This item was submitted to Loughborough's Research Repository by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Holonic product design: a process for modular product realisation

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

PUBLISHER

© Taylor and Francis

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Marshall, Russell, and P.G. Leaney. 2019. “Holonic Product Design: A Process for Modular Product Realisation”. figshare. https://hdl.handle.net/2134/2167.

Loughborough University

This item was submitted to Loughborough's Institutional Repository by the author and is made available under the following Creative Commons Licence conditions.

creative commons

COMMONS DEED

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

Under the following conditions:

Attribution. You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

Noncommercial. You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

No Derivative Works. You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

This is a human-readable summary of the Legal Code (the full license).

Disclaimer

For the full text of this licence, please go to:
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/

Journal of Engineering Design, 13(4), pp 293-304

Holonic Product Design: a process for modular product realisation.

Dr R. Marshall, Dr P.G. Leaney*.

Department of Design and Technology
Loughborough University.
Loughborough
Leicestershire
LE11 3TU
Tel (01509) 222 669

*Wolfson School of Mechanical and Manufacturing Engineering
Loughborough University

04/09/01

SUMMARY *This paper introduces a fresh perspective on product modularisation and proposes a process for modular product realisation called Holonic Product Design. The holon has recently been adopted from Arthur Koestler's work to represent subsystem entities within manufacturing systems and the enterprise chain. In addition, it has been embraced as a philosophy for change that attempts to fashion modern manufacturing businesses and manufacturing activity. This paper demonstrates the holon as being equally valid as an approach to product development. Through research at a number of UK companies Holonic Product Design (HPD) is developed and presented as a structured approach to product realisation. Addressing a total view through systems engineering, HPD provides an accessible and customisable modular product development workbook. The efficacy of the new approach is demonstrated through the initial results from a HPD case study. Further work remains in refining the integration of HPD elements and thoroughly testing the approach through a full new product development process.*

1. Introduction

The aims of this paper are to:

1. Present the case for a modularity based process for enhanced product development.
2. Present the modularity paradigm and explain its structure and how it supports Holonic Product Design (HPD)
3. Highlight some key features of the HPD workbook
4. Finally present some initial validation work at a small UK company and conclude.

Case study research on design modularisation has been undertaken across a broad range and scale of product manufacturers. The work carried out highlights a range of issues that must be addressed in order to introduce successful new products [1]. These issues can be summarised into four main concerns to which modularity is a strategic approach.

- Efficient deployment of stakeholder requirements
- A rationalised introduction of new technology

- A structured approach to dealing with complexity
- Responsive manufacturing through flexibility/agility.

This paper will now discuss some of the characteristics of modular products that enhance product realisation and highlight why modularity might be a strategic approach to meeting the issues presented.

2. Product Modularity

Modular product architectures are not new and have seen successful application, but have been largely passed over outside of a few specific industries. Constrained by engineering legacy and the lack of a broader view, modularity has been consigned to a process of decomposition or demarcation for manufacturing convenience in the form of subassemblies [2]. However, the research carried out [1] has determined that modules have a number of characteristics fundamentally different to subassemblies:

- Modules are co-operative subsystems that form a product, manufacturing system, business etc.
- Modules have their main functional interactions within as well as between modules
- Modules have one or more well defined functions that can be tested in isolation from the system
- Modules are independent and self contained and may be combined and configured with similar units to achieve a different overall outcome.

It is believed that the lack of modularity application is due to its initial perception as a tool to rationalise variety through the partitioning of product functions [3]. However, variety is only one aspect of product modularity. One of the most important aspects of modular product development is the potential for efficient flexibility. Modularity ultimately provides a means to address product flexibility, in order to efficiently meet a broad range of customer requirements, and manufacturing flexibility in the form of cells, parallelism, and late configuration.

3. Holons and Holonic Manufacturing

The term holon is derived from two observations by Koestler [4]. The first is from Simon [5] and is based on the parable of the two watchmakers. The parable concludes that a purely sequential assembly process is highly prone to disturbance, and that greater robustness, ease of maintenance and repair can be obtained through the use subassemblies, a point echoed by Hansen [6] when dealing with mechanical adjustments. The second is the relativity of hierarchies. Intermediary structures such as subassemblies have characteristics associated with ‘parts’ and also with ‘wholes’ depending on the way in which they are viewed. To represent these entities Koestler proposed the term ‘holon’. Holons are autonomous self reliant units, which have a degree of independence and handle contingencies without asking higher authorities for instructions; simultaneously holons are subject to occasional control from higher authorities.

Holons have already been adopted at an organisational level in the form of Holonic manufacturing systems (HMS). HMS are part of the Intelligent Manufacturing Systems (IMS) programme that addresses the so called ‘fragility’ of today’s manufacturing systems [7]. However, taking a system wide approach to manufacturing enterprise organisation and operation requires equal consideration of the product system. In the same way that

flexible manufacturing solutions are facilitated through the use of flexible designs [8] so too holonic manufacturing concepts can be facilitated through holonic product design. Indeed parallels can be drawn between the issues and requirements for modules and those for holons. The literature from various areas of design and manufacturing highlights the trend towards distributed, co-operative and intelligent modules but also highlights the need to bridge the gap between the analytical nature of these observations and the design / synthesis of artefacts [9,10,11,12]

4. Modularity Principles

Case study research has determined that regardless of the approach taken modularity exhibits a number or facts or rules that define the principles of a modular approach [13]. An example of these principles includes:

1. Modularity is inherently based upon a mapping of functional aspects to physical entities and is governed by concepts such as the domain theory [14,15] the work of Hubka and Eder [16,17], and Suh's design axioms [11]. The nature of this mapping and the ultimate configuration controls a product's modularity and ultimately its ability to meet requirements.
2. A number of factors have been identified that influence the mapping of physical to functional elements e.g. interactions, geometry, core business, and manufacture, (See Section 6.2).
3. Some initial metrics have been developed to allow numerical measurement of advantage to be gained and suitable level of modularity though further validation is necessary.
4. Modularity has a negative effect upon assembly when a localised view of assembly operations and fixture requirements is taken. The modular assembly will always take an extra number of assembly operations.
5. A total view of assembly highlights the overall beneficial effects of modularity. By using parallel assembly total cycle time is reduced and further positive impacts upon flexibility and timeliness attributes are seen.
6. Modularity provides a rational product flexibility to enhance existing manufacturing flexibility solutions.
7. Modularity needs the support of a system level framework in order to manage its complexity and broad ranging links and interactions. Modularity cannot be viewed as an isolated process capable of being implemented without consideration of the business context in which it is to fit.

5. Holonic Product Design

The principles above highlight the systemic nature of modularity. In addition, analysis of the work of exponents of modularity such as Ulrich and Eppinger [18] supports the need for an equally systemic approach addressing a broader scope suited to the needs identified. Thus, HPD embodies a generic approach from which increasing levels of detail on processes and underlying principles can be targeted at increasing resolution of implementation. This hierarchy of modularity forms what has been termed the modularity paradigm (Fig. 1) [13] and is largely implementation independent. The paradigm consists of three levels and combines elements of best practice from systems engineering (SE) standards IEEE 1220 [19], EIA 632 [20] and design standards such as BS7000 pt2 [21]. Holonic Product Design has been developed in a workbook form [22] as a pragmatic implementation of the modularity paradigm and addresses the development of modular products in conjunction with the process and organisational issues that accompany them.

5.1. Systems Engineering Framework and Modularity Methodology

These areas are not covered in detail here but aim to meet the need for a total view and a means of relating this view to the actual process of engineering the product. The framework supports an approach to modularity from the perspective of integrated product and process development (IPPD) [23], where the traditional aspects of systems engineering are combined with a truly integrated product and the means by which it is developed and manufactured [24]. In the same way that quality function deployment (QFD) can provide a linking mechanism between the various stages of the product life cycle, HPD embodies a linking methodology supported by a systems level framework for product realisation to provide an integrated and structured product modularisation process. Thus, the processes carried out in one aspect of module realisation must be addressed in the context of the lifecycle. The phases of the methodology (Fig. 1) focus on establishing a corporate stance on modularity to guide the strategic modular intent of the company and carrying this intent throughout the product lifecycle.

5.2. Modular Product Development Process

The actual process of developing modular products deals with the engineering activity involved in converting the results of the early phases of the methodology into product and process specifications. The process (Fig. 2) was developed to maintain the structured approach outlined by the systems framework by ensuring stakeholder requirements, through module criteria, permeate the process and provide traceability for all development decisions. The process then follows a classical functional analysis / physical analysis structure to provide a largely unconstrained environment for the designer, to encourage innovation and the opportunity to foster an approach to modularity that is not constrained by legacy designs. The two key stages in this process concern interaction analysis, and are performed twice; once at a functional stage and again at a physical stage to ensure the optimum consideration of interface interactions.

6. Key Features of HPD

6.1. Level of Modularity

One of the initial requirements for the modular design process is the level to which the modular architecture is to be taken. Case study work undertaken by the authors has shown that for a modular product there are a number of dimensions to the implementation of modularity. This application difference of modularity has been named the level of modularity (LOM) and is classified as a combination of three factors:

1. *Complexity* - This is the functional level of modularity for each module. A module can contain anything from a single function to a combination of many functions.
2. *Resolution* - This is the number of modules in the product. The number of modules often relate to complexity, where high numbers of modules are likely to have low individual functionality.
3. *Composition* - This is the degree to which module complexity varies within a single product, and whether the product is a hybrid of an integrated common module and variant modules.

Where products with a high LOM exhibit benefits in terms of flexibility, those with a low LOM act as an integrated whole and tend to be products where optimum performance is critical. The affect of the LOM has been identified through a number of additional factors:

1. The LOM gives a basis for development to maximise the ability to utilise common modules. Products of greatly differing LOM are unlikely to be compatible due to the module interfaces.
2. The LOM will affect the flexibility and the performance of the product. Though highly flexible modular solutions can perform extremely well, they are unlikely to exhibit the optimal architecture and performance. It must be stressed that this only relates to examples of exacting performance, as non-integrated systems can also be designed to function to very high levels.
3. The LOM will affect the manufacturability of the modules. The greater the number of common modules the more efficient the manufacture. Also, complex modules will naturally be more complex to manufacture.
4. The LOM will also affect, complexity, robustness (both in quality and flexibility), and cost.

6.2. Module Definition

Module definition is a complex and largely intuitive process. However there are a number of factors that may be considered to aid in the process:

- Interactions: Interactions between elements that are critical may benefit from the elements being grouped as may interactions utilising mechanical movement which is not sympathetic to being made to function across interfaces. Electronic interactions are more sympathetic to separation and may even benefit from being in separate modules, as in multiplexed systems.
- Geometric location: Integrating elements that require precise geometric alignment will benefit from being in the same module, as control of the alignment is done in a localised area or by a single component.
- Function deployment: When a single physical element can implement a number of functions the elements can be grouped. This may inhibit flexibility as not all of the integrated elements may be used in another product. However there is the possibility of redundancy if advantageous.
- Supplier capability: A regular supplier to the company may have a specific area of expertise, elements in this area may be grouped to utilise the capability of a supplier to the maximum.
- Natural Modules: Groups of elements that naturally complement each other and benefit little from being separate are termed natural modules, such as power supply units.
- Core Business: The grouping of elements into modules that contain features, functions and expertise that fall outside of the core business allows them to be provided by a supplier.
- Localisation of change: If change is anticipated in certain elements through, wear, use, obsolescence or fashion, then these elements should have their own modules, such that they may be altered, replaced or serviced without affecting the whole, as in toner cartridges.
- Configurability: Elements should be grouped such that the company may combine modules in differing ways to provide variety if desired.
- Standardisation: Elements useful to a range of products should be grouped so that modules can be common or form a generic platform or architecture. A generic architecture provides a standard proportion for each product, and introduces benefits through flexibility. Modules can then be developed that provide variety when configured with this generic architecture. Also, designs should consider existing and possible future products and how they may be integrated with the current designs, components, processes, facilities etc.
- Manufacture: Elements may be grouped that require the same manufacturing processes or combined through the use of processes such as injection moulding or casting. Such groupings may also be mirrored through

modular assembly cells. In addition, elements composed of the same material may be grouped to aid manufacturing and also recycling. Groups can also be formed that encapsulate features of the product that allows for these to be introduced to the assembly process late on i.e. late configuration.

- Failure modes and effect analyses: If product or process FMEA studies are carried out or previous data is available, the results may aid element grouping with a view to minimising the failures and their consequence.

Once elements have been grouped into modules interactions between modules should be identified. It cannot be taken that the interactions will purely be combinations of those between functions determined previously. Module interactions are at a higher level than functional interactions and will arise due to the physical implementation of the functional elements or due to the geometric arrangement of the modules. These interactions will probably not appear on the schematic and must be identified to ensure that any detrimental effects may be removed. The outcome of this process provides input for detail specifications to be drawn up for modules and interfaces. Interactions documented in the specifications are very important and may be used to structure and manage the remaining development activities. Modules that have many interactions should be developed by teams that are closely tied, or even a single team. Modules that have few or no interactions can be developed by independent teams or outside suppliers.

6.3. Self Analysis

HPD's pragmatic approach also provides the ability to tailor the process and means by which the user may determine metrics from which they can base decisions. Kohlhase and Birkhofer [25] echo this need through their evaluation of modular structures. HPD provides a set of simple self analysis, checklists, and distilled guidelines for quick reference [22]. One such analysis concerns implementation and aims to identify a guideline for an appropriate LOM. The analysis is performed through answering the seven question shown below:

1. To what extent will the user desire / require configurability of the product?
2. What is the degree of possible commonality between the product and any other?
3. To what extent is the product likely to be modified / updated in the future?
4. How complex is the product and project to be undertaken?
5. To what extent is the product constrained by manufacturing strategy and processes?
6. To what extent will the product include elements requiring regular service or replacement?
7. What is the degree of possible recyclable / reuseable elements within the product?

The results from the analysis provide a LOM metric. The score indicates a degree of modularity on a scale of 0-21 ranging from a low level to a high level. The metric can then be used to determine a broad level of complexity and resolution using the LOM Graph for guidance (Fig. 3). The LOM Graph represents a 'hot-spot' for optimum LOM and highlights the benefit of a balance within the modular architecture.

A further aid to determining the appropriate LOM is the permutation chart (Fig. 4). The chart is based on a morphological matrix [26] and has been developed as a simple graphical method of exploring the possibilities for the levels of modularity. The actual implications of composition, complexity, and resolution can be mapped and a 3 digit value determined that represents the desired LOM. An example of its use may see a value of 003 representing a modern personal computer or 301 an automobile. However, this particular analysis is very

subjective and highly dependent on its context. Answers may vary depending on whether the product is considered in isolation or part of an existing product family. Thus any conclusions derived from this analysis should only form part of an important discussion on the level of modularity suited to the company's products.

7. Initial Implementation

Initial validation has been carried out through a project based at Sperry-Sun Drilling Services, UK (SSDS) who manufacture test equipment for down-hole drilling applications. A version of HPD was used to aid the development of a new business strategy that used modularity as a strategic tool in shaping the long term goals of the company. Within this strategy HPD was used to develop two new products. The benefits gained from the implementation of the new modular strategy have been widespread. New product development is much simplified and responsive. The re-use of modules reduces the engineering effort required to realise a new product and ensures that the customer's needs are met quickly. Design changes and upgrades have also benefited in the same way through forward compatibility and the ability to upgrade selective modules, addressing customer requirements pre-emptively and allowing existing products to be upgraded with greater efficiency.

Complexity has been addressed through decomposition into modules, partitioning of dedicated and common areas and a reduction in interfaces and provision of generic modules. This has improved management, design, manufacture, service and use of the product. Modules have simplified and allowed more efficient manufacturing and assembly tasks. This has been achieved through the early involvement of manufacturing but also a reduction in part numbers and part variety, thus reducing stock holding, parts inventory, lead times (from 12-20 weeks to 6-8) and increases in economies of scale and quality (2.5% rejects to 1.2%). Assembly sequences are generic across the majority of products and variety can be introduced late on in the assembly process providing flexibility to the build plan. Testing is simplified as modules can be tested separately and also by the supplier ($190,000 saving). There are also less varieties of products to test and a reduced requirement for test tooling and facilities.

The implementation of the process has also seen some general benefits including administration and documentation overheads reduced, a closer knit and more motivated development operation with engineers more appreciative of functions outside their own and an emphasis on finding and addressing problems early on.

8. Concluding Remarks

The concerns summarised at the beginning of this paper relating to variety, complexity, and flexibility demand a structured requirements driven approach to product realisation. Modularity offers this approach, providing a timely opportunity to drive integrated product / process development. To these ends Holonic Product Design has been developed as a highly pragmatic approach embodying this total view with the core concepts of modularity and the autonomy, flexibility and co-operative nature of holons. Thus a tiered paradigm has been proposed to target the appropriate perspective, detail, and approach to each level. This paradigm then supports

the principles of modularity that can be carried over regardless of application and can be used to determine metrics for control and support of the methodology. To validate this model the work was embodied within a Holonic Product Design Workbook [22], accessible by the practitioners of modularity and with all necessary tools for implementation and support of the process. An initial implementation of the workbook has produced some positive results and also opportunities for refinement and a planned expanded assessment of the approach in terms of its applicability, accessibility and its overall scope.

REFERENCES

[1] MARSHALL, R. (1998) *Design Modularisation: a systems engineering based methodology for enhanced product realisation*. PhD thesis, Loughborough University, UK.

[2] WHITNEY, D.E. (1992) *Systematic Design of Modular Products at Telemechanique.* (URL:http://web.mit.edu/ ctpid/www/Whitney/europe.html).

[3] PAHL, G. and BEITZ, W. *Engineering Design: a Systematic Approach. -2Rev.ed,* (London, Springer Verlag).

[4] KOESTLER, A. **(**1967) *The Ghost in the Machine.* (London, Hutchinson).

[5] SIMON, H.J. (1962) The architecture of complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* 106(6).

[6] HANSEN, F. (1970) *Adjustment of Precision Mechanisms*. (London: Iliffe Books)

[7] VALCKENAERS, P. and VAN BRUSSEL, H. (1994) Holonic manufacturing systems: system components of autonomous modules and their distributed control. *IMS TC5: Holonic Manufacturing Systems Deliverable of WP6.*

[8] BARNETT, L., LEANEY, P.G. and MATKE, J. (1995) Striving for manufacturing flexibility in body construction. *Proceedings of the IMechE AutoTech/95 Conference*, Birmingham, UK, C498/3/140.

[9] RZEVSKI, G. (1998). Engineering design for the next millennium: the challenge of artificial intelligence. *The 86th Thomas Hawksley Memorial Lecture, IMechE,* 9 Dec.

[10] WYNNS, J. (1999) *Reference Architecture for Holonic Manufacturing Systems - the key to support evolution and reconfiguration*. Phd Thesis, KU-Leuven.

[11] SUH, N.P. (1990) *The Principles of Design.* (London, Oxford University Press).

[12] VALCKENAERS, P. (1993) *Flexibility for Integrated Production Automation*. PhD Thesis, KU-Leuven.

[13] MARSHALL, R. and LEANEY, P.G. (1999) A systems engineering approach to product modularity. *Journal of Engineering Manufacture, IMechE Proceedings Part B.* **213**(8)**,** 847-851.

[14] ANDREASEN, M.M. (1980) *Machine Design Methods Based On A Systematic Approach – contribution to a design theory*. PhD thesis, Lund Institute of Technology, Sweden.

[15] ANDREASEN, M.M. (1998) Conceptual Design Capture. In: *Design Reuse: Proceedings of the Engineering Design Conference,* pp. 21-30 (Professional Engineering Publishing, London).

[16] HUBKA, V. and EDER, W.E. (1988) *Theory of Technical Systems*, (New York: Springer-Verlag).

[17] HUBKA, V. and EDER, W.E. (1996) *Design Science: introduction to the needs, scope and organisation of engineering design knowledge,* (London: Springer-Verlag).

[18] ULRICH, K.T. and EPPINGER, S.D. (1995) *Product Design and Development,* (New York , McGraw-Hill).

[19] IEEE (1995) IEEE Std 1220-1994. *IEEE Trial-use standard for application and management of the systems engineering process.* The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., New York, USA.

[20] EIA (1997) EIA 632 *Processes For Engineering a System.* Electronics Industry Association.

[21] BS 7000 (1997**)** BS 7000, Design Management Systems Part 2. *Guide to Managing the Design of Manufactured Products.* London: BSI.

[22] MARSHALL, R (1999) *Holonic Product Design: A Workbook.* V1.3. (URL: http://info.lboro.ac.uk/departments/en/research/cae/res_int/ipps/mod3.htm)

[23] SHUMAKER, G.S. and THOMAS, R.E. (1998) Integrated processes in defence manufacturing. In*: Integrated Product and Process Development: Methods Tools and Technologies* (Eds J. M. Usher, U. Roy and H. R. Parsaei), pp.281-308 (New York, John Wiley & Sons).

[24] STEVENS, R. et al. (1998) *Systems Engineering: Coping with Complexity,* (London, Prentice-Hall).

[25] KOHLHASE, N. and BIRKHOFER, H. (1996) Development of modular structures: the prerequisite for successful modular products, Journal of Engineering Design, 7(3), pp. 279-291.

[26] CROSS, N (1989) *Engineering Design Methods,* (Chichester, John Wiley & Sons).

FIGURES.



Fig. 1 The Modularity Paradigm.



Fig. 2 The Modular Product Development Process Flow.



Fig. 3 Level of Modularity Graph.

Classifications \ Solutions	0	1	2	3
Composition	Integrated common element(s)	No common element, all variant modules	Only a common layout principle	Modular common element(s)
Complexity	Mixed complexity levels in modules	Low level of complexity in most modules	High level of complexity in most modules	Medium level of complexity in most modules
Resolution	Only a small number (2-4) of variant modules	A high number (10+) of variant modules	A medium number (5-10) of variant modules	A variable number of modules to meet requirements

Fig. 4 Module Permutation Chart.