

COMPANION WORKSHEET PACK

Warehouse Management Essentials

Control What Enters, What Is Stored, and What Leaves Your Warehouse

9 Worksheets · 3 Categories · A4 Print-Ready

High-Volume · Niche-Search · Specific-Case

PT Hibrkraft Kreasi Indonesia · hibranwar.com

PART 1

High-Volume Worksheets

Universal worksheets — what most operators reach for daily or weekly. Run these on a regular cadence regardless of business size or stage.

PART 2

Niche-Search Worksheets

Rare-situation worksheets — high value when the situation hits. Run these only when the trigger appears, but keep them findable.

FIFO Breach Investigation Worksheet

Use when a cycle count, a picker report, or a customer complaint reveals that a newer lot was picked instead of the older lot. This is not primarily a people problem — it is a layout or labelling problem.

Use when a cycle count, a picker report, or a customer complaint reveals that a newer lot was picked instead of the older lot. This is not primarily a people problem — it is a layout or labelling problem.

SKU CODE	LOCATION CODE	LOT PICKED (DATE ON LABEL)	CORRECT LOT (EARLIEST RECEIPT DATE IN ZONE)	AGE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LOTS (DAYS)	PHYSICAL LAYOUT AT TIME OF PICK (DESCRIBE)	WAS RECEIPT DATE LABEL VISIBLE FROM PICKING DISTANCE?	WAS A DIRECTIONAL MARKER PRESENT? (Y/N)	PROBABLE CAUSE OF BREACH
----------	---------------	----------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--	---	---	--------------------------

1. For each breach: identify whether the root cause is (a) no receipt date label visible from picking distance, (b) no directional marker enforcing the picking sequence, or (c) a solid floor stack with no aisle down the middle allowing access to the older lot. Each cause has a specific fix — do not apply a general 'remind staff to follow FIFO' response to a physical layout problem.

2. Calculate the financial exposure from this breach: quantity of incorrectly picked units × days of age difference × estimated loss rate per day (use 0.05 percent of unit cost per day as a conservative proxy for perishable goods, lower for non-perishables). If the exposure exceeds the cost of fixing the physical layout, the fix is not optional.

3. After implementing the physical fix: re-check the same location in the next weekly cycle count. Confirm the lot at the picking face is the earliest-receipt-date lot. Document the confirmation date and counter name as evidence the breach has been resolved.

PART 3

Specific-Case Worksheets

Pre-framed scenarios — each worksheet walks you through a single, concrete situation. Read the scenario, then fill in your version of it.

Persistent Zone Discrepancy Investigation Worksheet

Scenario: cycle counts for one specific zone consistently show a negative discrepancy against the ERP or stock card for three or more consecutive counting periods. The zone's balance is corrected after each count, but the same gap reappears. A recurring discrepancy in one zone is not a counting error — it is a process failure with a specific location.

Scenario: cycle counts for one specific zone consistently show a negative discrepancy against the ERP or stock card for three or more consecutive counting periods. The zone's balance is corrected after each count, but the same gap reappears. A recurring discrepancy in one zone is not a counting error — it is a process failure with a specific location.

COUNT DATE	ZONE	SKU CODE	RECORD BALANCE	PHYSICAL COUNT	DISCREPANCY	INBOUND TRANSACTIONS SINCE LAST COUNT (QTY)	OUTBOUND TRANSACTIONS SINCE LAST COUNT (QTY)	TRANSACTIONS VERIFIED IN RECORD? (Y/N)	UNRECORDED TRANSACTION FOUND? (Y/N)

- For any row where Transactions Verified = N: pull the physical receiving documents and outgoing documents for that zone and period. Compare them line by line against the stock card or ERP entries. A discrepancy that appears in three consecutive counts without a confirmed unrecorded transaction is either a recording gap (someone recording transactions in a batch at period end rather than in real time) or an access control problem (goods leaving the zone without a document).
- After completing the table: does the discrepancy appear across all SKUs in the zone or only specific SKUs? If specific SKUs, the issue is likely SKU-level (wrong location code being recorded on transactions). If all SKUs, the issue is zone-level (a recording or access procedure that applies to the whole zone is not being followed).
- Design one specific corrective action — not a general policy reminder — and implement it before the next count. Examples: require the recorder to scan the location code label before any entry is submitted (catches wrong-code errors); require a manager sign-off on all outgoing transactions from this zone for 30 days (identifies unauthorised outflows). Re-run the count two weeks after implementation and compare the discrepancy to the baseline in this table.

Companion to:

Warehouse Management Essentials – Control What Enters, What Is Stored, and What Leaves Your Warehouse

by Ibrahim Anwar

PT Hibrkraft Kreasi Indonesia

hibranwar.com