Beyond the Silicon Crunch: Sustainability and Resilience in Next-Generation Semiconductor Supply Chains

Irita Mishra[1]; Senali Amarasuriya[2]; Mojan Naisani Samani[1]

1 Department of Management and Marketing, University of Wisconsin–River Falls, River Falls, Wisconsin, USA

2 Department of Management, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, USA

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS NOTICE

This is an extended abstract submitted to and presented at the International Conference on Sustainability-Led Transformation in Business and Society (SBTLS). It is also available on SSRN (Abstract No. 6335358).

Suggested citation:

Mishra, Irita and Amarasuriya, Senali and Naisani Samani, Mojan, Beyond the Silicon Crunch: Sustainability and Resilience in Next-Generation Semiconductor Supply Chains (February 26, 2026). Proceedings of the International Conference on Sustainability-Led Transformation in Business and Society.

Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=6335358

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.6335358

Beyond the Silicon Crunch: Sustainability and Resilience in Next-Generation Semiconductor Supply Chains

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Introduction

Semiconductors underpin a broad spectrum of modern technologies, yet the supply chains that enable their production face increasing instability. Environmental pressures, geopolitical fragmentation, and volatile demand patterns have exposed the limits of legacy supply chain models optimized for efficiency rather than adaptability (Ravi, 2024; Araullo, 2024). Climate change, regional water scarcity, hazardous waste generation, and shortages of critical materials further demonstrate that sustainability challenges are inseparable from operational performance (James, 2024; Jacobs et al., 2022).

This article positions sustainability and resilience as deeply interdependent priorities that must be addressed through integrated, rather than parallel, strategies. It synthesizes emerging evidence to explain how structural pressures reinforce one another across environmental, geopolitical, and multi-tier supply chain domains. The extended abstract then outlines a forward-looking conceptualization of what a sustainable and resilient semiconductor ecosystem may look like in 2035.

Background and Problem Context

Semiconductor supply chains historically relied on speed, cost efficiency, geographic clustering, and deep specialization. However, this architecture is now stressed by multiple converging forces. Fabrication plants consume more than 10 million gallons of ultrapure water each day, making production highly sensitive to hydrological volatility and energy grid instability (James, 2024; Jacobs et al., 2022).

Demand volatility driven by AI, electrification, and cloud computing amplifies bullwhip effects, heightening both resource use and waste generation during rapid scale-ups and exacerbating hazardous disposal challenges during downturns (Shan et al., 2014; Rajavi et al., 2024). Geopolitical interventions—including export controls on gallium, germanium, and advanced lithography equipment—have revealed the fragility inherent in geographically concentrated global production hubs (Luo & Van Assche, 2023).

Lower-tier suppliers often lack the resources to meet rising environmental and labor expectations, generating significant governance and compliance risks across the network (Diebel et al., 2024; Yan et al., 2015). Meanwhile, digitalization, while improving visibility, introduces new cybersecurity, data integrity, and algorithmic vulnerabilities (Gabler et al., 2023; Singhania & Saini, 2023). These overlapping pressures underscore the need to conceptualize sustainability and resilience not as discrete domains but as deeply connected forces shaping semiconductor supply chains.

Conceptual Foundations

Although sustainability and resilience have often been examined independently, recent research shows that many of their underlying drivers are shared (Araullo, 2024). Environmental stewardship reduces exposure to climate-related disruptions by stabilizing access to water, energy, and critical materials. Circularity mitigates geopolitical and market risks associated with concentrated extraction and purification of rare inputs. Collaborative governance across supply tiers strengthens compliance performance and reduces the likelihood of relational or operational breakdowns. Digital transparency supports both ethical accountability and the early detection of emerging risks. Together, these insights establish the foundations for an integrated understanding of sustainability–resilience interdependencies.

Analytical Framework

The analytical perspective developed in this paper highlights five structural mechanisms through which sustainability challenges and operational risks reinforce one another. *Resource intensity* makes semiconductor production vulnerable to environmental and geopolitical volatility, since water scarcity, energy instability, and rare-material dependency can interrupt output or trigger emergency measures. *Demand volatility* amplifies environmental burdens as supply chains scale up and down abruptly, increasing scrap, energy use, and chemical waste. *Geopolitical forces* reshape access to materials and technology while responses such as capacity duplication often elevate carbon intensity and water demand. *Multi-tier governance constraints* leave upstream suppliers struggling to meet environmental and labor standards, creating cascading compliance and continuity risks. *Digitalization*, while improving visibility, simultaneously introduces cybersecurity and data-related vulnerabilities.

These mechanisms interact dynamically. Environmental constraints intensify geopolitical pressures; geopolitical interventions generate new environmental burdens; operational volatility amplifies both environmental harm and supply chain instability. This interdependence illustrates why sustainability and resilience must be conceptualized as a unified system.

Proposed Future-State Model for Semiconductor Supply Chains

A 2035 semiconductor ecosystem that is both sustainable and resilient would incorporate several mutually reinforcing characteristics. Regenerative resource systems including closed-loop water reuse, renewable energy integration, and chemical recovery would reduce exposure to climate volatility and stabilize production conditions. Climate-informed geographic diversification would guide capacity expansion to regions with sustainable water basins, decarbonizing energy grids, and lower exposure to climatic and geopolitical shocks (Cohen & Kouvelis, 2021).

Deep supply chain transparency enabled by digital twins, traceability platforms, and predictive analytics would reduce informational asymmetry and support proactive mitigation of environmental and operational risks (Gabler et al., 2023). Circular material flows involving reclamation, recycling, and remanufacturing of gases, chemicals, and wafers would decrease dependency on geopolitically sensitive materials while lowering waste and emissions (Esenduran et al., 2022).

Collaborative multi-tier governance including supplier capability-building, shared environmental infrastructure, and relational governance would strengthen compliance performance and continuity (Diebel et al., 2024). Finally, adaptive and distributed capacity would enable firms to respond to volatility without resorting to emergency measures that elevate resource consumption and carbon intensity. Collectively, these features describe a system in which sustainability and resilience function as complementary foundations.

Implications and Strategic Directions

The analysis demonstrates that sustainability and resilience should be pursued as integrated rather than parallel objectives. Strengthening transparency across multi-tier networks is critical for early detection of environmental and operational risks. Governance structures must evolve so suppliers possess the capabilities needed to meet rising expectations; without this, upstream capability gaps will continue to generate downstream fragility. Environmental intelligence should be embedded in geopolitical and capacity-planning decisions to prevent resilience-oriented strategies from creating unintended ecological burdens.

Embedding circularity into material and process design stabilizes access to critical inputs, reduces waste, and buffers against geopolitical and market disruptions. Developing adaptive and distributed capacity enables firms to manage volatility without reliance on resource-intensive or emissions-intensive emergency practices. These strategic directions also carry broader implications: researchers must develop models that capture sustainability–resilience interactions as systemic phenomena; practitioners must recognize that sustainability investments can reduce long-term volatility; and policymakers should embed environmental and social criteria into semiconductor industrial incentives.

Conclusion

Semiconductor supply chains now operate within a convergence of environmental, geopolitical, and operational pressures that necessitate a rethinking of supply chain architecture. Sustainability and resilience are not competing priorities; they are mutually reinforcing foundations for long-term competitiveness. Water stewardship reduces climate risk, circularity stabilizes material flows, transparency enhances risk intelligence, and supplier development reduces systemic fragility. As global investment accelerates, the coming decade offers an unprecedented opportunity to embed these principles into next-generation semiconductor ecosystems. This article provides a conceptual foundation for guiding that transformation.

References

Araullo, K. (2024). *How should risk managers tackle the sustainable supply chain question?* https://www.insurancebusinessmag.com/us/risk-management/news/how-should-risk-managers-tackle-the-sustainable-supply-chain-question-503868.aspx

Cohen, M. A., & Kouvelis, P. (2021). Revisit of AAA Excellence of Global Value Chains: Robustness, Resilience, and Realignment. *Production and Operations Management, 30*(3), 633–643.

Diebel, W., Gualandris, J., & Klassen, R. D. (2024). How do suppliers respond to institutional complexity? Examining voluntary public environmental disclosure in a global manufacturing supply network. *Journal of Operations Management, 70*(2), 285–315.

Esenduran, G., Kemahlıoğlu-Ziya, E., & Swaminathan, J. M. (2022). Online to Offline Retailing: Impact of Platform Logistics. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management, 24*(1), 108–127.

Gabler, C. B., Richey, R. G., & Stewart, G. T. (2023). Supply Chain Resilience in a Digital World. *Journal of Business Logistics, 44*(1), 7–23.

Jacobs, B. W., Singhal, V. R., & Subramanian, R. (2022). Supply Chain Disruptions and Environmental Impact. *Production and Operations Management, 31*(6), 2329–2344.

James, M. (2024). *Semiconductor Water Consumption and Climate Exposure Report.* https://semienvironment.org/research/water-usage-2024/

Luo, S., & Van Assche, A. (2023). Geopolitics and Global Value Chains. *Journal of International Business Studies, 54*(3), 379–398.

Rajavi, A., Ketabi, S., & Saedi, S. (2024). How Demand Volatility Drives Environmental Waste. *Journal of Operations Management, 70*(1), 145–161.

Ravi, S. (2024). *Semiconductor Industry Outlook 2030.* https://www.techanalysisgroup.org/semiconductors2030

Shan, Z., Fu, H., & Tsang, E. (2014). Bullwhip Effects in High-Tech Supply Chains. *International Journal of Production Economics, 158*, 208–216.

Singhania, A., & Saini, V. (2023). Cyber-Risk and Digital Fragility in Supply Networks. *Journal of Supply Chain Management, 59*(4), 71–88.

Yan, T., Choi, T. Y., Kim, Y., & Yang, Y. (2015). A Theory of Supplier Social Responsibility. *Journal of Operations Management, 39*(1), 1–15.