volatility for farmers? An overview of international agricultural policies and instruments”. *Tech. rep.* FarmEurope. URL: <https://www.farm-europe.eu/travaux/how-to-tackle-price-and-income-volatility-for-farmers-an-overview-of-international-agricultural-policies-and-instruments/> (accessed on 10/13/2022).
- Muth, J. F. (1961). “Rational expectations and the theory of price movements”. *Econometrica*. 29(3): 315–335.
- Nath, G. C. and T. Lingareddy (2008). “Commodity derivative market and its impact on spot market”. URL: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1087904.
- Rosen, S. and S. Shapouri (2008). “Rising food prices intensify food insecurity in developing countries”. *Tech. rep.* Amber Waves. URL: <https://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2008/february/rising-food-prices-intensify-food-insecurity-in-developing-countries/> (accessed on 10/13/2022).
- Shao, L., D. Wang, and X. Wu (2022). “Competitive trading in forward and spot markets under yield uncertainty”. *Production and Operations Management*. 31(9): 3400–3418.
- Tadasse, G., B. Algieri, M. Kalkuhl, and J. v. Braun (2014). “Drivers and triggers of international food price spikes and volatility”. *Food Policy*. 47: 117–128.
- Trostle, R. (2008). “Fluctuating food commodity prices: A complex issue with no easy answers”. *Tech. rep.* Amber Waves. URL: <http://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2008/november/fluctuating-food-commodity-prices-a-complex-issue-with-no-easy-answers/> (accessed on 10/13/2022).
- Wu, D. J. and P. R. Kleindorfer (2005). “Competitive options, supply contracting, and electronic markets”. *Management Science*. 51(3): 452–466.
- Yang, J., R. B. Balyeat, and D. J. Leatham (2005). “Futures trading activity and commodity cash price volatility”. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*. 32(1–2): 297–323.

The Impact of Commodity Price Uncertainty on the Economic Value of Waste-to-Energy Conversion in Agricultural Processing

Bin Li¹, Onur Boyabatlı² and Buket Avcı³

¹*Economics and Management School, Wuhan University, China; bin.li@whu.edu.cn*

²*Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University, Singapore; oboyabatli@smu.edu.sg*

³*Lee Kong Chian School of Business, Singapore Management University, Singapore; buketavci@smu.edu.sg*

ABSTRACT

This section studies the economic implications of waste-to-energy conversion; that is, converting organic waste into a saleable product to be used as a feedstock in another firm (e.g., biomass boiler) to generate energy (e.g., heat, electricity). We focus on the context of an agricultural processor that uses a commodity input to produce both a commodity output and organic waste. By making a comparison with a benchmark case in which waste goes to landfill, we characterize the economic value of waste-to-energy conversion. Using a model calibration based on palm oil industry in Malaysia, we examine how this economic value is impacted by (i) input and output spot price uncertainties and (ii) organic waste price's dependence on the output spot price.

Bin Li, Onur Boyabatlı and Buket Avcı (2023), "The Impact of Commodity Price Uncertainty on the Economic Value of Waste-to-Energy Conversion in Agricultural Processing", *Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management*: Vol. 16, No. 3–4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 229–249. DOI: 10.1561/0200000106-4.

©2023 B. Li *et al.*

References

- Ata, B., D. Lee, and E. Sönmez (2019). “Dynamic volunteer staffing in multicrop gleaning operations”. *Operations Research*. 67(2): 295–314.
- Ata, B., D. Lee, and M. H. Tongarlak (2012). “Optimizing organic waste to energy operations”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 14(2): 231–244.
- Bolger, A. (2011). “Scottish company in biocoal breakthrough”. *Financial Times*.
- Boyabathl, O. (2015). “Supply management in multiproduct firms with fixed proportions technology”. *Management Science*. 61(12): 3013–3031.
- Boyabathl, O., P. R. Kleindorfer, and S. R. Koontz (2011). “Integrating long-term and short-term contracting in beef supply chains”. *Management Science*. 57(10): 1771–1787.
- Boyabathl, O., J. Nguyen, and T. Wang (2017). “Capacity management in agricultural commodity processing and application in the palm industry”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 19(4): 551–567.
- Dong, L., P. Kouvelis, and X. Wu (2014). “The value of operational flexibility in the presence of input and output price uncertainties with oil refining applications”. *Management Science*. 60(12): 2908–2926.

- Goel, A. and F. Tanrisever (2017). “Financial hedging and optimal procurement policies under correlated price and demand”. *Production and Operations Management*. 26(10): 1924–1945.
- Klimowicz, G. (2013). “Southeast Asia set for biomass boom”. *Eco-Business*. URL: <https://www.eco-business.com/news/southeast-asia-set-biomass-boom/>.
- Lee, D. (2012). “Turning waste into by-product”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 14(1): 115–127.
- Lee, D. and M. H. Tongarlak (2017). “Converting retail food waste into by-product”. *Eur. J. Operations Research*. 257(3): 944–956.
- Li, B., O. Boyabatlı, and B. Avcı (2022). “Economic and environmental implications of biomass commercialization in agricultural processing”. *Management Science*.
- Martínez-de-Albéniz, V. and D. Simchi-Levi (2005). “A portfolio approach to procurement contracts”. *Production and Operations Management*. 14(1): 90–114.
- Plambeck, E. and T. Taylor (2013). “On the value of input efficiency, capacity efficiency, and the flexibility to rebalance them”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 15(4): 630–639.
- USDA (2018). “U.S. Department of Agriculture Foreign Agricultural Service, Japan: Biofuels Annual”. URL: https://apps.fas.usda.gov/newgainapi/api/report/downloadreportbyfilename?filename=Biofuels%20Annual_Tokyo_Japan_11-5-2018.pdf.
- Zegher, J. F. de, D. A. Iancu, and H. L. Lee (2017). “Manufacturing & service operations management”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 21(2): 271–289.

Corporate Renewable Procurement Analytics

Selvaprabu Nadarajah

Information and Decision Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, USA; selvan@uic.edu

ABSTRACT

Corporate decarbonization goals have increased rapidly in the last few years. The procurement of renewable power is a core strategy used by companies to meet these goals, increasingly in a dynamic manner that addresses the risks associated with uncertain prices and supply intermittency, among others. This section discusses the interplay between data and decision analytics in this rapidly evolving area by considering the construction of a dynamic portfolio of power purchase agreements, which are popular long-term contracts signed by corporations, to meet a future renewable procurement target. It analyzes a stylized setting to provide insight into the effect on decisions of the joint evolution of uncertainties. It also discusses how forecasts, stochastic processes, and deterministic models can be used to obtain procurement policies in practical settings. These elements have a rich history in operations management but have received limited attention for renewable power procurement. Emphasis is placed on how a traditional rolling planning model based on forecasts can be adapted to this procurement setting, as well as where a recent rolling planning technique based on information relaxations can add value.

Keywords: power purchase agreements; climate targets; renewable procurement; optimization; reinforcement learning; Markov decision processes.

S. Nadarajah (2023), “Corporate Renewable Procurement Analytics”, *Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management*: Vol. 16, No. 3–4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 250–266. DOI: 10.1561/0200000106-5.

©2023 S. Nadarajah

References

- Agrawal, V. V. and Ş. Yücel (2021). “Renewable energy sourcing”. In: *Responsible Business Operations*. Springer. 211–224.
- Awaysheh, A., C. Chen, and O. Q. Wu (2022). “Does renewable energy renew the endeavor in energy efficiency?” URL: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4069435>.
- Brown, D. B. and J. E. Smith (2022). “Information relaxations and duality in stochastic dynamic programs: A review and tutorial”. *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*. 5(3): 246–339.
- Chand, S., V. N. Hsu, and S. Sethi (2002). “Forecast, solution, and rolling horizons in operations management problems: A classified bibliography”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 4(1): 25–43.
- Enkvist, P., T. Naucclér, and J. M. Oppenheim (2008). “Business strategies for climate change”. *McKinsey Quarterly*. 2: 24.
- Henze, V. (2021). “Corporate clean energy buying tops 30GW mark in record year”. *Tech. rep.* Bloomberg New Energy Finance (BNEF). URL: <https://about.bnef.com/blog/corporate-clean-energy-buying-tops-30gw-mark-in-record-year/>.
- Jang, D., L. Spangher, S. Nadarajah, and C. Spanos (2023). “Deep reinforcement learning with planning guardrails for building energy demand response”. *Energy and AI*. 11: 100204.

- Loukatou, A., S. Howell, P. Johnson, and P. Duck (2018). “Stochastic wind speed modelling for estimation of expected wind power output”. *Applied Energy*. 228: 1328–1340.
- Lucia, J. J. and E. S. Schwartz (2002). “Electricity prices and power derivatives: Evidence from the Nordic power exchange”. *Review of Derivatives Research*. 5(1): 5–50.
- Marnay, C., G. Venkataramanan, M. Stadler, A. S. Siddiqui, R. Firestone, and B. Chandran (2008). “Optimal technology selection and operation of commercial-building microgrids”. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*. 23(3): 975–982.
- Mohseni-Taheri, D., S. Nadarajah, and A. Trivella (2023). “Physical versus virtual corporate power purchase agreements: Meeting renewable targets amid demand uncertainty”. *Working Paper*, University of Illinois at Chicago.
- Trivella, A., D. Mohseni-Taheri, and S. Nadarajah (2022). “Meeting corporate renewable power targets”. *Management Science*. 69(1): 491–512.
- Weirens, J., V. Poole, K. Sullivan, and D. Pankratz (2021). “Building credible climate commitments: A road map to earning stakeholder trust”. *Tech. rep.* Deloitte. URL: <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/topics/strategy/trust-in-corporate-climate-change-commitments.html>.
- Weron, R. (2014). “Electricity price forecasting: A review of the state-of-the-art with a look into the future”. *International Journal of Forecasting*. 30(4): 1030–1081.
- Woo, C.-K., I. Horowitz, J. Moore, and A. Pacheco (2011). “The impact of wind generation on the electricity spot-market price level and variance: The Texas experience”. *Energy Policy*. 39(7): 3939–3944.
- Zeng, Y., D. Klabjan, and J. Arinez (2015). “Distributed solar renewable generation: Option contracts with renewable energy credit uncertainty”. *Energy Economics*. 48: 295–305.

Blockchain-Based Digital Payment Obligations for Trade Finance

Jing Hou¹, Burak Kazaz² and Fasheng Xu³

¹*Nanjing University, China; jinghou@smail.nju.edu.cn*

²*Syracuse University, USA; bkazaz@syr.edu*

³*Syracuse University, USA; fxu107@syr.edu*

ABSTRACT

To help deep-tier suppliers access cheaper financing, the downstream anchor manufacturer can issue digital payment obligations (DPOs) based on a blockchain platform. The DPO can be passed on to the upstream of the supply network as a payment instrument and then the deep-tier suppliers are able to adopt factoring at a more favorable financing rate due to the manufacturer's creditworthiness programmed into the DPO. We investigate how DPO adoption impacts the operational decisions and profits of different participants in a three-tier supply network, and examine whether these participants voluntarily accept the DPO. We find that DPO adoption increases the efficiency of the supply network and benefits the downstream manufacturer and the suppliers on the reliable branch. However, the suppliers on the unreliable branch can be worse off. Despite the profit decrease, the suppliers on the unreliable branch accept the DPO voluntarily due to the threat posed by competitors.

Jing Hou, Burak Kazaz and Fasheng Xu (2023), "Blockchain-Based Digital Payment Obligations for Trade Finance", *Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management*: Vol. 16, No. 3-4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 267-287. DOI: 10.1561/0200000106-6.

©2023 J. Hou *et al.*

References

- Chod, J., N. Trichakis, G. Tsoukalas, H. Aspegren, and M. Weber (2020). “On the financing benefits of supply chain transparency and blockchain adoption”. *Management Science*. 66(10): 4378–4396.
- Chod, J., N. Trichakis, and S. Yang (2022). “Platform tokenization: Financing, governance, and moral hazard”. *Management Science*. 68(9): 6411–6433.
- Cui, Y., V. Gaur, and J. Liu (2023a). “Supply chain transparency and blockchain design”. URL: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3626028>.
- Cui, Y., M. Hu, and J. Liu (2023b). “Value and design of traceability-driven blockchains”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 25(3): 1099–1116.
- Devalkar, S. and H. Krishnan (2019). “The impact of working capital financing costs on the efficiency of trade credit”. *Production and Operations Management*. 28(4): 878–889.
- Dong, L., P. Jiang, and F. Xu (2023). “Impact of traceability technology adoption in food supply chain networks”. *Management Science*. 69(3): 1518–1535.
- Dong, L., Y. Qiu, and F. Xu (2022). “Blockchain-enabled deep-tier supply chain finance”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* (Forthcoming).

- Dong, L. and B. Tomlin (2012). “Managing disruption risk: The interplay between operations and insurance”. *Management Science*. 58(10): 1898–1915.
- Gan, J., G. Tsoukalas, and S. Netessine (2021). “Initial coin offerings, speculation, and asset tokenization”. *Management Science*. 67(2): 914–931.
- Gupta, D. and Y. Chen (2020). “Retailer-direct financing contracts under consignment”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 22(3): 528–544.
- Huberman, G., J. Leshno, and C. Moallemi (2021). “Monopoly without a monopolist: An economic analysis of the bitcoin payment system”. *The Review of Economic Studies*. 88(6): 3011–3040.
- Klapper, L. (2006). “The role of factoring for financing small and medium enterprises”. *Journal of Banking & Finance*. 30(11): 3111–3130.
- Kouvelis, P. and F. Xu (2021). “A supply chain theory of factoring and reverse factoring”. *Management Science*. 67(10): 6071–6088.
- Shibuya, Y. and V. Babich (2022). “Economics of multi-tier supply chain financing enabled by blockchain”. URL: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3787044>.
- Tunca, T. and W. Zhu (2018). “Buyer intermediation in supplier finance”. *Management Science*. 64(12): 5631–5650.
- Wang, X. and F. Xu (2022). “The value of smart contract in trade finance”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* (Forthcoming).
- Wuttke, D., E. Rosenzweig, and H. Heese (2019). “An empirical analysis of supply chain finance adoption”. *Journal of Operations Management*. 65(3): 242–261.

Long-Term Service Agreement in Power Systems

Panos Kouvelis¹, Hirofumi Matsuo², Yixuan Xiao³ and Quan Yuan⁴

¹*Olin Business School, Washington University in St. Louis, USA;*
kouvelis@wustl.edu

²*Institute for International Strategy, Tokyo International University,*
Japan; hmatsuo@tiu.ac.jp

³*Carson College of Business, Washington State University, USA;*
yixuan.xiao@wsu.edu

⁴*School of Management, Zhejiang University, China;*
quanyuan@zju.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

We study a long-term service agreement (LTSA) in a power system between an Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) of a conventional power generator and a utility firm. The OEM offers the LTSA to the utility firm which specifies the service fee and the maintenance interval. The utility firm dynamically chooses among different resources (conventional, renewable, or emergency) to meet energy demand. Different from traditional supply chain contracts, an LTSA contracts on a generator's long-term production schedule (i.e., usage time and the number of starts). We characterize that the conventional generator's optimal operating mode (i.e., on or off) follows a two-threshold policy, which shows a hysteresis phenomenon, and capture the OEM's tradeoff between the service margin and the usage of the conventional generator in the LTSA design.

Panos Kouvelis, Hirofumi Matsuo, Yixuan Xiao and Quan Yuan (2023), "Long-Term Service Agreement in Power Systems", *Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management*: Vol. 16, No. 3–4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 288–303. DOI: 10.1561/0200000106-7.

©2023 P. Kouvelis *et al.*

References

- Bird, L., M. Milligan, and D. Lew (2013). “Integrating variable renewable energy: Challenges and solutions”. <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy13osti/60451.pdf>.
- Bollapragada, S., A. Gupta, and C. Lawsirirat (2007). “Managing a portfolio of long term service agreements”. *European Journal of Operational Research*. 182(3): 1399–1411.
- Energy Information Administration (2019). “Short-term energy outlook”. <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/steo/report/electricity.php>.
- Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (2020). “Annual report of major electric utilities”. https://www.eia.gov/electricity/annual/html/epa_08_04.html.
- International Renewable Energy Agency (2019). “Renewable capacity statistics 2019”. <https://www.irena.org/publications/2019/Mar/Renewable-Capacity-Statistics-2019>.
- Janawitz, J., J. Masso, and C. Childs (2015). “Heavy-duty gas turbine operating and maintenance considerations”. GE Power & Water, Atlanta, GA. GER-3620M (02/15).
- Kouvelis, P., H. Matsuo, Y. Xiao, and Q. Yuan (2023). “Long-term service agreement in electricity supply chain with renewable penetration”. *Production and Operations Management*: 1–16.

- Lawsirirat, C. (2007). *Creating Optimal Service Delivery Strategy of Long-Term Service Agreements from Risk Management Perspective*. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.
- Leung, T., M. Sanchez-Gonzales, P. Rodilla, and C. Batlle (2014). “Optimizing long-term service agreements for gas-fired units in the context of increasing penetration of intermittent generation”. *Working paper*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Luh, P. B., Y. Yu, B. Zhang, E. Litvinov, T. Zheng, F. Zhao, J. Zhao, and C. Wang (2014). “Grid integration of intermittent wind generation: A Markovian approach”. *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*. 5(2): 732–741.
- Osório, G., J. Lujano-Rojas, J. Matias, and J. Catalão (2015). “A new scenario generation-based method to solve the unit commitment problem with high penetration of renewable energies”. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*. 64: 1063–1072.
- Rodilla, P., S. Cerisola, and C. Batlle (2014). “Modeling the major overhaul cost of gas-fired plants in the unit commitment problem”. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*. 29(3): 1001–1011.
- Stoll, H. (2001). “Creating owner’s competitive advantage through contractual services”. GE Power Systems, Schenectady, NY. GER-4208.
- Tang, J., A. Brouste, and K. L. Tsui (2015). “Some improvements of wind speed Markov chain modeling”. *Renewable Energy*. 81: 52–56.
- Wu, O. Q. and R. Kapuscinski (2013). “Curtailling intermittent generation in electrical systems”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 15(4): 578–595.
- Zargar, M. and Y. Moghaddam (2019). “Development of a Markov-chain-based solar generation model for smart microgrid energy management system”. *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy*. 11(2): 736–745.
- Zhou, L., X. Zhou, H. Liang, M. Huang, and Y. Li (2022). “Hybrid short-term wind power prediction based on Markov chain”. *Frontiers in Energy Research*. 10: 1–7.

The Impact of Servicization of Manufacturing Firms on Bullwhip Effects

Jiang Shenyang¹, Jiang Zhibin², Niu Yimeng³ and Wu Jing⁴

¹*Advanced Institute of Business, Tongji University, China; shenyangjiang@tongji.edu.cn*

²*Antai College of Economics and Management, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China; zbjiang@sjtu.edu.cn*

³*Antai College of Economics and Management, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China; yimeng_niu@sjtu.edu.cn*

⁴*CUHK Business School, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong; jingwu@cuhk.edu.hk*

ABSTRACT

Service-oriented economies have triggered manufacturing firms to increasingly integrate services into their businesses. This section delves into the impact of servicization on two key bullwhip effects: the felt bullwhip, representing demand variability, and the intra-firm bullwhip, reflecting demand distortion. Manufacturers typically offer services complementing product sales, like maintenance and repair, and those replacing product sales, like machine hours. Employing text mining techniques, two service categories in 10-K reports are identified. Complementing services initially lead to a decrease in demand variability, while substituting services subsequently results in diminished demand distortion.

Jiang Shenyang, Jiang Zhibin, Niu Yimeng and Wu Jing (2023), “The Impact of Servicization of Manufacturing Firms on Bullwhip Effects”, *Foundations and Trends® in Technology, Information and Operations Management*: Vol. 16, No. 3–4, Special Issue on Frontiers in Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management. Edited by P. Kouvelis and L. Dong, pp 304–317. DOI: 10.1561/0200000106-8.

©2023 J. Shenyang *et al.*

References

- Agrawal, V. V. and I. Bellos (2017). “The potential of servicizing as a green business model”. *Management Science*. 63(5): 1545–1562.
- Bakshi, N., S.-H. Kim, and N. Savva (2015). “Signaling new product reliability with after-sales service contracts”. *Management Science*. 61(8): 1812–1829.
- Cusumano, M. A., S. J. Kahl, and F. F. Suarez (2015). “Services, industry evolution, and the competitive strategies of product firms”. *Strategic Management Journal*. 36(4): 559–575.
- Deloitte (2020). “Aftermarket services: Transforming manufacturing in the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic”. URL: https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/insights/us/articles/6494_aftermarket-services/DI_Rise-of-Aftermarket-services.pdf.
- Lee, H. L., V. Padmanabhan, and S. Whang (1997). “Information distortion in a supply chain: The bullwhip effect”. *Management Science*. 43(4): 546–558.
- Örsdemir, A., V. Deshpande, and A. K. Parlaktürk (2019). “Is servicization a win-win strategy? Profitability and environmental implications of servicization”. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*. 21(3): 674–691.
- Osadchiy, N., W. Schmidt, and J. Wu (2021). “The bullwhip effect in supply networks”. *Management Science*. 67(10): 6153–6173.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Panos Kouvelis and Ling Dong for organizing the annual Supply Chain Finance and Risk Management Workshop, and to all the participants in this edition. Special thanks to Andy Sample and Evan Dalton at the Boeing Center for their exceptional organizational skills. Extra gratitude goes out to Andy for all the help in realizing this publication.