



 Research Article

Next-Generation Warehousing: Integrating Agility, Intelligence, and Digital Value-Added Services in Contemporary Distribution Systems

Journal Website:
<http://sciencebring.com/index.php/ijasr>

Submission Date: July 10, 2025, **Accepted Date:** July 18, 2025,
Published Date: July 30, 2025

Copyright: Original content from this work may be used under the terms of the creative commons attributes 4.0 licence.

John M. Ellison

Department of Logistics and Supply Chain Management, Pacific Meridian University

ABSTRACT

Background: Contemporary warehousing is undergoing a profound transformation driven by the dual imperatives of value capture through value-added services (VAS) and operational modernization via digital technologies, agile practices, and the Internet of Things (IoT) (Rushton et al., 2014; Frazelle, 2002; Atzori et al., 2010). This paper synthesizes foundational and contemporary scholarship to articulate a comprehensive theoretical and practical framework that explains how Third-Party Logistics (3PL) providers leverage VAS, digitalization, and agile operational paradigms to secure competitive advantage, enhance sustainability, and meet evolving customer demands (Foulds & Luo, 2006; Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009; Herrera & Yang, 2017).

Objectives: The study aims to (1) map the conceptual landscape of VAS within warehousing and distribution, (2) examine the role of digital technologies—especially IoT, AI-enabled analytics, and digital operations management—in enabling VAS and operational transparency (Atzori et al., 2010; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021; DHL Trend Research, 2020), (3) analyze how agile principles apply to non-software operational contexts such as warehousing (Beck et al., 2001; Conforto et al., 2014; Chowdhury, 2025), and (4) propose an integrative model that aligns VAS strategy, digital infrastructure, and organizational practices to produce resilient, responsive warehouses (Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011; Furmans & Deml, 2014).

Methods: This conceptual research employs rigorous synthesis of the provided literature, critical comparative analysis, and theoretical extension. The methodology emphasizes interpretive integration—careful cross-referencing of empirical findings and theoretical claims from logistics, operations management, and information systems literatures to create a unified, testable model for future empirical research (Chopra & Meindl, 2016; Fawcett et al., 2011).

Findings: The synthesis identifies a set of interdependent capabilities—VAS portfolio design, digital sensing and analytics, agile process reconfiguration, collaborative cluster participation, and managerial governance—that collectively determine warehouse performance, customer value, and provider competitiveness (Rivera et al., 2016; Herrera & Yang, 2017; Van Den Berg, 2007). The analysis shows that VAS effectiveness is contingent on deep interoperability between warehouse management systems and IoT-enabled operational layers as well as on organizational cultural shifts toward agile decision-making (Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009; Atzori et al., 2010; Beck et al., 2001).

Conclusions: For 3PLs and distribution networks to extract sustainable value from VAS, they must adopt an integrated approach that synthesizes technology investments with service design and agile organizational processes. Policy implications, managerial recommendations, limitations, and avenues for empirical validation are outlined. This research contributes a theoretically grounded, multidisciplinary narrative and an actionable conceptual model that scholars and practitioners can use to guide implementation and future study (Rushton et al., 2014; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021).

Keywords: Warehousing, Value-Added Services, Internet of Things, Agile Operations, Third-Party Logistics, Digital Operations, Warehouse Management

INTRODUCTION

Warehousing and distribution lie at the operational heart of global supply chains; they are the nodes where value is stored, assembled, customized, and finally dispatched to markets (Rushton et al., 2014; Bowersox et al., 2010). Historically, warehouses served primarily as storage and break-bulk points, but over the past decades their role has expanded noisily into realms of service differentiation—value-added services (VAS) such as kitting, labeling, quality inspection, light assembly, returns

processing, and product customization (Frazelle, 2002; Foulds & Luo, 2006). Third-Party Logistics (3PL) providers, in particular, have increasingly positioned VAS as both revenue sources and strategic levers to lock in customer relationships (Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009; Herrera & Yang, 2017). Scholarly interest in VAS has thus grown, focusing on development drivers, operational systems, and service portfolio management (Furmans & Deml, 2014; Rivera et al., 2016).

Simultaneously, rapid advances in digital technologies—most notably the Internet of Things (IoT), artificial intelligence, and the broader movement toward digital operations—have opened new avenues for operational visibility, predictive control, and automation (Atzori et al., 2010; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021; DHL Trend Research, 2020). Real-time sensing, edge computing, and intelligent analytics can transform previously black-box warehouse processes into transparent, continuously optimizable flows (Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011; Fawcett et al., 2011). Yet technology alone does not automatically produce value: organizational design, process agility, collaborative networks, and strategic service choices mediate the value that digital investments unlock (Chopra & Meindl, 2016; Conforto et al., 2014). Agile methods, while born in software development, have been successfully translated into non-software contexts—including project and operations management—offering principles for iterative adaptation and cross-functional collaboration within warehouses (Beck et al., 2001; Conforto et al., 2014; Chowdhury, 2025).

Despite a robust set of insights across logistics, operations, and information systems, two critical gaps remain. First, scholarship and practice often treat VAS, digitalization, and agility as separate domains; there has been insufficient synthesis that explains how these elements interact to shape warehouse performance. Second, while case studies and technical reports highlight successes of digital investments, there is limited conceptual clarity about the organizational capabilities and

governance mechanisms required to translate digital sensing and analysis into modular, scalable VAS offerings (Atzori et al., 2010; Herrera & Yang, 2017). This article addresses these gaps by integrating the literature on VAS, warehouse management, IoT, digital operations, and agile practices into a coherent theoretical framework. The framework seeks to guide both managerial action and empirical research by outlining testable relationships and practical pathways for implementation (Rushton et al., 2014; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021).

This study contributes in three substantive ways. First, it synthesizes and reinterprets foundational logistics texts and contemporary digital operations research to map the determinants of VAS success (Frazelle, 2002; Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021). Second, it elaborates an integrated model linking VAS portfolio design, IoT-enabled operational transparency, agile process governance, and external cluster collaboration to warehouse performance and competitiveness (Rivera et al., 2016; Van Den Berg, 2007). Third, it generates actionable propositions and managerial guidelines for aligning investments, organizational capabilities, and service strategies—providing a pathway for 3PLs and distribution networks to realize sustainable value (Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009; Herrera & Yang, 2017).

METHODOLOGY

This research is conceptual and synthetic in its method. Rather than collecting new empirical primary data, the study performs a rigorous literature synthesis and theoretical integration

based strictly on the input references provided. The approach consists of three complementary phases: (1) literature collation and thematic coding, (2) comparative analysis and theory building, and (3) integrative model formulation and proposition development. Each phase is described in detail below, with attention to rigor, transparency, and a path for subsequent empirical validation.

Literature Collation and Thematic Coding. The first phase involved close reading and systematic extraction of core themes, theoretical claims, empirical findings, and operational recommendations from each provided source (Rushton et al., 2014; Frazelle, 2002; Atzori et al., 2010; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021). Key dimensions coded included VAS typologies, technological enablers (e.g., IoT, WMS, AI), organizational practices (e.g., agile methods, workforce training), cluster-level effects (e.g., logistics agglomeration), and performance outcomes (e.g., service responsiveness, cost efficiency). To increase analytic rigor, each extracted claim was cross-checked against multiple sources in the supplied list, ensuring that major claims corresponded to documented arguments or empirical evidence (Rivera et al., 2016; Fawcett et al., 2011).

Comparative Analysis and Theory Building. The second phase synthesized coded themes into higher-order constructs by mapping complementarities and tensions across literatures. For instance, claims about VAS as sources of differentiation (Foulds & Luo, 2006; Herrera & Yang, 2017) were juxtaposed against arguments

about the centrality of operational transparency and WMS integration (Van Den Berg, 2007; Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011). Mismatches—such as the paradox of increased service complexity raising operational fragility—were explicitly analyzed. The analysis adopted abductive reasoning: iterative movement between empirical claims and conceptual categories to generate plausible theoretical linkages (Chopra & Meindl, 2016).

Integrative Model Formulation and Propositions. The third phase produced an integrative conceptual model that articulates causal and mediating relationships among constructs: VAS design, digital infrastructure (IoT + WMS + analytics), agile process governance, cluster collaboration, and performance outcomes. For each linkage, the study advances formal propositions—clear, falsifiable statements that can guide empirical testing and managerial practice. The propositions are grounded in citations from foundational texts and contemporary reports (Frazelle, 2002; Atzori et al., 2010; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021; DHL Trend Research, 2020).

Methodological Rigor and Limitations. The methodology emphasizes transparent linkage to source materials: every major theoretical derivation is traced to at least one reference in the provided corpus (Rushton et al., 2014; Frazelle, 2002; Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009). The study acknowledges inherent limitations: being conceptual, it cannot assess parameter values, effect sizes, or empirical contingencies that require quantitative or qualitative fieldwork. To mitigate this, the paper intentionally formulates propositions and practical heuristics that facilitate

empirical testing in future work (Conforto et al., 2014; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021).

RESULTS

This section presents the analytic outputs of the synthesis: a detailed mapping of VAS typologies and drivers, an exposition of digital and organizational enablers, the integrated conceptual model, and a set of propositions that operationalize the model for future empirical investigation.

Mapping Value-Added Services: Typologies, Drivers, and Operational Implications. The literature yields a rich typology of VAS frequently offered by warehouses and 3PLs. These include: kitting and assembly, labeling and packaging customization, postponement and configuration, quality inspection and rework, returns processing and refurbishment, final-mile customization, and merchandising support (Frazelle, 2002; Foulds & Luo, 2006; Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009). Each VAS exhibits a distinct operational footprint: kitting demands synchronized picking and short-cycle assembly; labeling requires reliable product identification workflows; returns processing requires triage logic and variable routing decisions; and postponement benefits from proximity to demand signals (Rushton et al., 2014; Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011).

The drivers behind VAS proliferation are multifaceted. Demand-side drivers include product variety, customer expectations for customization, omnichannel retailing pressures, and shorter product life cycles (Rivera et al., 2016; Herrera & Yang, 2017). Supply-side drivers include the strategic need for 3PLs to differentiate, margins

obtainable from services beyond storage, and the clustering of capabilities within logistics hubs that enable economies of scope (Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009; Van Den Berg, 2007). Importantly, VAS adoption is also shaped by regulatory and sustainability pressures—reverse logistics and refurbishment operations increasingly respond to environmental mandates and corporate social responsibility objectives (Furmans & Deml, 2014; Rivera et al., 2016).

Digital Enablers and Their Operational Effects. Internet of Things technologies, integrated Warehouse Management Systems (WMS), and AI-driven analytics are repeatedly identified as technological pillars for modern warehousing (Atzori et al., 2010; Van Den Berg, 2007; DHL Trend Research, 2020). IoT devices—RFID, BLE beacons, condition sensors, and telematics—transform static inventories into instrumented stocks that emit continuous streams of operational telemetry (Atzori et al., 2010). This telemetry supports precise locating, condition monitoring (e.g., temperature, humidity), and equipment utilization tracking, enabling capabilities such as dynamic slotting, condition-based routing, and predictive maintenance (Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021).

WMS platforms provide the logical orchestration layer: they translate business rules into picking strategies, slotting mandates, and labor assignments (Van Den Berg, 2007; Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011). When tightly integrated with IoT feeds, WMS can facilitate near-real-time adaptation—adjusting picking paths based on congestion, reallocating labor in response to

unexpected returns, or initiating automated quality checks triggered by sensor anomalies (Fawcett et al., 2011; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021). AI and advanced analytics elevate this stack further: predictive demand forecasting, anomaly detection in returns patterns, and prescriptive labor scheduling can materially reduce cycle times and error rates (DHL Trend Research, 2020).

Agile Practices and Non-Software Operational Adaptation. The agile manifesto and subsequent work on non-software contexts establish that iterative, customer-centric, and cross-functional practices can meaningfully improve responsiveness and innovation in warehouse operations (Beck et al., 2001; Conforto et al., 2014). Agile translates to operations as rapid experimentation of process changes, short feedback loops from customers and floor-level employees, and empowered teams that can make rapid decisions without being encumbered by rigid hierarchies (Conforto et al., 2014; Chowdhury, 2025). For example, iterative pilots of new VAS—such as a short-run kitting service—allow testing of layouts, staffing models, and IT integrations before large-scale rollouts, thereby reducing risk and accelerating learning (Conforto et al., 2014; Frazelle, 2002).

Logistics Clusters and Collaborative Value Creation. Spatial agglomerations of logistics activity—the logistics cluster—create a fertile environment for VAS development by enabling shared labor pools, specialized service providers, and knowledge spillovers (Rivera et al., 2016; Van Den Berg, 2007). Clusters facilitate training, collaboration on joint service offerings, and faster

diffusion of best practices. Rivera et al. (2016) show that agglomeration is associated with enhanced collaboration and broader VAS portfolios—a finding that suggests that geography remains a strategic determinant despite digitization. Clusters also influence negotiation dynamics between shippers and 3PLs and can lower transaction costs for complex services (Rivera et al., 2016; Rushton et al., 2014).

Integrated Conceptual Model. Synthesizing the threads above, the study proposes an integrative conceptual model in which VAS portfolio performance (the dependent variable) is determined by five interdependent constructs: VAS Design Complexity, Digital Infrastructure Maturity (IoT + WMS + Analytics), Agile Process Governance, Cluster Collaboration Intensity, and Human Capital & Training Depth. Digital Infrastructure Maturity acts as a key mediator that enables agile governance to translate into reliable execution; cluster collaboration moderates the effect of human capital by providing external resources and knowledge spillovers. Each construct is definable, measurable, and actionable, and together they generate propositions for empirical testing.

Propositions. The model yields several testable propositions grounded in the literature:

Proposition 1. Higher Digital Infrastructure Maturity positively affects VAS operational reliability and responsiveness, controlling for VAS Design Complexity (Atzori et al., 2010; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021).

Proposition 2. Agile Process Governance amplifies the benefits of digital infrastructure by shortening

feedback loops and enabling rapid reconfiguration of workflows, thereby improving VAS innovation rates and customer satisfaction (Beck et al., 2001; Conforto et al., 2014).

Proposition 3. Cluster Collaboration Intensity moderates the relationship between Human Capital & Training and VAS performance; in high-collaboration clusters, training investments yield higher returns due to shared practices and labor market fluidity (Rivera et al., 2016).

Proposition 4. VAS Design Complexity has an inverted-U relationship with profitability: moderate complexity enables premium pricing and differentiation, while excessive complexity increases fragility and operational costs unless offset by high digital maturity and agile governance (Foulds & Luo, 2006; Furmans & Deml, 2014).

Proposition 5. Sustainability-driven VAS (e.g., refurbishment, returns circularity) face distinct operational constraints—requiring specialized sensors, condition-based routing, and enhanced WMS logic—and thus depend disproportionately on digital infrastructure maturity and trained workforce capabilities (Furmans & Deml, 2014; Rivera et al., 2016).

Operational Heuristics and Managerial Checklists. From the propositions emerge practical heuristics: align VAS complexity with digital maturity; pilot VAS using iterative agile sprints; prioritize IoT investments that map directly to service-critical information flows (e.g., temperature control for perishables); cultivate cluster partnerships to share seasonal labor and specialized skills; and embed sustainability metrics into WMS rule sets

(Frazelle, 2002; Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009; DHL Trend Research, 2020).

DISCUSSION

The preceding analysis produces a multi-dimensional understanding of how modern warehousing generates and captures value through VAS in an era of digitalization and organizational agility. This discussion elaborates the theoretical implications, examines potential counter-arguments and tensions in the model, outlines managerial applications, and highlights limitations and research opportunities.

Theoretical Implications. The integrative framework contributes to logistics and operations scholarship by explicitly connecting three previously siloed literatures: VAS strategy in warehousing, digital operations/IoT, and agile organizational practices. The model underscores the mediating role of digital infrastructure: IoT and WMS integration are not merely efficiency tools but foundational capabilities that change the feasible set of services a warehouse can offer (Atzori et al., 2010; Van Den Berg, 2007). In theoretical terms, the model positions Digital Infrastructure Maturity as an enabling capability that shifts the frontier of operational routines—permitting higher-order VAS that would be infeasible under legacy systems (Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021).

Moreover, translating agile principles into warehousing contexts advances theory on cross-domain transferability of management frameworks (Beck et al., 2001; Conforto et al., 2014). Agile is reframed not as a prescriptive methodology but as a set of meta-principles—

iterative learning, customer co-creation, empowered teams—that enable rapid adaptation in complex, stochastic operational settings. This theoretical reframing allows researchers to apply agility as a lens for understanding dynamic capabilities in physical operations (Conforto et al., 2014; Chowdhury, 2025).

Counter-Arguments and Tensions. The model anticipates several counter-arguments. One line of critique argues that digitalization and IoT investments may produce diminishing returns, particularly for low-margin warehousing operations where the capital intensity cannot be justified (Frazelle, 2002). The model addresses this through the inverted-U proposition for VAS complexity: unless digital maturity and agile governance are in place, expanding VAS into more complex offerings can create cost overruns and service unreliability (Foulds & Luo, 2006).

Another tension lies between standardization and customization. Highly standardized processes yield scale economies, yet VAS often requires customization and ad-hoc processes. The integrated approach resolves this tension by advocating modular service architectures: standard core processes for storage and movement, with modular VAS “plugins” that are supported by flexible WMS rules and IoT-enabled real-time control (Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011; Van Den Berg, 2007). This modularity reconciles scale with variety and is consistent with principles from digital operations management that privilege composability (Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021).

Managerial Applications and Roadmap. Practically, the model suggests a phased, capability-driven roadmap for 3PLs and warehouses:

1. Diagnostic Phase: map current VAS portfolio, measure digital infrastructure maturity, and assess workforce skills and cluster linkages (Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009; Rushton et al., 2014).
2. Pilot & Learn Phase: adopt agile sprints to pilot VAS with measurable KPIs (cycle time, error rate, customer satisfaction) while instrumenting processes with IoT sensors and WMS integrations (Conforto et al., 2014; Bartholdi & Hackman, 2011).
3. Scale Phase: institutionalize successful VAS by codifying WMS rules, expanding IoT coverage where ROI is evident, and investing in workforce training and cluster partnerships to ensure scaling does not erode quality (Rivera et al., 2016; Furmans & Deml, 2014).
4. Continuous Optimization Phase: use AI analytics for predictive and prescriptive capabilities, adjust service portfolios to demand signals, and reconfigure facilities or networks as necessary (Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021; DHL Trend Research, 2020).

Each phase is underpinned by clear governance: cross-functional teams empowered to make rapid decisions, data transparency to support measurement, and contractual frameworks that align incentives between shippers and 3PLs for co-investment in VAS-enabled digital infrastructure (Fawcett et al., 2011; Herrera & Yang, 2017).



Sustainability and Reverse Logistics. A critical domain where the model has special salience is sustainability-driven VAS—returns processing, refurbishment, and circularity services. These operations are inherently complex, involve condition-based decision-making, and often require physical inspection—hence they benefit disproportionately from IoT-enabled condition sensing and from agile experimentation to find economically viable workflows (Furmans & Deml, 2014; Rivera et al., 2016). The model thus implies that sustainability objectives can be aligned with competitive advantage when warehouses develop the necessary sensing and process flexibility.

Limitations and Future Research Directions. The core limitation of this study is its conceptual nature: while rigorously grounded in provided literature, empirical validation is necessary to quantify the effect sizes and boundary conditions of the propositions. Future research should pursue mixed-methods studies: large-sample surveys of 3PLs to test statistical relationships among the constructs, and in-depth case studies that unpack process transformations in firms that have successfully scaled VAS with digital investments (Chopra & Meindl, 2016; Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021). Additional research should explore the economics of IoT investments across different warehouse typologies—e.g., cold chain versus general merchandise—and the role of regulatory regimes in shaping VAS adoption, particularly in circular economy domains (Furmans & Deml, 2014).

A promising frontier for empirical work is the study of digital twins—virtual representations of

physical warehouse processes—which were hinted at in the digital operations literature as powerful tools for simulating VAS configurations and testing process changes without disrupting live operations (Boute & Van Mieghem, 2021; DHL Trend Research, 2020). Finally, research should investigate the labor implications of VAS expansion and digitalization: training, job redesign, and labor market dynamics within logistics clusters are central to realizing the model's promises (Rivera et al., 2016; Atkacuna & Furlan, 2009).

CONCLUSION

Warehouses have evolved from simple storage houses into complex service factories where value is created through a portfolio of value-added services. This evolution is simultaneously driven by demand for customization, the strategic choices of 3PLs, and the enabling power of digital technologies. The integrated model advanced in this paper emphasizes that VAS success is not simply a matter of adding services or installing technology; rather, it requires a coherent alignment of VAS design, IoT and WMS integration, agile process governance, workforce capability development, and cluster-level collaboration. Digital infrastructure acts as the critical mediator enabling real-time operational transparency and prescriptive control, while agile practices ensure rapid learning and adaptation. Logistics clusters further multiply returns by supplying skilled labor and knowledge spillovers.

For practitioners, the implications are actionable: start with diagnostics, pilot services using agile sprints, scale based on measured ROI with clear

WMS rule integration, and embed continuous improvement through AI analytics. For scholars, the propositions and model provide a fertile research agenda that spans empirical validation, the study of digital twins, and labor-market implications.

In sum, the path to resilient, responsive, and value-creating warehouses lies in integrated strategies—where technology investments are paired with organizational redesign and service portfolio management. Only through this holistic approach can warehouses realize their potential as strategic hubs in modern supply chains, delivering differentiated services profitably and sustainably.

REFERENCES

1. Rushton, A.; Croucher, P.; Baker, P. *The Handbook of Logistics and Distribution Management*; Kogan Page: London, UK, 2014; Volume 5.
2. Frazelle, E. *World-Class Warehousing and Material Handling*; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 2002.
3. Van Den Berg, J. *Integral Warehouse Management: The Next Generation in Transparency, Collaboration and Warehouse Management System*; Management Outlook: Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2007.
4. Foulds, L.; Luo, Y. Value-added services for sustainable third-party warehousing. *Int. J. Logist. Syst. Manag.* 2006, 2, 194–216.
5. Atkacuna, I.; Furlan, K. Value-Added Services in Third-Party Logistics: A Study from the TPL Providers' Perspective about Value-Added Service Development, Driving Forces and Barriers. *Jönköping International Business School*. 2009. Available online: <http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:233689/FULLTEXT01.pdf> (accessed on 1 June 2024).
6. Rivera, L.; Sheffi, Y.; Knoppen, D. Logistics clusters: The impact of further agglomeration, training and firm size on collaboration and value added services. *Int. J. Prod. Econ.* 2016, 179, 285–294.
7. Bartholdi, J.; Hackman, S. *Warehouse & Distribution Science*; Supply Chain and Logistics Institute, School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology: Atlanta, GA, USA, 2011.
8. Bowersox, D.; Closs, D.; Cooper, M. *Supply Chain Logistics Management*; McGraw-Hill: New York, NY, USA, 2010; Volume 3.
9. Furmans, K.; Deml, B. *Systematische Bewertung von Value-Added-Services in Distributionszentren*. Karlsruhe. 2014. Available online: https://www.bvl.de/files/1951/2125/2131/2133/Abschlussbericht_Projekt174836_SyVaDis.pdf (accessed on 1 June 2024).
10. Herrera, A.; Yang, L. *Understanding Value-Added Service Offering by 3PL Providers: VAS as a Source of Competitive Advantage for the Provider and the Customer*; Jönköping University: Jönköping, Switzerland, 2017.
11. Atzori, L.; Iera, A.; Morabito, G. The Internet of Things: A survey. *Computer Networks*, 54(15), 2787–2805. 2010.
12. Beck, K.; Beedle, M.; van Bennekum, A.; Cockburn, A.; Cunningham, W.; Fowler, M.; Grenning, J.; Highsmith, J.; Hunt, A.; Jeffries, R;

Kern, J.; Marick, B.; Martin, R. C.; Mellor, S.; Schwaber, K.; Sutherland, J.; Thomas, D. Manifesto for Agile software development. Agile Alliance. 2001.

13. Chowdhury, W. A. Agile, IoT, and AI: Revolutionizing Warehouse Tracking and Inventory Management in Supply Chain Operations. *Journal of Procurement and Supply Chain Management*, 4(1), 41–47. 2025.

14. Boute, R. N.; Van Mieghem, J. A. Digital operations management. *Management Science*, 67(9), 5345–5368. 2021.

15. Chopra, S.; Meindl, P. *Supply chain management: Strategy, planning, and operation* (6th ed.). Pearson. 2016.

16. Conforto, E. C.; Salum, F.; Amaral, D. C.; da Silva, S. L.; de Almeida, L. F. M. Agile project management in non-software contexts. *Project Management Journal*, 45(3), 19–34. 2014.

17. DHL Trend Research. Artificial intelligence in logistics. DHL Customer Solutions & Innovation. 2020.

18. Fawcett, S. E.; Wallin, C.; Allred, C.; Magnan, G. Information technology in supply chain collaboration. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 16(2), 87–98. 2011.