Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 6, No.1, June : 2024

STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF CUSTOMER ORDER PATTERN AND ON-TIME DELIVERY PERFORMANCE IN SEMICONDUCTOR SUPPLY CHAIN

Trisha. A, Anika Vishwas, Tejas. H, Students of Dept. of Industrial Engineering and Management, R V College of Engineering, Bangalore
Dr. Vikram N Bahadurdesai, Assistant Professor, Dept. of Industrial Engineering and Management, R V College of Engineering, Bangalore

ABSTRACT
Combining the insights from various research papers, customer order patterns and on-time delivery are critical aspects of the semiconductor supply chain. On one hand, studies like "Right product, right time, right location: Quantifying the semiconductor supply chain" highlight the challenge of on-time delivery due to complex manufacturing processes and inaccurate demand forecasts. This can lead to frustrated distributors and lost sales. On the other hand, research like "Order Management of Supply Chain" emphasizes the importance of a well-managed order fulfillment process (OFP) that tracks customer orders from placement to delivery. An efficient OFP requires understanding customer order patterns and ensuring they are incorporated into production planning. Furthermore, studies like "Maximizing delivery performance in semiconductor wafer fabrication facilities" propose methods to optimize scheduling and prioritize customer orders based on factors like value and urgency. Overall, a successful semiconductor supply chain bridges the gap between customer needs reflected in order patterns and on-time delivery through effective communication, planning, and process optimization.
Keywords: On-time delivery performance (OTD), Lead time, supply chain, semiconductor industry.

I. Introduction
The ever-growing demand for semiconductors and the intricate manufacturing processes have created significant challenges in the semiconductor supply chain, impacting both customer satisfaction and company profitability. This literature review aims to explore the factors influencing on-time delivery (OTD) performance within the complex ecosystem of semiconductor production. Several key themes emerge from the research: understanding customer order patterns through accurate demand forecasting (Right Product, Right Time, Right Location), optimizing internal processes to reduce cycle times through automation (Automation: Key to Cycle Time Improvement in Semiconductor Manufacturing), and developing effective management strategies to navigate the inherent complexities of the industry (Managing complexity in supply chains: A discussion of current approaches on the example of the semiconductor industry). By leveraging these areas of research, companies can develop a more holistic approach to supply chain management, ensuring timely deliveries and a competitive edge in the global market.

II. Literature
2.1 Order Management of Supply Chain
As the author mentions[1], supply chain management is a complex system that involves various stakeholders and activities. It is crucial for a company to have a well-managed order fulfilment process (OFP) to meet customer expectations [1]. An effective OF relies on communication and collaboration among different departments such as sales, planning, production, and logistics. The author highlights that on-time delivery (OTD) is a key performance indicator (KPI) to measure the effectiveness of a supply chain. Meeting the planned lead time is essential to achieve customer satisfaction. However, delays from any department can impact the overall lead time. The paper explores the role of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) and Manufacturing Execution System (MES) in streamlining the order fulfilment process. ERP systems integrate various functionalities like order processing, inventory management, and production planning, enabling better data

management and communication across departments. MES, on the other hand, focuses on real-time monitoring and execution

2.2 Automation: Key to cycle time improvement in semiconductor Manufacturing

The author mentions[2] that in a typical state-of-the-art automated Fab, several systems interact with each other to achieve high throughput and reduce costs. These systems include: Equipment Interface (El): This is the interface between the process tool and factory automation systems, enabling error-free water processing. Manufacturing Execution System (MES): This system tracks and manages all aspects of a job in real-time, including resource management, scheduling, and quality control. Real-Time Dispatch (RTD): This system dispatches lots and reports on work in progress (WIP). [2] It determines lot priority and provides data for production reports. In a highly automated Fab, RTD uses real-time information to optimize dispatching. Recipe Server: This software application stores and retrieves tool recipes and ensures version control.

2.3 Future research directions for mastering end-to-end semiconductor supply chains

As the author mentions, [3] semiconductor supply chains are complex and constantly changing. They require a high degree of responsiveness, short innovation cycles, and long production lead times. To overcome these challenges, an agile, adaptable, and aligned end-to-end supply chain is necessary. This type of supply chain is referred to as a Triple-A Supply Chain. One of the challenges identified in the paper is the difficulty of managing order fulfilment due to long lead times and customized products .Companies may begin production based on forecasts, but these forecasts can change frequently. This can lead to issues with order fulfilment if the supplier is not able to adapt to these changes .The author mentions that supply chain contracts are a way to manage the rules for changes, delays, and cancellations. However, there is little research[3] on how to create these contracts specifically for the semiconductor industry. This is an area where further research is needed Another challenge identified in the paper is the phenomenon of "gaming" in Collaborative Planning, Forecasting, and Replenishment (CPFR). CPR is a technique where supply chain partners share information with each other. However, some companies may try to game the system by providing inaccurate information. This can lead to the bullwhip effect, which is a magnification of demand fluctuations throughout the supply chain. The author suggests [3] that agent-based simulation (ABS) can be used to study the impact of gaming in CPFR. ABS is a modelling approach that can be used to simulate the behaviour of autonomous agents. This type of modelling can be used to investigate how different behaviour can impact the supply chain. Finally, the author mentions that simulation can be a valuable tool for decision support in semiconductor supply chains. However, there is a need for research on how to develop simulation models that are both accurate and efficient. This research should consider the specific needs of the semiconductor industry.

2.4 A Study of key Success Factors for Supply Chain Management System in Semiconductor Industry

The authors mention [4] that today's global business environment is highly competitive, characterized by volatile demand, shorter product lifecycles, and a growing emphasis on mass customization. This forces companies to drastically reduce inventory, improve throughput, and still deliver products on time . As a result, companies are rethinking their collaboration strategies with upstream and downstream partners in their supply chains . [4] The focus has shifted from company-to-company competition to competition between entire supply chains . Companies now view themselves as members of a larger ecosystem rather than isolated entities.

Challenges with SCM Systems: While Supply Chain Management (SCM) has become a crucial management approach for fostering closer collaboration among enterprises, the authors highlight that many companies continue to invest heavily in developing information systems to achieve successful SCM, yet struggle to see the desired results. [4] Making error-free decisions about IT investments is essential for a firm to adapt to its ever-changing business environment. However, the authors point out that the complex nature and large scope of SCM IT projects often lead to unsuccessful implementations, particularly within the semiconductor industry .[4] They cite research by

Gunasekaran and Ngai indicating a lack of research focused on the success factors for SCM systems. Additionally, few studies address the differing KSFs (Key Success Factors) required for the implementation and operation phases of such systems Focus on KSFs for Different Phases Motivated by this gap in research, the authors aim to identify two distinct hierarchies of KSFs specifically for the implementation and operation phases of SCM systems in the semiconductor industry . Their approach involves a two-step process:

Literature Review: A comprehensive review of relevant research in SCM, operations management, and information systems and management to identify initial KS hierarchies. Focus Group Discussions: Utilizing focus groups with industry and academic participants to refine the proposed KS hierarchies by leveraging the expertise of those involved in successful SCM integration projects.

The proposed hierarchies are intended to serve as a valuable reference for future SCM project managers, ensuring they consider all critical factors for successful implementation and improved system performance.[4] By comparing the KSFs for each phase, the authors aim to provide project managers with insights into the differing management focuses required throughout the SCM system lifecycle . These hierarchies are expected to serve as a foundation for further academic research in related fields .

Successful Industry Example: TSMC and ASE .The authors discuss the ongoing trend of disintegration within the semiconductor value chain, highlighting the need for close collaboration between upstream and downstream partners. This collaboration is essential to meet the ever-increasing demands of end consumers who expect shorter time-to-market, lower costs, higher responsiveness, and better quality products .[4] They emphasize the critical role of streamlining business processes between partners, optimizing information sharing, and effectively "re-integrating" the value chain in a virtual manner.

As an example of a successful industry collaboration, the authors cite the e-Supply Chain Management (eSCM) project jointly completed by Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company (TSMC) and Advanced Semiconductor Engineering Inc. (ASE) from 1998 to 2004 .[4] This project successfully integrated 11 key business processes through the internet, enabling a seamless interface between the two companies and their customers .

This collaboration allowed them to obtain accurate and timely information on product status, facilitating better decision-making. Their pioneering experience has evolved into a potent force for the entire semiconductor industry, promoting process and data standardization.

2.5 Managing complexity in supply chains: A discussion of current approaches on the example of the semiconductor industry

This paper, authored by Judith Aelker et al.,[5] dives into the growing need for complexity management within supply chains. They focus on the semiconductor industry as a prime example due to its inherent complexities.

The authors begin by highlighting the consensus among scientists and business experts: supply chains have become increasingly complex in recent years (Aelker et al., 2013). This complexity stems from various trends, such as globalization, product diversification, and shorter product lifecycles (Aelker et al., 2013). This phenomenon is particularly relevant for organizations operating within global value networks, where competition transcends individual companies and extends to entire supply chains (Aelker et al., 2013). As complexity rises, so too does the challenge of managing it effectively.

The authors [5] point out that competitive advantage can be gained through superior complexity management capabilities. Studies have shown that product and process complexity can account for up to 25% of total expenditure in manufacturing companies (Aelker et al., 2013). Conversely, A.T. Kearney suggests that companies can achieve a 3-5% EBIT increase through active complexity management (Aelker et al., 2013). These findings underscore the importance of integrating complexity management into supply chain management (SCM).

Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 6, No.1, June : 2024
However, despite the potential benefits, the authors note that complexity management is not yet widely adopted within industry. It is often poorly integrated into existing SCM practices (Aelker et al., 2013). They reference former HP CEO Lew Platt, who, as early as 1993, acknowledged the challenge of managing supply chain complexity for large manufacturing companies (Aelker et al., 2013). Unfortunately, even today, many companies struggle with this issue (Aelker et al., 2013).
In response to this gap, [5] the authors propose a solution: measuring and managing supply chain complexity. They acknowledge that supply chain managers often rely on intuition due to the lack of available tools for quantifying complexity (Aelker et al., 2013).
The paper outlines the core objectives:
* Highlighting the need for complexity measurement and management in supply chains. The semiconductor supply chain serves as a specific example.
* Investigating the current state of complexity management in supply chains.
* Introducing complex adaptive system (CAS) modeling as a tool for understanding how complexity emerges within these systems.
* Leveraging insights from the semiconductor industry, a highly complex supply chain, to inform practical methods for managing complexity in other manufacturing industries.
The authors contribute to the ongoing effort to develop practical methods for complexity management in supply chains.
Defining Key Terms
The authors recognize the need for clear definitions before delving deeper. They provide working definitions for several key terms:
* Complexity: The definition of complexity itself is acknowledged as a complex task. The authors [5] differentiate complexity from mere complicatedness, which is often confused in everyday language (Aelker et al., 2013). A complex system involves many interwoven elements that create an intricate whole. Luhmann's definition suggests that complexity surpasses a threshold at which it becomes impossible for an observer to connect all elements and their relationships (Aelker et al., 2013).
* Supply Chain Complexity: Wilding's supply chain complexity triangle (Figure 1) is introduced to illustrate the three key factors contributing to the dynamic behavior of supply chains: demand amplification (bullwhip effect), parallel interactions occurring at the same tier, and deterministic chaos (Aelker et al., 2013). Deterministic chaos describes the situation where a system is theoretically predictable, but non-linear effects and initial conditions can lead to highly unpredictable outcomes.
* Complexity Management: The authors posit that complex cause-and-effect relationships necessitate some form of organization, or complexity management [5] (Aelker et al., 2013). Kirchhoff et al. outline the core tasks of complexity management as considering and solving problems arising from internal and external factors, observing how individuals deal with complexity subjectively, and integrating various individual approaches into a unified framework (Aelker et al., 2013).
* Supply Chain Management (SCM): According to the Supply Chain Council, SCM encompasses all efforts involved in producing and delivering a final product from raw materials to the end customer (Aelker et al., 2013). It integrates supply and demand management within and across companies. The Gartner Group offers a more practical definition suitable for the globally fragmented semiconductor supply chain, comparing it to managing resources to create and deliver a product or service (Aelker et al., 2013). From a complexity perspective, SCM involves coordinating numerous elements with various states and interconnected relationships. A supply chain can be viewed as a system that surpasses the threshold where an observer cannot relate all elements

2.6 Right product, right time, right location: Quantifying the semiconductor supply chain

The author[6] sheds light on the critical yet often neglected issue of on-time delivery (OTD) in the complex world of semiconductor supply chains. They highlight the challenges faced by leading companies in this industry, where delays can lead to blacklisting and significant revenue losses.

The Problem: Missed Deadlines and Lost Business

The author points out that a significant gap exists between planned and actual lead times in semiconductor manufacturing. This discrepancy stems from a lack of focus on OTD throughout the supply chain. Traditional methods often analyse isolated areas like scheduling or inventory management, failing to capture the holistic picture. Additionally, overly simplistic models struggle to account for the real-world complexities of these intricate networks.

The Solution: The RPRTRL Metric

The author[6] proposes a novel solution – the Right Product, Right Time, Right Location (RPRTRL) metric. This comprehensive metric aims to provide a detailed picture of end-to-end supply chain performance for each individual order. It focuses on three key aspects:

1. Right Product: This component assesses the accuracy of demand forecasts. Companies with low scores here need to re-evaluate their forecasting methodologies and potentially incorporate a wider range of data points beyond historical trends.
2. Right Time: This aspect evaluates execution efficiency within the supply chain. Delays in fabrication, sorting, assembly, or testing all contribute to a lower score. Companies scoring poorly here should scrutinize their production management processes and vendor partnerships.
3. Right Location: This component assesses inventory sufficiency at various points in the supply chain, including die banks and finished goods warehouses. Companies with inadequate inventory levels at crucial locations will struggle to meet on-time delivery targets.

Calculating and Utilizing the RPRTRL Score: [6] The RPRTRL score is calculated by multiplying the individual scores for each component (Right Product, Right Time, Right Location). The author recommends using data from the past 1-2 years for the initial calculation. Companies can then recalculate the score regularly (weekly or monthly) to track progress.

Benefits of the RPRTRL Approach

* Identifying Root Causes: By analysing the individual components of the RPRTRL score, companies can pinpoint the specific areas hindering their OTD performance. This allows them to focus improvement efforts on the most critical issues.
* Quantifying Progress: RPRTRL provides a quantifiable metric to measure the effectiveness of implemented solutions. Companies can track their progress over time and assess the impact of different strategies.
* Coordinated Response: The RPRTRL metric offers a common language for all stakeholders involved in the supply chain. This facilitates a coordinated response to identified problems, ensuring all teams work together to optimize OTD performance.

The Author's Call to Action:

The author emphasizes [6] the importance of OTD for customer retention in the semiconductor industry. They showcase research demonstrating a clear correlation between high OTD rates and increased customer satisfaction and purchase decisions. Companies that consistently deliver on time are seen as more reliable partners and enjoy greater customer loyalty.

Beyond the Data: Practical Recommendations :Building on the insights provided by the RPRTRL metric, the author offers additional recommendations for companies seeking to improve their OTD performance:

* Employee Engagement: Actively involving employees throughout the process is crucial. Empowering them to contribute and fostering a culture that prioritizes meeting delivery deadlines can significantly enhance OTD rates.

* Supplier Collaboration : Strong relationships with suppliers are essential. Implementing supplier rating systems based on factors like quality, delivery time, flexibility, and cost allows companies to identify reliable partners who contribute to a smoother supply chain and improved OTD.
* Continuous Improvement: Optimizing the supply chain is an ongoing process. Companies should continuously monitor and analyse the RPRTRL metric to identify new areas for improvement. This iterative approach ensures a constant drive towards achieving best-in-class OTD performance

2.7 Characterizing customer ordering behavior in semiconductor supply chain with convolutional neural networks

The research investigates the potential of convolutional neural networks (CNNs) to classify customer ordering behaviour patterns in the semiconductor industry. Convolutional neural networks are a type of artificial neural network particularly well-suited for analysing visual imagery. [7] In this study, the authors leverage CNNs to analyse heat maps, which represent customer forecasting behaviour over time. By establishing a set of predefined ordering patterns (Constant Planning, Overplanning, Under planning, Up-Down, Random), the study classifies customer behaviour based on how closely their forecasting patterns in the heat maps resemble these predefined categories.

The findings demonstrate the effectiveness of CNNs in identifying these patterns in heat maps generated from synthetic data. The CNN achieved an accuracy of over 98% in this controlled environment, suggesting a strong capability for learning and recognizing the distinguished features of each predefined pattern. However, when applied to real customer data, the accuracy remains promising but decreases slightly to around 86%.[7] This indicates that while CNNs are a viable approach for classification, there is room for improvement in generalizing the model's ability to recognize patterns specific to the complexities and nuances of real-world customer behaviour. This highlights the importance of using real-world data during the training process, as the model can learn the subtle variations and inconsistencies that may not be present in synthetic data. By incorporating real customer data, the CNN can become more robust and adaptable to the inherent messiness of real-world scenarios.

The authors propose several avenues for further exploration to enhance the model's capabilities. Retraining the CNN with real data is suggested as a way to improve its ability to recognize patterns specific to real-world customer behaviour. This is because real-world data contains a wider range of variations and complexities compared to synthetic data, which can be more limited in scope. [7] By exposing the CNN to the messiness and inconsistencies inherent in real customer ordering behaviour, the model can learn to adapt and identify these patterns more accurately. Additionally, employing unsupervised learning techniques could help discover new and unexpected patterns within the customer data that the predefined categories might not capture. Unsupervised learning allows the CNN to analyse the data without the constraints of predefined categories. This can lead to the identification of entirely new customer behaviour patterns that were not previously anticipated. These novel patterns could provide valuable insights into customer demand forecasting and inform more strategic business decisions.

Furthermore, the study proposes introducing context information, such as product lifecycle stage, into the analysis using a second CNN stream. This would allow for a more comprehensive understanding of customer behaviour by incorporating additional factors that might influence ordering patterns. [7] Finally, the authors recommend exploring the use of grayscale images alongside coloured images for training the CNN. This could be particularly beneficial when dealing with larger datasets that demand more computational resources, as grayscale images require less processing power.

Overall, the study highlights the potential of CNNs for analysing customer ordering behaviour patterns in the semiconductor industry. By incorporating the recommendations for further exploration, this approach can be refined to provide even more valuable insights into customer demand forecasting.

2.8 An on-time delivery improvement model for manufacturing organizations

The author mentions [8] that on-time delivery (OTD) is a critical aspect for manufacturers, especially in today's highly competitive market where technological innovation is constantly evolving. Traditional mass production has given way to batch production due to these changing customer requirements. This shift, along with the complexities of MTO manufacturing, necessitates a more comprehensive approach to OTD improvement.

The author highlights the limitations of conventional methods that focus on isolated areas like inventory management or scheduling. They argue that these methods fail to consider the entire manufacturing planning, control, and execution cycle.

To address this gap, the author proposes an improved OTD model that integrates two common processes:

1. Product Development Process (PDP): This process involves activities across marketing, design/research and development (R&D), and production. It encompasses tasks like market analysis, product design, component design, product testing, and production process design.
2. Customer Order Management Process (COMP): This process covers activities related to sales, logistics, and finance. It includes tasks like order processing, configuration and delivery planning, credit checking, billing, and collection.

The author emphasizes [8] that the proposed model strengthens the connection between these processes. It achieves this by incorporating interactions between functional areas like marketing, R&D, production, logistics, sales, and finance. This collaborative approach is crucial for enhancing OTD performance in MTO environments.

Here's a breakdown of the key features of the proposed OTD improvement model (OTDM):

1. Comprehensive Business Process Model: This model leverages Event-driven Process Chain (EPC) methodology to capture various process components. It includes elements like events, functions, process paths, and logical operators. This comprehensive model facilitates efficient planning, control, and execution across the entire manufacturing cycle.
2. Integrated Database with Applications: The OTDM incorporates an integrated database that stores both basic and transaction data. This data is accessible to various functional applications throughout the organization. This integration ensures real-time information flow, enabling informed decision-making and improved process visibility.

Key Principles of the OTDM:

The author outlines five key principles that underpin the OTDM:

1. Accurate Delivery Date Estimation: The model establishes a systematic procedure for setting realistic commitment dates. It integrates functionalities like Material Requirements Planning (MRP) and Capacity Requirements Planning (CRP) to account for material availability and resource constraints. This allows for finite capacity planning, leading to more accurate delivery time estimations.
2. Effective Communication: The model emphasizes open communication as a core principle. It suggests forming cross-functional teams (CFTs) with representatives from various departments like manufacturing, procurement, and sales. These teams facilitate collaboration and ensure all relevant aspects are considered throughout the process. Faster information flow and streamlined decision-making contribute to reduced lead times.
3. Process Focus over Functional Units: The OTDM moves away from the traditional approach where individual units focus solely on completing their tasks. It emphasizes a process-oriented mindset where the entire value chain, from order receipt to product delivery, is considered. This holistic view allows for proactive identification and mitigation of potential bottlenecks.
4. Supplier Collaboration: The author highlights [8] the importance of close relationships with suppliers. The model suggests establishing a supplier rating system based on factors like quality, delivery timeliness, product flexibility, and customer service. This system incentivizes suppliers to prioritize performance, ultimately contributing to improved OTD for the manufacturer.

5. Employee Involvement: The model recognizes employees as a valuable source of improvement ideas. It encourages employee participation in the process and empowers them to understand the significance of meeting delivery deadlines. This fosters a culture of ownership and accountability, leading to overall performance enhancement.

Case Study Implementation:

To validate the effectiveness of the OTDM, the author describes its implementation in a real-world scenario. PCB Australia Limited (PAL) was chosen as the case study organization. PAL had previously participated in a pilot study, and they expressed willingness to fully support the implementation process.

The following sections in the original paper would likely detail the specific implementation steps taken at PAL, the challenges encountered during the process, and the positive outcomes achieved through the implementation of the OTDM. This would provide valuable insights into the practical application of the model and its potential benefits for MTO manufacturers.

On-Time Delivery Improvement in Make-to-Order Manufacturing: Insights from the Author's Study

This document[8] summarizes the key findings presented by the author regarding on-time delivery (OTD) improvement in a make-to-order (MTO) manufacturing environment. The author proposes a novel model designed to address persistent discrepancies between planned and actual lead times, ultimately enhancing OTD performance.

Core Challenges in OTD:

The author highlights limitations associated with traditional OTD improvement methods. These methods often focus on isolated areas like scheduling or inventory management, neglecting the holistic product development process. Additionally, overly simplistic mathematical models struggle to capture the complexities of real-world supply chains.

The Proposed On-Time Delivery Improvement Model (OTDM):

The OTDM addresses these challenges by integrating business process improvements with data management. It comprises two primary components:

1. Comprehensive Business Process Model: This model, designed using Event-Driven Process Chain (EPC) methodology, integrates product development (PDP) and customer order management (COMP) processes. Key features include:

o Focus on Order Commitment Date: Establishing an accurate delivery date based on finite capacity and material plans is emphasized. This is achieved through simultaneous planning of materials and capacities using Material Requirements Planning (MRP) and Capacity Requirements Planning (CRP).

o Improved Communication: Formation of a cross-functional team (CFT) with representatives from various departments facilitates smooth information flow and coordinated decision-making.

o Process-Oriented Approach: The model shifts focus from individual functional units to the entire process flow, ensuring all constraints are considered upfront to minimize delays and rework.

2. Integrated Database with Applications: This component provides real-time data to the CFT, including:

o Basic and Transaction Data: Essential information like product specifications, customer details, and historical data are stored. Transaction data reflects ongoing activities within the processes.

o Functional Applications: Applications like MRP, production control, purchasing, and distribution planning systems integrate with the database, enabling the CFT to access relevant data for informed decisions.

Implementation and Outcomes in a Case Study:

The author implemented the OTDM in a real-world setting at PCB Australia Limited (PAL), an MTO manufacturer of electronic products. Here's a summary of the implementation process and results:

Industrial Engineering Journal
ISSN: 0970-2555
Volume : 53, Issue 6, No.1, June : 2024
* Understanding Existing Practices: A thorough analysis of PAL's existing MPC system identified weaknesses and potential areas for improvement. This analysis informed the development of the OTDM.
* Implementation and Challenges: Implementing the OTDM involved overcoming employee resistance to change and ensuring proper training on the new processes and data management systems.
* Benefits Achieved: Despite the challenges, OTD performance increased significantly. The average OTD performance jumped from 10% to 65% within a year of operation, demonstrating the model's effectiveness in enhancing on-time delivery rates in MTO environments.
The author offers valuable recommendations for organizations considering implementing the OTDM:
* Employee Involvement: Active employee engagement is crucial. Employees should be involved in the process, empowered to contribute, and made aware of the importance of meeting delivery deadlines.
* Supplier Collaboration: Building strong relationships with suppliers is essential. The author recommends establishing a supplier rating system to assess their performance on factors like quality, delivery time, flexibility, and cost. This ensures a reliable supply chain that contributes to improved OTD.
* Continuous Improvement: The OTDM [8] is a framework for ongoing improvement. Organizations should continuously monitor and review performance metrics to identify further areas for optimization.
In essence, the author proposes a novel OTD improvement model that integrates product development and customer order management processes. This model, supported by an integrated database and applications, facilitates accurate delivery date estimations, effective communication, process-oriented planning, and supplier collaboration. The case study implementation provides a practical example of how the OTDM can be applied in a real-world MTO manufacturing setting.

2.9 Maximizing delivery performance in semiconductor wafer fabrication facilities

This paper investigates [9] methods for improving on-time delivery performance in semiconductor wafer fabrication facilities (wafer fabs). due to the high demand for integrated circuits (ics), these facilities face pressure to deliver high-quality products to customers while adhering to tight deadlines.
The paper highlights the complexity of wafer fabs, characterized by:
Multiple identical machines: this allows for parallel processing but requires sophisticated scheduling algorithms. Individual lot release times and due dates: each customer order (lot) may have unique requirements regarding processing times and delivery deadlines. Tardiness prioritization: not all orders hold the same importance. tardiness penalties can be scaled based on customer priority. Mason (2000) emphasizes the challenges of scheduling in wafer fabs due to these complexities. the author compares wafer fabs to complex job shops with reentrant flow, necessitated by the high cost of equipment.
Existing research and limitations:
Previous research has [9] explored various scheduling approaches to minimize total weighted tardiness (twt) in wafer fabs. mason, carlyle, and fowler (2000) developed a mixed-integer program (mip) heuristic for this purpose. however, their approach suffered from performance degradation with increasing problem size.
Proposed heuristic and evaluation:
This paper introduces a new heuristic specifically designed to minimize twt in wafer fabs. the authors compare the performance of their heuristic against several established dispatching rules commonly used in job shop scheduling.
Key findings:

The study demonstrates that the proposed heuristic consistently outperforms existing dispatching rules in terms of minimizing twt. however, a trade-off exists between solution quality and computational speed. while the heuristic produces superior schedules, it requires significantly more processing time compared to simpler dispatching rules.

Potential applications and future research:

The paper suggests integrating the heuristic into a wafer fab's manufacturing execution system (mes) for daily or shift-based scheduling. this approach could improve on-time delivery performance without significantly impacting production flow. the authors acknowledge [9] the need for further research to optimize the heuristic's execution speed while maintaining its effectiveness in minimizing twt.

Limitations of the reviewed study:

The reviewed paper focuses solely on a single heuristic and its comparison with existing dispatching rules. it would be beneficial to explore a wider range of scheduling algorithms, including more recent advancements in the field. additionally, the research is limited to a simulated environment using a modified dataset. real-world implementation and validation in an actual wafer fab setting would strengthen the findings.

Future research efforts could explore:

Comparative analysis [9] of a broader range of scheduling algorithms to identify the most effective approaches for different wafer fab scenarios. Integration with real-time data to account for dynamic changes in production conditions and customer demands. Machine learning techniques to develop adaptive scheduling algorithms that learn and improve over time. Hybrid approaches that combine the strengths of different scheduling methods to optimize performance. By addressing these areas, researchers can contribute to significant advancements in on-time delivery performance within the complex and ever-evolving environment of semiconductor wafer fabrication.

III. Conclusion

Achieving on-time delivery in the complex world of semiconductor supply chains requires a multi-faceted approach. Several key themes emerge from the research literature:

Understanding customer needs: Accurate demand forecasting (Right Product) is crucial to avoid overproduction or stockouts (Right Time, Right Location). Streamlining processes: Implementing automation (e.g., Equipment Interface) and real-time dispatching can significantly reduce cycle times. Collaboration throughout the supply chain: Successful integration between design houses, fabs, assembly/testing facilities, and distributors ensures seamless information flow and efficient order management. Performance measurement: Metrics like Right Product, Right Time, Right Location (RPRTRL) provide valuable insights into areas for improvement. Continuous improvement: By analyzing root causes of delays and inefficiencies, companies can develop data-driven strategies for optimizing their supply chains. Effective on-time delivery hinges on a comprehensive understanding of customer needs, efficient internal processes, strong supplier relationships, and a culture of continuous improvement.

References

[1] Queenie Chua Nam Sie, "Order Management of Supply Chain", 2011 International Conference on Information Management, Innovation Management and Industrial Engineering

[2] Amit Sonar, Satyajit Shinde, Susanto Teh," Automation: Key to Cycle Time Improvement in Semiconductor Manufacturing"

[3] Hans Ehm and Thomas Ponsignon," Future Research Directions for Mastering End-to-End Semiconductor", 8th IEEE International Conference on Automation Science and Engineering August 20-24, 2012, Seoul, Korea

[4] Ta-Ping Lu, Bang-Ning Hwang, Yu-Da Chang, “A Study of Key Success Factors for Supply Chain Management System” 2011 12th ACIS International Conference on Software Engineering, Artificial Intelligence, Networking and Parallel/Distributed
[5] Judith Aelkera, Thomas Bauernhanslb, Hans Ehmc,” Managing complexity in supply chains: A discussion of current approaches on the example of the semiconductor industry”, Forty Sixth CIRP Conference on Manufacturing Systems 2013
[6] Gaurav Batra, Kristian Nolde, Nick Santhanam, and Rutger Vrijen,” Right product, right time, right location: Quantifying the semiconductor supply chain”, McKinsey & Company
[7] Marco Ratusny, Alican Ay, Thomas Ponsignon, Infineon Technologies AG,Am Campeon 1 – 15,Neubiberg, 85579, Germany,” “Characterizing customer order behaviors in semiconductor supply chains with convolutional nueral networks”, Proceedings of the 2020 Winter Simulation Conference
[8] M. A. Karim a, P. Samaranayake b,A. J. R. Smith c,S. K. Halgamuge,” An on-time delivery improvement model for manufacturing organizations”, First published on: 17 April 2009
[9] Scott J. Mason, John W. Fowler,” Maximizing Delivery performance in semiconductor wafer fabrication facilities”, Proceedings of the 2000 Winter Simulation Conference