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#### Abstract

Ross products which belongs to a division of Abbott, is one of the leaders in the U.S market in the field of pediatric nutritionals and is considered to be one of the world's leading developers in adult nutritionals. The vision of Ross products is to be the worldwide leader in providing excellent services to their customers. This firm mainly focuses on four products. The firms collapse was due to the poor forecasting models used and also due to the fact that they were not able to meet their demand at the specified time. Other main factor for their drawback is due to the high work in progress (WIP), long cycle times and poor machine utilization times resulting in high cost. The firm was not able to uphold the number of customers they had due to the increase in cost and gradually over the years the firm kept losing its customers. In order to increase their demands the firm decided to concentrate on important criteria's like reducing the cost of their products, bringing down the number of cycle times and moreover reducing the high (WIP). Moreover, the firm has to focus more on forecasting. A proper forecasting model needs to be implemented to their four major products which will lead to burgeoning of their demands in the future. Simulation test by Arena software was carried out by introducing a model which is used to analyze a plant processing for four sub-products. For routing purposes there are four stations used namely Workstations one to four. The objective of this project is to reduce the overall cost which would be spent on buying new machines and bringing down the under time cost. Furthermore, the most important factor is to complete the job within the stipulated time period and minimize the number of machines used. Process Analyzer was used to obtain the optimum solution.


Index Terms - Cycle Times, Forecasting, Nutritionals, Process Analyzer, Scheduling, Simulation, Work In Progress.

## 1 Introduction

Our main objective is to perform a detail study on the Ross products with regards to its manufacturing process in various areas such as:
Forecasting - Due to current stock level of the company's products which were insufficient to meet the upcoming demands of the customers, ultimately, resulted in drastic decrease of the profits. This in turn led to customer dissatisfaction and decline of profits.
Production \& Utilization - The inefficiency of the firm in predicting the accurate forecasting models and the ignorance of forecasting the demand at the right time lead to their downfall. The utilization of production machines was indeed inadequate.
Inventory -Higher work in progress leads to higher inventory and higher cycle-time. By determining the root cause of the increase in (WIP) we would gradually decrease the average cycle-time and inventory cost.
Scheduling - Scheduling is considered to be a significant factor in assigning jobs and recourses to various employees and placing them in proper shifts. It was due to the improper scheduling of the firm in the areas like not placing the employees at the correct slots and inefficient methodology used for scheduling products resulted in off-putting effect on their overall performance.

## 2 Ross New STRATEGY

Ross is planning to revise their production and planning strategy by hiring part time engineers to collect, analyze data and identify the best method for forecasting the demand, planning the production based on Bill of Materials (BOM).

### 2.1 Step One (Data Collection)

The cost information of products and sub-products are collected as shown below on table 1:

Table 1: Cost Information of Products

|  | Product 1 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Product } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Product } \\ 3 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Product } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regular cost (\$/unit) | 87 | 45 | 35 | 76 |
| Holding (\$/unit/week) | 14 | 10 | 9 | 13 |
| Backorder (\$/unit/week) | 43 | 28 | 20 | 18 |
| Regular Workforce | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Regular production/worker | 20 | 20 | 20 | 30 |
| Under-time Cost | \$20/unit |  |  |  |
| Hiring Cost | \$2,000/worker |  |  |  |
| Firing Cost | \$1,000/worker |  |  |  |
| Constrains | No overtime or subcontracting, holding cost based on ending inventory and beginning inventory is zero |  |  |  |

Table 2: Cost Information of Sub-Products

|  | Sub- <br> Product <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | Sub- <br> Product <br> $\mathbf{2}$ | Sub- <br> Product <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | Sub- <br> Product <br> $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regular <br> Cost(\$/unit) | 23 | 22 | 12 | 9 |
| Under-time <br> cost | $\$ 2 / \mathrm{min}$ |  |  |  |
| Buy M/c <br> Cost | $\$ 2,500 /$ machine |  |  |  |
| Resale M/c <br> Cost | $\$ 1,250 /$ machine |  |  |  |
| Constrains | No overtime or subcontracting allowed, Hold- <br> ing cost based on ending inventory |  |  |  |

### 2.2 Step Two

### 2.2.1 Forecasting

Forecasting is the method of predicting the company's future sales demand. There are various approaches used in determining the demand forecast namely,

- Qualitative approach
- Quantitative approach

If the company has a better understanding of the demand, it can prove to be more significant and competitive in the worldwide market. The supplier needs to have the right amount of stock and this can be done only when there is enough knowledge of fluctuation of demand in the future. There is also a possibility of decrease in sales, when there insufficient supply of goods due to the underestimation of demand in the future. On the other hand when the demand is overestimated, this can lead to excess storage of stock resulting in financial drain. The method that we used to build the forecasting models is as follows:

Table 3: Forecasting Methods for each Product

| Product | Method |
| :---: | :---: |
| Product 1 | Moving Average |
| Product 2 | Seasonal Model With Trend |
| Product 3 | Adjustment |
| Product 4 | Linear Regression |

### 2.2.2 Production Planning

The major concerns of production planning are to reduce the work in progress, determine the forecasting methods which are optimal and efficient, and finding the bottlenecks. When a firm is able to use their resources in an efficient way it means, that, they are performing well in their production planning department. A company plans its production either in long term, medium term or short term. Production planning in long term mainly focuses on increasing the capacity after various decisions taken by the firm. In case of medium term the company mainly focuses on hiring or firing employees and making adjustments in increasing inventory.

The evaluation of products is carried out using two different
production plans to minimize cost and time:

- Level Policy - Constant production rate throughout the year
- Chase Policy - Producing exactly what is required

In our project we have made use of Material Requirements Planning (MRP) for all the products and sub-products based on the BOM (Bill OF Materials) to produce the forecasted demands.

### 2.2.3 Capacity Planning

Capacity planning is defined as process in which a company is able to withstand the required demand by having the necessary stock or inventory in hand at the right time. The main goal of capacity planning is to maximize the capacity of the company in terms of increase in efficiency and profitability and minimize the discrepancy such as factor affecting the capacity planning namely ability of the workers, number of workers, production and suppliers. Aggregate planning is one of the popular methods of capacity planning it's responsible for matching the demand with the supply of goods thereby maintaining a tremendous production rates without backlogs.

### 2.2.4 Scheduling

Scheduling is crucial to the production planning process because by performing scheduling properly a company can improve its efficiency and reduce its cost while maximizing its productivity.

## 3 Data Analysis \& Results

Table 4: Demand Data

| History <br> Horizon | Product <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | Product <br> $\mathbf{2}$ | Product <br> $\mathbf{3}$ | Product <br> $\mathbf{4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 53 | 232 | 28 | 120 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 53 | 52 | 45 | 140 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 48 | 162 | 83 | 146 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 44 | 62 | 63 | 144 |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 42 | 266 | 71 | 140 |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 50 | 56 | 72 | 156 |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 48 | 186 | 68 | 155 |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 43 | 66 | 85 | 160 |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 46 | 310 | 116 | 165 |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 52 | 64 | 122 | 150 |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | 50 | 200 | 126 | 156 |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 47 | 84 | 128 | 165 |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 44 | 325 | 138 | 160 |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 46 | 77 | 152 | 165 |
| $\mathbf{1 5}$ | 48 | 235 | 162 | 170 |
| $\mathbf{1 6}$ | 50 | 88 | 166 | 176 |
| $\mathbf{1 7}$ | 48 | 365 | 178 | 180 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 44 | 82 | 180 | 186 |
| $\mathbf{1 9}$ | 46 | 265 | 198 | 191 |
| $\mathbf{2 0}$ | 45 | 99 | 208 | 197 |


| 21 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 22 |  |
| 23 | Forecasting Periods |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |



Figure 1: Historical Data for All Products

### 3.1 Forecasting

The first 10 weeks were used to forecast, and the recent 10 weeks were used to validate the forecast for the next 5 weeks.

Table 5: Forecast Summary

| Period | Product 1 | Product 2 | Product 3 | Product 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{2 1}$ | 46.8 | 387.20 | 203.90 | 202.25 |
| $\mathbf{2 2}$ | 46.8 | 85.08 | 212.20 | 207.62 |
| $\mathbf{2 3}$ | 46.8 | 274.25 | 220.50 | 212.99 |
| $\mathbf{2 4}$ | 46.8 | 103.13 | 228.79 | 218.36 |
| $\mathbf{2 5}$ | 46.8 | 411.83 | 237.09 | 223.73 |



Figure 2: Forecast Summary

### 3.2 Production Planning

Level Policy and Chase Policy were used for our calculations:
Table 6: Production Plan for each Product

|  | Product <br> $\mathbf{1}$ | Product 2 | Product 3 | Product 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level <br> Plan Cost | $\$ 23,745$ | $\$ 79,415$ | $\$ 55,331$ | $\$ 96,342$ |
| Chase <br> Plan Cost | $\$ 23,745$ | $\$ 159,025$ | $\$ 53,775$ | $\$ 96,040$ |
| Best Plan | Level or <br> Chase | Level | Chase | Chase |

Table 7: Production for the next 5 weeks

|  | Plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |  |
| Product 1 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | Level Plan |
| Product 2 | 253 | 253 | 253 | 253 | 253 | Level Plan |
| Product 3 | 204 | 213 | 221 | 229 | 238 | Chase Plan |
| Product 4 | 202 | 208 | 213 | 218 | 224 |  |

### 3.3 Capacity Planning

After calculating the MPS for each sub-product we started calculating the Capacity:

Table 8: Time Available in every Station

|  | Time Available (In Next 5 Weeks) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 2194 | 2194 | 2194 | 2194 | 2194 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 2215 | 2215 | 2215 | 2215 | 2215 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 2194 | 2194 | 2194 | 2194 | 2194 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 2215 | 2215 | 2215 | 2215 | 2215 |

Table 9: \# of Machines Required in every Station

|  | Number of Machines Required |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Station | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 20 | 12 | 18 | 15 | 15 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 21 | 10 | 18 | 12 | 13 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 18 | 11 | 16 | 13 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 21 | 10 | 18 | 14 | 13 |

Table 10: \# of M/C to Buy and Sell per week

|  | Number Of Machine Difference ('+' = buy, '-' = |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sell) |  |  |  |  |  |$|$| Station | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 15 | -8 | 6 | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 11 | $\mathbf{- 1 1}$ | 8 | -6 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 13 | -7 | 5 | $\mathbf{- 3}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 11 | $\mathbf{- 1 1}$ | 8 | $\mathbf{- 4}$ |
| Total <br> Required | 50 | 0 | 27 | 0 |
| Total <br> Excess | 0 | 37 | 0 | 16 |

Table 11: Total Cost of Machines

|  | Total Cost |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ |
| Buy Ma- <br> chine Cost | 125000 | 0 | 67500 | 0 | 2500 |
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| Resale Ma- <br> chine Cost | 0 | 46250 | 0 | 20000 | 2500 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost For <br> Each Week | $\$ 125,000$ | $\$ 46,250$ | $\$ 67,500$ | $\$ 20,000$ | $\$ 5,000$ |
| Total Cost | $\$ 263,750$ |  |  |  |  |

### 3.4 Scheduling

We add more machines to minimize the total finish time and bring it below 40 hours. Using Process Analyzer Tool we changed the batch size and machine count to minimize the total processing time in order to minimize the total cost. The least utilized machines are removed to bring the total cost down.

### 3.4.1 Process Analyzer Output

Table 12: Process Analyzer Output

| Scenario | \# of machines |  |  |  | Batc | Batc | Batc |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{M} /$ <br> $\mathbf{C} \mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{M} /$ <br> $\mathbf{C 2}$ | $\mathbf{M} /$ <br> $\mathbf{C} 3$ | $\mathbf{M} /$ <br> $\mathbf{C 4}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | 20 | 21 | 18 | 21 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 13 | 16 | 22 | 15 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 31 |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 13 | 16 | 22 | 15 | 12 | 1 | 10 | 12 |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 12 | 13 | 17 | 12 | 12 | 1 | 10 | 10 |

Total Cost for each scenario is as follow:
Table 13: Total Cost for each Scenario

| Scenario | Total Pro- <br> cessing <br> Time | Buy <br> Machine <br> Cost | Under <br> Time <br> Cost | Total <br> Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | Over 40 <br> hours | --- | --- | --- |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 29.05 | 90,000 | $87,481.2$ | $\$ \mathbf{1 7 7 , 4 8 1}$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 33.22 | 90,000 | $58,576.82$ | $\$ \mathbf{1 4 8 , 5 7 7}$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 35.03 | 80,000 | 20,503 | $\$ 100,503$ |

Cycle times for each scenario are as follow:
Table 14: Cycle-times for each scenario

| Cycle Time (min) |  |  |  | Avg. Cycle- <br> Time (min) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 |  |
| 1237.1 | 1021.23 | 1115.35 | 1750.34 | $\mathbf{1 2 8 1 . 0 0 5}$ |
| 1423.72 | 1139.31 | 1141.46 | 1734.22 | $\mathbf{1 3 5 9 . 6 7}$ |
| 1508.62 | 1368.43 | 1186.37 | 1973.05 | $\mathbf{1 5 0 9 . 1 1 8}$ |

## 4 Conclusion

After the analysis and calculation, scenario four reflects the best result in terms of cost efficacy. On the other hand, scenario one will result in a shorter cycle-time but higher cost. The managers at Ross have to decide what will yield a higher customer satisfaction and will keep the company profitable.

