International Journal of Next-Generation Engineering and Technology (IJNGET)
eISSN: 3087-4319
Volume03 Issue09 | Page No: - 01-07

Received: 30 June 2026, Revised: 19 July 2026, Accepted: 23 August 2026, Published: 01 September 2026

DOI: https://doi.org/10.55640/ijnget-v03i09-01

Event-Driven Intelligent Manufacturing: Autonomous Exception Resolution Using Multi-Agent Generative AI and SAP S/4HANA

Kwame Mensah[1], Ama Owusu[2]

[1] Generative AI Research Unit, Accra Intelligent Technologies, Ghana

[2] AI Systems and Automation Division, Ghana Digital Research Center, Ghana

ABSTRACT: Modern manufacturing systems increasingly depend on rapid detection and resolution of process deviations involving equipment condition, grinding performance, tool setting, process compensation, energy consumption, and production quality. Conventional enterprise resource planning systems can record such deviations, but effective resolution requires the integration of operational intelligence with enterprise decision processes. This research develops a conceptual event-driven intelligent manufacturing framework that combines multi-agent generative artificial intelligence (AI) with SAP S/4HANA to support autonomous exception resolution. The framework interprets manufacturing events, identifies the probable operational cause, coordinates specialized AI agents, evaluates corrective alternatives, and initiates controlled enterprise actions. The theoretical foundation is derived from the supplied literature on grinding-process modeling, dynamic verification, wheel life, tool deflection, dressing performance, compensation modeling, grinding ratio, and specific energy. These studies collectively demonstrate that manufacturing deviations are measurable, dynamic, and interconnected rather than isolated events. The proposed architecture therefore treats operational exceptions as event streams requiring contextual reasoning rather than simple threshold alarms. The study conceptually evaluates the framework according to detection accuracy, causal interpretation, response latency, decision consistency, process traceability, and human-governed execution. Findings indicate that multi-agent orchestration can provide a stronger mechanism for connecting process-level evidence with enterprise-level corrective actions than isolated monitoring or rule-based intervention. However, autonomous execution introduces important limitations involving data quality, model uncertainty, conflicting agent recommendations, authorization, explainability, and operational risk. The proposed framework establishes a research foundation for integrating intelligent manufacturing analytics with SAP S/4HANA-oriented enterprise execution while maintaining controlled autonomy.

KEYWORDS: Multi-Agent Generative AI; SAP S/4HANA; Event-Driven Manufacturing; Autonomous Exception Resolution; Intelligent Manufacturing; Manufacturing Analytics; Process Compensation; Predictive Decision-Making; Grinding Processes.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Manufacturing processes generate continuous operational information through equipment behavior, process parameters, quality measurements, energy requirements, tool conditions, and production outcomes. In precision grinding, for example, process behavior is influenced by grinding mechanics, tool deflection, wheel condition, dressing operations, compensation requirements, and energy consumption. The supplied literature demonstrates that these factors can be mathematically and experimentally investigated, establishing a technical basis for identifying deviations and understanding their consequences (Tönshoff, Peters, & Inasaki, 1992; Hou & Komanduri, 2003).

The increasing availability of enterprise and shop-floor data creates an opportunity to move from passive exception monitoring toward event-driven intelligent manufacturing. Instead of treating an abnormal measurement as an isolated alarm, an intelligent architecture can interpret the event within its production context, determine its likely cause, evaluate alternative interventions, and coordinate an appropriate enterprise response. The proposed approach is particularly relevant to SAP S/4HANA environments, where production, material, maintenance, quality, and procurement

processes can be represented as interconnected business transactions.

The conceptual foundation of this research is the integration of process intelligence with autonomous reasoning. The compulsory framework, Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, is used as a central conceptual reference for positioning multi-agent generative AI as an exception-management mechanism. Because no author or publication year was supplied for this reference, it is cited as (Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, n.d.) rather than assigning fabricated bibliographic information.

1.2 Problem Statement

Traditional manufacturing exception management frequently separates detection from decision-making. A sensor or process-monitoring system may identify an abnormal condition, while an engineer or planner determines its significance and decides how to respond. This separation becomes problematic when production processes are highly interconnected. A deviation in tool setting, for example, may produce profile errors that subsequently require compensation or process adjustment. Similarly, deterioration in wheel performance can influence grinding ratio, static force, and process efficiency (Kwak & Ha, 2002; Wei, Li, & Chen, 2018).

The central research problem is therefore how an intelligent manufacturing system can transform heterogeneous operational events into context-aware corrective decisions while preserving enterprise control and traceability.

1.3 Research Relevance

The relevance of event-driven autonomous exception management emerges from the dynamic nature of manufacturing processes. Grinding research has shown that process characteristics change according to tool condition, dressing, cooling and lubrication conditions, and other operating variables (Torrance & Badger, 2000; Wu, Li, & Yang, 2019). Consequently, a fixed rule may not adequately represent the causal relationships underlying every exception.

Generative AI provides an opportunity to reason over heterogeneous information, while multi-agent architectures provide a mechanism for decomposing complex decisions into specialized functions. The proposed integration with SAP S/4HANA extends this reasoning from analytical interpretation toward controlled enterprise execution. Such integration is consistent with the conceptual direction of the compulsory autonomous exception-management framework (Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, n.d.).

1.4 Objectives

This research aims to develop a conceptual architecture for event-driven intelligent manufacturing in which multi-agent generative AI autonomously interprets production exceptions and coordinates corrective actions through SAP S/4HANA. Specifically, the study seeks to establish a manufacturing event model, define specialized AI agents, integrate process-level evidence with enterprise context, establish a controlled decision and execution mechanism, and evaluate the expected benefits and limitations of autonomous exception resolution.

1.5 Scope and Significance

The research focuses on precision manufacturing scenarios in which process deviations can be represented through measurable technical indicators. The grinding domain is used as the principal analytical context because the supplied references provide evidence concerning process mechanics, dynamic behavior, tool deflection, wheel life, compensation, dressing, energy, and grinding ratio. The framework is conceptual rather than a claim of experimentally validated SAP deployment. Its significance lies in establishing an architecture that connects technical manufacturing knowledge with enterprise-level decision automation.

2. Literature Review

The supplied literature establishes a strong technical foundation for event-driven exception management. Tönshoff, Peters, and Inasaki (1992) position grinding as a process requiring systematic modeling and simulation. This perspective is important for intelligent exception management because an observed deviation cannot be interpreted effectively without understanding the process relationships that produce it. Hou and Komanduri (2003) further emphasize the stochastic nature of grinding, indicating that process variation must be considered when distinguishing normal variability from abnormal behavior.

Kurfess, Whitney, and Brown (1988) investigate verification of a dynamic grinding model. Their work is particularly relevant to event-driven systems because dynamic verification supports the principle that manufacturing intelligence should evaluate process behavior over time rather than relying exclusively on static thresholds. An exception-resolution agent can consequently examine event sequences, temporal patterns, and deviations from expected behavior.

Tool and geometric deviations provide another

important foundation. Peng, Dai, and Song (2016) examine tool deflection and profile-error control in helix-path contour grinding. Wei, Li, and Chen (2018) investigate tool-setting error compensation in large aspherical mirror grinding. Together, these studies demonstrate the relationship between process conditions, geometric deviation, and corrective compensation. For the proposed framework, this relationship supports the design of specialized agents capable of diagnosing error patterns and recommending compensation-related actions.

Wheel condition and process performance introduce another dimension. Kwak and Ha (2002) evaluate wheel life using grinding ratio and static force, while Torrance and Badger (2000) examine the relationship between traverse dressing of vitrified grinding wheels and performance. These studies suggest that equipment or tooling exceptions cannot be interpreted independently of historical process behavior. A wheel-performance agent could therefore combine current measurements with historical indicators before recommending intervention.

Wang, Wang, and Wang (2021) examine a time-dependent compensation model for roller CVC profile generation in precision grinding. This work strengthens the argument for time-sensitive exception interpretation because corrective parameters may depend on process evolution rather than a single observation. Wang, Lou, and Wang (2018) study grinding ratio in form grinding with White Fused Alumina wheels, further supporting the use of performance indicators for exception identification.

Wu, Li, and Yang (2019) investigate specific energy and G ratio under different cooling and lubrication conditions. Their findings conceptually reinforce the importance of contextual variables in interpreting manufacturing events. A change in energy consumption, for example, may not independently indicate a fault; it may reflect a change in lubrication or cooling conditions.

The literature therefore reveals a common theoretical pattern: manufacturing outcomes arise from interacting variables, and meaningful intervention requires contextual interpretation. However, the supplied studies primarily address individual process phenomena rather than an enterprise-level autonomous exception-resolution architecture. The research gap is consequently located at the interface between detailed manufacturing process intelligence and coordinated enterprise execution.

The proposed multi-agent approach addresses this gap by distributing interpretation among specialized agents while maintaining an orchestration layer for coordinated decision-making. The compulsory framework, Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, provides the conceptual basis for applying multi-agent generative AI to autonomous exception management (Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, n.d.). The present research extends this concept specifically toward event-driven manufacturing conditions informed by process-modeling and grinding-performance literature.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a conceptual design-science-oriented methodology. Rather than reporting a fabricated production deployment, the research derives an architecture from the relationships established in the supplied manufacturing literature and maps those relationships into an event-driven AI and SAP S/4HANA decision framework.

The methodology consists of five conceptual layers: event acquisition, event contextualization, multi-agent diagnosis, decision orchestration, and controlled enterprise execution. Each layer addresses a specific stage of exception resolution.

3.2 Event Acquisition Layer

The first layer converts manufacturing observations into structured events. Events may include abnormal grinding force, increased specific energy, declining grinding ratio, tool-setting deviation, profile error, excessive wheel deterioration, or compensation requirement.

An event is represented conceptually as:

E = {t, asset, process, parameter, value, threshold, context}

where t represents event time, asset identifies the relevant machine or tooling resource, process describes the manufacturing operation, parameter identifies the measured variable, value represents its observed condition, and context contains production and operational information.

The event-driven design is important because manufacturing exceptions are temporal. A single measurement may be insufficient, whereas a sequence of related events can reveal deterioration or causal progression.

3.3 Contextualization Layer

The second layer associates technical events with manufacturing context. For example, an increase in specific energy should be interpreted alongside cooling

and lubrication conditions because process performance can vary according to these factors (Wu, Li, & Yang, 2019). Similarly, a profile error may require consideration of tool deflection and compensation history (Peng, Dai, & Song, 2016).

The contextualization engine therefore combines current events with historical measurements, equipment state, production order information, material conditions, process parameters, and previous corrective actions. This prevents an AI agent from interpreting a technical signal independently of its operating environment.

3.4 Multi-Agent Intelligence Layer

The core of the proposed architecture is a group of specialized AI agents coordinated by an orchestration agent.

A Detection Agent identifies significant deviations and classifies their severity.

A Process Diagnosis Agent analyzes relationships among process variables. In a grinding application, it can examine evidence related to grinding mechanics, wheel performance, energy, and process dynamics (Hou & Komanduri, 2003; Tönshoff, Peters, & Inasaki, 1992).

A Tool and Compensation Agent evaluates deviations involving tool setting, tool deflection, geometric error, and corrective compensation. Theoretical inputs are derived from Peng, Dai, and Song (2016), Wei, Li, and Chen (2018), and Wang, Wang, and Wang (2021).

A Wheel Performance Agent evaluates wheel life, dressing effects, grinding ratio, and static-force-related indicators using the supplied literature (Kwak & Ha, 2002; Torrance & Badger, 2000).

An Energy and Condition Agent interprets specific-energy deviations in relation to operating conditions, including cooling and lubrication variables (Wu, Li, & Yang, 2019).

An Enterprise Impact Agent evaluates how a technical exception may affect production orders, material availability, scheduling, quality, maintenance, and downstream operations.

Finally, an Orchestrator Agent synthesizes the outputs, resolves conflicts, assigns confidence levels, and determines whether an action can be executed automatically or requires human authorization. This multi-agent organization reflects the conceptual principle of autonomous exception management through coordinated generative AI (Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, n.d.).

3.5 SAP S/4HANA Integration Model

SAP S/4HANA functions as the enterprise execution and transaction context rather than merely a data repository. When an exception is validated, the framework maps the recommended intervention to an appropriate enterprise action.

For example, a suspected tooling deterioration event may trigger an analytical recommendation for inspection. If confidence is high and authorization policies permit automated action, the system could initiate a maintenance-related workflow. A production-impacting exception could instead generate a planning recommendation, while a quality deviation could initiate controlled quality-management procedures.

The architecture therefore separates reasoning from execution. AI agents generate and evaluate recommendations, whereas enterprise controls determine whether those recommendations can be implemented. This separation is essential because autonomous intelligence should not automatically imply unrestricted transaction authority.

3.6 Decision-Confidence Model

A conceptual decision score can be represented as:

$$D = w_1C + w_2H + w_3P + w_4I - w_5R$$

where C is diagnostic confidence, H represents historical consistency, P represents process-model consistency, I represents expected operational impact, and R represents execution risk.

High-confidence, low-risk decisions can be candidates for autonomous execution. Medium-confidence decisions should receive human validation, while low-confidence or high-risk decisions should remain recommendations.

This mechanism directly addresses a central limitation of generative AI: plausible reasoning does not necessarily imply correct reasoning. Autonomous execution therefore requires confidence and governance controls rather than unrestricted generation.

3.7 Exception-Resolution Workflow

The proposed workflow begins when a manufacturing event is detected. The event is contextualized, relevant agents are activated, and each agent independently evaluates the evidence within its specialized domain. The orchestrator then compares the agent outputs and determines whether the evidence converges on a common diagnosis.

For example, a rising energy signal combined with deteriorating grinding ratio and altered cooling conditions should not immediately be interpreted as

machine failure. The energy agent may identify process-condition effects, while the wheel-performance agent evaluates tooling deterioration. Their combined evidence can produce a more defensible recommendation than either signal alone.

The system subsequently evaluates alternative actions, estimates enterprise consequences, applies authorization policies, and records the reasoning chain. The resulting action or recommendation is then returned to the manufacturing and enterprise environment. This closed-loop mechanism corresponds to the autonomous exception-management orientation of the compulsory framework (Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, n.d.).

4. Results

The conceptual evaluation indicates that the proposed architecture produces five principal findings.

First, event contextualization is more suitable than isolated threshold detection for complex manufacturing exceptions. The supplied literature repeatedly demonstrates dependencies among process variables. Grinding behavior is dynamic and stochastic, while tool deflection, wheel performance, dressing, compensation, and energy consumption influence manufacturing outcomes (Hou & Komanduri, 2003; Tönshoff, Peters, & Inasaki, 1992). Consequently, exception identification should incorporate temporal and contextual evidence.

Second, multi-agent specialization provides a logical mechanism for decomposing manufacturing diagnosis. Tool-setting errors and profile deviations require different analytical considerations from wheel-life or energy-related deviations. The specialization demonstrated in the proposed architecture reflects the differentiated technical relationships identified in the literature (Peng, Dai, & Song, 2016; Wei, Li, & Chen, 2018; Kwak & Ha, 2002; Wu, Li, & Yang, 2019).

Third, autonomous exception resolution becomes more defensible when AI reasoning is separated from transaction execution. The architecture allows generative AI to interpret events and formulate corrective alternatives while SAP S/4HANA-oriented governance determines whether the proposed action is authorized. This reduces the risk of directly converting uncertain AI outputs into irreversible enterprise actions.

Fourth, historical and time-dependent information is critical to reliable intervention. Wang, Wang, and Wang (2021) demonstrate the relevance of time-dependent compensation, while Kurfess, Whitney, and Brown (1988) emphasize dynamic model verification. These principles support the framework's use of event sequences rather than single observations.

Fifth, the primary contribution is architectural rather than merely algorithmic. The framework connects shop-floor evidence, specialized generative AI reasoning, multi-agent orchestration, confidence evaluation, and enterprise execution. Its value consequently lies in reducing the separation between manufacturing diagnosis and enterprise response. However, these findings remain conceptual because the study does not provide experimental measurements from an operational SAP S/4HANA implementation.

5. Discussion

The findings suggest that event-driven intelligent manufacturing should be understood as an integration problem rather than solely an AI-model problem. Manufacturing intelligence becomes operationally valuable only when technical evidence can be translated into decisions that are consistent with production objectives and enterprise constraints. The literature provides substantial evidence that manufacturing deviations emerge from interacting and time-dependent process variables. Grinding mechanics, wheel behavior, dressing, tool deflection, compensation, and energy conditions cannot always be interpreted independently (Tönshoff, Peters, & Inasaki, 1992; Torrance & Badger, 2000; Peng, Dai, & Song, 2016).

The proposed multi-agent structure addresses this complexity by distributing analytical responsibilities. This has a theoretical advantage over a monolithic AI agent because domain-specific agents can preserve specialized reasoning boundaries. A tool-compensation agent, for example, can focus on geometric and tool-related evidence, while an energy agent considers process-condition effects. The orchestrator can then compare their conclusions rather than relying on one generalized interpretation. This is consistent with the conceptual direction of autonomous exception management in SAP S/4HANA (Multi-Agent Generative AI Framework for Autonomous Exception Management in SAP S/4HANA Manufacturing, n.d.).

A major practical implication is improved response coordination. Conventional exception management may identify a problem but leave the subsequent response dependent on manual interpretation. In the proposed framework, detection, diagnosis, recommendation, authorization, and execution form a connected decision chain. This can potentially reduce response latency, particularly for recurring exceptions whose diagnostic patterns are well understood.

However, autonomy creates a fundamental trade-off between speed and control. A highly autonomous system may respond quickly but could propagate an incorrect diagnosis into production transactions. A highly restrictive system may preserve control but eliminate much of the benefit of autonomous reasoning. The

proposed confidence-based execution model addresses this tension by differentiating between low-risk autonomous actions and high-risk human-approved decisions.

Another limitation concerns data quality. Generative AI cannot compensate reliably for incomplete, inconsistent, or incorrectly contextualized manufacturing data. The stochastic character of grinding described by Hou and Komanduri (2003) also indicates that variability should not automatically be treated as failure. Consequently, the framework requires carefully designed baselines and contextual thresholds.

Model explainability is another important limitation. Multi-agent systems can produce several plausible interpretations, and disagreement among agents may itself become an exception requiring escalation. The orchestrator should therefore preserve evidence, confidence, alternative hypotheses, and decision rationale rather than presenting only a final recommendation.

Finally, the framework should not be interpreted as evidence that all manufacturing exceptions can or should be autonomously resolved. The supplied literature primarily concerns manufacturing-process behavior rather than enterprise AI deployment. Therefore, empirical validation remains necessary. Future implementation studies should measure detection precision, false-positive rates, decision latency, corrective-action success, production disruption, and human override frequency before autonomous execution is introduced at scale.

6. Conclusion

This research proposed an event-driven intelligent manufacturing architecture that integrates multi-agent generative AI with SAP S/4HANA-oriented enterprise execution for autonomous exception resolution. The framework is grounded in the supplied literature demonstrating that manufacturing deviations are influenced by dynamic, stochastic, and interconnected process conditions.

The principal contribution is the integration of event contextualization, specialized AI agents, multi-agent orchestration, confidence-based decision control, and enterprise execution. Rather than treating an exception as an isolated alarm, the proposed architecture interprets it as a contextual event requiring diagnosis, impact assessment, and controlled intervention.

The framework also establishes an important boundary between AI reasoning and enterprise execution. Generative AI can support diagnosis and recommendation, but autonomous action should remain governed by confidence, operational risk, authorization, and traceability. This approach provides a more defensible pathway toward intelligent manufacturing than unrestricted automation.

Future research should validate the framework using real manufacturing event streams and SAP S/4HANA transaction environments. Experimental evaluation should focus on diagnostic accuracy, response time, agent agreement, false-positive reduction, human intervention requirements, and measurable production benefits. Particular attention should also be given to explainability, governance, data quality, and safe escalation mechanisms. Such validation could transform the proposed conceptual architecture into a measurable operational framework for autonomous manufacturing exception management.

References

1. Hou ZB, Komanduri R. On the Mechanics of the grinding process-Part I. stochastic nature of the grinding process. International Journal of Machine Tools and Manufacture 2003;43(15):1579-93

2. Kurfess TR, Whitney DE, Brown ML. Verification of a dynamic grinding model. Journal of Dynamic Systems, Measurement, and Control 1988; 110(4):403-9.

3. Kwak JS, Ha MK. Evaluation of wheel life by grinding ratio and static force. KSME International Journal 2002;16(9):1072-77.

4. Peng Y, Dai Y, Song C. Tool deflection model and profile error control in helix path contour grinding. International Journal of Machine Tools and Manufacture 2016;111:1-8.

5. Torrance AA, Badger JA. The relation between the traverse dressing of vitrified grinding wheels and their performance. International Journal of Machine Tools and Manufacture 2000; 40(12):1787-1811.

6. Tönshoff HK, Peters J, Inasaki I. Modelling and Simulation of Grinding Processes. CIRP Annals 1992;41(2):677-88.

7. Wang C, Wang D, Wang L. The development of time-dependent compensation model for roller CVC Profile generation in precision grinding. The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 2021;114(5-6):1671-84.

8. Wang JM, Lou DY, Wang J. The study on grinding ratio in form grinding with White Fused Alumina (WA) grinding wheels. IOP Conference Series:Materials Science and Engineering 2018;317:012006.

9. Wei X, Li B, Chen L. Tool setting error compensation in large aspherical mirror grinding. The

International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 2018;94(9-12):4093-4103.

10. Wu W, Li C, Yang M. Specific energy and G ratio of grinding cemented carbide under different cooling and lubrication conditions. The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology 2019;105(1-4):67-82.

11. M. Kalal, "Predictive Production Planning in Advanced Manufacturing Using SAP PP and Analytics," 2026 5th International Conference on Sentiment Analysis and Deep Learning (ICSADL), Birendranagar, Nepal, 2026, pp. 1363-1370, doi: 10.1109/ICSADL67539.2026.11452022.