10TH INTERNATIONAL DESIGN STRUCTURE MATRIX CONFERENCE, DSM'08

11 – 12 NOVEMBER 2008, STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

MODELING STRUCTURAL CHANGE OVER TIME – REQUIREMENTS AND FIRST METHODS

Katharina Eben, Wieland Biedermann and Udo Lindemann

Institute of Product Development, Technische Universität München, Germany

Keywords: MDM, DSM, time modeling, structural change

1 INTRODUCTION

Products are the subject of a continuous optimization process in order to be adapted to the fast changing market conditions and customer requirements. Product development grows more and more complex to match the increasing market complexity. Even small, apparently unimportant product changes may lead to far reaching impacts on the product structure or product development process. These dynamic changes in product structure have to be modeled in order to allow for a thorough system analysis and deriving predictions concerning further changes.

Matrix based methods like the Design Structure Matrix (DSM) [1] or the Domain Mapping Matrix (DMM) [2] are often used to describe those structures. Both matrices have been combined to form the Multiple-Domain Matrix (MDM) [3]. The MDM enables the depiction of a system from different perspectives, i.e. domains.

A model of changes in DSMs can be obtained by using the Δ DSM [4]. This allows for the analysis of a system's alterations between two time steps. Currently no methods have been introduced to depict a system structure evolving over time.

This paper presents the requirements for a method to model structural change over time. Subsequently those will be used to assess the ΔDSM . Finally, a MDM approach combining the ΔDSM with an additional mapping matrix will be introduced and assessed.

2 REQUIREMENTS FOR MODELING STRUCTURAL CHANGE OVER TIME

There are two main classes of requirements for depicting structures evolving over time. Firstly there are some basic requirements. If they are fulfilled a method can be applied for time modeling. Secondly there are supplementary requirements. They allow for further analyses and reasoning about the evolving structure. Supplementary requirements mainly address the logic behind the changes. The basic requirements are:

Nodes can be created or removed.

- Edges can be created or removed.
- The supplementary requirements comprise:
- Nodes can be split or merged. The new nodes are directly linked to the previous nodes.
- Edges which replace a single edge can be linked to this edge.
- A node and its adjacent edges, introduced to replace an edge, can be linked to this edge and vice versa.

The requirements described above will be used to evaluate the ΔDSM as well as the extended approach described in section 4.

3 VALIDATION EXAMPLE FOR THE REQUIREMENTS

Based on the requirements a test case was developed. It spans one instance of each requirement. The structure of the first time step comprises n nodes; the second structure comprises m nodes.

The node changes between the two depicted states are the removal and adding of one node, as well as the merging of two nodes and the splitting of one node.

Between the time steps several edges adjacent to one node are removed. Respectively several edges linked to a different node are added.

Additionally there are several combined changes. An edge is replaced by an indirect path between the linked nodes. Additionally an edge is replaced by a node and two edges maintaining the link between the original nodes.

This test serves to evaluate different methods for modeling structural changes over time. The minimum requirement is to model all the effects e.g. that node 2 and node 3 vanish and a node 23 appears. The optimum is to model the logic behind the changes e.g. that the node 23 comprises node 2 and node 3.

4 EXEMPLARY ASSESSMENT OF SEVERAL TIME MODELING APPROACHES

4.1 The ΔDSM

The Δ DSM depicts the deviation from one DSM to another (equation 1), which enables the analysis of differences between the matrices. Both matrices may describe the same system at different points in time. Thus the changes carried out in the meantime become clear.

 $DSM(new) = DSM(old) + \Delta DSM$

(1)

The basic claim of modeling the difference between two time steps is fulfilled. Changes of nodes are only partly included, their merging or splitting cannot be shown. This information is conveyed in a semantic way. Furthermore the changes concerning edges cannot be considered in a ΔDSM .

		node 1	node 23	node 3	node 4a	node 5	node 6	node 7	node 8	node 9	node 4b	node 10	node 11
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
node 1	1	-1		-1	-1								
node 23	2					1				1	1		
node 3	3			-1		-1				-1			
node 4a	4						-1						
node 5	5						1	-1					
node 6	6			-1				1					
node 7	7												
node 8	8									-1	1		1
node 9	9												
node 4b	10						1				1		
node 10	11				1				1			1	
node 11	12												1

Figure 1: ΔDSM of the test case

Finally, in order to include every possible case the system has to consist of all elements which might be of interest at an arbitrary time step. Consequently a unnecessary large matrix results, which aggravates further analysis steps.

4.2 ΔDSM extended by mapping DMM

In the following an approach augmenting the Δ DSM will be presented. A mapping matrix (MAP) is introduced, which maps the old system with the new system. It is used to model the changes of the nodes. It is possible to model the logic behind the changes. It can be seen from the matrix in which way nodes are added or deleted.

The ΔDSM serves to implement the changes in edges.

$$DSM(new) = MAP^{T} \cdot DSM(old) \cdot MAP - \Delta DSM$$
⁽²⁾

The mapping enables limiting the system size. The gained DSM contains only elements momentarily necessary; the main focus can remain on the current system state.

Within this approach not only the basic requirement of depicting changes between different time steps is fulfilled but also part of the supplementary requirement by the implementing the logic behind the node changes. It is possible to grasp implicit knowledge as well as semantic knowledge. Though the logic behind node changes can be modeled explicitly the approach cannot model the logic behind edge and combined node and edge changes.

			v node 23	► node 4a	ი node 5	თ node 6	⊲ node 7	∞ node 8	α node 9	5 node 4b		c node 11
	node 1	1	-	•	v	Ŭ		v	•	10	••	
	node 2	2	1									
	node 3	3	1									
	node 4	4		1						1		
	node 5	5			1							
	node 6	6				1						
	node 7	7					1					
	node 8	8						1				
a)	node 9	9							1			

		2	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
node 23	2										
node 4a	4				-1						
node 5	5				1	-1					
node 6	6					1					
node 7	7										
node 8	8							-1			1
node 9	9										
node 4b	10				1						
node 10	11		1				1				
node 11	12							1			

Figure 2. a) Mapping DMM of the test case, and b) the corresponding ΔDSM

b)

5 CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper requirements for structural change over time were presented. These requirements can be applied to evaluate any method for modeling structural change. There are basic requirements which every method must fulfill. Further there are supplementary requirements which mainly comprise the logic behind the changes.

Then a test case based on these requirements was introduced and applied to two time modeling methods. Although both fulfilled the basic requirements, only the second approach can model the logic behind the node changes. The logic behind edge changes and combined node and edge changes cannot be depicted by both methods. To solve this problem is still an open task. The here presented requirements and test case allow for comparing any time modeling method. Gaps in the possibilities of new approaches can be identified and their potential can be assessed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the Deutsche Forschungsgesellschaft (DFG) for funding this research as a part of the collaborative research centre "Managing cycles in innovation processes – Integrated development of product service systems based on technical products" (SFB 768)

REFERENCES

- [1] Browning T. R. Applying the Design Structure Matrix to System Decomposition and Integration Problems: A Review and New Directions. In *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, 48(3), 2001, pp. 292-306
- [2] Danilovic M. and Browning T. R. A Formal Approach for Domain Mapping Matrices (DMM) to Complement Design Structure Matrices (DSM). In *Proceedings of the 6th Design Structure Matrix (DSM) International Workshop*, Cambridge, 2004 (University of Cambridge, Engineering Design Centre)
- [3] Maurer M. Structural Awareness in Complex Product Design, 2007 (Dr. Hut, München)
- [4] de Weck O. L. On the role of DSM in designing systems and products for changeability. In *Proceedings of the 9th International DSM Conference*, München, 2007 (Technische Universität München, Institute of Product Development)

Contact: Katharina Eben Technische Universität München Institute of Product Development Boltzmannstraße 15 D-85748 Garching Germany Phone: +49 89 289 151 32 Fax: +49 89 289 151 44 Katharina.eben@pe.mw.tum.de http://www.pe.mw.tum.de

10TH INTERNATIONAL DSM CONFERENCE

Modeling Structural Change over Time – Requirements and first Methods

Katharina Eben, Wieland Biedermann, Udo Lindemann

Institute of Product Development Technische Universität München, Germany



MANAGE COMPLEX SYSTEMS

LLOW THE FLOW OF INFORMATION

Index

- Motivation
- · Requirements for modeling structural change over time
- Validation example
- The ΔDSM and time modeling
- Assessment of the ΔDSM
- Extension of the ΔDSM by mapping matrices
- Assessment of the extended ΔDSM
- Conclusion and outlook



10th International DSM Conference 2008- 2

Motivation

- Increasing requirements on products
- Fast changing markets
- Product, process and organization changes
 - Structural changes 5 6 5 1 2 3 2 3 5 7 7 1 4 8 2 3 5 1010
- \rightarrow Focus of the DSM methods on one particular point of time
- \rightarrow Some methods for modeling differences between structures
- → So far no methods specifically designed for time modeling



MANAGE COMPLEX SYSTEMS

FOLLOW THE FLOW OF INFORMATION

Requirements for modeling structural change over time





Validation example

- 7 5 • Merging of element 2 and 3 into element 23 • Splitting of element 4 into elements 2 4a and 4b 8 9 1 **Basic requirements** Creation of elements · Removal of elements Creation of relations 5 7 Removal of relations 6 Supplementary requirements • Merging of elements (5) • Splitting of elements 6 8 9 • Replacing one relation by other relations · Replacing one relation by one 10 element ШП echnische Universität München 10th International DSM Conference 2008- 6

Validation example



Validation example

MANAGE COMPLEX SYSTEMS



The ΔDSM and time modeling

ΔDSM ode 4b ode 10 bde 11 ode 9 ode 1 ode 8 ode ΔDSM=DSM(old) - DSM(new) node 1 node 23 node 3 node 4a node 5 node 6 node 7 node 8 node 9 **Basic requirements** node 4b Creation of elements node 10 ode 11 Removal of elements Creation of relations · Removal of relations ΔDSM must contain all elements of Supplementary requirements all time steps \rightarrow Matrix is oversized • Merging of elements x x Splitting of elements Modeling beyond basic requirements · Replacing one relation by other based on semantics relations x • Replacing one relation by one element 8 1885 80 Technische Universität München 10th International DSM Conference 2008- 9

Assessment of the ΔDSM

MANAGE COMPLEX SYSTEMS



FOLLOW THE FLOW OF INFORMATION

MANAGE COMPLEX SYSTEMS



OLLOW THE FLOW OF INFORMATION

MANAGE COMPLEX SYSTEMS



۸

	pou	pou	noc	noc	pou	noc	noc	pou	pou	bou
node 1										
node 2	1									
node 3	1									
node 4		1						1		
node 5			1							
node 6				1						
node 7					1					
node 8						1				
node 9							1			
DSM	23	4a	5	9	7	8	6	4b	10	11
DSM	de 23	de 4a	de 5	de 6	de 7	de 8	de 9	de 4b	de 10	de 11
DSM	node 23	node 4a	node 5	node 6	node 7	node 8	node 9	node 4b	node 10	node 11
DSM	node 23	node 4a	node 5	node 6	node 7	node 8	node 9	node 4b	node 10	node 11
node 23 node 4a	node 23	node 4a	node 5	다 node 6	node 7	node 8	node 9	node 4b	node 10	node 11
node 23 node 4a node 5	node 23	node 4a	node 5	9 apou -1 +1	1-	node 8	node 9	node 4b	node 10	node 11
node 23 node 4a node 5 node 6	node 23	node 4a	node 5	+ - + - + - + - + - + - + - + - + - + -	+ + + 1	node 8	node 9	node 4b	node 10	node 11
node 23 node 4a node 5 node 6 node 7	node 23	node 4a	node 5	1+ 1- 1-	1+ 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1- 1-	node 8	node 9	node 4b	node 10	node 11
node 23 node 4a node 5 node 6 node 7 node 8	node 23	node 4a	node 5	1-1 +1	-1 +1	node 8	-1	node 4b	node 10	+1
node 23 node 4a node 5 node 6 node 7 node 8 node 9	hode 23	node 4a	node 5	1 -1 +1	1+ 1- 1-	node 8	-1	node 4b	node 10	11 node 11
node 23 node 23 node 4a node 5 node 6 node 7 node 8 node 9 node 4b	node 23	node 4a	node 5	1+ 1- 1- 1-	1 - 1 - 1 - 1	node 8	-1	node 4b	node 10	1+ node 11
node 23 node 4a node 5 node 6 node 7 node 8 node 9 node 4b node 10	node 23	L+ node 4a	node 5	+ + hode 6	+ + Hode 7	++	- hode 9	node 4b	node 10	11 hode 11

Assessment of the extended ΔDSM



Technische Universität München

 $DSM(new) = MAP^{T} \cdot DSM(old) \cdot MAP + \Delta DSM$

10th International DSM Conference 2008- 12

FOLLOW THE FLOW OF INFORMATION

Conclusion and Outlook

- · Requirements for modeling structural change
 - 4 basic requirements \rightarrow What are the changes?
 - 4 supplementary requirements \rightarrow How are the changes?
- Validation example
 - At least one instance of each requirement
- Methods for change modeling
 - ΔDSM: only basic requirements fulfilled
 - Extended ΔDSM: basic and two supplementary requirements fulfilled
 - No method fulfilling all requirements
- Future work
 - Designing better modeling methods fulfilling all requirements
 - Studying structural evolution

