Development of a Collaboration Mechanism for a Manufacturing System in a Semiconductor Industry Supply Chain

Piyush Singhal[a] and Rajkumar Sharma[b]

[a] Department of Mechanical Engineering, GLA University, Mathura 281406, India.
[b]Department of Mechanical Engineering, GLA University, Mathura 281406, India.

Article History: Received: 10 January 2021; Revised: 12 February 2021; Accepted: 27 March 2021; Published online: 20 April 2021

Abstract: The paper sets a methodology for motivating multinational organizations to work together in an atmosphere of international collaboration. We propose that there is an effort for e-intermediary between buyers and suppliers to work together so that the buyers and suppliers can work together. We expect this method, through a selection of order quantities and price penalties by market intermediaries, to enable the optimal choice of supply capability by market intermediaries.

Keywords: Resources in semiconductor industry, order quantities, supplier management scheme (SMS).

1. Introduction

Due to the fast changing technologies of semiconductor industry, the market for semiconductors is rising rapidly. In order to stay efficient they must handle products in varying shapes and quantities [1,2]. Due to high capital and product cost, it is necessary for semiconductor manufacturers to make high use of equipment with a small inventory [Morrice and Valdez (2005)] [3]. The company partners deal with risks that arise from lower level shifts in the supply chain by establishing mutual obligations (Grover and Saeed 2007). This relationship is made up of business associates. Joint initiative [4] is used to achieve this. Our dependence on capital is an understandable solution to uncertainty in a dynamic environment. It is really important to begin to expand as rapidly as possible when modeling the dynamic process of global supply chain. The goal was to create a model as exact and simple as possible, making the system easier and more flexible. This application uses the standard for aggregate inventory forecasting in the supply chain [5, 6]. There can be a better way to deal with the modeling problem when one can consider amount of single SKUs rather than modeling all SKUs.

There is lack of adequate analytical literature to assist organizations in making arrangements for resource distribution and sharing [7]. We look at the impact of corporate work on personal choices and financial compensation. Collaboration may be by firms seeking to maximize their anticipated profits to above all expected net benefits [8]. In marketing, cooperation is better interpreted as a mixture of two parties (Samadar and Kadiya (2006)). Braun et al. (2015) Vargas-Villamil et al (2003) Sampat& Kumar (2003) and Kempf (2004) also analyze the production and inventory management techniques of the semiconductor supply chain that involve detailed, dynamic, and sophisticated models [9].

The main research questions of this paper are the circumstances under which businesses are ready to cooperate in sharing capital and the conditions under which such cooperation is successful [10]. Collaboration in the manufacture of electronics and semiconductor was beneficial because it can be accomplished economies of scale and distance. Therefore, the parties should create a detailed strategy on distribution of resources to ensure the feasibility of co-operation.

2. Principle of Collaboration

A standard paradigm for semiconductor supply chain entails contracting the manufacture of devices to a small number of top-quality suppliers. The components are assembled and delivered sequentially in this manner. These data centers are primarily situated in geographically distributed areas. This can be improved by tapping larger supply chains in partnership with microprocessor company to produce synchronization of supply. Ozlem (2004, pp. 299) Manufacturing should be done in the organized supply chain, so it would benefit for both for the suppliers and consumers. Synchronization enables total productivity of market and efficiency of output will be realized as the phases of production are properly scheduled. Chopra and Meindl (2003) addressed the preparation dilemma in a sequence of supplies. Lower costing of AS creates lower lead time, geographical gap and supply volatility. Yet upstream decision-making and activity in other industries can be organized by demand for consumer electronics goods or construction plans [11, 12].

A close thorough analysis of SC activities would explain the composite technique of sequential and combined operations known as hybrid semiconductor supply chain (HSSC). This is the HSSC concept is that the 'decoupling point' must be pushed as low as possible and as much as possible. This is the interface of the order-driven hierarchical operations in the semiconductor SC. Decoupling point's upstream and downstream activities are forecasted and streamlined. Therefore, the order should be initiated from the client-company connection. Customers are voluntarily increasing customization to lower the cost of supply chain components [13].

This study claimed that teamwork leads to supply chain collaboration. The functions of these members need to be organized in order to create relation between the members. The HSSC increases the productivity of the supply chain and ensures real-time sharing of information [14].

3. Exchanging Capital Among The Production Process In Co-Developed Semiconductor Devices.

This is the end of the semiconductor supply chain, where the teardown point is located. In order to achieve maximum competitive efficiency, optimal products and optimum partners, the customer needs to provide an efficient supplier management scheme (SMS). Buyers and vendors must coordinate to justify their network SMS transmissions. Manufacturers normally collaborate with sourcing agencies, and has a relationship with retailers. Inside the supply chain, the device manufacturer is the input and the semiconductor sector is the output. The seller of this product has a diverse pool of buyers. To satisfy the demand of the customer, the supplier shares the services of other providers (employees) in order to maximize the additional requirements of capacity [15].

Notations

D = Product request from the consumer (foreseen)
= Buyer's complete request
Q = Purchaser order number
C = Supplier's capability
u = Random variable depending on the supplier's ability to reach theRequest for purchasers;
u1, u2 = random number set u. u.
uC = Supplier 's capacity to supply the buyer
f(u) = Therandom variable u probability density function
f(u) = Random-variable u distribution function
G = additional capacity to meet the customer request from another supplier
S = Manufacturer supply quantity
Gc = The integrated device provider's optimized shared power.
Gz = Maximum supplier shared capacity in the scheme, with a supplier cost.
hs = Part keeping cost per supplier unit
p = Cost of production of the manufacturer per unit
s = Unit shortage of the good completed for the purchaser
= The amount of penalty per unit for a goodwill purchaser's loss of sale
W = Extra capacity share costs per unit supplied by another supplier
Z = the supplier's penalty cost, i.e. for each unit ordered but not supplied by the manufacturer, the sum to be paid for.
E(Pb) = Complete buyer's estimated cost
E (Ps) = Total supplier's planned cost
E (Pc) = Total cost required of the supply chain collaborated

3.1 Assumptions

When consumer wants component or product that he desires, the producer raises production so the customer's demands are fulfilled [16]. The manufacturer shall have one unit of the finished product.The ability of vendors to supply the customer is uC as a portion of their total productivity. The producer has no sure information about the worth of u until the consumer has put the order. When the retailer orders, the probability density function f is known (u). This might lead to uncertainty in the Supreme Court (SC).

If the quantity has been determined, the procedure reaches the next step, which is that the delivery notice must be issued to the recipient.

. The producer must pursue additional capital. The amount of extra power depends on the cost to divide capital and the cost to pay wages. This notion further broadens the sharing capacity of LUCC. The net benefit of a single commodity surpasses the costs of manufacturing, i.e. p > w.

The supplier would take pooled capacity and this is the safest outcome for the supplier.

In any case, the weaker source of materials would charge the keeping expense for unsold parts.

E-market will help ensure that the customer understands the need. That is why the amount will not be needed. The only parameter is that the power of G is shared with another provider at the lowest expected cost of the unit.

Generally this supplier is spread evenly over the whole spectrum [a, b].

$$\text{So, } f(u)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{b-a}\ ; if\ a\ \leq u \geq b\\ 0\ ; otherwise\end{cases}$$

3.2 Collaboration Scenario Analysis

Because the consumer is presented with the problem of estimating the ideal purchasing volume (Q) it is worth assessing the buyer's approximate total cost according to the rend of the manufacturer's variable u [17]. The availability of (S) depends on the sum requested, voltage, and gauge (Q). Complete capacity prices. When used correctly, newsboy query will solve this dilemma (6). The optimum shared potential of Gz can be calculated by solving the phrase with regard to penalty costs:

$$\text{Pr. } [uC + G_z \geq Q]=\frac{p+Z-W}{p+Z-h_s} \qquad (7)$$

As the random variable u follows an uniform distribution in the specified range [a, b], the Expression (8) can be represented by

$$\text{Pr. [uC} + G_z \geq \text{Q]} = \int_{(u_1)_z}^{b} \frac{1}{b-a} \text{du} \tag{8}$$

$$= \frac{\text{bC} - \text{Q} + \text{G}_\text{z}}{\text{C(b} - \text{a)}}$$

Hence, we have

$$\frac{bC-Q+G_Z}{C(b-a)} = \frac{p+Z-W}{p+Z+h_S}$$

$$\Rightarrow G_z = Q - C\left[\frac{b(h_S+W)+(p+Z-W)}{p+Z+h_S}\right] \tag{9}$$

In other terms, the market trader will first calculate the optimum share, and use the details on the seller and the customer to determine the respective penalty. The mutual potential lies in the line of the buyer 's buying amount [18].

The e-market relies on buyer's order level and investor's buying amounts to solve the industry supply expense. The industry broker recommends the producer which will ensure optimum response (Gc).Therefore, it is important for the supplier to choose the joint capacity decision in a way which minimizes the total cost required of the SC. So, Gc = Gz, that means,

$$\text{D-C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w\ )+a(s-W}{S+h_S}\right] = \text{Qz-C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w)+a\ (p+Z-W}{s+z+h_S}\right]$$

So, Qz

$$= \text{D-C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w\ )+a(p+Z-W}{S+h_S}\right] \tag{10}$$

$$-\text{C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w)+a\ (s-W}{s+h_S}\right].$$

3.3 Managerial Implications

Collaboration scheme (Expression 5). This agency is created if e-market is aware of the partnership between the customer and the seller. (3) notes that the probability of a commodity to meet market demands decreases as the unit cost per unit of the finished product is increased.

In the case of an E-market penalty fee on the supplier, the 2nd type of partnering (Expression 9) will generate the sum of usable share (Gz) if appropriate knowledge is identified to the supplier. Expression (7) reveals the chance that the retailer will be able to meet consumer demand increases as the price rise and cost per unit increased. It will come at the expense of exchanging the other vendors' resources. This guarantees maximum use of the resources of the collaborating supply network. This is a promising step for the global chip processing industry (as the expense of the goodwill is minimized).

By combing the various variations of amounts and costs, the two will agree to a relationship for the long run. Furthermore, Q is constant and the net cost is minimized [19].

Ex. 10 indicates the order increases as the price penalty costs are eliminated. The capability determination relies on the collection and penalty system for the lowest expected overall cost of the Co-operative SC.

Company's net cost. When used correctly, newsboy query will solve this dilemma (6).The optimum shared potential of Gz can be calculated by solving the phrase with regard to penalty costs:

$$\text{Pr .}[uC + G_z \geq Q] = \frac{p+Z-W}{p+Zh_S} \tag{7}$$

As the random variable u follows an uniform distribution in the specified range [a, b], the Expression (8) can be represented by

$$\text{Pr.[uC+}G_{z}\_ \geq \text{Q]} = \int_{(u_1)_z}^{b} \frac{1}{b-a}\ du = \frac{bC-Q+\ G_Z}{C(\ b-a)} \tag{8}$$

Hence, we have

$$\frac{bC-Q=G_Z}{C(b-a)} = \frac{p+\ Z-\ W}{p+Z+\ h_S}$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{Gz} = \text{Q} - \text{C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+W)+a\ (\ p+Z-W}{p+Z+\ h_S}\right] \tag{9}$$

In other terms, the market trader will first calculate the optimum share, and use the details on the seller and the customer to determine the respective penalty. The mutual potential lies in the line of the buyer 's buying amount.

The e-market relies on buyer's order level and investor's buying amounts to solve the industry supply expense. The industry broker recommends the producer which will ensure optimum response (Gc). For supplying suppliers to select the joint capacity that can reduce overall cost. Therefore, GC = GZ. What this means is.

$$= \text{D-C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w\ )+a(p+Z-W}{S+h_S}\right]$$

$$= \text{Qz-C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w)+a\ (p+Z-W}{s+z+h_S}\right]$$

So,Qz

$$= \text{D-C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w\ )+a(p+Z-W}{S+h_S}\right] \tag{10}$$

$$\text{C}\left[\frac{b(h_S+w)+a\ (s-W}{s+h_S}\right]$$

4. Managerial Implications

If the E-Market is aware of all known detail from the customer and seller, the reciprocal scheme (Expression 5) generates the mutual potential (gc). (3) notes that the probability of a commodity to meet market demands decreases as the unit cost per unit of the finished product is increased.

When penalty costs and scale of the seller are known, the joint scheme (Expression 9) is used to sum up shared capability (Gz) information for the seller. Expression (7) reveals the chance that the retailer will be able to meet consumer demand increases as the price rise and cost per unit increased. It will come at the expense of exchanging the other vendors' resources. This guarantees maximum use of the resources of the collaborating supply network. This is a promising step for the global chip processing industry (as the expense of the goodwill is minimized).

By ordering the required quantity and form of goods, a customer can ensure a long-term relationship. In addition, if Q is of D, then, the total cost of the SC is minimum plus Z, which is equal to S plus Z, the coefficient p is needed.

The value of the warrant will increase as penalty expenses are decreased. The capability determination relies on the collection and penalty system for the lowest expected overall cost of the Co-operative SC [20].

5. Conclusion

This study aims to better understand material, internal delivery and consumer distribution within the university throughout the semester. These companies may be able to model the organizational decisions taken and proactively simulate the impacts before final decision is made. This is critical for long supply chains such as semiconductor manufacturing. The outcome of the simulation in the previous paper was not shown, because of space constraints. The future seems to lie in studying circumstances such as no exchange of knowledge, no sharing of data or resources but sharing of information and power.

References

1. Braun, M. W., Rivera, D.E., Carlyle, W.M, and Kempf, K.G., Application of model predictive control to robust management of multi-echelon demand networks in semiconductor manufacturing, Simulation: Transactions of the Society for Modeling and Simulation International, Vol. 79, No. 3, 2003, pp. 139-156
2. Braun, M. W., Rivera, D.E., Carlyle, W.M, and Kempf, K.G., Application of model predictive control to
3. robust management of multi-echelon demand networks in semiconductor manufacturing, Simulation: Transactions
4. of the Society for Modeling and Simulation International, Vol. 79, No. 3, 2003, pp. 139-156
5. Goyal, M., Shape, size and phonon scattering effect on the thermal conductivity of nanostructures. Pramana,
6. 2018. 91(6): p. 87.
7. Goyal, M. and B. Gupta, Study of shape, size and temperature-dependent elastic properties of
8. nanomaterials. Modern Physics Letters B, 2019. 33(26): p. 1950310.
9. Chopra, S., and Meindl, P., Supply Chain Management: Strategy, Planning and Operation, Prentice Hall,
10. New Delhi, 2003.
11. Coleman, J., Lyons, A., and Kehoe, D., The glass pipeline: increasing supply chain synchronisation through
12. information transparency International Journal of Technology Management, Vol. 28, No2, 2004, pp. 172-190.
13. Grover, V., and Saeed, K. A., Impact of product, market, and relation characteristics on interorganizational
14. system integration in manufacturer-supplier dyads, Journal of Management Information System, Vol. 23, No. 4,2007, pp. 185-216.
15. Goyal, M. and B. Gupta, Analysis of shape, size and structure dependent thermodynamic properties of
16. nanowires. High Temperatures--High Pressures, 2019. 48.
17. Goyal, M. and M. Singh, Size and shape dependence of optical properties of nanostructures. Applied
18. Physics A, 2020. 126(3): p. 1-8.
19. Kempf, K. G., Control-oriented approaches to supplychain management in semiconductor manufacturing,
20. Proceedings of the 2004 American Control Conference, Boston, 2004, pp. 4563-4576.
21. Morrice, D.J., and Valdez, R.A., Discrete event simulation in supply chain planning and inventory control
22. at Freescale Semiconductor Inc., Proceedings of the 2005 Winter Simulation Conference, (Eds), Kuhl, M.E.,
23. Steiger, N.M., Armstrong, FB., andJoines, J.A., 2005, pp. 1718-1724.
24. K Sharma, KS Kaushalyayan, M Shukla, Pull-out simulations of interfacial properties of amine functionalized multi-walled carbon nanotube epoxy composites, Computational Materials Science 99, 232-241
25. A Yadav, A Kumar, PK Singh, K Sharma, Glass transition temperature of functionalized graphene epoxy composites using molecular dynamics simulation, Integrated Ferroelectrics 186 (1), 106-114
26. PK Singh, K Sharma, A Kumar, M Shukla, Effects of functionalization on the mechanical properties of multiwalled carbon nanotubes: A molecular dynamics approach, Journal of Composite Materials 51 (5), 671-680

27. PK Singh, K Sharma, Mechanical and Viscoelastic Properties of In-situ Amine Functionalized Multiple Layer Grpahene/epoxy Nanocomposites, Current Nanoscience 14 (3), 252-262
28. Samaddar, S., And Kadilaya, S.S., An analysis ofinterorganizational resource sharing decisions in
29. collaborative knowledge creation, European Journal of Operational Research, Vol. 170, 2006, pp. 192-210.
30. A Kumar, K Sharma, AR Dixit, Carbon nanotube-and graphene-reinforced multiphase polymeric composites: review on their properties and applications, Journal of Materials Science, 1-43
31. MK Shukla, K Sharma, Effect of carbon nanofillers on the mechanical and interfacial properties of epoxy based nanocomposites: A review, Polymer Science, Series A 61 (4), 439-460
32. A Kumar, K Sharma, AR Dixit, A review on the mechanical and thermal properties of graphene and graphene-based polymer nanocomposites: understanding of modelling and MD simulation, Molecular Simulation 46 (2), 136-154
33. Silver, E.A., Pyke, D.F., and Peterson, R., InventoryManagement and Production Planning and Scheduling,
34. Third edition, John Wiley and Sons,New York, 1998.
35. Vargas-Villamil, F. D., Rivera, D.E, and Kempf,K.G., A hierarchical approach to production control of
36. reentrant semiconductor manufacturing lines, IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology, Vol. 11, No. 4,
37. 2003, pp. 578-587.