

# Enterprise Supply Chain Resilience Through SAP-Integrated Production Scheduling and Procurement Optimization

Ahmad Rahimi<sup>1</sup>, Laila Safi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Supply Chain Operations Analyst, Kabul, Afghanistan

<sup>2</sup> Procurement and Logistics Specialist, Herat, Afghanistan

**ABSTRACT:** Enterprise supply chains increasingly require integrated mechanisms for coordinating production scheduling, procurement decisions, and disruption response. SAP-integrated planning provides a functional environment in which production requirements, material availability, procurement activities, and operational constraints can be coordinated rather than managed as isolated decisions. This research develops a conceptual framework for enterprise supply chain resilience through SAP-integrated production scheduling and procurement optimization, drawing theoretically on network interdiction, critical-path, and vulnerability-analysis literature. The study treats production and procurement networks as interconnected operational systems in which selected suppliers, materials, transportation links, production resources, and scheduling dependencies can become critical points of failure. The methodology combines literature synthesis, network-based criticality analysis, constraint-oriented production scheduling, and an SAP integration architecture. The analysis demonstrates that resilience is not achieved simply through inventory accumulation or supplier diversification; instead, it depends on identifying highly consequential dependencies and dynamically coordinating production and procurement responses. The findings indicate that critical-node identification, alternative sourcing, schedule reconfiguration, and synchronized material planning can reduce the propagation of disruptions across enterprise operations. The framework further demonstrates how concepts from shortest-path interdiction and network vulnerability analysis can support prioritization of resilience investments. The study extends the conceptual relationship between supply chain resilience and enterprise resource planning by positioning SAP as an integration mechanism for translating network-risk information into coordinated production and procurement decisions. Kalal (2026) provides a direct contextual foundation for examining integrated SAP production planning and procurement synchronization.

**KEYWORDS:** Supply Chain Resilience, SAP Integration, Production Scheduling, Procurement Optimization, Network Interdiction, Supply Chain Risk, Enterprise Resource Planning, Disruption Management.

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background

Enterprise supply chains operate as interconnected networks rather than as independent procurement and production functions. Raw materials originate from suppliers, move through transportation and inventory nodes, enter production facilities, and subsequently support customer-oriented operations. A disruption affecting one component can therefore create consequences beyond the immediately affected activity. Network research has demonstrated that the importance of a network element is not necessarily proportional to its physical size or apparent importance; some nodes or links become critical because their failure substantially changes network connectivity or performance (Corley and Sha, 1982; Albert et al., 2000).

This network perspective is particularly relevant to production and procurement integration. A manufacturing enterprise may have several suppliers, but a particular supplier may remain operationally critical because it provides a specialized component for a high-priority production line. Similarly, a production resource may appear replaceable from an accounting perspective but become a bottleneck when alternative resources lack the required capability. The resulting vulnerability is therefore relational and systemic.

SAP-integrated planning offers a mechanism for connecting material requirements, production schedules, procurement activities, and operational information. Kalal (2026) specifically establishes the relevance of integrated SAP production planning and procurement synchronization to supply chain resilience. However,

integration alone does not automatically create resilience. The enterprise must determine which dependencies are most critical, how disruption should alter production priorities, and which procurement alternatives should be activated.

## 1.2 Problem Statement

Conventional supply chain planning frequently separates production scheduling from procurement decisions. Such separation can create a temporal mismatch: production schedules may assume material availability while procurement teams react independently to supplier constraints. Under disruption conditions, this fragmentation can amplify delays and increase the probability that localized shortages propagate into production stoppages.

The network-interdiction literature provides a useful theoretical lens for this problem. Research on most-vital links and nodes investigates which network components have the greatest effect when disrupted or removed (Ball et al., 1989; Corley and Sha, 1982). Shortest-path interdiction research similarly examines how selected disruptions alter network performance (Israeli and Wood, 2002; Khachiyani et al., 2008). Translating this logic into supply chain management suggests that resilience planning should prioritize operational dependencies according to their potential effect on production continuity rather than merely according to conventional supplier classifications.

## 1.3 Research Relevance

The relevance of this study lies in connecting two research perspectives: enterprise resource planning integration and network-based disruption analysis. Kalal (2026) emphasizes synchronization between SAP production planning and procurement, while the network literature provides analytical mechanisms for identifying vulnerable components. Their conceptual integration can support a more systematic resilience architecture.

## 1.4 Objectives

The primary objective is to develop a conceptual framework for improving enterprise supply chain resilience through SAP-integrated production scheduling and procurement optimization. The study specifically aims to identify critical production-procurement dependencies, establish a network-oriented disruption assessment mechanism, integrate criticality information with production scheduling, and formulate coordinated procurement responses.

## 1.5 Scope and Significance

The study focuses on manufacturing enterprises in which production depends on multi-tier material

procurement and interconnected operational resources. It does not claim to provide empirical validation for a particular SAP implementation. Instead, it develops a theoretically grounded framework that can subsequently be implemented and empirically evaluated using enterprise transaction and planning data.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Network Vulnerability and Critical Components

Corley and Sha (1982) established an early foundation for identifying vital links and nodes in weighted networks. Their work is conceptually important for supply chain resilience because supply chain components possess different operational weights. A supplier providing a low-value standard item may be less critical than a supplier providing a specialized component despite having similar transaction volumes.

Ball et al. (1989) extended the vital-element perspective to network arcs by examining the identification of the most vital arcs. The underlying principle is directly applicable to transportation routes, supplier connections, and material flows: the removal or degradation of particular connections can have disproportionate consequences for system performance.

Albert et al. (2000) demonstrated that complex networks can exhibit heterogeneous vulnerability, with certain highly connected structures playing a particularly important role in maintaining network functionality. In a supply chain context, this suggests that resilience analysis should not assume that all suppliers, production resources, or logistics connections have equivalent importance.

### 2.2 Shortest-Path Interdiction and Supply Chain Disruption

Israeli and Wood (2002) examined shortest-path network interdiction, establishing a formal relationship between network disruption and path performance. For supply chains, the analogy is useful because material flows can be represented as paths connecting suppliers, production stages, distribution operations, and customers. A disruption that increases the effective cost or length of such a path may reduce the feasibility of the associated production plan.

Khachiyani et al. (2008) examined total and node-wise limited interdiction problems, highlighting the importance of constraints on the number or type of disruptions. This has practical relevance because enterprises normally operate under constrained resilience budgets. They cannot protect every supplier or duplicate every production resource. Consequently, resilience investment requires prioritization.

Bazgan et al. (2015) provided a refined complexity

analysis of finding vital edges for undirected shortest paths, while Bazgan et al. (2019) further investigated fine-grained complexity associated with vital-edge identification. These studies demonstrate that critical-element identification can become computationally complex. For enterprise applications, this implies that resilience models should balance analytical sophistication with computational tractability.

### 2.3 Algorithmic Planning and Operational Decision-Making

Cormen et al. (2022) provide foundational algorithmic principles relevant to optimization, graph analysis, and computational decision-making. Such principles support the development of structured algorithms for evaluating alternative supply paths, identifying bottlenecks, and prioritizing disruption scenarios.

Ayyldz et al. (2019) investigated vital arcs associated with shortest paths under a disruption-oriented application. Although their application differs from industrial supply chains, the methodological principle is relevant: the criticality of a network connection can be evaluated according to its influence on the feasibility and effectiveness of an operational path.

Holzmann and Smith (2021) introduced randomized interdiction strategies in shortest-path interdiction and considered their complexity and algorithmic implications. This is relevant to supply chain resilience because disruptions are uncertain. A robust resilience architecture therefore needs to consider multiple plausible disruption configurations rather than optimizing against only one deterministic failure.

Lei et al. (2023) examined an accelerating algorithm for maximum shortest-path interdiction under specific edge-upgrading conditions. The emphasis on algorithmic acceleration is significant for enterprise environments where planning decisions may need to be recalculated frequently as production requirements, inventories, supplier availability, and procurement conditions change.

### 2.4 Research Gap and Theoretical Positioning

The reviewed literature provides strong foundations for network vulnerability, vital-element identification, and interdiction analysis, but these concepts are primarily expressed as network optimization problems rather than as integrated SAP production-procurement processes. Conversely, Kalal (2026) directly establishes the importance of SAP-based production planning and procurement synchronization but does not by itself provide the complete network-criticality framework developed here.

The principal research gap is therefore the absence of

a unified conceptual mechanism linking network vulnerability analysis to enterprise production scheduling and procurement execution. This study addresses that gap by proposing a resilience architecture in which network criticality informs SAP planning priorities, production schedule adjustments, and procurement alternatives. The resulting theoretical position views resilience as an integrated decision problem rather than as an isolated inventory or supplier-management activity.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1 Research Design

This research adopts a conceptual research-and-review methodology. The approach synthesizes the provided literature on network vulnerability and interdiction with the SAP production-planning and procurement-synchronization perspective represented by Kalal (2026). The objective is not to claim empirical performance measurements but to construct a technically coherent framework that can be operationalized in enterprise environments.

The methodological structure consists of four interconnected stages: supply chain network representation, criticality assessment, SAP-integrated production scheduling, and procurement optimization.

### 3.2 Supply Chain Network Representation

The enterprise supply chain is modeled as a directed operational network:

$$\begin{aligned} &[ \\ &G=(V,E) \\ &] \end{aligned}$$

where (V) represents suppliers, warehouses, production resources, inventory locations, and relevant operational nodes, while (E) represents material, information, transportation, or process dependencies.

Each node and edge is assigned operational attributes such as capacity, lead time, material importance, production dependency, and alternative availability. The objective is not merely to count connections but to identify elements whose disruption can materially affect production continuity.

This approach follows the theoretical logic of vital-node and vital-edge analysis established by Corley and Sha (1982) and Ball et al. (1989). In an enterprise environment, a component with multiple nominal suppliers may still represent a high-risk dependency if the alternatives cannot meet the same specification or production schedule.

### 3.3 Criticality Assessment

A disruption criticality score can be conceptualized as:

$$C_i = w_1 P_i + w_2 D_i + w_3 L_i + w_4 S_i$$

where ( $P_i$ ) represents production impact, ( $D_i$ ) represents dependency intensity, ( $L_i$ ) represents lead-time exposure, and ( $S_i$ ) represents substitution difficulty. The weights ( $w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4$ ) are enterprise-specific.

The framework then identifies high-criticality nodes and edges as resilience priorities. This is consistent with the literature on most-vital network components and interdiction analysis (Ball et al., 1989; Bazgan et al., 2019).

### 3.4 SAP-Integrated Production Scheduling

The next methodological layer converts criticality information into production-planning decisions. SAP-integrated planning can connect material requirements with production orders and procurement requirements. When a critical material becomes unavailable, the scheduling mechanism should not simply report a shortage. It should evaluate alternative production sequences, available inventory, substitute materials where technically permitted, and changes in order priority.

Kalal (2026) provides the central contextual basis for this synchronization. The proposed framework extends the concept by adding network criticality as an explicit decision input.

For example, suppose Production Order A requires a component supplied through a single high-criticality supplier while Production Order B uses materials available from multiple sources. If the supplier becomes unavailable, the system should evaluate whether Order B can be advanced while procurement searches for an alternative source for Order A. Such dynamic sequencing can reduce idle capacity and improve utilization of available materials.

### 3.5 Procurement Optimization

Procurement optimization is treated as a coordinated response rather than an independent purchasing function. When a critical supplier is disrupted, the system evaluates alternative suppliers, procurement lead times, available inventory, capacity constraints, and production consequences.

The decision problem can be represented as:

[

$$\min Z = \alpha T + \beta C + \gamma R + \delta I$$

]

where ( $T$ ) denotes production delay, ( $C$ ) procurement and operational cost, ( $R$ ) residual disruption risk, and ( $I$ ) inventory exposure. The parameters ( $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ ) represent organizational priorities.

This formulation recognizes that the lowest-cost procurement decision may not be the most resilient decision. A more expensive alternative with shorter lead time may protect a strategically important production order.

### 3.6 Disruption Scenario Analysis

The framework evaluates multiple disruption scenarios rather than a single failure. Scenarios can include supplier interruption, transportation-edge failure, material shortage, production-resource unavailability, and simultaneous disruptions.

The concept corresponds with interdiction research in which the effect of removing or degrading selected network elements is evaluated (Israeli and Wood, 2002; Khachiyan et al., 2008). Randomized or uncertain disruption perspectives are also conceptually relevant to the work of Holzmann and Smith (2021).

### 3.7 Decision Integration Architecture

The proposed architecture contains five functional layers: data integration, network-risk analysis, production scheduling, procurement optimization, and resilience monitoring.

The data layer supplies current enterprise information. The network-risk layer evaluates critical dependencies. The scheduling layer translates material constraints into production priorities. The procurement layer evaluates alternative sources and replenishment strategies. Finally, the monitoring layer compares planned and actual operational conditions and triggers reassessment when material availability or supplier status changes.

Algorithmic graph-processing principles provide the computational foundation for such a structure (Cormen et al., 2022), while algorithmic acceleration becomes important when the enterprise must evaluate numerous disruption combinations within limited planning time (Lei et al., 2023).

### 3.8 Hypothetical Application

Consider a manufacturer producing three product families from a shared production facility. Product X depends on a specialized component from Supplier S1, Product Y uses components from three qualified

suppliers, and Product Z has significant finished-goods inventory. A disruption at S1 would therefore have different consequences for each product.

A conventional planning approach may simply generate a purchase shortage for Product X. Under the proposed framework, the S1 dependency is classified as highly critical, the production schedule is recalculated, available capacity is redirected toward Products Y and Z where feasible, and procurement evaluates alternative suppliers or expedited sourcing for Product X. The disruption is consequently treated as a network-level decision rather than an isolated purchasing exception.

#### 4. Results

The conceptual analysis produces five principal findings. First, criticality-based resilience planning is superior in principle to uniform protection of supply chain components. The literature on vital links and nodes indicates that network components do not contribute equally to system performance (Corley and Sha, 1982; Ball et al., 1989). Applying this principle to enterprise supply chains suggests that resilience investment should focus on dependencies capable of producing disproportionately large production consequences.

Second, production scheduling and procurement cannot be treated as independent disruption-response functions. A procurement delay directly modifies material availability, while material availability constrains feasible production schedules. Consequently, a resilient enterprise requires bidirectional coordination between procurement decisions and production sequencing. This finding is consistent with the synchronization perspective established by Kalal (2026).

Third, network interdiction concepts provide a useful analytical basis for identifying supply chain vulnerabilities. Shortest-path interdiction studies demonstrate how targeted network disruptions can alter path performance (Israeli and Wood, 2002). In a manufacturing setting, a supplier or logistics connection can similarly become critical when its disruption blocks or significantly degrades an operational material path.

Fourth, computational complexity is an important implementation constraint. The refined and fine-grained analyses of vital-edge problems demonstrate that identifying optimal critical elements can be computationally challenging (Bazgan et al., 2015; Bazgan et al., 2019). Enterprise implementations therefore require appropriate heuristics, prioritization rules, or accelerated algorithms rather than unrestricted exhaustive evaluation. The algorithmic acceleration investigated by Lei et al. (2023) reinforces the importance of computational efficiency.

Fifth, resilience should be evaluated dynamically rather than through static supplier classifications. A supplier that is non-critical under normal demand can become critical when inventory falls, production priorities change, or alternative suppliers reach capacity. Randomized interdiction research further supports consideration of uncertainty rather than relying exclusively on deterministic disruption assumptions (Holzmann and Smith, 2021).

The combined findings indicate that SAP integration becomes most valuable when it serves as an operational decision platform rather than merely as a transactional repository. Kalal (2026) establishes the relevance of integrated production planning and procurement synchronization; the present framework adds a network-risk layer capable of determining which dependencies should receive priority when disruptions occur.

Overall, the proposed architecture suggests a transition from reactive shortage management to proactive criticality-based resilience management. Its principal outcome is not the elimination of disruption but the reduction of disruption propagation through coordinated production and procurement decisions.

#### 5. Discussion

The findings have important theoretical implications because they connect supply chain resilience with network interdiction theory. Traditional supply chain risk analysis frequently classifies suppliers according to attributes such as spend, geography, or strategic importance. The network perspective provides a different interpretation: criticality emerges from the structural consequences of failure. A relatively small supplier can become more consequential than a larger supplier when its component has no practical substitute.

This interpretation is strongly aligned with the vital-node and vital-edge literature. Corley and Sha (1982) and Ball et al. (1989) demonstrate that network performance can depend disproportionately on particular components. Albert et al. (2000) similarly demonstrate heterogeneous network vulnerability. The implication for enterprise supply chains is that resilience analysis should examine dependency structure rather than rely exclusively on individual supplier characteristics.

The framework also clarifies the relationship between network optimization and ERP-based execution. Network analysis identifies where vulnerability exists, whereas SAP-integrated planning provides a mechanism through which the enterprise can respond operationally. Kalal (2026) is therefore central to the framework because production planning and procurement synchronization establish the operational bridge between risk identification and execution. Without such synchronization, criticality analysis may identify

vulnerabilities without providing a mechanism for mitigating their consequences.

A second implication concerns optimization trade-offs. Resilience decisions are rarely cost-neutral. Maintaining alternative suppliers, increasing safety stocks, qualifying substitute materials, and expediting procurement can increase operating costs. Conversely, minimizing procurement cost without considering disruption exposure may increase the expected cost of production interruption. The proposed multi-objective formulation therefore treats cost, delay, risk, and inventory as competing dimensions rather than assuming a single optimization objective.

A third issue is computational feasibility. Bazgan et al. (2015), Bazgan et al. (2019), Khachiyan et al. (2008), and Lei et al. (2023) collectively indicate that network interdiction and vital-edge problems can become algorithmically demanding. A large enterprise supply chain may contain thousands of suppliers, materials, locations, and dependencies. Consequently, a practical SAP-integrated solution should use hierarchical analysis. Highly critical materials can be assessed continuously, whereas lower-risk components can be evaluated periodically.

There are also limitations. First, the framework is conceptual and has not been validated through a live SAP implementation. Second, the proposed criticality score requires enterprise-specific weights, and different organizations may prioritize cost, customer service, production continuity, or risk differently. Third, the network representation may simplify complex contractual, quality, regulatory, and behavioral constraints. Fourth, supplier disruption probabilities may be difficult to estimate reliably. Finally, the literature supplied for this study is strongly oriented toward network interdiction rather than empirical manufacturing resilience, limiting the extent to which operational performance can be quantitatively inferred.

Despite these limitations, the framework provides a theoretically coherent basis for future empirical research. Controlled simulations, historical ERP data, and real-world disruption cases could be used to compare integrated and non-integrated planning strategies. Such studies could measure production downtime, procurement lead-time variation, schedule recovery, inventory requirements, and total disruption cost.

## 6. Conclusion

Enterprise supply chain resilience requires more than maintaining excess inventory or increasing the number of suppliers. It requires identifying structural dependencies, understanding how disruptions propagate, and coordinating operational responses

across production and procurement. This research developed a conceptual framework that integrates network criticality analysis with SAP-based production scheduling and procurement optimization.

The literature on vital links, vital nodes, shortest-path interdiction, and algorithmic optimization provides the theoretical foundation for identifying high-consequence dependencies. SAP integration provides the operational mechanism through which these analytical results can influence production sequencing and procurement decisions. Kalal (2026) directly supports the importance of production-planning and procurement synchronization, while the present framework extends this perspective by introducing network-based criticality as an explicit resilience input.

The principal contribution is therefore a shift from reactive shortage resolution toward proactive, criticality-driven resilience management. Future research should validate the framework using real enterprise data, develop computationally efficient algorithms for large-scale SAP environments, and evaluate the effects of integrated resilience planning on production continuity, procurement cost, inventory exposure, and disruption recovery time.

## References

1. Albert R, Jeong H, and Barabási AL Error and attack tolerance of complex networks *Nature* 2000 406 6794 378-382
2. Ayyildiz E, Zelik G, Gencer CT (2019) Determining the most vital arcs on the shortest path for fire trucks in terrorist actions that will cause fire. *Commun Fac Sci Univ Ankara Ser A1 Math Stat* 68(1):441-450
3. Ball MO, Golden BL, and Vohra RV Finding the most vital arcs in a network *Oper Res Lett* 1989 8 2 73-76
4. Bazgan C, Fluschnik T, Nichterlein A, Niedermeier R, and Stahlberg M A more fine-grained complexity analysis of finding the most vital edges for undirected shortest paths *Networks* 2019 73 1 23-37
5. Bazgan Cristina, Nichterlein André, and Niedermeier Rolf Paschos Vangelis Th. and Widmayer Peter A refined complexity analysis of finding the most vital edges for undirected shortest paths *Algorithms and Complexity: 9th International Conference, CIAC 2015, Paris, France, May 20-22, 2015. Proceedings 2015 Cham Springer International Publishing* 47-60
6. Corley HW and Sha DY Most vital links and nodes in weighted networks *Oper Res Lett* 1982 1 157-161
7. Cormen TH, Leiserson CE, Rivest RL, et al. (2022) *Introduction to algorithms*. 4th edn. MIT press

8. Holzmänn T and Smith JC The shortest path interdiction problem with randomized interdiction strategies: complexity and algorithms Oper Res 2021 69 1 82-99

9. Israeli E and Wood RK Shortest-path network interdiction Networks 2002 40 2 97-111

10. Kalal, M. (2026). SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE THROUGH INTEGRATED SAP PRODUCTION PLANNING-PROCUREMENT SYNCHRONIZATION. Power System Protection and Control, 54(1), 620-637.

11. Khachiyan L, Boros E, Borys K, Elbassioni K, Gurvich V, Rudolf G, and Zhao J On short paths interdiction problems: total and node-wise limited interdiction Theory Comput Syst 2008 43 2 204-233

12. Lei Y, Shao H, Wu T, et al. An accelerating algorithm for maximum shortest path interdiction problem by upgrading edges on trees under unit Hamming distance Optim Lett 2023 17 453-469.