Vol. 01, No. 01/2026

Engineering Intelligence Journal

Systematic Integration of Industry 4.0 Technologies and Key Performance Indicators for Resilient Supply Chains

Julia Golubeva [1,*]

[1] Department of Information and Robotechnic Systems, Belgorod State University, Belgorod, 308015, Russia

E-mail (corresponding author): golubeva.julivgt@inbox.ru

Received: March 01, 2026 – Revised: June 07, 2026 – Accepted: June 18, 2026

Abstract

In an era characterized by unprecedented global volatility, this research investigates the strategic emergence of "Resilient Supply Chain 4.0"—a framework necessitating the systematic integration of Industry 4.0 (I4.0) technologies to fortify organizational stability. While traditional supply chain models prioritize lean efficiency, the contemporary landscape demands a transition toward "smart" resilience to mitigate both external shocks (pandemics, geopolitical conflicts) and internal vulnerabilities (equipment malfunctions, information failures). Utilizing a dual-stage methodology—comprising a non-systematic literature review of theoretical foundations and a systematic analysis of 133 scholarly works—this study deconstructs the causal linkage between technological adoption and quantifiable resilience. A primary finding of this research underscores that I4.0 technologies—such as the Internet of Things (IoT), Big Data Analytics (BDA), and Blockchain (BC)—do not exert a direct impact on supply chain resilience (SCRes). Instead, they function as critical enablers for fourteen constituent elements of resilience, including agility, visibility, and flexibility. By mapping these technological enablers to specific Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), such as Time to Recovery (TTR) and Inventory Velocity, the study provides a strategic roadmap for measuring the Return on Investment (ROI) of digital transformation. The report concludes that a KPI-driven approach is a prerequisite for organizations to transcend disruptions and prepare for the human-centric, value-driven paradigm of Industry 5.0.

Keywords: Resilience;Industry 4.0;Internet of Things; Big Data Analytics; Blockchain

Engineering Intelligence Journal

1. Introduction

The modern logistical landscape is currently navigating a period of heightened "VUCA" (Volatility, Uncertainty, Complexity, Ambiguity). This environment is defined by an increasing frequency of external risks—unavoidable environmental or environmental shocks such as global pandemics and natural disasters—and internal risks, ranging from information system failures and data loss to management coordination lapses. To survive these stressors, the traditional supply chain must undergo a metamorphosis into "Supply Chain 4.0."

The core concepts of this transformation originated with the 2011 German Working Group, which defined Industry 4.0 as the impact of innovative digital systems on manufacturing and the broader value chain. This "Smart" transition is characterized by the acquisition of three pillars: connectivity, intelligence, and automation. By digitalizing functional domains—resulting in Logistics 4.0, Procurement 4.0, and Manufacturing 4.0—organizations can achieve a level of situational awareness previously unattainable.

The "Resilience Imperative" suggests that efficiency alone is no longer a viable competitive advantage. Unlike traditional models, a Resilient Supply Chain 4.0 focuses on the adaptive capacity to restore operations post-disruption. The objective of this paper is to bridge the existing gap between raw technological adoption and quantifiable resilience outcomes, illustrating how digital enablers translate into organizational stability through a structured, KPI-driven methodology.

2. Literature Review

Resilience is not a static state of "robustness" but a dynamic, multi-dimensional capability. The efficacy of Industry 4.0 is predicated on its ability to augment specific "constituent elements" of resilience, which act as the functional bridge between technology and stability.

2.1 Evolution of Supply Chain Resilience (SCRes)

Theoretical definitions of SCRes have evolved from a focus on "restoration" to a focus on "long-term success." The core idea of most important research items is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of most related research items

Author(s)	Core Definition & Strategic Focus
Rice and Caniato (2003)	Focused on the ability to respond to unexpected disruptions and restore normal supply network operations.
Christopher and Peck (2004)	Defined as the ability of a system to return to its original state or move to a more desirable state post-disturbance.
Ponomarov and Holcomb (2009)	Emphasized adaptive capability and the maintenance of connectedness and control over structure and function.

Engineering Intelligence Journal

Author(s)	Core Definition & Strategic Focus
Ponis and Koronis (2012)	Introduced the proactive planning element; the ability to anticipate events and transcend to a post-event robust state.
Hohenstein et al. (2015)	Highlighted the growth aspect; moving to a more desirable state to increase market share and financial performance.
Datta (2017)	Characterized SCRes as a dynamic process of steering actions to adapt operations before competitors to succeed in the long run.

The Three Dimensions of Resilience

According to Ali et al. (2017), SCRes must be analyzed through three lenses:

1. **Time of Reaction:** Distinguishing between activities occurring before, during, and after a disruption.
2. **Strategies:** The implementation of proactive (pre-event), concurrent (during event), and reactive (post-event) measures.
3. **Capabilities:** The fundamental abilities to *anticipate, adapt, respond, recover, and learn*.

2.2 The Constituent Elements of Resilience

To achieve these capabilities, an organization must cultivate fourteen constituent elements. These elements represent the "strategic levers" that I4.0 technologies influence.

1. **SC Configuration/Network Design:** The ability to rapidly redesign the network structure.
2. **Redundancy:** Maintaining strategic extra capacity (e.g., safety stock) to absorb supply shocks.
3. **Flexibility:** The capacity to adjust operations at the resource, plant, or network level.
4. **Visibility:** End-to-end transparency to locate and characterize disruptive events.
5. **Collaboration:** Joint planning and execution fueled by mutual trust between partners.
6. **Agility:** The speed of reaction to unpredictable shifts in supply or demand.
7. **Information Sharing:** The continuous exchange of real-time, accurate data across the chain.
8. **Security:** Protecting the chain from intentional attacks and cyber-threats.
9. **SCRM Culture:** The organizational commitment to risk-aware decision-making.

Engineering Intelligence Journal

10. **Knowledge Management:** The ability to capture, transfer, and discover insights from data.
11. **Market Position:** Leveraging organizational status to secure supply and customer loyalty.
12. **Situation Awareness:** Deep understanding of vulnerabilities and potential disruption triggers.
13. **Velocity:** The pace of physical and information movement throughout the system.
14. **Robustness:** The ability to maintain functional continuity during a disturbance.

1.3 The Industry 4.0 Technological Landscape

Govindan et al. (2022) categorize I4.0 innovations into two distinct groups:

- **Technologies:** Discrete, functional tools like Cyber-Physical Systems (CPS), Augmented Reality (AR), Artificial Intelligence (AI), Big Data Analytics (BDA), Digital Twins (DT), Industrial Robotics (IR), and Additive Manufacturing (AM).
- **Concepts:** Overarching architectural frameworks such as the Internet of Things (IoT), Internet of Services (IoS), and Cloud Computing (CC).

2. Research Methodology

This research utilizes a dual-stage review process to identify the nexus between I4.0, SCRes elements, and KPIs.

1. **Stage 1: Non-Systematic Review:** Employed to establish the theoretical origins of SCRes and define the fourteen constituent elements.
2. **Stage 2: Systematic Review:** A targeted search of Scopus and Google Scholar databases using Boolean strings (e.g., "Supply Chain 4.0" AND "Resilience" AND "KPI"). This process yielded 133 results, which were filtered to validate the "Indirect Impact Model."

The theoretical backbone of this study is the Causal Chain Logic: Technologies act as enablers for Resilience Elements, which in turn optimize KPIs, resulting in a Resilient Supply Chain 4.0.

3.1. The Indirect Impact Model: Technologies vs. Resilience Elements

A strategic realization for operations managers is that I4.0 technologies rarely provide direct resilience; rather, they serve as the infrastructure for the constituent elements defined in Section 2.2. The mapping technology matrix is provided in Table 2.

Engineering Intelligence Journal

Table 2. Mapping Technology to Resilience Capabilities Matrix

Technology	SC Config	Redundancy	Flexibility	Visibility	Collaboration	Agility	Sit. Awareness	Info Sharing	SCRM Culture	Security	Robustness	Risk Mgmt	Knowledge Mgmt	Velocity
IoT			√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
CPS	√		√	√	√			√	√		√			√
AR			√		√								√	√
CC			√	√	√	√		√				√		√
IoS			√	√							√	√		
BDA	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√	√
AI		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√	√
DT			√	√	√	√	√	√			√	√		
BC	√		√	√	√	√		√	√		√	√		√
IR			√		√	√				√	√			
AM	√	√	√			√					√			√

3.2. Deep-Dive Analysis

- **Internet of Things (IoT):** By utilizing RFID tags and advanced sensors (temperature/vibration), IoT provides the real-time visibility necessary to track freight security and inventory. This connectivity allows for immediate reconfiguration when a node fails.
- **Blockchain (BC):** BC facilitates "untrusted" business process monitoring. Through smart contracts, it automates responses to disruptions (e.g., rejecting an order if a temperature threshold is violated) and provides an immutable ledger for information sharing.
- **Big Data Analytics (BDA):** BDA allows firms to transition from reactive to proactive stances by monitoring the "ripple effect"—the propagation of local failures downstream. It is the primary engine for situational awareness.
- **Additive Manufacturing (AM):** AM provides unparalleled flexibility and redundancy. By enabling on-demand production near the customer, it effectively reduces supply chain layers and dependency on distant suppliers.

5. Results: Quantifying Resilience through KPIs

Key Performance Indicators serve as the "dashboard" for monitoring the strategic effectiveness of I4.0 integrations.

5.1 Identification of Resilient KPIs

Following Patidar et al. (2023), KPIs are categorized into four functional groups:

Engineering Intelligence Journal

1. **Time-Oriented:** Lead Time, Time to Recovery (TTR), Order Cycle Time.
2. **Operational:** Capacity Utilization, Risk Assessment Frequency, Supplier Delivery Efficiency, SC Cycle Time.
3. **Structural:** Number of SC Nodes (a measure of decentralization/robustness per Li & Zobel), Proximity to Suppliers/Customers.
4. **Organizational:** Service Rate, Equipment Effectiveness, Inventory Velocity, Stock Level, Forecasting Accuracy.

5.2 Technological Impact on KPIs (Granular Findings)

Based on a systematic synthesis of Source Table 8, specific technologies impact these metrics as follows:

1. **Lead Time & TTR:** IoT, AI, and BC significantly shorten recovery cycles. AM and AR reduce production lead times by facilitating rapid prototyping and flaw detection.
2. **Operational Efficiency:** CPS, AR, and IR are the primary drivers for increasing Equipment Effectiveness and reducing downtime. BDA and IoT increase Supplier Delivery Efficiency through real-time tracking.
3. **Inventory & Stock:** AM, BC, and IR optimize stock levels. Specifically, AM reduces the need for "dead" safety stock by enabling on-demand production, while IR increases Inventory Velocity through automated picking.
4. **Forecasting & Accuracy:** BDA, DT, and AI process massive volumes of real-time data to predict demand/supply variations, drastically reducing forecasting errors.
5. **Structural Robustness:** BC and BDA enable the management of higher numbers of SC nodes, allowing for the decentralization required to prevent total system failure (robustness).

5.3. Discussion

The integration of I4.0 allows a firm to "transcend to a post-event robust state" faster than competitors, creating a definitive competitive advantage. However, managers often fail by investing in technologies like BDA or Blockchain as standalone solutions, rather than as enablers for the underlying elements (e.g., visibility or collaboration) that actually drive TTR.

For Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), implementation hurdles such as high capital requirements and technical complexity necessitate the use of Industry 4.0 Maturity Models. These models allow firms to audit their current digital progress and ensure that technological adoption aligns with their specific resilience gaps. Without a systematic roadmap, the implementation of complex tools like Blockchain can paradoxically decrease resilience by increasing system complexity without sufficient human-machine control.

Engineering Intelligence Journal

6. Conclusion

The mapping of "Resilient Supply Chain 4.0" confirms that while technology is the engine, resilience elements and KPIs are the steering and dashboard. We are currently witnessing a shift from the technology-driven paradigm of Industry 4.0 toward the value-driven paradigm of Industry 5.0.

Industry 5.0, as defined by the European Commission (2021), is characterized by human-centricity, sustainability, and resilience. While Industry 4.0 focused on machine efficiency, Industry 5.0 leverages the Internet of Everything (IoE) and Edge Computing to harmonize industrial goals with environmental and worker well-being. In a VUCA world, a KPI-driven approach to these technologies is no longer a luxury; it is the prerequisite for long-term survival and competitive transcendence.

References

Ali, A., Mahfouz, A., & Arisha, A. (2017). Analysing supply chain resilience: Integrating the constructs in a concept mapping framework via a systematic literature review. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal, 22*(1), 16–39. https://doi.org/10.1108/SCM-06-2016-0197

Ashton, K. (2009). That 'Internet of Things' thing. *RFID Journal, 22*(7), 97–114.

Baryannis, G., Validi, S., Dani, S., & Antoniou, G. (2019). Supply chain risk management and artificial intelligence: State of the art and future research directions. *International Journal of Production Research, 57*(7), 2179–2202. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2018.1530476

Christopher, M., & Peck, H. (2004). Building the resilient supply chain. *The International Journal of Logistics Management, 15*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1108/09574090410700275

Datta, P. P. (2017). Enhancing competitive advantage by constructing supply chains to achieve superior performance. *Production Planning & Control, 28*(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2016.1231854

European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Breque, M., De Nul, L., & Petridis, A. (2021). *Industry 5.0: Towards a sustainable, human-centric and resilient European industry*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2777/308407

Govindan, K., Kannan, D., Jørgensen, T. B., & Nielsen, T. S. (2022). Supply Chain 4.0 performance measurement: A systematic literature review, framework development, and empirical evidence. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review, 164*, 102725. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tre.2022.102725

Hohenstein, N.-O., Feisel, E., Hartmann, E., & Giunipero, L. (2015). Research on the phenomenon of supply chain resilience: A systematic review and paths for further investigation. *International Journal of Physical Distribution & Logistics Management, 45*(1/2), 90–117. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPDLM-05-2013-0128

Engineering Intelligence Journal

Hsu, C.-H., Chang, A.-Y., Zhang, T.-Y., Lin, W.-D., & Liu, W.-L. (2021). Deploying resilience enablers to mitigate risks in sustainable fashion supply chains. *Sustainability, 13*(5), 2943. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13052943

Ivanov, D., & Dolgui, A. (2021). A digital supply chain twin for managing the disruption risks and resilience in the era of Industry 4.0. *Production Planning & Control, 32*(9), 775–788. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537287.2020.1768450

Li, Y., & Zobel, C. W. (2020). Exploring supply chain network resilience in the presence of the ripple effect. *International Journal of Production Economics, 228*, 107693. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2020.107693

Marinagi, C., Reklitis, P., Trivellas, P., & Sakas, D. (2023). The impact of Industry 4.0 technologies on key performance indicators for a resilient supply chain 4.0. *Sustainability, 15*(6), 5185. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15065185

Patidar, A., Sharma, M., Agrawal, R., & Sangwan, K. S. (2023). Supply chain resilience and its key performance indicators: An evaluation under Industry 4.0 and sustainability perspective. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal, 34*(4), 962–980. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-03-2022-0091

Ponis, S. T., & Koronis, E. (2012). Supply chain resilience: Definition of concept and its formative elements. *Journal of Applied Business Research, 28*(5), 921–929.

Ponomarov, S. Y., & Holcomb, M. C. (2009). Understanding the concept of supply chain resilience. *The International Journal of Logistics Management, 20*(1), 124–143. https://doi.org/10.1108/09574090910954873

Rice, J. B., & Caniato, F. (2003). Building a secure and resilient supply network. *Supply Chain Management Review, 7*(5), 22–30.

Tukamuhabwa, B. R., Stevenson, M., Busby, J., & Zorzini, M. (2015). Supply chain resilience: Definition, review and theoretical foundations for further study. *International Journal of Production Research, 53*(18), 5592–5623. https://doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2015.1037934