# Re-Shoring or Near-Shoring Concepts Should be Strongly Considered when the OEM's Goal is To Deliver Optimum Balance between Landed Cost and Time to Market

#### Brian Graham, Kimball Electronics

The old tactic of outsourcing to a low cost geography simply to deliver lowest cost direct and indirect labor was never a panacea supply chain solution. In fact, when evaluating solutions for lower volume and higher mix products typically found in the medical, industrial and public safety segments of the OEM market, IL & DL costs are only one subset of the total cost to land the product and service the ultimate customer. In this paper, there will be examination of what actual cost components should be included in a landed cost analysis, the soft costs that an OEM should consider to deliver outstanding performance in quality, logistics and delivery management of the supply chain solution. A detailed comparison using a "case study" will be presented to demonstrate a total landed cost option versus one that is focused on IL/DL cost. In addition, near-shoring options have developed over recent years initially for consumer oriented products such as cellular phones and printers with the goal of optimization of landed cost, ease of communication and avoidance of the typical issues that make an outsourcing only approach problematic. These include: different language and culture, long distances and different time zones, investing time and effort on establishing trust and the complexity these elements contribute to the development of long term relationships between an OEM and EMS partner. In summary, Near-shoring, when developed in partnership between the OEM and EMS provider can be a marketing differentiator for those clients who wish to set themselves apart by servicing their customers in the market close to "home".

### Case Study: Medical Product Company (MPC) changes strategy – Simple Model for evaluating off-shore manufacturing.

#### **Background:**

MPC a growing mainstream medical product company brings on new Vice President (VP) of Supply Chain Management (SCM) with proven track record in reducing cost of Electronic Manufacturing Services (EMS). In first quarter of their tenure, the VP delivers the following message to the Incumbent EMS companies: "Reduce costs or face losing the "lucrative" High mix Low volume Printed Circuit Board Assembly (PCBA) business to a low cost region." The SCM group of MPC selected potential suppliers and the Request for Quotation (RFQ) is sent out to several companies including the Incumbent. In Table 1 below, are the details of the basic model MPC employed for the evaluation.

Table 1. Mil C I Christianucu Cost mouch											
Part Number	Bill	Of	BOM markup	Value add	Total	Logistics	Landed				
	Material				Manufacturing		Cost				
	(BOM)	cost			(MFG) cost						
	(US\$)										
XYZ											
ABC											

Table 1: MPC PCBA Landed Cost Model

In addition to the model MPC sent with the RFQ were the following instructions: "The quote should be formatted with your best price using Incoterms of Ex-works. MPC will evaluate the submitted proposals using a landed cost model you may include logistics costs, however MPCs will substitute costs from our preferred logistics suppliers."

Undisclosed to the Incumbents and potential new suppliers were the following facts:

1) All products will be converted to be Restriction of Hazardous Substances (RoHS) Directive compliant by the industry mandated date (June 2014).

2) The supply chain was complicated with several suppliers that were single sourced, some suppliers with very high Part per Million (PPM) defect rate, and several parts on last time buy/obsolete/special prep/sourced through brokers.

4) MPC believes supplier collaboration only belongs in the development phase of a product's life cycle and all production relationships with the EMS to be black and white strictly to the letter of the contract.

5) MPC would offer the winning bidders a contract with very one sided terms, including a clause which forbid changing the manufacturing process once products were approved through a strict validation/qualification build. Suppliers must use a supplier process change request (SPCR) post qualification approval.

6) There will be a constant push down of responsibility from MPC to the EMS for material liability such as excess and obsolete inventory (E&O), pass through warranty support and resolution of quality issues with the suppliers that MPC mandates the EMS must use.

After their analysis MPC determined that they would split the EMS spend with 40% going to a new EMS in SE Asia; another 40% going to a new factory of one of the existing EMS also in SE Asia, and the balance (20%) to stay in North America with the same EMS. The VP declared an annual savings of \$2,500,000 in EMS spend and kicked off the transfer of product to the low cost regions.

Upon launch plan acceptance the supply chain management (SCM) organization and supplier quality engineering team (SQE) at MPC submitted the incremental budget outlined in Table 2 below, to support the 24 month process of transfer (no ROHS conversion costs):

			6				
Project #	Qualification	Travel	Headcount	Sales General	Our Time	Engineering	
			North	and	Over Time	Change	Total
			America	Administration	Cost	Order Cost	
1	\$20000	\$20000	2	\$200000	\$30000	\$15000	\$285000
2	\$30000	\$40000	1	\$100000	\$15000	\$7500	\$192500
3	\$40000	\$80000	2	\$200000	\$30000	\$15000	\$365000
Total	\$90000	\$140000	5	\$500000	\$75000	\$37500	\$842,500

#### Table 2: SCM and SQE Incremental budget for implementation at Low Cost Region

The EMS companies submitted the incremental ROHS conversion cost and carrying cost on the excess material (\$3,000,000) due to supplier Minimum Order Quantity (MOQ), Purchase Price Variance (PPV) for the last time buy, broker buy and counterfeit testing costs in an end of year roll up are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: E	MS Supplier	budget for <b>F</b>	RoHS conve	rsion and q	ualification fo	or Low Cost 1	Region Imple	mentation

Project #	ROHS (# of assemblies at cost per assembly)	Excess Inventory carrying cost	PPV last time buy	PPV Broker buy	Counterfeit testing cost	Total
1	15 @ 2500 ea. = \$37500	\$78000	\$15000	\$30000	\$3000	\$163500
2	15 @ 2500 ea. =\$37500	\$78000	\$15000	\$30000	\$3000	\$163500
3	5 @ 5000 ea. = \$25000	\$39000	\$7500	\$15000	\$1500	\$88000
Total	\$100000	\$195000	\$37500	\$75000	\$7500	\$415,000

While all the companies in this case study are staffed by professional PM and SQE personnel, there are soft support costs involved which will fall on the NA MPC and EMS professionals to execute. Consider the simple list which will not be considered for monetizing:

- Cultural differences and language/lost in translation communication challenges resulting in extra time to implement transfer.
- Time spent after normal business hours spent on conference calls to Asia or North America evenings and early mornings will be scheduled with frequent status calls and updates.
- ECO implementation just takes longer especially when complex requirements like traceability are required.
- HMLV is not an easy transition into SE Asia unless the EMS there already has perfected this process. MPC should review the project schedule to assure time for the SE Asia EMS to continuously improve cycle time until they equal the operational performance level of the veteran NA EMS HMLV process.

- Is MPC's IP really protected? If there is a breach what is the remedy?
- S & OP process is not in sync between the MPC and the EMS companies MPC is unable to maintain a fixed or frozen fence MPC demands late changes and is not willing to accept true liability costs. "EMS is damaging the relationship by playing hardball when it comes to collecting contract specified costs of excess."
- Lead time just went up 4 weeks for MPC using sea freight and air freight is getting more expensive each year from SE Asia. What is the real cost of safety stock and is the EMS covering it?
- How does MPC commit to an order inside lead-time? Load and Chase as they have no BI tools in position as of yet. The cost of a lost order could be calculated...

What is the next generation cost model going to include? Or should MPC simply calculate a payback period to see when the cost savings would pay for itself? Let us take a few more data points into consideration and calculate the payback period.

First, the VP wants to get the savings as soon as possible, however the implementation team will need a full 24 months to transfer the products and complete the RoHS conversions all the way through validation. The \$2,500,000 annual projected savings will occur at the following rate: 25% at the end of each 6 month window. Assuming that the costs are mostly project based and the post implementation annual recurring cost for supporting the South East (SE) Asia EMS is \$500,000. The payback period will be right around 18 months. See Chart 1 below for a visual image of the breakeven point. The real annual savings in year two will be \$1,625,000; for year three and beyond the savings will be \$2,000,000.



Chart 1: Breakeven point shown on Cumulative Savings Graph

This confirms the old adage that "there is no such thing as a free lunch."

Conclusion: a careful analysis of outsourcing options should include detailed savings, hard and soft costs of implementation when determining the relative fit for the organization. The author recognizes many companies use a specific ROI method with a threshold rate when evaluating options for outsourcing. The choice of the Payback period tool in the case study is the author's personal favorite!

#### Near-shoring Case study: Distribution in multiple regions of the world – is near-shoring a good option?

a) Build product 100% in low cost region and ship around the world, or

Data Product Company (DPC) a leading supplier of personal storage devices for retail consumption requires their new product to be shipped to distribution centers in North America (NA), Europe the Middle East (EME) and Asia Pacific (APAC). Annual volume forecast (total rolled up volume annually 10,000,000 units equally spread) will allow for one of two options –

b) Establish three regional solutions and near-shore shipping methods. Table 4 below shows the basic cost model. Table 4: Low Cost Region Model for DPC or Option a) Ave Bill of Total Logistics/unit Landed Part Number Material BOM Markup Value Add Manufacturing single Cost (BOM) (MFG) Cost location for all regions \$22.5 NA \$15 10% \$27.5 \$6 \$5 EME \$16 10% \$4 \$21.6 \$6 \$27.6 APAC \$14 10% \$3 \$18.4 \$8 \$26.4

Without a near shoring option DPC would have chosen the APAC solution. In Table 5 below, is the near shoring solution cost model for option b):

Table 5: Near shoring model for DPC of Option D)											
Part Number	ROM	BOM markup	Value add	Total MFG	Logistics/unit	Landed					
	DOM	DOW markup	value auu	Cost	Near shore	Cost					
NA	\$15	10%	\$6	\$22.5	\$3	\$25.5					
EME	\$16	10%	\$4	\$21.6	\$4	\$25.6					
APAC	\$14	10%	\$3	\$18.4	\$3	\$21.4					

#### Table 5: Near shoring model for DPC or Option b)

The significant savings of the near shoring model (\$2, \$2 and \$5 per unit respectively) made the near shoring model very attractive. However let us look at the costs and implementation.

There are four major commodities with this product – metals, plastics, PCBA and power supply. One minor commodity is the in-region packaging (with proper language, electronic users license agreement (EULA), etc. for each of the three regions) which also is a consideration. After review with the engineering and marketing team the specifications are finalized and the EMS partner sent out competitive bid requests to a listing of preferred suppliers in each of the three regions. Acceptable responses were received and processed confirming the budgeted pricing or in some cases with a slight variance +/- which are accepted by DPC.

The three facilities kicked off their validation and qualification builds and submitted to PDC for testing. After approval, POs were issued to the major vendors and production began with PCBA as the only commodity manufactured in a region outside of the near-shoring factory. This was a low cost strategy as the shipping cost from SE Asia for the small electronic component of the product was within the budget.

In this case study, the near shoring solution did in fact deliver the published advantages of greater ability to support increases in demand, rapid restocking of inventory in the retail and online retailers, lower landed cost and a healthier bottom line for the product, than a standalone low cost supply. There are some challenges that will potentially remain. Those include:

A) Disconnected Sales and Operation Plan (S & OP) process between the customer DPC and the EMS provider – further disconnected S & OP process between the EMS provider and the rest of the supply chain...

Result - increase in excess and obsolete inventory (E&O); Lost Sales & Lost Opportunities

B) Inability to leverage end to end visibility of the supply chain - can either DPC and EMS provider do a what-if within their Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems that adds value – can one of the two companies use it to correctly commit what the supply chain can deliver?

- C) Can DPC and EMS provider drive a cultural change to eliminate software spread sheets as the primary Supply Chain modeling tool? Simulation, collaboration and analytics together will be more effective than any spreadsheet software tool on its own.
- D) Supply chain risk identify it; assess it, prioritize it; quantify it; mitigate it then implement and TEST business continuity plans with the suppliers in the supply chain.

Measure the performance of the solution using Quality, Cost and On-time delivery. These should be easy to measure and of course be relevant to the business model. For DPC Quality could be measured as PPM with a low goal of <100; Cost could be measured as % reduction in each of the four main commodities quarter over quarter, with a goal of 1% reduction per each commodity group, and On-time delivery could be measured as either % or # of stock out per quarter. The goal is 100% or 0 respectively.

#### Conclusions

In almost all cases there are options for near shoring which when implemented to a high level of regionalization in the local supply chain can provide better end to end service and a more responsive solution for the ultimate consumer at a fair profit margin to the OEM and EMS provider.





# Re-shoring or Near-shoring Concepts Should be Strongly Considered When the Oem's Goal is to Deliver Optimum Balance Between Landed Cost and Time to Market

Brian Graham, BDM, Kimball Electronics, Inc. February 24, 2015







# The Question is: Who wins when OEM and EMS partner to deliver a Near-shoring solution?

### Answer: The Customer, OEM and EMS Partner!







## Case Study

### Medical Product Company (MPC) changes strategy – Simple Model for evaluating offshore manufacturing.



Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015













Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015

















#### Super Deluxe Landed Cost Evaluation Model

Part Number	Bill Of Material	BOM markup	Value add	Total	Logistics	Landed Cost
	(BOM) cost			Manufacturing		
	(US\$)			(MFG) cost		
XYZ						
ABC						







## Incoterms 2010 from Wikipedia

### EXW – Ex Works (named place)

The seller makes the goods available at his/her premises. This term places the maximum obligation on the buyer and minimum obligations on the seller. The Ex Works term is often used when making an initial quotation for the sale of goods without any costs included.

# EXW means that a buyer incurs the risks for bringing the goods to their final destination.

The seller does not load the goods on collecting vehicles and does not clear them for export. If the seller does load the goods, he does so at buyer's risk and cost. If parties wish seller to be responsible for the loading of the goods on departure and to bear the risk and all costs of such loading, this must be made clear by adding explicit wording to this effect in the contract of sale.

The buyer arranges the pickup of the freight from the supplier's designated ship site, owns the in-transit freight, and is responsible for clearing the goods through Customs. The buyer is responsible for completing all the export documentation. Cost of goods sold transfers from the seller to the buyer.



Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015







TECH [nowledgy] IPC APEX EXPO 2015





The **Restriction of Hazardous Substances Directive** 2002/95/EC, **(RoHS 1)**, short for **Directive on the restriction of the use of certain hazardous substances in electrical and electronic equipment**, was adopted in February 2003 by the <u>European Union</u>.



Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015



Commodity	Good	Bad or Ugly	History
Transformers		Х	Delamination PPM > 10,000
Semiconductors	Х		Demonstrated Quality
Capacitors	Х		Demonstrated Quality
Proprietary Device		Х	Last time buy 1-2012
Single Sourced Devices		Х	214 individual MPNs
PCB		Х	NA sourced \$\$
Through Hole IC		Х	Special step to form into SMD





Minimum Order Quantity – Impact

- High Mix with Low Volume PCBA
- Quarterly Demand 100 pcs to 500 pcs
- Many components are used across models
- MPC plans to move higher volume models to Low Cost Geography
- Most devices have MOQ of 5,000
- Result is Supply Chain designed Excess...







# Flexibility – see the Contract!

• By the way what can the EMS do to expedite...









### Supplier Process Change Request



- Never, Never, Never Change
- Without written approval and lots of validation testing







"Supplier should absorb as much of the liability as possible"



















### MPC's SCM & SQE Incremental budget for implementation at Low Cost Region

Project #	Qualification	Travel	Headcount	SG&A	Over	ECO Cost	Total
			Increase NA		Time Cost		
1	\$20000	\$20000	2	\$200000	\$30000	\$15000	\$285000
2	\$30000	\$40000	1	\$100000	\$15000	\$7500	\$192500
3	\$40000	\$80000	2	\$200000	\$30000	\$15000	\$365000
Total	\$90000	\$140000	5	\$500000	\$75000	\$37500	\$842,500





Three things are Certain:

- 1) Death
- 2) Taxes
- 3) Pay the Piper when you have to implement a low cost geography solution!





Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015



### EMS Supplier budget for RoHS conversion & qualification for Low Cost Region Implementation

Project #	ROHs (# of	Excess	PPV last time buy	PPV Broker buy	Counterfeit	Total
	assemblies at cost	Inventory			testing cost	
	per assembly)	carrying cost				
1	15 @ 2500 ea. =	\$78000	\$15000	\$30000	\$3000	\$163500
	\$37500					
2	15 @ 2500 ea.	\$78000	\$15000	\$30000	\$3000	\$163500
	=\$37500					
3	5 @ 5000 ea. =	\$39000	\$7500	\$15000	\$1500	\$88000
	\$25000					
Total	\$100000	\$195000	\$37500	\$75000	\$7500	\$415,000



















**Conflict resources** are <u>natural resources</u> extracted in a <u>conflict zone</u> and sold to perpetuate the fighting.<sup>[1]</sup> There is both anecdotal and statistical evidence that belligerent accessibility to precious commodities can prolong conflicts (a "<u>resource curse</u>"). **OEM must audit for and report usage of Conflict mineral resources - Traceability** is a requirement of Section 1502 of the <u>Dodd–Frank Wall Street Reform and</u> <u>Consumer Protection Act</u>.

For some Medial Products **component level traceability** requires the contract manufacture to manage the inbound material including retaining **certificates of conformance** from the approved component manufacturer AND have a system for **identifying the batch or lot number used on any one PCBA** 





Description	HIGH VOLUME	HIGH MIX LOW VOLUME = HMLV
Annual Volume	Tens of thousands to millions	Hundreds to a few thousand
Number of builds per year	Many to continuous	One to twelve or more
Number of change overs	Very few	Daily or many times per day
Manufacture focus	Line speed - highest volume achievable. Low variation in assembly - dedicated	Rapid change over & flexibility for large variation in assembly type







Can you protect your Intellectual Property???

#### At what cost in a low cost region??

How to verify IP is protected??



Upgrade Your **TECH** [NOWIEDGY] IPC APEX EXPO 2015

VS



MPC Sales and Operations Plan

Material availability















Business Intelligence (BI) tools – Run by Planning Specialists!!

What if –or-

What on earth!!

Lessons Learned:

Can you easily run the supply chain analysis to check available to promise???

Safety stock of PCBA or of Components

Who bears the cost??

Real return on investment of BI tools







### A More Detailed Landed Cost Model???

01	(1) (i)			-	10.15	sin.									
100	1000				100	6					10 10	10.00			
Den	e - Rosse	tion 88 (106.7)													
1.11	1.00	Contraction and the second									Core of				
				1.1	1.10	1.1	1.0				1.0		1.00		
			1.10	2	1.8	12	14	1.22	1.80		8	1.8	日春日	18.	1
			1.2	1.27	1.2	1.50	- B	2	1	1.00	1.1	1.20	1.2	- X.	2
			1.20	14.	1.61	1.2	1.	198	18.	18.	18.1	1910	121	18	1.90
			1.00	120	150	120	1.20	624	1000	- 2-	120	8.224	121	Sec	20
100	444	Investigated & Darks, Descriptions of and Mar-	1000	and and	100	100.00	and a	1.12		100	1.00	1.04			
1000	- Relation	Coulds to see CD thread research	1.50	1.00	0.05	10.00	0.00	10.00	10.00	4.00	4.00	11.05			
HO.	2.12	APL For Constitute a Submaniphism				1000				1000	1100				
	100	Characterial perturbation of hearing do	on 8.35.	1.25	4.24	3.24	1.76	1.26	14.34	3.36	2.25	1.35	1.00		
	1000	Garanaha ananyort with anachina ta	4.582	1.80	1.62	SA BE	1.00	(430)	1.144	4.80	1.60	11.26			
	10.0	Balances, Task Rult new that user 1	<b>6.33</b>	1.5.89	3.25	9.35	10.00	1242	3.24	3.24	2.25	2846.	19.29	9.90	
	100	Selection prevention is a prevention	ett. 7,300	1.000	1.00	1.589	1.00	4.86	4.000	4.88	4.90	-	4.00	1.0	
	100	exclusion for furniting as required.	1.80	1200	0.00	8.62	1.20								
	100	Serie Series for specification	1.50	10.00	1000	10.00	100	and a	Paris and	Sec.	Sec.	Sec.	and a	10.000	
		The second real second of the op-	1. 1. 1.	1.00	10.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	1.54	12.52	1.16	1.54	1.000	100	
	100	Repairing Chartening Streetworks	2.646	1996	1918	10.00	12.46	18.66	1.16	1.00	1.12	1100	10.000	6.66	
1.3	111	Additions to Bally App for Jone Had	a ditta P	in the second	ding)		1000								
1000	2.4.5	And little bottom and size	3.26	10.26	1.26	12.24	0.00								
	100	The extention in the and date and	6- 0 KZ	1.16	0.00	67 C	THE .								
	100	Talentum: Test automiting expirate	1.5.60	14.66	0.66	4.60	0.00	1.8.99							
	100	Belerium, Presetinged moseget	W 1.25	1.28	0.05	18.36	10.26	1.53							
	124	Web Barrows, TC, and DE up by 6	en 1992.	0.02	0.00								_		
100	100	Official header for the head had	(R. 1994)	1.8.89	18.96				1.00						
100	242	Autorogant Respirate & Calls on Bully	an a	Consta		1.00	in the	10.000	1.000	1.145	in the	4.44	Carlos .	10.00	in here
	100	Exception Test for Rendered State	1.1.1.20	1222	1.00	1.000	1000	1.00	12.55	1.00	10.00	10.00	1920	2.22	8.00
1.1	Sec.	Proven West Blands	19 3 Sec.	1.100	1.04	1000	1.00	2.246	1.000	1.00		2.00	Carlos .	1.00	
100	1000	Charts Scheduler without it institut	1. 1. 10	1.00	1.161	6.06	14.66	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	1.00	the set	10.00	10.000
	144	Set up high plan promotions	9.50	1.60	1.66	1.56	8.80	1.90	1.00	1.86	6.99	1.50	1.88	0.00	
	100	And up (hour IP address)	1.66	1.66	0.50	10.66	10.66	1.65	10.66	0.86	10.00	1.44	1444	0.00	
	1444	Beiley Results saying for the relian	as. 7.001	1.00	1.00.	1.89.	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.000	1.00	10.000	1.000	10.20	10.10
14	5.15	Realights Over Nexus Chaols	100		1.1				1222	1.1.1	12.11	1.10			
1.1.1	1000	Salt something for proper same take	电子路	1.8.26	1.18	18.08	18.79	28.89	19.09	8.94	1.26	346			
10.00	100	De R	1.00	1.100	1.1.16	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.000	1.00	9.00	12.00			
2.0	110	Biality of the Property of	10.00	Sec.	Sec.	1000	in her								
1.1	1000	Contract David Interesting	1222	1000	10.00	12.22	10.00								
	1.000	Charters in Resources Marriel Result	1.11	1.10	10.60	Cash.	1000								
	10.00	Constant of Designal Did Prov	3.95	1.64	0.65	0.00	0.02	1.00							
	1.1.1	Figure and what this is the loss of	1.00	1.00	10.00	0.00	2.22	10.00	10.04	0.00	0.00	1.00			
	12.5	Verify that and early services and been	1.6.66	10.64	0.64	10.00	3.94	1.44	9.69	0.94	0.99				
	100	Marriel Banta Creat	1.00	0.26	0.30	8.00	18.00	1.20	0.36	0.08	0.00	8.53			
1.0	510	Balte, Migration Stars Not In Frede	alles 1	1.1				1.1.1	1.1.1	1000		1.1			
1	11.5	- COMPANY STORE	1.00	1.8.95	3.94	2.00	1.00	1.64	1.8.80	. 8 94	8.68	1.00	4 10.1	10.000	1.00
100	100 100	A.A.A.A. Milett						1.00		-					
	Sec. A Sec.	ally .								1	and a little	1.1		10	10.00





Item	6 Months	12 Months	18 Months	24 Months	30 Months					
MPC SCM	-\$125,000	-\$125,000	-\$125,000	-\$335,000	-\$132,500					
EMS TOW	-\$125,000	-\$125,000	-\$125,000	-\$40,000	0					
SAVINGS	\$625,000	\$625,000	\$625,000	\$625,000	\$625,000					
TOTAL	\$375 <i>,</i> 000	\$375 <i>,</i> 000	\$375 <i>,</i> 000	\$375 <i>,</i> 000	\$492,500					
Cumulative	\$375,000	\$750,000	\$1,125,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,992,500					
Brook										

even

Total Cost to Implement \$1,257,500

Annual Maintenance cost \$500,000 NET Annual Savings \$2,000,000







Cumulative Savings Breakeven







- Review detailed requirements in SOW
- Factor Hard and Soft costs of implementation to show realistic savings
  - For both EMS and OEM
- Check the breakeven point
- Agree to a fair two way MSA

The End!!





Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015



Case Study Two: Distribution in multiple regions of the world – is near-shoring a good option ?













DPC analysis of Low cost Geography or Near Shore options!







One low cost manufacturing location and ship around the globe, or.....





Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015



Points of Distribution based decision – Near Shoring!!!









### Low Cost Region Model for DPC

Disty Center	Bill of Material	Bill of Material BOM Markup Value Add		Total	Ave	Landed Cost		
Location	(BOM)	BOM)		Manufacturing	Logistics/unit			
				(MFG) Cost	single location			
					for all regions			
NA (Mexico)	\$15	10%	\$6	\$22.5	\$5	\$27.5		
EME (Poland)	\$16	10%	\$4	\$21.6	\$6	\$27.6		
APAC (Nanjing)	\$14	10%	\$3	\$18.4	\$8	\$26.4		







### Near shoring model for DPC

Disty Center BOM		BOM markup	Value add	Total MFG	Logistics/unit	Landed Cost	
Location				Cost	Near shore		
NA	\$15	10%	\$6	\$22.5	\$3	\$25.5	
EME	\$16	10%	\$4	\$21.6	\$4	\$25.6	
АРАС	\$14	10%	\$3	\$18.4	\$3	\$21.4	







### We have a Winner!!!!

Disty Center Location	Low Cost Geography	Near Shore	Near Shore Savings per Unit
NA	\$27.50	\$25.50	\$2.00
EME	\$27.60	\$25.60	\$2.00
APAC	\$26.40	\$21.40	\$5.00





# Time to Pay the Piper Again

































Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015







Upgrade Your **TECH [NOWIEDGY]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015











Business Intelligence (BI) tools – Run by Planning Specialists!!

What if –or-

What on earth!!

Lessons Learned:

Can you easily run the supply chain to check availability???

Safety stock of PCBA or of Components

Who bears the cost??

Real return on investment of BI tools







### Better Supply Chain Modeling Tool than this???

0	•				10.03	No.		_							
100.0		Contraction of the local division of the loc		10.00	10.0					NO.	10.00	10.00	100		
Den	· - 69.59	tion #8 (106.7)									-				
		and the second							-		Sec. 1				
				1	1.10	1	1				1		1.1		
			1.1	2	1.2	1.2	12	1.4	1.8	1	- Ø	1.80	- 6 -	8.	1
			1.1	1.27	1.5	121	19.1	2.1		100	120	法要任	1.21	1.0	4.1
			-1.80	140	15	1.	1.	18	1.	1	12.1	125	121	1.1	18
			1.000	Sec.	14.0	ine.	100.00	1976	1.00	120	1.64	1.56	1.50	6.00	160
1.6	444	Secular I faits for should and M	Advention from	asked.	100		Cherry.	1.00		100	1.00				
	145.1	Mediate to pay CEVIDentiti respond.	1.50	0.00	0.05	1.00	0.00	10.00	10.86	4.00	4.00	12:25			
107	2.15	AP For Cristing a Robustistion													
	10.00	Characteristical generational out have the a	ALM 141	1.25	4.24	12.24	11.76	18.26	19.395	2.24	2.25	1.3%	1.30		
	1943	Generality analysist with admitted	<b>9</b> 9月月1日日	3.65	1.68	1.586	2.19	1.80	3.44F	4.82	1.00	1.26	Sec. 1		
	100	Balances, Tax Post new that use	28.3.25		1.20	1.00	10.00	1998	19.25	325	2.25	38.	19.29	8.95	
	100	personality prevention while the enterthering	100 T 100	1.000	12.22	12.22	10.000	1.4.00	4.000	4.00	4.000	-	1.00		
	100	and the first standard and the standard	1.12	12.00	10.00	10.00	12.20	1111							
	100	Relation. The standard of her to	100 C 100	1.20	12.00	10.000	12.26	10.00	10.00	10.00	16.04	16.00	10.00	10.000	
	100	Test sector tax hadres and other are	10.020	1.24	10.00	10.00	0.36	0.20	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.50		100	
	141	Beignium, Chant sign fine works	are 1.25.	1.26	1.04	0.00	1.26	14.35	0.36	0.56	1.25	1.26	1120	6.90	
1.3	141	Additions to Bally App for John Bil	ain (Che P	in the second	ding?		1.14								
	1.0	And fither betters and date	3.26	12.2%	1.20	12.24	4.96								
	192	The extention has and date as	66-34X	1.148	1.22										
	100	<ul> <li>Balacture: Test submitting explosit</li> </ul>	100 - 5 AV	1.000	3.50	19.90	2.00	1.8.991							
	100	<ul> <li>Selecture, Preserveged research</li> </ul>	10.125	0.25	0.25	10.36	4.25	1.20							
1	100	find through 1C, and DE or by	1998 - 1992) 1998 - 1992 - 1993	0.00	10.00										
100	100	<ul> <li>A de la contrata de la</li></ul>	0.4 0.04	2.00	1.00				1.00						
	TAX.	Sectors for her berefard at the		1.000	1.00	1.00	10.00	1.00	4.000	1.04	1.00	1.14	Courses."	10.00	10.000
	Contract of	Builty of Solar state institutes of \$1	and A life	12.00	1.00	10.000	Contraction of	1.000	14.36	1000	1.00	1.000	1.00	1.00	and.
1.6	515	Courty Nucl. Starts		1.12	1.100	Course of	a series	- Adda	1.1	1000	1.04	1.000	1000	1.00	12.27
1.27	2.6.6	Charle deletions whereas a prote-	abs 2.55	100	3.25	2.05	12.26	8.95	1.00	1.04	2.00	1.00	1.15	2.00	2.95
	10.0	Ref on the second sectors	9.30	1.50	1.94	1.8.86	1.00	14.90	1.00	1.10	1.99	1.96	14.88	9.00	
	1.000	And up (how if whites,	1.10	19.86	0.50	10.96	1,66	19.60	10.60	0.86	4.60	1446	1144	9.89	
	Tak	Belley Rysening Landing Rel Marchilly	1011, 140	53.0M	1.00	1.00	- <b>1.</b> (94)	1.10	C. 188	1.00	1,00	14,041	1.00	0.20	11.18
1.1	535	Realightie Gear Name Chaole	Sec. 1	Card I	Sec.	and the second	in the	10.00	and a	Sec.	1.00	1.10			
D Lab		and the second second second second	10.00	12.22	12.25	1202	12.22	12.02	12.02	2.00	12.22	1220			
10.0	100	Rearing of 1981 Researching	1.12	(1998) 1997 - State Barrison, 1997 - State B 1997 - State Barrison, 1997 - State B 1997 - State Barrison, 1997 - State Barrison, 1 1997 - State Barrison, 1997 - State Ba	Sec.	1.000	1997 - Series B.	1.00	1.000	1.00	1.000	10.00			
	123	Sature Stree 200	10.00	1.64	10.65	10.00	10.00								
	100	Configure Build answednes	1 2 3 5	1.22	8.25	2.2%	0.00								
	10.5	Charges to Balgance Mpril Bas	100 235	1.64	3.50	18.86	10.00								
	100	Constant of Second DE Paul	0.60	1.54	0.66	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.111	10.00		1.00			
	1.8.5	Figure and what him is the loss of	4 2.65	1.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	10.04	10.00	1.00	18.49			
	19.45	Wenty that and earliest raise and to	6-8, <u>8, 86</u>	1.11	18.84	10.00	12.98	13.45	19.69	1.94	0.99	1.00			
100	10.0	Marviel, Banta Drath	1.00	0.26	0.35	8.00	8.00	3.50	10.00	0.01	0.00	8.50			
1.0		manne. Wightenen berer Rief in Pres	Contraction of the local division of the loc	Contract of	10.00	Land.	Sec.	Same	10.00	Sec.	10.00	10.00	1.00	1.100	
	1912	and the second second				and the second	1.00	1.10	1.00	1.11	6.99	1.00		1.00	1000
100	D	A CALLER OF ADDRESS OF	and the second	Colores in	1.0000	and the second second	1000	a second		-				1.00	-
	1000									1.0	100.00	1000		10	10.00











# Simulation, collaboration and analytics = Victory over spread sheet modeling







Supply chain risk – identify it; assess it, prioritize it; quantify it; mitigate it – then implement and TEST business continuity plans with your Key suppliers









## **KPI Summary**

• Quality Incoming



• Delivery Performance



• Cost Performance







- Adequate volume for Near Shore solution to provide financial return
- Regional Suppliers for key commodities
- Run S&OP with BI tools
  - Simulate, Collaborate and Use Analytics
- Test Business Continuity Plans
- Deploy Q, C & D Metrics











**TECH [NOWIEDDS]** IPC APEX EXPO 2015



# **Thank You Very Much!**

# Questions???