June 26, 2025

E-Commerce Fulfillment

A Comparative Study of In-House vs Outsourced Operational Models

APS1049

Edwardo Bassil, Joseph Capan, Bart Cui, Cony Qin, Zengyi Qin

Professor: Stephen Armstrong

In collaboration with Deloitte

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The e-commerce industry consistently grows year-after-year. As companies attempt to compete within this expanding digital marketplace, navigating the logistical complexities around warehouse management and shipping, known as fulfillment, has become a top concern. The e-commerce fulfillment market alone was valued globally at USD$124 billion in 2024. Companies can utilize two operational models to perform their fulfillment: *in-house* where a company can do it themselves and directly innovate upon their logistics chain, and *outsourced* where a company can hire a Third Party Logistics provider (3PL) to do it for them. The project evaluates these models for e-commerce fulfillment specifically within the Apparel and Accessories sector, with the goal of providing strategic guidance to organizations on selecting the most effective fulfillment approach.

Mid-sized apparel and accessories brands are evaluated with annual revenues ranging USD$90–300 million. On the in-house side, companies like Adore Me and Ruggable demonstrate how investments in robotics, warehouse management software, and data-driven labor planning have doubled daily order capacity, pushed inventory accuracy above 99%, and enabled reliable 2-day delivery promises. Conversely, the outsourced success stories of HalloweenCostumes and Bonobos shows how global 3PL infrastructures absorb seasonal surges of up to 100,000 daily orders while maintaining 97% on-time accuracy and freeing management to focus on merchandising and marketing.

Based on insights extracted from the case studies, our team developed a Three-Pillar Fulfillment Framework for Deloitte, consisting of People, Logistics, and Technology, to evaluate and compare the performance of in-house and outsourced models. In the People dimension, we find that regulatory knowledge, customer service, labor expertise, headcount, and labor geographic location are central to fulfillment success. Companies that are able to directly invest in these areas benefit from in-house control, while those that cannot manage this investment may gain efficiency and risk reduction through a qualified 3PL. Logistically, the fulfillment model must align with a company's order volume patterns and strategic control needs. Brands with steady, predictable growth often benefit from in-house expansion, which enables tighter control over branding and customer experience. Meanwhile, those facing high seasonality or rapid geographic expansion are better served by outsourcing, which offers instant scalability and access to global fulfillment networks. Technology further differentiates the options. Advanced robotics, tight WMS/ERP integration, and real-time analytics support in-house innovation, but 3PLs now offer automation and API integration without upfront capital investment.

Based on company priorities and operational focus, our framework offers tailored guidance on model selection. When cost efficiency and rapid scaling are the top priority, an outsourced model is often the optimal path. Brands like HalloweenCostumes underscore how a shared 3PL network can absorb sudden peaks without the fixed overhead of extra floor space. In this case, management should accept looser process control and depend on the provider's reliability. Conversely, for companies that compete on customer experience, product customization, or complex SKU bundles, an in-house model provides greater advantages. Adore Me's try-before-you-buy programme and Ruggable's real-time dashboards show how in-house automation unlocks tailored workflows, instant data visibility, and sub-two-day shipping. In cases where companies require both operational control and international reach, a hybrid model emerges as the core inventory can stay under a self-run WMS while overflow moves through global 3PL nodes.