The OSCAR PUBLISHING Services
American Journal of Applied Science and Technology

VOLUME Vol.05 Issue 8 2025
PAGE NO. 105-111

Designing Adaptive and Resilient Supply Chains: A Strategic Framework for Market-Specific Optimization

Dr. Emily Carter

School of Management, University of Manchester

Received: 16 August 2025; **Accepted:** 25 August 2025; **Published:** 31 August 2025

Abstract: This article develops a comprehensive, integrative framework for designing market-specific supply chain strategies that reconcile the competing demands of agility, resilience, and efficiency across diverse product, market, and institutional contexts. Drawing on foundational taxonomies and strategy prescriptions from seminal works on supply chain segmentation and product-market alignment (Christopher & Towill, 2002; Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006; Fisher, 1997), and synthesizing insights from scholarly and practitioner literature on agile and lean paradigms (Goldman, Nagel & Preiss, 1995; Harrison, Christopher & van Hoek, 1999; Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009), sourcing and procurement (Handfield et al., 2009), and contemporary technological enablers including IoT and AI (Chowdhury, 2025), the article proposes a multidimensional model to guide managers in selecting, configuring, and managing supply chain strategies. The model incorporates market demand characteristics, product attributes, organizational capabilities, and governance structures, and explicitly accommodates public sector-specific dynamics (Gansler, Luby & Kornberg, 2004). Methodologically, the study follows a rigorous theoretical synthesis and conceptual modelling approach, using structured literature review techniques and multi-lens theoretical reasoning to derive propositions and actionable guidance (Machi & McEvoy, 2016; Locke, Silverman & Spirduso, 2010). The findings emphasize the necessity of aligning strategy with product architecture and market volatility, tailoring agility levers where responsiveness is a competitive priority, and embedding resilience mechanisms — redundancy, flexibility, and risk governance — even in cost-sensitive contexts. The discussion unpacks tensions between lean efficiency and agile responsiveness, explores the role of benchmarking in capability development (Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009), and examines sourcing decisions and supplier network design under strategic segmentation (Handfield et al., 2009). Limitations and future research directions include empirical validation across industries and investigation of digital intelligence's operationalization in strategy selection. This contribution offers a richly elaborated, citation-anchored guide for academics and senior practitioners seeking a principled route from product-market analysis to tailored supply chain strategy.

Keywords: Supply chain strategy, agility, resilience, market segmentation, sourcing, digital intelligence

INTRODUCTION:

The past three decades have witnessed profound evolution in how organizations conceive, design, and operate their supply chains. Early perspectives emphasized the transactional and logistical dimensions of supply (Gansler, Luby & Kornberg, 2004), but theoretical and practitioner literatures progressively shifted towards strategy-centred thinking that ties supply chain configuration to product characteristics and market demands (Fisher, 1997; Christopher & Towill, 2002). This shift—moving from operationally focused logistics to strategically aligned supply chain management—was driven by recognition that a one-size-fits-all approach is suboptimal and oftentimes counterproductive when firms face heterogeneous product portfolios and disparate market dynamics (Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006; Fawcet, Ellram & Ogden, 2007).

The central problem motivating this study is the persistent managerial dilemma: how to select and configure a supply chain strategy that balances competing objectives—cost, speed, service, and robustness—in ways that are specific to the market and

product involved. Popular strategic paradigms—lean, agile, resilient, and digitized supply chains—each offer specific strengths and trade-offs (Goldman, Nagel & Preiss, 1995; Lee, 2004). Yet practitioners frequently struggle to operationalize these paradigms in a coherent, market-oriented manner. Moreover, the acceleration of technological capabilities (e.g., IoT and AI) provides new levers to enhance visibility and responsiveness, but their integration into strategic decision frameworks remains inconsistent (Chowdhury, 2025). Simultaneously, sourcing and governance choices, which determine the network's structural properties, often receive inadequate strategic linkage to the market segmentation process (Handfield et al., 2009).

There is thus a clear literature gap for a richly articulated, integrative framework that synthesizes product-market segmentation taxonomies, agility and lean doctrines, sourcing and governance perspectives, and contemporary digital enablers into an actionable model for market-specific supply chain strategy selection. Prior taxonomies and segmentation frameworks provide necessary building blocks but typically stop short of offering exhaustive managerial roadmaps that address implementation trade-offs, countervailing risks, and the role of benchmarking and capability development (Christopher & Towill, 2002; Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006; Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009).

This article addresses that gap. It constructs a multidimensional framework that: (1) systematically maps product and market characteristics to appropriate strategic archetypes; (2) disaggregates agility into operational levers and organizational capabilities; (3) integrates resilience as an explicit design objective; (4) aligns sourcing and supplier network decisions with strategic archetypes; and (5) explicates how digital intelligence and technological affordances can be deployed to strengthen chosen strategies. The framework is developed through rigorous theoretical synthesis, drawing on canonical texts and targeted contemporary contributions, and is designed to guide both academic inquiry and executive action.

In assembling this framework, this article pursues three objectives. First, to reconceptualize market-specific strategy selection by situating it within an extended capability and governance lens that incorporates both agility and resilience. Second, to provide operationalizable prescriptions—i.e., which levers to pull, which capabilities to build, and which governance forms to adopt—conditional on product-market archetypes. Third, to delineate a research agenda for empirical validation and refinement, acknowledging the increasingly pivotal role of digital technologies and the need for cross-industry evidence. The remainder of the article develops these arguments in sequence: the methodology explains the theoretical synthesis approach; the results section presents the integrative framework and associated propositions; the discussion interprets the framework's implications and limits; and the conclusion summarises the contribution and charts next steps.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a theory-building, integrative review methodology that aims to synthesize existing conceptual knowledge into a unified, actionable framework. The approach combines structured literature review techniques with iterative conceptual modelling, guided by methodological best practices for constructing theoretical frameworks from secondary sources (Machi & McEvoy, 2016; Locke, Silverman & Wyrick Spirduso, 2010). The rationale for a theory-development approach is twofold. First, the research objective is to clarify and extend conceptual understanding rather than test a specific empirical hypothesis. Second, literature is sufficiently rich and varied—spanning supply chain taxonomies, lean and agile doctrines, sourcing strategy, and technological innovation—that synthesis will yield novel integrative propositions with direct managerial relevance (Christopher & Towill, 2002; Handfield et al., 2009).

The review procedure involved several stages, executed sequentially. Stage one comprised scoping and selection: identifying seminal and contemporary works relevant to supply chain strategy, agility, lean operations, sourcing, benchmarking, and digital enablers, using the provided core references as anchor texts and adding complementary literature to fill conceptual gaps (Christopher & Towill, 2002; Fisher, 1997; Goldman et al., 1995; Lee, 2004). Stage two consisted of extraction and mapping: systematically extracting theoretical constructs, definitions, and recommended strategic levers from each work and mapping these onto a common analytic schema focused on four dimensions—product attributes, market characteristics, organizational capabilities, and governance/sourcing structures (Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006; Handfield et al., 2009). Stage three was integrative synthesis: using abductive reasoning to construct a framework that reconciles tensions and maps conditions to strategy choices, iteratively refining constructs and linkages to ensure theoretical

coherence (Machi & McEvoy, 2016). Stage four generated managerial propositions and implementation guidance derived from the framework, and stage five articulated limitations and directions for empirical validation.

Throughout the synthesis, rigorous citation discipline was maintained: every substantive claim that draws on extant literature is supported by explicit citation to its source (Fawcet, Ellram & Ogden, 2007; Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009). Where multiple sources converge on the same claim, plural citations are provided to indicate the breadth of support (Christopher & Towill, 2002; Harrison, Christopher & van Hoek, 1999). The methodological focus was deliberately theoretical; hence the methods section does not include primary data collection or statistical analysis. Instead, careful conceptual elaboration and cross-textual integration provide the basis for the framework and propositions.

To ensure managerial relevance, the framework articulates implementation levers—operational practices, capability development priorities, and governance choices—explicitly derived from the literature; for instance, the role of benchmarking in lean implementation is traced to empirical studies and practice guides (Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009). The methodology section concludes by acknowledging the limits of conceptual research: the propositions and prescriptions emerging from this synthesis require empirical testing across multiple industries and market contexts, a theme revisited in the discussion and conclusion (Machi & McEvoy, 2016).

RESULTS

The principal outcome of this study is a detailed, integrative framework for market-specific supply chain strategy selection and design. The framework is presented here through descriptive exposition and a set of propositions that explicate the linkages between market/product characteristics and strategic choices. Each component is described with operational detail to aid implementation.

1.Market and Product Segmentation as the Strategic Nexus

Central to the framework is the recognition that product and market characteristics determine the strategic priorities of the supply chain (Fisher, 1997; Christopher & Towill, 2002). The framework employs a two-axis segmentation: product demand predictability (from predictable to highly uncertain) and product lifecycle/complexity (from simple/commodity to technologically complex/custom). This segmentation generates four archetypal strategic contexts:

Predictable demand, simple product: Prioritize cost efficiency and lean operations. Inventory optimization and process standardization are the dominant levers (Fisher, 1997; Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009).

Predictable demand, complex product: Emphasize modularization and supplier integration to manage complexity while retaining efficiency; configure supply networks to support component standardization and postponement where possible (Christopher & Towill, 2002).

Unpredictable demand, simple product: Prioritize agility—rapid replenishment, flexible distribution, and responsive sourcing—to prevent stockouts and capture ephemeral opportunities (Goldman et al., 1995; Harrison, Christopher & van Hoek, 1999).

Unpredictable demand, complex product: Combine agility with resilience. Organizations must manage uncertainty through flexible manufacturing, dual sourcing for critical components, and enhanced visibility enabled by digital tracking (Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006; Chowdhury, 2025).

Proposition 1: Product demand variability and product complexity jointly determine the primary strategic orientation (lean, agile, hybrid, or resilience-augmented)—firms should map each product or product family onto this segmentation before selecting operational levers. This proposition synthesizes Fisher's logic on right-sizing supply chains for product types (Fisher, 1997) and the supply chain strategy taxonomy that emphasizes market specificity (Christopher & Towill, 2002; Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006).

2.Disaggregating Agility: Operational Levers and Organizational Capabilities

Agility is often treated as a monolithic capability, but the literature highlights multiple, discrete levers that collectively create responsiveness (Goldman et al., 1995; Lin, Chiu & Chu, 2006). The framework disaggregates agility into six operational levers:

Market sensing and demand intelligence—rapidly capturing market signals and translating them into operational decisions (Lee, 2004).

Flexible manufacturing and capacity pooling—ability to reallocate capacity and switch production mixes swiftly (Kisperska-Moron & Swierczek, 2009; Kumar, Singh & Jain, 2019).

Rapid replenishment and distribution—short lead times and expedited logistics capabilities (Harrison, Christopher & van Hoek, 1999).

Postponement and product modularity—delaying final

configuration to respond to actual demand (Christopher & Towill, 2002).

Supplier responsiveness—contractual and collaborative arrangements that enable quick changes in supply volumes and specifications (Handfield et al., 2009).

Digital visibility and automation—real-time tracking, predictive analytics, and automated workflows (Chowdhury, 2025).

Proposition 2: Agility should be operationalized via targeted levers selected according to which dimension of responsiveness is critical—market sensing for short-lived trends, flexible manufacturing for mix changes, and digital visibility for coordination—rather than as an undifferentiated aspiration. This proposition aligns with the agility index scholarship that advocates measuring specific capabilities (Lin, Chiu & Chu, 2006) and agile manufacturing frameworks (Kumar et al., 2019).

3.Embedding Resilience: Design Principles and Trade-offs

Resilience is increasingly recognized as a strategic imperative, distinct from agility but complementary in many contexts (Lee, 2004; Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006). The framework identifies three resilience design principles:

Structural redundancy and diversity—backup suppliers, alternate routes, and spare capacity.

Flexibility and reconfigurability—capabilities to reassign resources and alter production footprints.

Risk governance and buffering—financial and contractual mechanisms, and inventory buffers where necessary.

Proposition3:Resilience should be designed deliberately alongside efficiency or agility objectives, with explicit trade-off analysis: redundancy increases cost but reduces vulnerability; buffering reduces service volatility but inflates working capital. Managers must quantify these trade-offs using scenario analysis and risk appetite frameworks (Gansler, Luby & Kornberg, 2004; Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006).

4.Sourcing and Governance Aligned to Strategy

Sourcing decisions—single vs multiple sourcing, global vs local suppliers, vertical integration—critically shape strategic outcomes (Handfield et al., 2009). The framework links sourcing archetypes to the segmentation:

For lean, predictable contexts: favor long-term relationships with specialized suppliers, tight cost control, and standardized contracts.

For agile contexts: favor modular suppliers with rapid response capabilities, flexible contracts, and proximity when speed matters.

For resilience-sensitive contexts: adopt dual or multi-sourcing for critical items, diversify geographic exposure, and include contingency clauses.

Proposition 4: Sourcing and contract governance must be explicitly aligned to the supply chain strategic archetype; misalignment (e.g., single sourcing for unpredictable demand) magnifies operational risk (Handfield et al., 2009; Christopher & Towill, 2002).

5.Digital Intelligence as an Enabler, Not a Panacea

Contemporary digital technologies—IoT sensors, AI for demand forecasting, and advanced analytics—offer potent enablers for both agility and resilience (Chowdhury, 2025; Lee, 2004). But technology is an enabler, not a substitute for strategic clarity. The framework distinguishes three roles for digital intelligence:

Visibility and sensing: real-time data collection and event detection.

Decision augmentation: AI-driven forecasting and optimization to improve replenishment and capacity decisions.

Automation and orchestration: executional automation to shorten response times.

Proposition 5: Digital intelligence amplifies appropriate strategic choices (e.g., improves the responsiveness of an agile supply chain) but must be adopted with governance mechanisms to avoid overreliance on automated outputs and ensure alignment with strategic trade-offs (Chowdhury, 2025; Lee, 2004).

6.Capability Development and Benchmarking

The framework recognizes that capabilities underpin strategic success and that systematic benchmarking accelerates learning and improvement (Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009). Capability development is multi-dimensional: processes, people, systems, and metrics. Benchmarking serves three roles: diagnostic (where are we?), aspirational (where do we want to get?), and prescriptive (what practices to adopt?).

Proposition 6: Firms should adopt a structured capability development pathway guided by benchmarking of critical practices—for instance, lead time compression, supplier lead time variability, and inventory turnover—integrating lessons from lean and agile implementations (Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009; Goldman et al., 1995).

7.A Decision Protocol for Managers

To operationalize the framework, a decision protocol is

proposed:

Step A: Segment products by demand predictability and complexity (Fisher, 1997).

Step B: Select primary strategic orientation (lean, agile, hybrid, resilience-augmented) consistent with segmentation (Christopher & Towill, 2002).

Step C: Choose specific operational levers for agility or resilience as required (Lin et al., 2006; Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006).

Step D: Align sourcing and governance choices to the selected orientation (Handfield et al., 2009).

Step E: Identify digital intelligence investments that directly support chosen levers (Chowdhury, 2025).

Step F: Design capability development and benchmarking plans (Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009).

Proposition 7: Adherence to this protocol increases the likelihood of strategic fit and operational performance, relative to ad-hoc selection of practices.

8.Illustrative Application: A Hypothetical Consumer Electronics Division

To ground the framework, consider a hypothetical consumer electronics division with a mixed portfolio: low-cost, high-volume accessories (predictable demand, simple products) and flagship devices with short product lifecycles and unpredictable demand (complex, volatile). Applying the protocol, the accessories line should be configured for lean efficiency—centralized procurement, long-term contracts, and optimized replenishment—while flagship devices require hybrid agile-resilient approaches: modular design, postponement, dual sourcing for critical chips, and IoT-enabled visibility in distribution (Christopher & Towill, 2002; Handfield et al., 2009; Chowdhury, 2025). This illustration exemplifies how the framework guides differentiated strategy across the product portfolio.

DISCUSSION

The integrative framework contributes several theoretical and practical insights. Theoretically, it extends classical segmentation logic (Fisher, 1997; Christopher & Towill, 2002) by explicitly incorporating resilience and sourcing governance into the decision calculus, making the model more suited to contemporary uncertainties and geopolitical risks (Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006; Gansler, Luby & Kornberg, 2004). The framework's disaggregation of agility into specific levers clarifies ambiguous prescriptions in earlier literature and enables measurement and capability development aligned with organizational priorities (Lin, Chiu & Chu, 2006; Kumar et al., 2019).

A central contribution is the reconciliation of lean and agile logics through strategic segmentation rather than prescriptive dichotomy. Where Fisher (1997) advocated matching supply chains to product characteristics, and lean schools promoted cost minimization via waste elimination, the framework synthesizes these perspectives by arguing that lean remains optimal for stable, predictable contexts, while agile and resilience logics are necessary where uncertainty and complexity dominate (Goldman et al., 1995; Gurumurthy & Kodali, 2009). The practical implication is that firms should resist universal adoption of any single paradigm and instead embrace nuanced, portfolio-level strategy design.

The role of digital intelligence merits further unpacking. Chowdhury (2025) documents how IoT and AI revolutionize warehouse tracking and inventory management; this study positions such technologies as strategic multipliers that increase the efficacy of chosen levers—improving market sensing for agile strategies and enhancing visibility for resilient network reconfiguration. However, technology adoption should follow strategic clarity: investing in visibility without redesigning processes or governance that capitalize on that visibility yields suboptimal returns (Lee, 2004; Christopher, Peck & Towill, 2006).

Benchmarking and capability development are practical mechanisms through which organizations operationalize strategic choices. Gurumurthy and Kodali (2009) highlight benchmarking's effectiveness in assessing lean implementation; this study generalizes that lesson to agility and resilience by recommending targeted benchmarking of lead times, supplier responsiveness, and recovery times—metrics that directly map to strategic levers.

Limitations and counter-arguments deserve explicit attention. One critique might be that the segmentation framework oversimplifies dynamic markets where demand predictability and product complexity evolve rapidly. Indeed, product attributes can shift as technologies mature or consumer tastes change; thus, strategic orientation must be periodically revisited, and organizations need dynamic capabilities to reconfigure supply chains (Kisperska-Moron & Swierczek, 2009). Another critique pertains to cost: resilience mechanisms (redundancy, inventory buffers) can be financially costly and may face resistance from stakeholders focused on short-term profitability. Here, the framework recommends scenario analysis and risk quantification approaches to reveal the expected value

of resilience investments under plausible disruption scenarios (Gansler, Luby & Kornberg, 2004).

A further limitation relates to governance complexity in global supply chains. Christopher, Peck and Towill (2006) emphasize that global strategies must account for political, regulatory, and institutional variances. The sourcing prescriptions in this framework—such as dual sourcing or geographic diversification—must therefore be implemented with careful legal and compliance designs, particularly for public sector supply chains where procurement rules can limit flexibility (Gansler, Luby & Kornberg, 2004).

The framework also raises avenues for future empirical research. Cross-industry validation is necessary to test whether the segmentation consistently predicts superior performance when matched with the recommended strategic archetypes. Longitudinal studies could examine the dynamic reconfiguration process—how firms transition from lean to agile/resilient postures as product markets evolve. Additionally, there is a need for empirical work to quantify the incremental value of digital intelligence investments in specific strategic contexts—does IoT investment yield greater ROI in agile or in resilient configurations? Chowdhury's (2025) work provides early empirical signals in warehousing, but broader studies are needed.

Finally, managerial implementation challenges should not be understated. Organizational inertia, legacy systems, and capability gaps impede strategy shifts. The framework's prescriptions on capability development and benchmarking are designed to address these hurdles, but success hinges on leadership commitment, cross-functional alignment, and investment in both people and systems (Fawcet, Ellram & Ogden, 2007).

Conclusion

This article offers a richly detailed, theoretically grounded framework for market-specific supply chain strategy design. By integrating product-market segmentation with a disaggregated view of agility, explicit resilience design, aligned sourcing and governance decisions, and prudent digital intelligence deployment, the framework provides a practical roadmap for managers grappling with complex trade-offs. The propositions articulated here bridge classic supply chain strategy scholarship and contemporary concerns about uncertainty and technological change, and they point to concrete levers—postponement, modularization, dual sourcing, IoT visibility, and benchmarking—that managers can deploy in alignment with strategic priorities.

The contribution is twofold: first, conceptual clarity—by decomposing agility and embedding resilience into the segmentation logic—and second, operational guidance—by specifying levers, sourcing archetypes, and a decision protocol. Practitioners should use the protocol to map product portfolios to strategic archetypes, select relevant operational levers, and align sourcing and digital investments accordingly. Scholars should view the framework as a basis for empirical testing and extension, particularly in dynamic and digitally enabled contexts.

In closing, the essential managerial lesson is that strategic fit—between product, market, and supply chain—is neither automatic nor static. It requires deliberate analysis, targeted capability development, and governance choices that reflect the realities of contemporary risk and opportunity. The framework presented here aims to make that analysis systematic and actionable.

REFERENCES

1. Christopher, M. and Towill, D.R. (2002), "Developing Market Specific Supply Chain Strategies", International Journal of Logistics Management, 13:1, pp. 1-14.
2. Christopher M, Peck, H and Towil, D. (2006), A Taxonomy for selecting global supply chain strategies, International Journal of Logistics Management, 17: 2, pp 277-287.
3. Fawcet, SE, Ellram, LM and Ogden, JA, (2007), Supply Chain Management: From Vision to Implementation. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice hall.
4. Fisher, M., (1997), "What is the Right Supply Chain for your Product?", Harvard Business Review, March/April.
5. Gansler C, Luby RE Jr., Kornberg B (2004). ' Supply Chain Management in Government and Business', in Transforming Government in Gansler J, and Luby, JR. The IBM Centre for the Business for Government Series.
6. Goldman, S.L., Nagel, R.N. and Preiss, K., (1995), Agile competitors and virtual organisations: Strategies for enriching the customer. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
7. Chowdhury, W. A. (2025). 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. https://doi.org/10.58425/jpscm.v4i1.349

8. Gurumurthy, A and Kodali R (2009), Application of benchmarking for assessing the lean manufacturing implementation. Benchmarking: An international journal. Vol. 16:2, pp. 274-308.
9. Handfield, RB, Monczka, RM, Giunipero, LC & Patterson, JL. (2009), Sourcing and supply chain management. 4th edition. Ontario: South Western.
10. Harrison, A., Christopher, M and van Hoek, R., (1999), "Creating the agile supply chain", working paper, School of Management, Cranfield University.
11. Kawa, A., & Maryniak, A. (2019). Lean and agile supply chains of ecommerce: Empirical research. Journal of Information and Telecommunication, 3(2), 235-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/24751839.2018.1553915
12. Kisperska-Moron, D., & Swierczek, A. (2009, March). The agile capabilities of Polish companies in the supply chain: An empirical study. International Journal of Production Economics, 118(1), 217-224. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2008.08.019
13. Kumar, R., Singh, K., & Jain, S. J. (2019). Development of a framework for agile manufacturing. World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development, 16(4), 161-169. https://doi.org/10.1108/WJSTSD-05-2019-0022
14. Lee, H. L. (2004, October). The Triple-A supply chain. Harvard Business Review (Online).
15. Lin, C. T., Chiu, H., & Chu, P. Y. (2006). Agility index in the supply chain. International Journal of Production Economics, 100(2), 285–299. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2004.11.014
16. Locke, L. F., Silverman, S. J., & Wyrick Spirduso, W. (2010). Reading and understanding research (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
17. Machi, L. A., & McEvoy, B. T. (2016). The literature review: Six steps to success (3rd ed.). Corwin Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/obo/9780199756810-0169
18. Malakouti, M., Rezaei, S., & Shahijan, M. K. (2017, January). Agile supply chain management (ASCM): A management decision making approach. Asia Pacific Journal of Marketing and Logistics, 29(1), 171-182. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJML-02-2016-0031