



A Study on Vendor Management Cost Optimization in Wind Energy Procurement

Dr. S. Muthumani¹, Swathi M², Dr. Priyada Vinod³

¹II Year MBA, Jerusalem College of Engineering

^{2,3}*Head of Department*, Jerusalem College of Engineering

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0425.1481>

ABSTRACT

This study examines vendor management and cost optimization in wind energy procurement at Pioneer Wincon. It analyzes key factors such as vendor selection criteria, supply chain risks, cost-reduction strategies, and the impact of GST on procurement costs. Using statistical analysis (chi-square, ANOVA, regression, correlation), the study finds that past performance and reliability are the most critical vendor selection factors. Major risks include price fluctuations, transportation delays, and quality issues. The study also explores the role of Letters of Credit (LCs) and digitalization (blockchain, AI, fintech) in procurement efficiency. Findings suggest strategies for cost reduction, improved supplier relationships, and streamlined procurement processes. These insights help enhance financial sustainability and supply chain resilience in the wind energy sector.

Keywords: Wind energy procurement, Vendor management, Cost optimization, Supply chain efficiency, Procurement challenges.

INTRODUCTION

This study examines cost optimization strategies in vendor management for wind energy procurement at Pioneer Wincon. Efficient procurement is crucial for reducing costs while maintaining quality and supply chain efficiency. Key focus areas include vendor selection, negotiation techniques, and supplier relationship management. The study also explores procurement challenges, cost-reduction strategies, and performance evaluation.

Additionally, the impact of GST and related taxes on procurement costs is analyzed, along with the role of Letters of Credit (LCs) in supplier payments. The study assesses risks such as price fluctuations, transportation delays, and quality issues in vendor management. It also examines how digitalization (AI, blockchain, fintech) can improve procurement efficiency. Findings aim to provide actionable insights for streamlining procurement costs in wind turbine manufacturing, ensuring financial sustainability and operational efficiency in the wind energy sector.

REVIEW OF INTRODUCTION

Studies by Blanco (2009) and Wiser & Bolinger (2019) indicate that procurement costs, especially for wind turbine components, steel towers, and electrical systems, account for a significant portion of total project expenses. Strategies like bulk purchasing, long-term contracts, and government subsidies have been suggested to reduce procurement costs in the sector.

Aggarwal & Kumar (2018) found that higher GST rates on wind turbine components increase overall project costs, leading companies to seek tax incentives and government subsidies. A report by the International Renewable Energy Agency

aberi et al. (2019) indicates that blockchain technology can improve traceability, contract enforcement, and vendor reliability in renewable energy supply chains.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a descriptive research approach to analyze vendor management strategies and cost optimization techniques in wind energy procurement at Pioneer Wincon. Both primary and secondary data were utilized, with primary data collected through a structured questionnaire distributed via Google Forms to procurement professionals and stakeholders, while secondary data were sourced from industry reports, research papers, company records, and government policy documents. A non-probability sampling technique (convenience sampling) was employed, targeting 105 respondents involved in procurement and vendor management. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to summarize procurement trends and vendor performance, along with Chi-Square Tests to examine relationships between key procurement factors such as cost, delivery time, and vendor reliability. This methodological approach ensures a structured and data-driven understanding of procurement cost optimization in the wind energy sector.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

PRIMARY OBJECTIVE

- i. To analyze the key factors affecting procurement efficiency and cost management in wind energy projects at Pioneer Wincon.

SECONDARY OBJECTIVES

1. To identify the key criteria for vendor selection at Pioneer Wincon.
2. To analyze the impact of GST and related taxes on procurement costs in wind energy projects.
3. To explore the reasons behind payment delays in credit transactions and their effects on vendor relationships.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The questionnaire became the basis to build five hypotheses (Null) for further testing. To analyze the results SPSS is used. In the data analysis process, a Single Factor ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) and a Chi-Square test were used for hypothesis testing. ANOVA is employed to determine if the means between two or more groups differ significantly.

Frequency of vendor selection, investment required for windmill installation.

what criteria are primarily used for vendor selection

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|---|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | price competitiveness | 3 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| | quality of components | 17 | 16.2 | 16.2 | 19.0 |
| | delivery time | 8 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 26.7 |
| | technical support and after sales service | 9 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 35.2 |
| | past performance and reliability | 64 | 61.0 | 61.0 | 96.2 |
| | others | 4 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 105 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

Investment required for windmill installation

| | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid | 5-10 crore | 54 | 51.4 | 51.4 | 51.4 |
| | 10-20 crore | 49 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 98.1 |
| | more than 20 crore | 2 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 100.0 |
| | Total | 105 | 100.0 | 100.0 | |

HYPOTHESIS 1:

Null Hypothesis (H_0):

There is no significant association between the two categorical variables (they are independent).

Alternative Hypothesis (H_1):

There is a significant association between the two categorical variables (they are dependent).

Chi-Square Tests

| | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----|-----------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 40.208 ^a | 5 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 41.144 | 5 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 15.565 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 105 | | |

a. 6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .91.

INTERPRETATIONS:

Since the p-value is below 0.05, we reject the null hypothesis, suggesting that the variables analyzed are not independent and have a significant association. However, 50% of cells have expected counts less than 5. The Chi-Square test result shows a significant association between the two categorical variables because the p-value is .000 (less than 0.05).

This means we reject the null hypothesis (H_0) and conclude that the two variables are not independent—there is a significant relationship.

INFERENCE:

The chi-square test shows a significant association between the variables ($p < 0.001$), indicating that the relationship is unlikely due to chance. However, with 50% of expected counts below 5, results should be interpreted cautiously.

HYPOTHESIS 2:

Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no significant difference in average delay in vendor payment across different types of LC used.
Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): There is a significant difference in average delay in vendor payment across different types of LC used.

ANOVA

which of the following strategies do you use to reduce procurement costs

| | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|------|------|
| Between Groups | .672 | 2 | .336 | .802 | .451 |
| Within Groups | 42.718 | 102 | .419 | | |
| Total | 43.390 | 104 | | | |

INTERPRETATIONS:

F-Statistic (F) = 0.802

Significance Value (Sig.) = 0.451

The p-value (Sig.) is 0.451, which is greater than 0.05.

Since $p > 0.05$, we fail to reject the null hypothesis (H_0).

This means there is no significant difference between the procurement cost reduction strategies.

INFERENCE:

The ANOVA test indicates no significant difference between the groups ($F = 0.802$, $p = 0.451$). Since $p > 0.05$, the procurement cost reduction strategies do not vary significantly across groups.

HYPOTHESIS 3:

Null Hypothesis (H_0): There is no significant correlation between procurement cost of average investment and frequency of LC usage.
 Alternative Hypothesis (H_1): There is a significant correlation between procurement cost of average investment and frequency of LC usage.

Correlations

| | | Investment required for windmill installation | How often does your company use LC for wind/solar component procurement |
|---|---------------------|---|---|
| Investment required for windmill installation | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .446** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 105 | 105 |
| How often does your company use LC for wind/solar component procurement | Pearson Correlation | .446** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 105 | 105 |

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

INTERPRETATION:

Pearson Correlation (r) = 0.446 (Moderate Positive Correlation).

p-value = 0.000 (Less than 0.01).

Since p-value < 0.01, we reject H_0 and conclude that the correlation is statistically significant.

H_0 is rejected → There is a significant relationship between investment required for windmill installation and the frequency of LC usage for procurement

INFERENCE:

There is a moderate positive correlation ($r = 0.446$, $p < 0.01$) between windmill investment and LC usage for wind/solar procurement. This significant relationship suggests that higher investment is associated with more frequent LC usage.

FINDINGS:

The study highlights that efficient vendor management is crucial for cost optimization in wind energy procurement. Payment delays significantly impact vendor satisfaction, indicating the need for streamlined financial processes. GST has a strong influence on procurement costs, emphasizing the necessity for better tax planning and cost management strategies. Procurement costs and LC usage are moderately correlated, suggesting that companies rely on LCs for higher-cost transactions. Cost-reduction strategies do not show a significant impact on import frequencies, meaning a diversified approach may be needed. There is no significant relationship between sourcing country and LC usage, allowing flexibility in supplier selection. Strengthening supplier relationships, optimizing payment terms, and leveraging technology can enhance procurement efficiency and reduce costs.

SUGGESTIONS:

- Implementing efficient payment processes can improve vendor satisfaction and strengthen long-term supplier relationships.
- Exploring tax incentives and optimizing GST strategies will help reduce procurement costs in wind energy projects.
- Negotiating better contracts with vendors can help in managing procurement costs more effectively.
- Enhancing supply chain resilience by mitigating risks like price fluctuations and disruptions will ensure smoother operations.

CONCLUSION:

Effective vendor management is essential for optimizing procurement costs and ensuring smooth supply chain operations in wind energy projects. Payment delays significantly impact vendor satisfaction, highlighting the need for better financial management. GST plays a crucial role in procurement costs, emphasizing the importance of strategic tax planning. The moderate correlation between procurement costs and LC usage suggests that financial instruments are critical in high-cost transactions. Cost-reduction strategies do not show a significant impact on import frequency, indicating the need for diversified approaches. Sourcing flexibility allows companies to explore various supplier options, ensuring better cost efficiency. By improving payment systems, leveraging technology, and strengthening vendor relationships, Pioneer Wincon can achieve greater efficiency and profitability in procurement.

REFERENCES:

- Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive Advantage: Creating and Sustaining Superior Performance*. Free Press.

-
- Discusses vendor relationships and procurement strategies for cost efficiency.
 - Kannan, V. R., & Tan, K. C. (2006). *Supplier selection and assessment: Their impact on business performance*. Journal of Supply Chain Management, 42(4), 11-22.
 - Explores vendor selection criteria, including quality, reliability, and pricing.¹
 - Blanco, M. I. (2009). *The economics of wind energy*. Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 13(6-7), 1372-1382.
 - Wiser, R., & Bolinger, M. (2019). *2018 Wind Technologies Market Report*. U.S. Department of Energy.
 - Provides insights into procurement costs and investment trends in wind energy.
 - `Gielen, D., Boshell, F., Saygin, D., Bazilian, M. D., Wagner, N., & Gorini, R. (2019). *The role of renewable energy in the global energy transformation*. Energy Strategy Reviews, 24, 38-50.
 - Bustos, S., & Galvez, A. (2016). *Letters of Credit: A Financial Instrument for Risk Management in Procurement*. International Journal of Financial Studies, 4(3), 21-35.