Optimizing the Request for Quotation process with machine learning-based connector clustering

Alexander Lemmens

Master of Electronics and ICT Engineering Technology





Figure 1: wire harness [2]

Connectors are essential parts of a wire harness because they are **weak points** in systems, can be made with **high-profit margins**, and are **complex parts**, including 123 characteristics [3]. A connector is illustrated in Figure 2.

Yazaki is a global automotive supplier to all of the major Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs).

An OEM can require particular parts, like **wire harnesses**. A wire harness in the automotive industry assembles different components such as cables, terminals, **connectors**, etc. [1], [2]. A wire harness is shown in Figure 1.



Recent studies show that **time restrictions** are becoming more important during the RfQ response process. The methods now used process the data **manually**, meaning that interchangeable connectors must be found by manually searching the available databases. This results in long lead times and a disruption of the day-to-day schedule, which causes delays in current business [4].

The main objective of this thesis is **to find similar connectors** based on their characteristics to **speed up the RfQ process** using machine learning-based clustering methods.

However, before using clustering techniques, this thesis aims to **create preprocessed datasets** to optimize the grouping results and performances. Different clustering techniques will be applied to the preprocessed dataset and **compared** to investigate which ones are best for grouping the connectors based on their characteristics without knowing the type of connectors.



Figure 2: connector [11]

The requirements are communicated using the **Request for Quotation** (RfQ) process. The supplier then reacts to it with a response [3]. This response consists of a technical and commercial offer. The technical part consists of the product requirements, and the commercial part consists of the price, annual volumes, etc. Because of this, clear specifications are necessary **for accurate pricing and component selection** [4].



Figure 4: K-means clustering

Figure 4 validates that the results of the K-means algorithm produce clusters of **the same shape and size** due to how the algorithm works. It also doesn't handle noise, forcing data points to clusters it may not belong to.

Figure 5 demonstrates that DBSCAN has identified nine clusters and a group called noise. Contrary to the similar size and shape in the K-means results, it identifies clusters of **different densities and shapes**. This gives more insights into datasets with more **complex structures** and **high dimensions**.



Figure 5: DBSCAN clustering



Figure 6 shows that most of the data points lie in the center of the plot after grouping the connectors using GMM. The clusters are **more compact** compared to the results of K-means and DBSCAN.

Figure 6: GMM clustering

Figure 7 illustrates the confusion matrix of the **best-performing approach**, namely K-means, without standardizing the data, without adding weights, using the average values of the connectors per type as the initial center, and handling the outliers. The accuracy of this method is **62%**, and Figure 9 shows the plot of this approach.

1		Canal I																
			_	- T. I				1.5			9	-	1.4			100		141
			10			1.				(14)	1		4		100			
						147	1	1.1	1.			1	10				100	
-		-					1		÷.		140	-	06	16	- 10	1.00		142
				100		220	-			1.00							10.1	
		+	-	100	1	+		10-7	100	100		1		14				240
	101-0-0					1		690	-	14					+	-	1.60	1.4
	-			100						10						10		1.00
8.0		4.0	-	1963		- +	141			4.	14	10	11					14
×	-			4	14		14		1.4.1			-	14	14	1	141	1	14
			-			+	140	1.0	1	14.	10	640	4.	÷.	- 43			
	-	10	-						1				200			100		
			÷.	1							100	1	- 8	1.1		(4)		
		+	-	167				1.	1	1.		-	167		1.00	-		
	-		10		1.0		1.00	1.1		140						-	-	
	tine -	10			-	10			1.00		160	1	14.1	1.0	160		180	
-			÷.	10			1.00		1	1.00		12				18	1.0	
		10	4		4	4		. 6				4	4					-

Figure 7: Validation of bestperforming approach

Figure 8 illustrates the **third round of clustering** by **combining** the Kmeans and DBSCAN results. This approach is **successful** because it is tested with information from Yazaki.

Results

Another objective is to suggest a clustering approach using the K-means method specifically to group wire harness connectors, using **additional information** about the connector types to validate and compare various approaches.

Finally, this study aims to find the **advantages and limitations** of the suggested approaches and discusses **feature work** to improve these suggestions.

The methodology to achieve the objectives is split into three parts: **data preprocessing**, **machine learning clustering**, and **validation and testing**.

Data preprocessing involves cleaning, reducing, and transforming the data to enhance quality. Figure 3 shows a visual overview of the preprocessing steps used. Data cleaning consists of handling outliers and missing values. Data reduction aims to reduce the form of the dataset while maintaining its essential features, including feature selection and dimensionality reduction. Data transformation will change the dataset's structure, so it becomes appropriate for clustering methods using normalization, standardization, and encoding categorical values.



Figure 3: Classification of data preprocessing techniques [7]





The machine learning clustering part of the methodology involved **unsupervised** learning containing **K-means clustering**, **balanced K-means** clustering, the **Gaussian Mixture Model** (GMM), and **Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise** (DBSCAN). These methods were performed on a dataset of approximately 6,500 connectors without true labels. Additionally, **supervised clustering** was performed on a dataset of 1020 connectors with true labels to **optimize** the K-means clustering method to group the connectors into 17 groups. Finally, to identify the most similar connectors based on their characteristics and find interchangeable connectors, the K-means and DBSCAN methods were **combined**.

Figure 9: Best performing approach

1

P. Director Assertation Table Add Concentration Table Add Concentration Control Concentration And Add Concentration And Concentration and Address Concentration and Address Concentration and Concentration (Concentration) (Concentration)



Figure 8: DBSCAN results for MOST connectors



For the dataset of 6,500 connectors without true labels, it was shown that DBSCAN identifies clusters of different shapes and densities better than K-means. The plots of the results after using GMM demonstrated that the clusters are more compact compared to K-means and DBSCAN. The second part of the thesis used the dataset of 1020 connectors, which included true labels. Here, the best-found approach was the K-means method, without standardizing the data, without adding weights, using the average values of the connectors per type as the initial center, and handling the outliers gives the best performance of K-means in terms of confusion matrices and the silhouette scores. Finally, the most similar connectors of the MOST connector group were successfully found.

Conclusion

Supervisors / Co-supervisors / Advisors: Rosa Rocha and Prof. Nikolaos Tsiogkas

 [1] Y. Corporation, "YAZAKI Corporation," YAZAKI Corporation. https://www.yazaki-group.com/en/ (accessed Mar. 23, 2024).
[2] L. Chen, "Automotive Wire Harness Connectors: An ultimate guide on wiring connectors for automotive applications," Wire Harness and Cable Assemblies Manufacturer - Cloom, Sep. 27, 2022. https://www.wiringo.com/automotive-wire-harness-connectors. html (accessed Mar. 23, 2024).
[3] "Degradation of road tested automotive connectors," IEE Journals & Magazine | IEEE Suplore, BAR. 01, 2000. https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=833055 (accessed Mar. 26, 2024).
[4] Car - centre for automotive research, "The strategic value of information in the RFQ respons process," Center for Automotive Research, Aug. 2007.



De opleiding industrieel ingenieur is een gezamenlijke opleiding van UHasselt en KU Leuven

