

Faculty of Manufacturing Engineering

DESIGN AND SIMULATION OF AUTOMATED MATERIAL HANDLING SYSTEM FOR AUTOMOTIVE ASSEMBLY PROCESS

Seha binti Mohd Saffar

Master of Science in Manufacturing Engineering

2019

🔘 Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka

DESIGN AND SIMULATION OF AUTOMATED MATERIAL HANDLING SYSTEM FOR AUTOMOTIVE ASSEMBLY PROCESS

SEHA BINTI MOHD SAFFAR

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Manufacturing Engineering

Faculty of Manufacturing Engineering

UNIVERSITI TEKNIKAL MALAYSIA MELAKA

2019

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis entitled "Design and Simulation of Automated Material Handling System for Automotive Assembly Process" is the result of my own research except as cited in the references. The thesis has not been accepted for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature of any other degree.

| Signature | : | |
|-----------|---|--|
| Name | : | |
| Date | : | |

APPROVAL

I hereby declare that I have read this thesis and in my opinion this thesis is sufficient in terms of scope and quality for the award of Master of Science in Manufacturing Engineering.

| Signature | · |
|-----------------|---|
| Supervisor Name | : |
| Date | |

C Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka

DEDICATION

To my beloved mother and father,

My beloved family,

To my beloved husband,

Who believed in me.

ABSTRACT

Improvement of process parameters for effective and efficient material handling system in manufacturing industry has been studied extensively lately in view of observed increases in demand for high technology to increase production and profit. This thesis investigates an actual industrial problem relating to improvement in material supply system in production line and inventory system in a warehouse. A case study was selected as a method to collect data in actual industry situation. The study aims to assess the influence of automated material handling system in an automotive industry by proposing a new integrated system design by mean of numerical analysis on significant effect and influence on the system. The system performance of the proposed integrated design was measured and compared to the current system. The system design and analysis were performed using Quest software. The methodology consisted of six phases. Firstly, data were gathered from actual industry as a case study. These data served as guideline and offer input on design limitation of the proposed integrated system. Secondly, a design concept was proposed using standard principle of design consideration for manufacturing. A full factorial design with two levels of three factors was applied as the design of experiment to analyze the performance measure of the integrated system and the current system. This thesis concludes that the overall result shows that the bottleneck for transport system was reduced by about 87% and 85% reduced was observed for the storage system. The transport equipment was utilized 4 times greater than the current transport system. Due to increment in utilization, the production output increased four times from the current system. Overall result showed decrement in cycle time of 63% for model 4 compared to model 1. The constraint for this research work was the preparedness of manufacturing industry towards flexibilities and leans. For future improvement, the simulation clock can be set in order to establish appropriate environment and the transition distance of entities between movement and distance of each resource to the others are properly premeditated. Also, in-depth study on Quest software and additional study on Delmia v5 as alternative simulation tool can be considered for virtual 3D simulation with ergonomic human movement results and analysis.

ABSTRAK

Sejak kebelakangan ini, penyelidikan dalam peningkatan sistem pengendalian bahan yang berkesan, cekap dan permintaan teknologi terbaru telah meningkat untuk mendapatkan satu peningkatan pengeluaran keuntungan dalam industri pembuatan. Isu-isu semasa telah diperkenalkan oleh ramai penyelidik. Tetapi, masih terdapat kekurangan dalam mengenal pasti punca masalah sebenar. Penyelidikan ini cuba untuk mengkaji salah satu daripada masalah sebenar di dalam sistem integrasi antara sistem bekalan bahan dalam barisan pengeluaran dan sistem inventori dalam gudang. Kajian kes dipilih sebagai satu kaedah untuk mengumpul data dalam keadaan industri yang sebenar. Matlamat kajian adalah untuk menilai pengaruh pengendalian bahan secara automatik dalam proses pemasangan industri automotif dengan mencadangkan satu rekabentuk baru sistem integrasi menggunakan simulasi dan analisis kesan utama yang mempengaruhi prestasi sistem. Termasuk juga, menganalisis prestasi sistem integrasi baru dengan sistem semasa dalam kajian kes. Kaedah pendekatan menggunakan perisian CAD (Delmia & Quest). Terdapat 6 fasa dirancang Pengumpulan awal data dilaksanakan di fasa 1 untuk untuk mencapai matlamat. mengumpul semua data yang berkaitan dari situasi industri yang sebenar di kilang terpilih untuk kajian kes. Ia memberikan garis panduan dan batasan dalam merekabentuk sistem integrasi baru nanti. Yang ke-2, idea atau konsep reka bentuk yang akan dilakukan menggunakan piawaian prinsip pertimbangan reka bentuk untuk pembuatan. Rekabentuk dengan faktoran penuh, 2 aras 3 faktor akan digunakan sebagai reka bentuk eksperimen untuk menganalisis pengukuran prestasi sistem integrasi dengan sistem semasa dalam kajian kes. Kesimpulannya, hasil keseluruhan tesis in menunjukkan hasil yang lebih baik di mana kesesakan sistem pengangkutan dikurangkan kira-kira 87% dan 85% dikurangkan dalam sistem storan. Sistem pengangkutan juga digunakan 4 kali ganda dari model 1. Disebabkan kenaikan penggunaan, pengeluaran juga meningkat 4 kali ganda dari model 1. Hasil keseluruhan menunjukkan penurunan masa kitaran model 4 adalah 63% dari model 1. Halangan untuk penyelidikan ini adalah kesediaan sistem pembuatan ke arah fleksibiliti dan 'lean'. Beberapa penambahbaikan boleh dilakukan seperti penetapan jam waktu simulasi dan jarak untuk setiap entiti dan sumber yang lebih teliti. Untuk analisis simulasi, kajian mendalam untuk perisian Quest dan penambahan penyelidikan pada Delmia V5 sebagai alat simulasi juga diperlukan untuk menghasilkan simulasi 3D maya dengan gerakan manusia ergonomik.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere acknowledgement to my supervisor Associate Professor Dr. Zamberi Bin Jamaludin and my co-supervisor Dr. Fairul Azni Bin Jafar from the Faculty of Manufacturing Engineering Universiti Teknikal Malaysia Melaka (UTeM) for their essential supervision, support and encouragement towards the completion of this thesis.

I would also like to express my greatest gratitude to En.Mohd Hidayat Bin AB Rahman from Faculty of Technology Engineering, for his advice and teaching in Delmia Quest Simulation software. Also, my deepest gratitude to Mawea's engineers in providing great service and guideline in conducting simulation using Delmia Quest Simulation software. Special thanks to Zamalah scholarship for funding financial support in 3 semesters of my study. Not forgetting, research grant FRGS/1/2015/TK03/FKP/02/F00277 for funding for the financial support throughout the semester left of this master study.

Special thanks to my husband, my beloved parents and siblings, and my colleagues for their moral support in completing this degree. Lastly, thank you to everyone who had been to the crucial parts of realization of this project.

iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

46

| APPI | ROV | ATION AL TION | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| ABST ABST ACK TAB | FRA FRA NOV LE (| СТ | i ii iii iv vii |
| | - | FIGURES | X |
| | | APPENDICES | xvii |
| | | ABBREVIATIONS PUBLICATIONS | xviii |
| | Or | I UDLICATIONS | XX |
| СНА | PTE | R | |
| 1. | | TRODUCTION | 1 |
| | | Background | 1 |
| | | Research motivation | 4 |
| | | Problem statement | 5 |
| | | Research question Research hypothesis | 6 7 |
| | | Research objectives | 7 |
| | | Research scope | 8 |
| | | Research outline | 9 |
| 2. | LIT | ERATURE REVIEW | 11 |
| | 2.1 | Overview of material handling | 11 |
| | | 2.1.1 Supply chain | 12 |
| | | 2.1.2 Material supply | 13 |
| | | 2.1.3 Material feeding applications | 15 |
| | a a | 2.1.4 Benefits of material handling system | 15 |
| | 2.2 | Technologies in material handling system | 16 |
| | | 2.2.1 Transport equipment | 16 18 |
| | 2.3 | 2.2.2 Storage equipment System design and development | 21 |
| | 2.3 | Simulation method for investigating MHS | 28 |
| | 2.5 | Experimentation and analysis of performance measure | 30 |
| | 2.6 | Summary | 37 |
| 2 | ME | | 20 |
| | | THODOLOGY | 38 |
| | 3.1 | Overall project progress flowchart | 38 |
| | 3.2 | Research approach 3.2.1 Interview | 40 41 |
| | | 3.2.2 Survey & questionnaire | 41 44 |
| | | | |

- 3.2.2 Survey & questionnaire3.2.3 Observations

| | 3.2.4 | Compilation of method on data gathering | 47 |
|-----|--------|---|-----|
| 3.3 | Phase | 1: Understanding research problem and data gathering of case stud | y |
| | compa | any | 48 |
| | 3.3.1 | Overview of case study company | 50 |
| | 3.3.2 | Case study: Factory layout and distance travel | 51 |
| | 3.3.3 | Case study: Parts supply | 52 |
| | 3.3.4 | Case study: Transport & storage equipment of material | 54 |
| | | handling system | |
| 3.4 | Phase | 2: Design and propose new material handling system | 55 |
| | 3.4.1 | Planning: Design consideration and prerequisite step | 59 |
| | | 3.4.1.1 Layout system flow | 59 |
| | | 3.4.1.2 Space utilization & unit load | 66 |
| | | 3.4.1.3 Automated material handling system | 69 |
| | | integration | |
| | 3.4.2 | Design on delmia/quest simulation software | 79 |
| | | 3.4.2.1 Result presentation | 79 |
| | | 3.4.2.2 Modelling element of quest | 81 |
| | | 3.4.2.3 Decision point logic for material handling | 93 |
| | | elements: AGV. Train and labour element | |
| | | 3.4.2.4 Depart requirement and part | 100 |
| | | destination for AGV, train and labour element | |
| | 3.4.3 | Part entry | 107 |
| | 3.4.4 | Running the simulation | 107 |
| | | 3: Design of experiment | 108 |
| 3.6 | | 4 & 5: Data compilation/ expected result & analysis | 109 |
| 3.7 | Summ | nary | 111 |
| RES | SULT A | AND DISCUSSION | 114 |
| 4.1 | Result | ts | 115 |
| | 4.1.1 | | 115 |
| | | 4.1.1.1 Element class satistic | 115 |
| | | 4.1.1.2 Warehouse source statistic | 118 |
| | | 4.1.1.3 Buffer statistic: Pick up points | 120 |
| | | 4.1.1.4 Buffer statistic : Drop off points | 121 |
| | | 4.1.1.5 Transportation statistic | 124 |
| | 4.1.2 | Simulation result for model 2 | 129 |
| | | 4.1.2.1 Element class satisfic | 129 |
| | | 4.1.2.2 Warehouse source statistic | 132 |
| | | 4.1.2.3 Buffer statistic: Pick up points | 134 |
| | | 4.1.2.4 Buffer statistic : Drop off points | 135 |
| | | 4.1.2.5 Transportation statistic | 137 |
| | 4.1.3 | Simulation result for model 3 | 142 |
| | | 4.1.3.1 Element class satisfic | 142 |
| | | 4.1.3.2 Warehouse source statistic | 145 |
| | | 4.1.3.3 Buffer statistic: Pick up points | 147 |
| | | 4.1.3.4 Buffer statistic : Drop off points | 147 |
| | 4 1 4 | 4.1.3.5 Transportation statistic | 150 |
| | 4.1.4 | Simulation result for model 4 | 154 |
| | | 4.1.4.1 Element class satistic | 154 |

4.

| | | | 4.1.4.2 Warehouse source statistic | 156 |
|----|------|--------|---|-----|
| | | | 4.1.4.3 Buffer statistic: Pick up points | 158 |
| | | | 4.1.4.4 Buffer statistic : Drop off points | 159 |
| | | | 4.1.4.5 Transportation statistic | 162 |
| | 4.2 | Discus | sion of overall result for all models | 165 |
| | | 4.2.1 | Discussion on influences of AMH transport equipment | 169 |
| | | | to the current system | |
| | | 4.2.2 | Discussion on influences of AMH storage equipment | 178 |
| | | | to the current system | |
| | | 4.2.3 | Discussion on influences of integration AMH | 185 |
| | | | and new layout to the current system | |
| | 4.3 | Summa | ary of overall result in discussion | 195 |
| 5. | CO | NCLUS | ION AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 203 |
| | FOI | R FUTU | VRE RESEARCH | |
| | 5.1 | Overvi | ew | 203 |
| | 5.2 | Conclu | ision | 203 |
| | 5.3 | Recom | mendations & future work | 206 |
| RE | FERE | NCES | | 208 |
| | | ICES | | 229 |

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE | TITLE | PAGE |
|-------|---|------|
| 2.1 | Performance measure using 95% confidence interval | 31 |
| | (Christopher, 2005) | |
| 2.2 | Level of Factors (Carlo, 2008) | 34 |
| 2.3 | Comparison in correlation metrics used by other authors as their | |
| | performance measure | 35 |
| 3.1 | Compilation of data gathering method in a review of design | 48 |
| | and simulation of AMHS in the assembly process | |
| 3.2 | Distance from warehouse to each process in chassis line | 52 |
| 3.3 | Type of part in assembly process | 53 |
| 3.4 | Definition and type of material handling equipment suitable for | 62 |
| | every different type of layout design (Tompkins et al., 2010) | |
| 3.5 | Distance from warehouse to each process in a new chassis line | 66 |
| 3.6 | Parts arrangement for bins in warehouse which contain the name of b | in |
| | along with their allocated name of parts | 67 |
| 3.7 | Parts allocation for old layout consisted of name of every | 68 |
| | drop off stations according to their name of parts | |
| 3.8 | Parts allocation for new layout | 69 |
| 3.9 | Summary of transportation configuration for old layout | 76 |
| 3.10 | Summary of transportation configuration for new layout | 77 |

| 3.11 | Summary of number of vehicles required for old layout | 78 |
|------|--|-----|
| 3.12 | Summary of number of vehicles required for new layout | 79 |
| 3.13 | Result presentation (Sharfiza, 2005) | 80 |
| 3.14 | List of AGV and train decision point for model 1 and 2 | 94 |
| 3.15 | List of AGV decision point for model 3 | 96 |
| 3.16 | List of AGV decision point for model 4 | 97 |
| 3.17 | List of labour decision point at warehouse of model 1 and 2 | 99 |
| 3.18 | List of factors and levels used as variables (Carlo, 2008) | 108 |
| 3.19 | Models used in the design of experiments (Carlo, 2008) | 109 |
| 3.20 | Template for result of experiment | 110 |
| 4.1 | Total created parts and parts in system for every assemble parts | 116 |
| | during simulation/working hour of model 1 | |
| 4.2 | Production output of real industry situation (before simulation) | 118 |
| | and model 1 (after simulation) | |
| 4.3 | Warehouse output and creation rate for every source in warehouse | 119 |
| | of model 1 | |
| 4.4 | Statistic result of pick up buffer of model 1 | 121 |
| 4.5 | Statistic result of drop off buffer of model 1 | 121 |
| 4.6 | Performance table for transportation of model 1 | 124 |
| 4.7 | Performance table for decision point of model 1 | 126 |
| 4.8 | Total created parts and parts in system for every assemble parts | 130 |
| | during simulation time of model 2 | |
| 4.9 | Warehouse output and creation rate for every source in | 133 |
| | warehouse of model 2 | |
| 4.10 | Statistic result of pick up buffer of model 2 | 135 |

| 4.11 | Statistic result of drop off buffer for model 2 | 135 |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.12 | Performance table for transportation of model 2 | 138 |
| 4.13 | Performance table for decision point of model 2 | 140 |
| 4.14 | Total created parts and parts in system for every assemble parts | 143 |
| | during simulation for model 3 | |
| 4.15 | Warehouse output and creation rate for every source in | 145 |
| | warehouse of model 3 | |
| 4.16 | Statistic result of pick up buffer of model 3 | 147 |
| 4.17 | Statistic result of drop off buffer for model 3 | 148 |
| 4.18 | Performance table for transformation of model 3 | 150 |
| 4.19 | Performance table for decision point of model 3 | 152 |
| 4.20 | Total part created and parts in system for every assemble parts | 154 |
| | during simulation for model 4 | |
| 4.21 | Warehouse output and part creation rate for every source in | 156 |
| | warehouse | |
| 4.22 | Statistic Result of pick up buffer for model 4 | 159 |
| 4.23 | Statistic result of drop off buffer for model 4 | 160 |
| 4.24 | Performance table for transportation of model 4 | 163 |
| 4.25 | Performance table for decision point of model 4 | 163 |
| 4.26 | The correlation of significant impact of MHS and Layout | 166 |
| | between literature and the research case study. | |
| 4.27 | Correlation of performance measure between literature review | 167 |
| | and research case study. | |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE | TITLE | PAGE |
|--------|--|--------|
| 2.1 | The part supply implementation in assembly line(Suhartini et al., 20 | 13) 19 |
| 2.2 | The sample of picking list from actual automation assembly parts | 20 |
| | (Sharifah, 2015) | |
| 2.3 | Mother trolley carry carts in plant layout of actual automation | 20 |
| | factory (Sharifah, 2015) | |
| 2.4 | The analysis model for assembly system design (Bellgran, 2004) | 23 |
| 2.5 | Work methodology to design and analysis material handling | 26 |
| | system (Santosh, 2016) | |
| 2.6 | Methodology of simulation of assembly line balancing (Jamil and | 27 |
| | Razali, 2016; Banks, 2004) | |
| 3.1 | Overall research flowchart | 39 |
| 3.2 | The study used Likert 5-point scale (Ho and Nguyen, 2006; Itaya and | d 45 |
| | Niwa, 2007) | |
| 3.3 | Preliminary data gathering process flowchart | 50 |
| 3.4 | Example of Egemin's AGV | 55 |
| 3.5 | Design consideration process flow | 56 |
| 3.6 | Design process flow for design of material handling system (Ulrich a | nd 57 |
| | Eppinger, 2016) | |
| 3.7 | Five steps of basic approach in facilities planning (Reyneke, 2010) | 61 |

| 3.8 | Steps applied in facilities planning process (Tompkins et al, 2010) | 61 |
|------|---|-----|
| 3.9 | Assembly approaches used at Volvo's Kalmar plant. Straight-line | 65 |
| | Assembly (Tompkins et al., 2010) | |
| 3.10 | Assembly approaches used at Volvo's Kalmar plant. Dock | 65 |
| | Assembly (Tompkins et al., 2010) | |
| 3.11 | Source characteristic box in Quest software | 84 |
| 3.12 | The list of sources in all models | 85 |
| 3.13 | Bins and cart used for parts storage during transferred | 86 |
| 3.14 | Sink characteristic dialog box | 87 |
| 3.15 | The buffer connection between source and operator | 88 |
| 3.16 | The process flow of buffer between sources to cart | 88 |
| 3.17 | List of buffers for old and new layout | 90 |
| 3.18 | The location of buffers at warehouse and assembly line for | 91 |
| | model 1 and 2 | |
| 3.19 | The location of buffers at warehouse and assembly line for | 92 |
| | model 3 | |
| 3.20 | The location of buffers at warehouse and assembly line for | 92 |
| | model 4 | |
| 3.21 | The location of AGV and train decision point (red-cross mark) | 95 |
| | for model 1 and 2 | |
| 3.22 | The location of AGV decision point (red-cross mark) for model 3 | 98 |
| 3.23 | The location of AGV decision point (red-cross mark) for model 4 | 98 |
| 3.24 | The location of labour decision point (red-cross mark) for model | 100 |
| | 1 and 2 | |
| 3.25 | The process flow of AGV and train depart requirement and | 102 |

part destination for model 1 and 2

| 3.26 | The process flow of train departs requirement and part destination | 103 |
|------|--|-----|
| | for model 3 | |
| 3.27 | The process flow of AGV depart requirement and part destination | 104 |
| | for model 4 | |
| 3.28 | The process flow of labor departs requirement and part destination | 106 |
| | for model 1 and 2 | |
| 4.1 | Warehouse output during simulation run time of model 1 | 119 |
| 4.2 | Part creation rate during simulation run time of model 1 | 120 |
| 4.3 | The line graph of bottleneck in assembly line buffer of model 1 | 123 |
| 4.4 | The line graph of number of part entries in assembly line buffer | 123 |
| | of model 1 | |
| 4.5 | Line graph of average part residence for transport system of | 125 |
| | model 1 | |
| 4.6 | Line graph of part capacity of transportation during simulation | 126 |
| | of model 1 | |
| 4.7 | The line graph of transportation process performance for model 1 | 128 |
| 4.8 | The line graph of transport utilization for model 1 | 129 |
| 4.9 | Warehouse output during simulation run time for model 2 | 132 |
| 4.10 | Part creation rate during simulation run time of model 2 | 134 |
| 4.11 | The line graph of bottleneck in assembly line supply buffer | 136 |
| | for model 2 | |
| 4.12 | The line graph of number of part entries in assembly line buffer | 137 |
| | for model 2 | |
| 4.13 | Line graph of average part residence for transport system for | 139 |

model 2

| 4.14 | Line graph of part capacity of transportation during simulation | 139 |
|------|--|-----|
| | for model 2 | |
| 4.15 | The line graph of transportation process performance for | 141 |
| | model 2 | |
| 4.16 | The line graph of transport utilization for model 2 | 142 |
| 4.17 | Warehouse output during simulation run time for model 3 | 146 |
| 4.18 | Part creation rate during simulation run time for model 3 | 146 |
| 4.19 | The line graph of bottleneck in assembly line supply buffer for | 149 |
| | model 3 | |
| 4.20 | The line graph of number of part entries in assembly line buffer | 149 |
| | for model 3 | |
| 4.21 | Bar graph of average part residence for transport system of | 151 |
| | model 3 | |
| 4.22 | Bar graph of part capacity of transportation during simulation for | 151 |
| | model 3 | |
| 4.23 | The line graph of transportation process performance for | 153 |
| | model 3 | |
| 4.24 | The line graph of transport utilization for model 3 | 153 |
| 4.25 | Warehouse output during simulation run time for model 4 | 157 |
| 4.26 | Part creation rate during simulation run time of model 4 | 158 |
| 4.27 | The line graph of bottleneck in assembly line supply buffer for | 161 |
| | model 4 | |
| 4.28 | Line graph of number of part entries in assembly line buffer for | 162 |
| | model 4 | |

| 4.29 | Line graph of transportation process performance for model 4 | 164 |
|------|--|-----|
| 4.30 | Line graph of transport utilization for model 4 | 165 |
| 4.31 | Bar graph of comparison number of parts and part in system | 170 |
| 4.32 | Comparison of warehouse output during simulation run time | 171 |
| 4.33 | Comparison of part creation rate in warehouse | 172 |
| 4.34 | Comparison of times performance in pickup point buffer | 173 |
| 4.35 | Comparison of parts performance in pickup point buffer | 173 |
| 4.36 | Line graph of comparison in assembly line buffer model 1 and 2 | 174 |
| 4.37 | Line graph of comparison number of parts entries in assembly | 175 |
| | line buffer model 1 and 2 | |
| 4.38 | Line graph of comparison of average part residence time for | 176 |
| | transport system | |
| 4.39 | The chart area of comparison transport process performance | 177 |
| 4.40 | The line graph of comparison of transport utilization | 177 |
| 4.41 | The bar graph of comparison number of parts and part in system | 179 |
| 4.42 | Line graph of warehouse output during simulation run time | 180 |
| 4.43 | Line graph of part creation at warehouse | 180 |
| 4.44 | Comparison of Time Performance in pickup point buffer | 181 |
| 4.45 | The pie chart of comparison number of parts entries at | 182 |
| | warehouse pick up point | |
| 4.46 | Comparison number of parts entries in assembly line buffer | 183 |
| 4.47 | Comparison of bottleneck in assembly line buffer | 183 |
| 4.48 | The bar graph of comparison part capacity to supply during | 184 |
| | simulation | |
| 4.49 | The chart of comparison of transport utilization | 185 |
| | | |

| 4.50 | Comparison number of parts and part in system between model 3 | 186 |
|------|--|-----|
| | and 4 | |
| 4.51 | Line graph of warehouse output during simulation run time | 187 |
| | between model 3 and 4 | |
| 4.52 | Line graph of part creation rate at warehouse between model 3 | 188 |
| | and 4 | |
| 4.53 | Comparison of time performance in pickup point buffer between | 189 |
| | model 3 and 4 | |
| 4.54 | Pie chart of comparison number of part entries at warehouse | 190 |
| | pickup point between model 3 and 4 | |
| 4.55 | Line graph of comparison of bottleneck in assembly line buffer | 191 |
| | model 3 and 4 | |
| 4.56 | Line graph of comparison of bottleneck in assembly line buffer | 192 |
| | model 3 and 4 | |
| 4.57 | Comparison of average part residence time for transport system | 193 |
| 4.58 | Comparison of Part capacity to supply during working hour | 193 |
| 4.59 | Comparison of transport process performance between model 3 | 194 |
| | and 4 | |
| 4.60 | Comparison of transport utilization between model 3 and 4 | 195 |
| 4.61 | Comparison number of part created and part in system between | 196 |
| | all models | |
| 4.62 | Comparison of warehouse output during simulation between all | 197 |
| | models | |
| 4.63 | Comparison of part creation rate at warehouse source between | 197 |
| | all models | |

| 4.64 | The comparison of time performance in pickup point buffer | 199 |
|------|--|-----|
| | between all models | |
| 4.65 | The pie chart of comparison part entries in transport pickup point | 199 |
| | for all models | |
| 4.66 | The comparison of average part residence time for transport | 200 |
| | system between all models | |
| 4.67 | The comparison of parts capacity to supply during simulation | 201 |
| | in all models | |
| 4.68 | The Comparison transport utilization between all models | 204 |

LIST OF APPENDICES

| APPENDIX | TITLE | PAGE |
|----------|--|------|
| А | Draft picture of measurement of plant layout of case study | 229 |
| В | Part positioning for the car model | 230 |
| С | Schematic diagram of current layout in case study company | |
| D | Drawing of new layout in case study company | |
| E | Schematic diagram of new layout in case study company | |
| F1 | Flow diagram of parts allocation and transport flows from | 234 |
| | old layout | |
| F2 | Flow diagram of parts allocation and transport flows from | 235 |
| | new layout | |
| G1 | From – to chart showing flowrate in old layout | 236 |
| G2 | From – to chart showing flowrate in new layout | 237 |
| Н | Simulation control language for model 1 and model 2 | 238 |
| Ι | Simulation control language for model 3 and model 4 | 244 |

xvii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| MHS | - | Material Handling System |
|---------|---|--|
| AGV | - | Automated Guided Vehicle |
| EMS | - | Electrical Monorail System |
| AS/RS | - | High Rise Storage Retrievel System |
| MH | - | Material Handling |
| MHIA | - | Material Handling Industry of America |
| RFID | - | Radio Frequency Identification |
| VMI | - | Vendor Managed Inventory |
| SADT | - | Structure and Analysis Design Technique |
| AMR | - | Autonomous Mobile Robots |
| FUMAHES | - | Fuzzy-Attributes Material Handling Equipment |
| ЈІТ | - | Just In Time |
| LIM | - | Linear Induction Motor |
| LCD | - | Liquid Crystal Display |
| WIP | - | Work in Process |
| PATH | - | Posture, Activities, Tools and Handling |
| MMH | - | Manual Material Handling |
| ANOVA | - | Analysis of Variance |
| HTA | - | Hierarchical Task Analysis |
| DoE | - | Design of Experiment |

xviii

| AMHS | - | Automated Material Handling System |
|------|---|--|
| DR | - | Dispatching Rule |
| DF | - | Degree of Freedom |
| SS | - | Sum of Square |
| MS | - | Mean of Square |
| F | - | Factors of the total deviation |
| Р | - | Null Hypothesis |
| RSM | - | Response Surface Method |
| PC | - | Polycarbonate |
| FMS | - | Flexible Manufacturing System |
| MESA | - | Manufacturing Enterprise Solutions Association |
| DPE | - | Digital Process Engineering |
| DPM | - | Digital Process Manufacturing |
| APMP | - | Assembly Process Micro-Planning |
| PSL | - | Process Specification Language |
| CAAP | - | Computer Aided Assembly Process |
| CAD | - | Computer Aided Drawing |
| TT | - | Tugger Train |
| OL | - | Old Layout |
| NL | - | New Layout |
| PL | - | Picking List |
| PTL | - | Pick-To-Light |
| m | - | meter |
| hr. | - | hour |
| SCL | - | Simulation Control Language |

xix