



HAL
open science

Order release in a workload controlled flow shop with sequence-dependent setup times.

Nuno Octávio Fernandes, Silvio Do Carmo_silva

► To cite this version:

Nuno Octávio Fernandes, Silvio Do Carmo_silva. Order release in a workload controlled flow shop with sequence-dependent setup times.. International Journal of Production Research, 2010, pp.1. <10.1080/00207541003720376>. <hal-00590754>

HAL Id: hal-00590754

<https://hal.science/hal-00590754v1>

Submitted on 5 May 2011

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization



Order release in a workload controlled flow shop with sequence-dependent setup times.

Journal:	<i>International Journal of Production Research</i>
Manuscript ID:	TPRS-2010-IJPR-0020
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Jan-2010
Complete List of Authors:	Fernandes, Nuno Octávio; Instituto Politécnico de Castelo Branco, Departamento de Engenharia Industrial Carmo_Silva, Silvio do; Minho University, Department of Production and Systems
Keywords:	DISPATCHING, DYNAMIC PRODUCTION CONTROL
Keywords (user):	order release, simulation



Order release in a workload controlled flow-shop with sequence-dependent set-up times

N.O. Fernandes¹; S. Carmo-Silva²

¹ *Department of Industrial Engineering, Polytechnic Institute of Castelo Branco, Av. do Empresário 6000-767, Castelo Branco – Portugal.*

² *Department of Production and Systems, University of Minho, Campus de Gualtar, 4710-057, Braga- Portugal.*

Abstract

In this paper, we report a simulation study on the role of sequence-dependent set-up times in decision making at the order release level of a workload controlled make-to-order flow-shop. The study evaluates the potential for set-ups savings, dependent on the level of workload in the shop, for two alternative strategies, namely considering set-up times centrally, within the release decision or locally, within the dispatching decision. These strategies are compared and assessed on the basis of two main performance measures namely time in system and standard deviation of the job lateness. Results indicate that the local strategy, which has been traditionally adopted in practice and in most of the studies dealing with sequence-dependent set-up times, does not always give the best results. The release frequency and the shop workload appear critical to the selection of the strategy to adopt, strongly influencing system performance.

Keywords: order release, set-up time, simulation

¹ Corresponding author: *Phone:* +351272339300, *Fax:* +351272339399, *E-mail address:* nogf@ipcb.pt

1. Introduction

Workload Control (WLC) is a production, planning and control (PPC) concept that has received much attention in recent years (Thurer et al. 2009). It is particularly appropriate for jobbing and flow-shops in the make-to-order (MTO) sector of industry (Haskose et al. 2004). WLC applies the basic principles of input/output control (Plossl and Wight 1973) to keep the length of queues on the shop floor at appropriate levels. The aim is to achieve short, stable and predictable shop flow times towards meeting the promised delivery dates. This requires limiting and balancing workload on the shop floor to avoid temporary overloading or underloading of machines. When workloads are balanced the queues on the shop tend to be stable. Stable queues lead to predictable shop flow times, which can be used to determine the planned release times of orders.

Order release is described as an essential decision function and a core part of WLC (Missbauer 2009). It determines the type, amount and time point of release of new orders into the shop (Qi et al. 2009). For this purpose, an order release mechanism is used, in combination with a pre-shop pool. Orders that arrive to the production system are gathered in this pool and are only released if they fit the workload norms, or bounds, of the required machines or capacity groups. This means that the decision to release an order is based on its influence on the current workload of the shop floor. As pointed out by Land and Gaalman (1998), the pre-shop pool acts as a shop floor buffer against the dynamics of the incoming flow of orders, e.g. reducing perturbations due to order cancellation and allowing later ordering of raw materials, among other benefits.

WLC conceptualises a shop floor as a queuing system. Any released order (job) enters the shop and goes to the first machine of its routing. It waits in the queue if the machine is busy. Once processed in a machine, the job is moved to the next machine of its routing where it again waits until processing starts. WLC acts to ensure that workload at each machine do not exceed its norm, which is established with basis on the maximum acceptable flow time at each machine. Limiting in this way the workload means that, a limit on the number of jobs that can join the queue of a machine is imposed. Therefore, at times, jobs are not released because the workload norms of the required machines would be exceeded. Thus, Haskose et al. (2004) considered the existence of finite buffers at machines.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The shop flow time of a job is the sum of the set-up time, the processing time and the queuing time at each machine on the job's routing. Set-up time refers to the time required to prepare a machine to perform a job operation, such as cleaning, adjusting and changing tools and fixtures. Set-up times are dependent on both, the job to be processed and the one that had been processed immediately before. Most WLC literature assume that set-up time is either nonexistent or consider it as part of the processing time of the operation. While this may be acceptable for scheduling in some production environments, in many others sequence-dependent set-up times need to be taken into consideration separately. In this situation, shop performance cannot be effectively improved without the aid of appropriate scheduling procedures which take set-up times into account (Kim and Bobrowski, 1994).

From the perspective of the WLC concept, essentially two alternative strategies can be considered to deal with sequence-dependent set-up times: considering them centrally, i.e. within the release decision, or locally, i.e. within the dispatching decision.

The first strategy is concerned with the role of set-ups in scheduling jobs on one or more machines to optimize certain objectives. Although different scheduling problems dependent on set-up times have been investigated in the literature, e.g. Allahverdi et al. 1999, 2008, Cheng et al., 2000, Liu and Chang 2000 and Norman 1999, few studies have been reported on dynamic jobbing and flow-shops with sequence dependent set-up times. Two examples are the works by Kim and Bobrowski (1994) and recently by Vinod and Sridharan (2009). Both studied dynamic job shops with sequence-dependent set-ups using computer simulation. Kia et al. (2009) have also recently investigated dispatching rules for sequence-dependent set-up times in a dynamic flexible flow line. These studies showed that set-up-oriented dispatching rules were very effective on improving shop performance, when compared with ordinary rules such as *shortest processing time (SPT)* or *first-in-first-out (FIFO)*. The difference in performance between these two groups of rules, ordinary and set-up-oriented, was emphasised as shop load and set-up to processing time ratio increased.

The second strategy is concerned with the role of set-ups in decision making at the higher planning levels of the WLC system. Until now, this topic has hardly received attention in the literature. A remarkable exception is the work of Missbauer

(1997), which examined the functional relationship between *work-in-process* (WIP) and total set-up time, in order to establish the suitable level of WIP on the shop floor.

This paper reports an investigation into the implications of sequence-dependent set-up times in decision making at the order release level of a workload controlled make-to-order flow-shop. In particular, it attempts to show if orders should be sequenced in the pre-shop pool or on the shop floor in order to reduce the number of set-ups and improve system performance. As long as the avoided set-up time is greater than the time the orders wait in the pre-shop pool, due to set-up based order release, time in system of jobs is likely to be reduced. However, the objective of workload balancing within the release decision, required by the WLC approach, may conflict with the strategy of reducing set-ups. The impact of this on the shop performance is here evaluated through a simulation study. The results of the study will contribute for better decision in choosing between the two above referred control strategies, to deal with sequence-dependent set-up times in practice.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents and discusses the experimental design of the simulation study referred. Section 3 is focused on the analysis of the results from simulation experiments and in Section 4 concluding remarks and directions for future research work are put forward.

2. Simulation Study

2.1 Simulation model and production system configuration

To investigate the effects of the two alternative control strategies discussed in the previous section, a simulation study using Arena[®] software (Kelton et al. 2004), was set-up. A dynamic flow-shop is considered under the following assumptions:

1. The shop has six machines, M1 to M6, all equal in terms of capacity.
2. Each job has six operations each of one processed on each of the six machines in the same order, starting on machine M1 and ending on machine M6.
3. A machine can only perform one operation at a time on any job and an operation of a job can be performed by only one machine at a time.
4. Each machine is continuously available and there are no breakdowns.
5. Operations are processed without pre-emption.
6. Job processing cannot be started at a machine before it is finished at the previous one.

7. The transportation time between machines is assumed to be zero.
8. Set-up time of each job on each machine is sequence-dependent.
9. Each machine has a limited buffer capacity, i.e. a limit to the workload allowed to be released to the machine; nevertheless, no restriction is imposed to the movement of released jobs from a machine to the next, after processing.
10. Orders arrive continuously to the production system. By production system we mean the pre-shop pool plus the shop floor.

Due dates of orders are set externally and known upon arrival. Four types of jobs are considered, each of which with an equal probability of being assigned to an arriving order. The inter-arrival time of orders follows a negative exponential distribution, with a mean that results in a machine utilisation rate of 90% when ordinary rules are used for both, order release and dispatching (section 2.2). The mean inter-arrival time (v) of orders, is given by the following equation (Yu and Ram 2006, Vinod and Sridharan 2009):

$$v = \frac{\mu_p \cdot \mu_g}{U \cdot m} \quad (1)$$

Where μ_p is the mean time per operation, including set-up, μ_g is the mean number of operations per order, U is the shop utilization and m is the number of machines in the shop.

Orders arrive at the production system (see figure 1) over time and flow directly into the pre-shop pool. At release time t , orders in the pool are selected for eventual release according to a *priority rule* i.e. the selection rule for release. An order is released only if, as a consequence of this, the accounted workload of each machine in its routing does not exceed its workload norm. If one or more workload norms are exceeded the order must wait in the pool until, at least, the next releasing period. Once an order is released the workload of each machine in the order routing is updated with the workload contribution of the selected order. This procedure is repeated until all orders in the pool, at release time t , have been considered for release. Therefore, only a subset of orders currently waiting in the pool is released each time order release is activated, i.e. at release time t .

[Insert figure 1]

Different methods to update workload at machines upon order release are presented in literature. Breithaupt et al. (2002) make a review of these methods. The

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

adjusted aggregated load method, which has been shown to perform well in flow-shops (Oosterman et al. 2000), is adopted in this work. The underlying idea of this method is that the accounted workload of an operation to a machine is a function of the sequencing position of the operation on the orders' routing. The workload contribution is obtained by dividing the order operation time in a machine by the operation position number in the orders' routing and added up to the machine accounted workload.

After release, priority dispatching rules are used to control the progress of the jobs through the shop floor. Operations processing times are stochastic following a 2-Erlang distribution with a mean of 0.75 hours per job. Set-up times are deterministic and equal to 0.15 hours (i.e. 20% of the mean operation processing time). For simplicity, we assume the same set-up time for each job type. In the literature, set-up times have been typically set between 20% and 40% of mean processing time (e.g. kia et al. 2009, Vinod and Sridharan 2009, Kurz and Askin 2003). Kim and Bobrowski (1994) consider that 20% represents a realistic set-up time and provides an environment that will differentiate the performance of sequencing rules without giving undue advantage to set-up-oriented rules. Jobs of the same type can be processed with the same machine setting, i.e. no set-ups are required for the same type of job.

2.2 Experimental Design

Table 1 summarises the four experimental factors and associated levels studied: (1) dispatching rule; (2) selection rule for releasing; (3) releasing period length; and (4) workload norm levels.

[Insert table 1]

Two types of *dispatching rules* were tested on the shop floor: the ordinary FIFO and the set-up-oriented *SIMilar Set-up* (SIMSET). Since WLC reduces the length of queues on the shop floor, it has been suggested in the literature (Bechte, 1988) that WLC allows for the use of a simple dispatching rule such as FIFO. With this rule jobs are processed in the order they arrive at a machine, i.e. the highest priority is given to the job which is waiting most in queue. No consideration is given to set-up time savings. SIMSET, on the other hand, gives the highest priority to the job with the smallest set-up time, i.e. selects a job of the type of the one that just

1
2
3 finished to be processed on the same machine. When there is no such a job, another is
4 selected using the FIFO rule.
5
6

7 Two *selection rules* for releasing are considered: the ordinary *Latest Release*
8 *Date* (LRD) rule and the set-up oriented *Similar set-up and Latest Release Date*
9 (SLRD) rule. According to the LRD the highest releasing priority is given to the more
10 urgent order i.e. that which has the lowest latest release date. The latest release date
11 (or time) of an order is determined by backward scheduling from the due date using
12 the planned lead times in all machines of the orders' routing. These were established
13 through some pilot simulation runs. SLRD, on the other hand, selects an order for
14 release which is of same type of the order that had just been released. When there is
15 no such an order, another is selected using LRD rule.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 The *releasing period length* (T) determines the time interval between order
24 release activations, i.e. between releasing times and therefore determines the releasing
25 frequency. The value of T influences the amount and of work that is released into the
26 shop each time order release is activated. For T equal to zero the continuous timing
27 convention is in place and for T greater than zero we say that a discrete time
28 convention is applied (Bergamaschi et al 1997). Using the former, order release may
29 occur at any time during the system operation; Using the latter order releases may
30 occur only at periodic intervals of length T . Land (2006) explains that the choice of an
31 appropriate period between releases is a delicate decision. A long release period
32 results in increased opportunities to find orders in pool that fit workload norms, and
33 therefore may lead to a better load balancing. However, it also delays orders in the
34 pool - on average an order has to wait $T/2$ before being released into the shop floor –
35 which may increase the time jobs spend in the system.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The *releasing period* T was tested at seven levels, namely: 0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and
47 20 hours. These different levels allow us to understand the influence of the release
48 period and were chosen after a previous preliminary study for obtaining enough points
49 to represent the pattern of change of performance curves.
50
51
52

53 *Workload norms* (WLN) *levels* are deterministic parameters, setting the
54 maximum workload that can be released from the pool to each machine and,
55 therefore, setting the maximum shop workload. To determine the best performing
56 WLN levels it is common practice in simulation studies (e.g. Thuerer et al. 2009,
57 Henrich 2007, Land 2006, Oosterman et al. 2000, Land and Gaalman, 1998) to define
58 it as an experimental variable. Experimentation was started with a large value for
59
60

1
2
3
4 assuring that the release of orders to the shop floor was not constrained by load limits.
5
6 In such a situation, immediate release under the continuous timing convention and
7
8 unrestricted periodic release under the discrete timing convention, takes place. Then
9
10 WLN levels were stepped down, in order to gradually increase the level of restriction
11
12 to the release of orders i.e. from unrestricted to highly restrictive values. Nine WLN
13
14 levels were tested. Since machines have identical characteristics, i.e. utilization,
15
16 operation processing times, stream of arriving orders and average flow times, WLN
17
18 levels were set identical for all machines. According to Oosterman et al. (2000) the
19
20 *adjusted aggregated load method*, which is used in this study, allows for identical
21
22 workload norm levels, independently of the machines' position within the order's
23
24 routing.

25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

2.3 Performance measures

The primary measure of the system performance is *time in system*. Time in system is the time an order or job spends waiting in the pre-shop pool plus the *shop flow time*. It provides a measure of the speed of the jobs through the whole system and is directly related to the percentage of late jobs. Reducing time in system has a beneficial impact on reducing the overall response time to customers.

Shop flow time is also recorded. This refers to the time that elapses between job release and job completion. It helps evaluating the performance of the shop floor operation. Reducing the shop flow time has also intrinsic benefits. In particular, reduces WIP and, therefore, minimizes the costs of tied-up capital.

As an indicator of timing performance, the *standard deviation of the job lateness* is used. It indicates how close the completion times of jobs are to their planned due dates. The mean job lateness was also recorded.

3. Experimental Results

During simulation runs, data were collected under system steady-state. The length of each run was for 125,000 simulated hours including a warm-up period of 25,000 hours. The average values of 100 independent replications are presented as results. The statistical analysis was performed using the paired Student *t*-test with a 95% confidence level.

Table 2 shows control strategies A1 to A3 that result from combining selection rules for order releasing with dispatching rules. One of such combinations is not

1
2
3 relevant for this study, and therefore was not considered. The strategies have different
4 implications for shop floor control and performance. While control strategy A1 gives
5 no importance to savings in set-up time, control strategy A2 considers set-up times
6 within the order release decision, and control strategy A3 considers them within the
7 dispatching decision.
8
9

10
11
12 [Insert Table 2]

13
14 Figure 2 shows time in system performance for each control strategy under
15 continuous timing convention, i.e. the releasing period length is set to zero ($T = 0$).
16 This means that an order release may occur at any time during system operation. A
17 point on a curve is the result of simulating a control strategy, i.e. A1, A2 or A3, at a
18 specific workload norm level. Series of simulations experiments with decreasing
19 workload norms levels, from unrestricted to highly restricted levels, were performed.
20 Thus, time in system performance is indicated for different levels of workload norm
21 tightness. Note that the shop flow time is used as an instrumental variable that
22 indicates the level of tightness of the WLN: the lower the shop flow time, the higher
23 the WLN tightness. In this figure, time in system is plotted against shop flow time,
24 showing the relative performance of the control strategies.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 [Insert figure 2]

35
36 Performance curve of strategy A1 is based on the use of ordinary rules at both
37 release and dispatching decisions. It uses the LRD rule at release and the FIFO rule at
38 dispatching. The curve has its right end point at a shop flow time of 27.9 hours. This
39 is the result of releasing jobs immediately to the shop floor, i.e. jobs do not wait in the
40 pre-shop pool. Tighter WLN, first leads to slightly lower values of time in system and
41 after a certain point, i.e. the point of minimum time in system, represented by a square
42 mark on the curve, time in system increases markedly. The minimum value of time in
43 system is achieved for a shop flow time of 26.9 hours. Since time in system is the sum
44 of the pool time and the shop flow time, this means that waiting times in the pool are
45 increasing more than waiting times on the shop floor are decreasing. Thus, to avoid
46 deterioration of time in system, WLN cannot be set excessively tight. Table 3 shows
47 the simulation results with the 95% confidence intervals on the mean, for the two
48 following “points”:
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

- 58 1. the *right end point* of each strategy, representing an non-controlled
59 release situation that results from unrestricting WLN.
60

2. the *point of minimum time in system* of each strategy, representing the minimum time in system that results from an appropriate WLN level (found empirically).

Note that for performance curve of strategy A3, the right end point and the point of minimum time in system are coincident and refers to the unrestricted WLN level.

The mean job lateness is also recorded in Table 3. It was observed, through pilot simulation runs, that the behaviour of time in system is very similar to that of mean job lateness, i.e. good results in terms of time system mean good results in terms of mean job lateness.

[Insert Table 3]

Performance curve A2 and A3 are based on the use of set-up-oriented rules for order release (A2) and for order dispatching (A3). Figure 2 shows that the right end points of A1 and of A2 are coincident. This happens because under immediately release differences in strategies are expressed only at dispatching. Since A1 and A2 use the same dispatching discipline, i.e. FIFO, the same performance value would be expected, as observed. Under immediately release, the right end point of A3 is placed rather differently in the figure, as expected, because it uses a different dispatching rule, i.e. SIMSET. This explains the behaviour of the three strategies at these extreme points.

Tightening of WLN, under A3, results in deterioration of time in systems due to fewer opportunities for set-up savings. Nevertheless, at each level of norm tightness, control strategy A3, based on set-up-oriented dispatching, clearly outperforms control strategy A1, based on FIFO dispatching, for time in system measure. Results show that set-up-oriented control strategies are very effective on improving system performance, i.e. time in system. This is in line with previous findings, e.g. Kim and Bobrowski (1994).

Figure 2 also shows that, as WLN becomes tighter, performance curves A2 and A3 cross each other. This means that the level of norms' tightness influences the decision for considering set-up time centrally or locally. Loose WLN, lead to a high level of shop floor WIP, i.e. longer queues of jobs, which, in turn, result in increased opportunities for set-up-oriented dispatching towards optimization of job sequencing with respect to set-ups. Thus, when set-up-oriented rules are used within the dispatching decision, curve A3, the lowest total set-up time and the lowest time in

1
2
3 system are obtained under immediate release (right end point of the curve). However,
4 tighter norms restrict WIP on shop floor and the set-up-oriented dispatching rules
5 partially lose their effectiveness. In this situation the use of set-up-oriented selection
6 rules, within the release decision, becomes a suitable option, as shown by the crossing
7 of curve A2 with A3.
8
9

10
11
12 In Figure 3 the standard deviation of the job lateness (StDev lateness) is
13 plotted against the shop flow time, indicating the timing performance of the control
14 strategies A1 to A3. We observe that under unrestricted WLN, the StDev of lateness
15 for control strategy A3 is much higher than that for the other strategies. Apparently
16 this is explained by the disruption of the 'natural' (based on FIFO) processing
17 sequence of jobs due to set-up oriented dispatching. The large values of the StDev of
18 job lateness at unrestricted workload norms denote the high fluctuation of the queue
19 lengths and consequently of shop flow times. Since shop flow times are used for
20 establishing the planned release times of orders, this behaviour is likely to hinder the
21 right timing at which orders should be released. Tighter WLN first improve the StDev
22 of lateness of strategies A1 to A3 and then, after a certain point, it worsens it. This
23 happens because, as WLN becomes tighter, the order release procedure tends to retain
24 longer the jobs (orders) at the pre-shop pool, resulting in both:
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

- 35 1. a reduction of the opportunities for set-up based dispatching. This allows
36 more jobs to flow 'naturally' without being held for exploring set-up time
37 savings. This explains job lateness variation decreases up to a minimum at
38 A3 curve.
39
- 40 2. increased opportunities for set-up oriented releasing and for fitting
41 workload norms at order release. As a consequence, the planned release
42 sequence based on job due dates, is disturbed by holding back the release
43 of urgent jobs and thus increasing the variability of the job lateness
44 distribution. This increasing effect is stronger as WLN tightness increases,
45 reason why StDev of job lateness increases, after a certain point, for all
46 strategies.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 It is also noteworthy that strategies A1 and A2 have an approximate behaviour
56 in terms of the StDev of lateness. In fact, the timing performance of set-up oriented
57 releasing (A2) is similar to, or better than, the timing performance of strategy A1,
58 across the whole range of norm tightness.
59
60

[Insert figure 3]

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Next, based on figures 4 and 5, we compare control strategies A1 to A3 under the influence of the release period length, for the two “points” above referred. Thus, figure 4 shows time in system for different releasing periods under unrestricted WLN and figure 5 shows the time in system for different releasing periods for the WLN level that results in the minimum time in system. In both figures we can observe that performance curves A2 and A3 cross each other, meaning that the releasing period length, which determines the releasing frequency, influences the relative performance of the control strategies. It is also shown that strategies A2 and A3 always perform better than strategy A1. It is worth pointing out here that it has been observed in previous studies (e.g. Land, 2006), that under unrestricted WLN an increase in the releasing period leads to an increase in the average time in system. This is in fact shown in figure 4 for control strategies A1 and A3. However, for control strategy A2, this is verified only for long releasing period lengths. This happens because a moderate increase of the release period length favours set-up savings, which result in a decrease of the time in system. However, increasing the release period length above a certain value, set-up savings no longer compensate for the pool delay of orders and time in system starts to increase.

[Insert figures 4 and 5]

Results show that, particularly, for large release period lengths or for situations with low levels of workload on the shop floor, set-up oriented dispatching does not seem to be as effective as set-up oriented releasing, in terms of time in system performance. In situations of non-controlled workload or looser WLN, set-up oriented dispatching becomes attractive in terms of the time in system performance, but performs comparatively worse in terms of the timing performance, measured by the standard deviation of lateness. This leads to conclude that the answer to our research question is not independent from the level of workload in the shop, the release period length and performance measure considered.

4. Conclusions

Sequence-dependent set-up times may lead to major set-up savings if appropriate production control strategies are used. This can have a major influence on manufacturing system performance. This paper reports a simulation study of such influence in the scope of the Workload Control concept.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Results show that the release frequency, as function of the release period length, and the shop workload are critical for the performance of the control strategies studied. Therefore, they need to be conveniently tuned in the order release procedure to be adopted. Results also show that, considering set-up times locally within the dispatching decision, as traditionally has been done, does not always result in the best performance. The degree of influence of set-up times on the control strategies performance may certainly vary with the set-up time values adopted or necessary in real situations. This, however, was not object of study in this research.

Future research work will explore other case study settings, including the influence of set-up time to processing ratio, and seek to make adjustments to the traditional release procedures in order to account for sequence-dependent set-up times in a more effective manner.

References

- Allahverdi, A., Gupta, J., and Aldowaisan, T., 1999. A review of scheduling research involving set-up considerations. *Omega* 27, 219–239.
- Allahverdi, A., Ng, C.T., Cheng, T.C.E., and Kovalyov, M.Y., 2008. A survey of scheduling problems with set-up times or costs. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 187 (3), 985–1032.
- Bechte, W., 1988. Theory and practice of load-oriented manufacturing control. *International Journal of Production Research*, 26 (3) 375-395.
- Bergamaschi, D., Cigolini, R., Perona, M., and Portioli, A., 1997. Order review and release strategies in a job shop environment: A review and a classification. *International Journal of Production Research*, 35, 399–420.
- Breithaupt, J., Land, M., and Nyhuis, P., 2002. The workload control concept: theory and practical extensions of Load Oriented Order Release. *Production Planning and Control*, 13 (7), 625-638.
- Cheng, T.C.E., Gupta, J.N.D. and Wang, G., 2000. A review of flowshop scheduling research with set-up times. *Production and Operations Management*, 9, 283–302.
- Haskose, A., Kingsman, B.G., and Worthington, D., 2004. Performance analysis of make-to-order manufacturing systems under different workload control regimes. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 90 (2), 169-186.
- Henrich, P., Land, M., and Gaalman, G., 2007. Semi-interchangeable machines: implications for workload control. *Production Planning and Control*, 18 (2), 91-104.
- Kelton, W., Sadowski, R., and Sturrock, D., 2004. *Simulation with arena*, 3rd Ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kia, H.R., Davoudpour H., Zandieh M., 2009. Scheduling a dynamic flexible flow line with sequence-dependent setup times: a simulation analysis. *International Journal of Production Research*, Forthcoming Article.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Kia, H.R., Davoudpour, H. and Zandieh, M., 2009. Scheduling a dynamic flexible flow line with sequence-dependent set-up times: a simulation analysis. *International Journal of Production Research*, In press.

Kim, S.C. and Bobrowski, P.M., 1994. Impact of sequence-dependent set-up time on job shop scheduling performance. *International Journal of Production Research*, 32 (7), 1503-1520.

Kurz, M.E. and Askin, R.G., 2003. Comparing scheduling rules for flexible flow lines. *International Journal of Production Economic*, 85 (3), 371–388.

Land, M., 2006. Parameters and sensitivity in workload control. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 104 (2), 625-638.

Land, M., and Gaalman, G. 1998. The performance of workload control concepts in job shops: Improving the release method. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 56–57 (20), 347–364.

Liu, C., and Chang, S., 2000. Scheduling flexible flow shops with sequence-dependent setup effects. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics and Automation*, 16 (4) 408-419.

Missbauer, H., 1997. Order release and sequence-dependent set-up times. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 49, 131-143.

Missbauer, H., 2009. Models of the transient behaviour of production units to optimize the aggregate material flow. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 118 (2), 387-397.

Norman, B., 1999. Scheduling flowshops with finite buffers and sequence-dependent setup times. *Computers and Industrial Engineering*, 36 (1), 163-177.

Oosterman, B., Land, M., and Gaalman, G., 2000. The influence of shop characteristics on workload control. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 68 (1), 107-119.

Plossl, G.W. and Wight, O.W., 1973. Capacity Planning and Control, *Production and Inventory management*, 3, 31-67.

Qi, C.; Sivakumar ,A. I. and Gershwin S. B., 2009. An efficient new job release control methodology. *International Journal of Production Research*, 47 (03), 703-731.

Thurer, M., Silva, C. and Stevenson, M., 2009. Workload control release mechanisms: from practice back to theory. *International Journal of Production Research*, In Press.

Vinod, V. and Sridharan, R., 2009. Simulation-based metamodels for scheduling a dynamic job shop with sequence-dependent set-up times. *International Journal of Production Research*, 47 (6), 1425-1447.

Yu, X. and Ram, B., 2006. Bio-inspired scheduling for dynamic job shops with flexible routing and sequence-dependent set-ups. *International Journal of Production Research*, 44 (22), 4793-4813.

Tables

Factor	Levels	
Dispatching rule	FIFO	SIMSET
Selection rule for releasing	LRD	SLRD
Release period length	TC{0, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10}	
Workload norm levels (WLN)	tested at nine levels of restriction	

Table 1. Experimental factors and levels.

Dispatching rule	Selection rule for releasing	
	Ordinary (LRD)	Set-up-oriented (SLRD)
Ordinary (FIFO)	A1	A2
Set-up-oriented (SIMSET)	A3	Not relevant

Table 2. Control strategies by combining dispatching and selection rules for releasing.

Control strategy	Shop flow time	Time in system	Mean lateness	StDev of lateness
A1 (unrestricted WLN)	27.899 (± 0.10)	27.899 (± 0.10)	3.402 (± 0.10)	15.469 (± 0.10)
A1 (WLN=10 hours)	26.857 (± 0.09)	27.853 (± 0.12)	3.354 (± 0.12)	15.204 (± 0.10)
A2 (unrestricted WLN)	27.899 (± 0.10)	27.899 (± 0.10)	3.402 (± 0.10)	15.469 (± 0.10)
A2 (WLN=5 hours)	22.007 (± 0.04)	25.037 (± 0.07)	0.538 (± 0.07)	16.335 (± 0.14)
A3 (unrestricted WLN)	22.581 (± 0.07)	22.581 (± 0.07)	-1.920 (± 0.07)	27.305 (± 0.15)

Table 3. Control strategies performance results.

Figures




Figure 1: Simulated shop floor model.




Figure 2: Time in system performance for different control strategies.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Figure 3: Timing performance for different control strategies.




Figure 4: Time in system at unrestricted workload norms for different release period lengths.




Figure 5: Minimum time in system for different release period lengths.