

A ROADMAP FOR PRODUCT ARCHITECTURE COSTING

Sebastian K. Fixson*

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years many markets have exhibited increasing demand heterogeneity; they are fragmenting into more and smaller market niches. This development threatens the large-scale assumption of many mass production processes. As a result, firms face the dilemma of how to provide a wide variety of goods for prices that can compete with mass produced products. To respond to these challenges, many firms have begun searching for ways to combine the efficiency of mass production with the variety of customer-oriented product offerings. A major focus of these efforts has been the fundamental structure of the product: the product architecture. Examples for this development are Sony's personal music players (Walkman) that use common drives across different models (Sanderson and Uzumeri 1995), different power tools that use similar motors (Meyer and Lehnerd 1997), PDAs (personal digital assistant) that with different attachments can be turned into an MP3 player, a camera, or a telephone (Biersdorfer 2001), and automobiles with common components across models (Carney 2004).

Researchers of disciplines ranging from engineering to management have focused their attention on these phenomena, and have developed tools to guide the difficult process of providing variety to the customer while maintaining near-mass production efficiency, i.e., to 'mass customize' (Pine 1993). The approaches vary in their perspective and level of analysis. Some focus more on ways to increase external product variety while maintaining low costs, while others target their efforts on internal variety reduction without losing the variety appeal for the customer. The underlying idea of most of these approaches is to increase commonality across multiple products. The level in the product hierarchy at which commonality is pursued varies: it can be focused on common components (Eynan and Rosenblatt 1996; Fisher et al. 1999), on modules (Chakravarty and Balakrishnan 2001; Dahmus et al. 2001; Sudjianto and Otto 2001), on product platforms and product families (Gonzalez-Zugasti et al. 2000; Jiao and Tseng

* Industrial & Operations Engineering, University of Michigan, 1205 Beal Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, fixson@umich.edu.

2000; Simpson et al. 2001) or on production processes (Wilhelm 1997; Siddique et al. 1998), although the lines between these levels are sometimes blurred.




Figure 1. Chain of requirements for developing product design support tools with respect to costs

From an overall strategic perspective a firm needs to balance all benefits it can achieve by increasing commonality across products with all the costs this approach creates. For example, it needs to weigh the revenue decreasing effects through cannibalization that product commonality can cause against the cost savings that commonality can achieve (Robertson and Ulrich 1998). Ideally, this multi-objective problem requires the balancing of cost, revenue, and performance effects when selecting a product architecture from a set of candidates. Although cost is only one of these variables, there are at least two major reasons that make it worthwhile to explore this problem with a focus on the cost portion alone. The first reason is that in many cases cost is a major, if not the most important, decision variable. More specifically, most products contain two types of components: those with a strong influence on product quality and those with only a weak influence on product quality (Fisher et al. 1999). For components of the latter type cost becomes the only decision variable, provided that the components' performance level is sufficient (Thonemann and Brandeau 2000). The second reason for building a roadmap focusing on cost is that it can—once established—serve as a building block for the development of more sophisticated design support tools such as product architecture design guidelines or optimization models. These tools often build on existing cost estimation models which in turn incorporate known or assumed relationships between product architecture and costs as well as cost allocation rules, and to interpret the results of the models requires a thorough understanding of how the problem has been framed. In other words, what are the multiple and complex relationships between various product architecture characteristics and various costs along the product life cycle? The existing research is somewhat inconclusive. For commonality decisions, one aspect of product architecture, effects on individual costs

have been demonstrated (Park and Simpson 2003), whereas for modularity, another aspect of product architecture, no general relationship with cost has been found (Zhang and Gershenson 2003). In other words, the complex relationship between product architecture and costs is still insufficiently understood (Simpson 2004). Similarly, what is the impact of the applied allocation rules on the cost models, and consequently, their results? Finally, to develop the deep understanding of the relationships between product architecture and costs in turn requires a good understanding of the input data, i.e., how is the product architecture described and what types of costs are considered? Figure 1 illustrates this chain of requirements for building design support tools with respect to costs. The remainder of the chapter develops a roadmap that helps covering all requirements from input data to the cost estimation models.

2. DEVELOPING A ROADMAP FOR PRODUCT ARCHITECTURE COSTING

The roadmap for comprises four steps (Figure 2). The first step is an assessment of the differences in product architecture between potential candidates. This step is crucial because in order to make the analysis of cost consequences of different product architectures possible requires the ability to distinguish different product architectures in the first place. The product architecture costing roadmap builds on a multidimensional product architecture description methodology. In the second step of the roadmap the relevant life cycle phase, or phases, with respect to costs have to be identified. The question of relevance hinges on a variety of factors such as product lifetime, production volume, total value, and cost ownership. The third step requires determining the cost allocation rules to be used for the costing procedure. The choice of certain accounting decisions can have a profound effect on how the product architecture-cost relationship is modeled. In its fourth step, the roadmap calls for the selection of suitable cost models. Existing models differ in their requirements for data accuracy and sample size, as well as their ability to predict cost differentials of product architectures differences. Below, each step of the proposed roadmap is discussed in more detail.




Figure 2. A roadmap for product architecture costing

2.1. Step 1: Assess Differences of Product Architecture Candidates

2.1.1 The Special Role of Product Architecture as a Design Variable

Product designers make numerous decisions throughout the design process. Each of these decisions has consequences for some costs along the product life cycle. Two characteristics label the links between these decisions and their cost consequences. The first characteristic describes how difficult it is to construct the link, the second how valuable it is to know it (

Figure 3).




Figure 3. Product architecture decisions in the design hierarchy

The level of difficulty to establish a link between design decisions and their cost effects depends on the hierarchy level at which the decisions are made. On a very detailed level, it is fairly straightforward to construct a link between the design decision and its cost implication. This is due to two reasons. First, on the detailed level it is often clear on what costs to focus on, and second, for well known links historical data often exist. For example, there is ample data on how a more stringent surface smoothness requirement affects the manufacturing cost to create that surface. Design textbooks typically provide cost tables or functions to guide these type of design decisions (Michaels and Woods 1989; Pahl and Beitz 1996). On the next higher level of abstraction, design decisions affect the choice of materials, production processes, or part features. Materials have been used as a cost determining decision variable for a long time since in many mass production environments material costs represent a significant fraction of total production cost (Ostwald and McLaren 2004). For this reason, rules-of-thumb have been developed to allow approximate but quick cost estimates. For example, to assess the cost impact of selecting manufacturing processes, Esawi and Ashby (2003) have developed a simple model that requires the input of only a few parameters. The primary aim of that method, however, is the relative ranking of multiple processes with

respect to cost, not to predict exact costs. Product features have also been used as decision variables for which cost models have been developed. Often the models combine cost estimations on the feature level with cost estimations on component and assembly levels (Weustink et al. 2000) and the product family level (Park and Simpson 2003). Yet another level up in abstraction is populated by design guidelines such as Design for Manufacturing (DFM) or Design for Assembly (DFA). They represent codified knowledge of links between design decisions and production costs. However, they are not cost prediction tools but present the knowledge in a condensed form such that they direct the designer's attention to cost creating design issues, and lead him towards (relatively) lower cost solutions (Boothroyd et al. 2002). Finally, on the level of product architecture there are numerous examples for relationships between *individual* aspects of the product architecture and *individual* costs, but no approach exists that provides a generic yet comprehensive description of this multidimensional relationship.

The second characteristic that describes the link between design decisions and cost elements along the product life cycle is the leverage to influence the costs if the link is actually known. It is generally assumed that earlier design decisions have greater potential to influence costs than later design decisions.¹ This creates a dilemma for the designer: it is the early design decisions where the potential to influence total life cycle cost is greatest, and yet early in the design process is where the fewest data for detailed cost estimations exist. How, then, can this link be constructed? This roadmap builds on a methodology that is capable to distinguish between different product architectures along multiple dimensions on a relatively abstract level.

2.1.2 A multidimensional Method to assess Product Architecture Differences

The product architecture is the fundamental structure and layout of a product and is defined during concept development (Ulrich and Eppinger 2000). Building on Ulrich's description of product architectures (Ulrich 1995), a multi-dimensional product architecture description method has been developed (Fixson 2005). The method relaxes three fundamental assumption of earlier work. First, it allows for independent assessments of the two main dimensions *function-component allocation* and *interfaces*. Second, it acknowledges that each of these two dimensions are themselves multidimensional constructs. Third, it assesses the product architecture for each function separately—in contrast to most product architecture descriptions in the literature that essentially provide *average* assessments of a product's architecture.


The first of the two dimensions, *function-component allocation (FCA)*, is concerned with the extent to which a product's functions are isolated on physical components. It measures for each function (on the selected architecture level) the degree of function-component allocation. More specifically, each function is assigned two indices that

¹ Various authors present the idea that somewhere between 60% and 90% of the total life cycle cost are committed during product design. Interestingly, although these numbers are used by a variety of authors from diverse fields ranging from accounting to engineering to management, e.g., (Smith and Reinertsen 1991:100; Anderson and Sedatole 1998:231; Blanchard and Fabrycky 1998:561; Clancy 1998:25; Knight 1998:21; Sands et al. 1998:118; Buede 2000:7; Weustink et al. 2000:1; Bhimani and Muelder 2001:28), nowhere is real data presented as evidence. One exception exists that models costs in more detail, however, it also does not specify a particular fraction of the total life cycle cost that is committed during design, but rather assesses the cost influence potential of the design phase versus the one of the production phase (Ulrich and Pearson 1998).

determine its position relative to the extremes of 1-to-1 and many-to-many relationships between functions and components. A 1-to-1 measurement indicates a situation in which the function under consideration is provided exclusively by one component, and this component provides exclusively this function only. This style of FCA is called modular-like. In contrast, a few-to-many measurement indicates a situation in which a function is provided by many components (an integral-fragmented style). A many-to-few measurement denotes an integral-consolidated style where one component provides multiple functions. Finally, a many-to-many measurement represents an integral-complex FCA style. It is important to take the FCA measure for each product function individually because the reuse of a component across a product family depends to a large degree on the role a component can play in different products. The second dimension of the product architecture description method, *interfaces*, is itself multidimensional and is concerned with three characteristics of the interfaces that connect the components. The first characteristic, interface intensity, describes in detail the role each interface plays for the product function. Interfaces can be spatial, or they can transmit material, energy, or signals or any combination of the above (Pimmler and Eppinger 1994). The second characteristic, interface reversibility, describes the effort it requires to disconnect the interface. This effort depends on two factors: the difficulty to physically disconnect the interface, and the interface's position in the overall product architecture. Finally, the third characteristic, interface standardization, depends both on product features as well as the population of alternatives. While some researchers have used different types of interfaces to categorize types of modularity like swapping, sharing, bus, and sectional (Ulrich and Tung 1991; Pine 1993), the method presented here views the extent to which an interface allows different kinds of interchangeability as a matter of perspective. In other words, the level of standardization can be different for either component that is involved in the interface. Standardization is a function of the number of alternatives that exist on either side of the interface.


As example, compare the two trailers in Figure 4 (top). They both provide the same functionality. However, they exhibit very different product architectures. Figure 4 (bottom) illustrates two different patterns of how each component is involved in providing one or more functions. Figure 5 illustrates this information much more detailed with help of product architecture maps. Each function is assessed separately and along multiple dimensions. The location on the x-y plane identifies where each function is positioned in between the extreme points of 1-to-1 and many-to-many function-component allocations. To put it differently, the position describes each function's FCA style. The three interface sub-dimensions intensity, reversibility, and standardization are independently scaled on the vertical axis. The value of this assessment independence can be seen by comparing individual functions for the two trailers. For example, the function *transfer loads to road* exhibits identical product architecture characteristics for both trailers whereas all other functions show significant differences along the multiple dimensions.

The following sections will refer to these dimensions of product architecture when discussing the remaining three steps of the roadmap for product architecture costing: identifying the relevant life cycle phases and costs and their product architecture-cost relationships, determining the relevant allocation rules, and selecting appropriate cost models.



Source: Ulrich (1995) "The role of product architecture in the manufacturing firm"

Figure 4. Two trailers with different product architectures



Source: Fixson (2005)

Figure 5. Product architecture maps for the two trailers

2.2. Step 2: Identify relevant product life cycle phase(s) and their Product Architecture-Cost Relationships

Before one can begin to investigate the cost implications of differences in product architecture one has to decide on which costs to incorporate in the analysis. This problem has two components. The first is concerned with the decision of which life cycle phase(s) are relevant with respect to cost for the decision at hand, and the second strives to identify the relevant product architecture-cost *relationships* within the selected life cycle phase or phases. Below, the factors helping to identify the relevant product life cycle phases are discussed, followed by a detailed account of known effects that individual product architecture characteristics have on costs for each life-cycle phase.

2.2.1 Which life cycle phase matters?

Every product and every system, regardless of size, value and lifetime, runs through different phases over its lifetime: design and development, production, use, and retirement. In each of these life cycle phases different processes and activities are performed with and on the product (Figure 6). Each of these processes and activities creates a cost. These costs can occur at different points in time, at different locations, and can be borne by different constituents.




Figure 6. Activities throughout the Product Model Life Cycle²

² Note that the diagram depicts the product life cycle of all units produced during a model's life. In case of only one unit produced (e.g., expensive or special equipment), the diagram collapses into the individual product's life cycle. For the discussion in this chapter the term product life cycle is used to describe the life of a single product.

Given that various costs occur in different phases of a product’s life, one of the first decisions of a cost evaluation is to determine those costs that are relevant for the design decision at hand. The relevance of individual costs depends on the life cycle cost profile and the ownership of the costs. A product’s life cycle cost profile is determined by both absolute values and relative distributions of the costs over the life cycle, the durations of the individual phases, and the production volume. To separate products according to their absolute values of total lifetime and total life cycle costs, it has been suggested to cluster the universe of different products into three major categories: large-scale, medium-scale and small-scale systems (Asiedu and Gu 1998). Large-scale systems can have total lifetimes of several decades and total life cycle costs of billions of dollars. Lifetimes of medium-sized products are typically measured in years, with total life cycle costs ranging from thousands to millions of dollars. Small-scale products can have lifetimes as short as a few months and life cycle costs as low as a few hundred dollars (Figure 7).




Figure 7. Lifetimes of different product categories

In addition to the absolute values, the relative distribution of time and cost over the different life cycle phases plays an important role in determining on which costs to focus. These differences in relative distribution can be caused by differences in scale and technical complexity. For example, a small product, say a radio clock, will require very few maintenance and support activities, which translate into low costs during its use, whereas for long living and large scale products as, for instance, a navy ship, these costs can represent almost 2/3 of total lifetime costs (Sands et al. 1998). Another factor that influences the relative size of the costs of the individual life cycle phases is the production volume per model. A small production volume results in relatively higher development cost per unit compared to the situation in which the total development costs

can be spread over a large production volume. The consequence of the differences in total life cycle cost, total life time, life cycle cost distributions, and production volumes are different life cycle cost incurrance curves (Figure 8).




Figure 8. Cost Committal and Incurrance Curves

Finally, the life cycle phase in which certain costs occur does not necessarily determine who bears these costs. For example, warranty policies can transfer costs between producer and user (Blischke and Murthy 1994), and most of so-called external costs are often borne by the society at large while the product user pays only a fraction of it directly. More generally, depending on a variety of additional factors such as market dynamics, level of competition, or institutional environment, a number of different cost distribution schemes are conceivable, enforced by different contractual agreements. Since most of these factors are not decision variables for the designer, the following discussion of each life cycle phase individually looks at costs independently from the ultimate ownership. Also note that while the primary focus of this chapter is on cost effects triggered by product architecture design decisions, other performance measures—such as time, and to some extent revenue—that are impacted by these decision, are discussed where relevant.

2.2.2 Product Architecture Effects on Costs of the Product Development Phase

The first phase of a product's life encompasses activities such as conceptual and preliminary design, detail design and prototyping, testing, as well as supporting functions such as data maintenance and project management. For engineered products, the costs for these processes represent primarily engineering resources, i.e., personnel. To address the question of how differences in product architecture affect the resource consumption during the design phase, some researchers have linked the task structure of the design

process to the product architecture (von Hippel 1990; Eppinger et al. 1994; Gulati and Eppinger 1996). Over time, a firm's organizational structure often mirrors the product structure of the products the firm produces (Henderson and Clark 1990). Thus, the design decision on the number and size of 'chunks' (subsystems, modules, parts, etc.), i.e., the *function-component allocation scheme*, translates into the number and size of teams working to develop the product (Baldwin and Clark 2003). The number and size of the teams determines their internal complexity as well as their external communication requirements. Both factors in turn determine the teams' level of efficiency. Either extreme, i.e., one very large team or many, very small teams, appears to be a relatively inefficient organizational form, the former requiring many internal iterations, the latter producing a long sequence of information transfers. Therefore, creating product architectures that balance the design complexity that incurs between the chunks (integration effort) on one hand, with the sum of the design complexity within the chunks on the other, by designing chunks of medium complexity, seems to be a resource efficient approach. This effect has been found empirically for complex software development projects (MacCormack et al. 2004). For the second product development performance measure next to cost, total development time, a similar effect has been found: for the development of a turbopump of a rocket engine it has been shown that there is a number of blocks of the product architecture (modules, chunks, etc.) that translates into a medium number of teams that minimizes the duration of the project development project (Ahmadi et al. 2001). Apparently, both costs and time functions exhibit a minimum if the product is decomposed into a medium number of subunits; and increases when fewer but larger subunits are chosen, and increases when more but smaller subunits are selected.

The relative value of time compared to cost depends on a number of market parameters as well as the ratio between revenue and costs. For example, companies operating in fast pace market environments will especially value a product architecture's potential to reduce the time-to-market. Product architectures that allow conducting much of the design process in clusters in parallel to arrive at the shortest possible total design time are of particular value to them. In a specific case about a Polaroid camera housing, for example, it has been found that the foregone sales in case of a longer development time far outweigh any achievable cost savings in manufacturing (Ulrich and Pearson 1993). In a case like this, a product architecture that helps to reduce development time is much more valuable than one that focuses on cost savings in the production phase.

Also, strictly speaking, the design phase is only one component of the time-to-market. If 'market' is understood as sale (or start of operation) of the first unit, then production preparations become part of the time-to-market, in particular tool design and manufacturing. Hu and Poli (1997) have compared assemblies made from stampings with injection molded parts regarding their effects on time-to-market. They find that parts consolidation, i.e., the reduction of the number of chunks the product consists of can be disadvantageous with regards to time-to-market when the time to produce the tool for larger, more complex parts extends the total time-to-market.

In addition to the particular product function-component allocation scheme, the characteristics of the *interfaces* between the chunks are likely to affect the efficiency of the design process, and thus its costs. The weaker the interface connections are, i.e., the lower their intensity, the more the different design teams can be working independently on different subsets of the product. This can reduce the number of iterations between the teams, and thus increase overall design process efficiency. In a case study of the development of an automotive climate control system, strong coupling between

components has been identified as one reason for development cost increases (Terwiesch and Loch 1999). Weaker interface dependencies may also improve the second performance indicator, total development time (time-to-market), because it allows the design tasks to proceed in parallel (Baldwin and Clark 2000). For example, analyzing the product development of integrated circuits it has been found that higher levels of interface independence increase the design flexibility and reduce the risk of having to repeat experiments (Thomke 1997).

Finally, both characteristics of a product’s architecture, i.e., its function-component allocation and its interfaces, affect development costs in a particular way as a consequence of the nature of design work. Design costs are one-time costs in the product model’s life, i.e., their relative contribution to the unit costs is highly sensitive to changes in the production volume. If only one product is ever produced, say, a racing boat, then this single unit has to bear all development costs which makes the cost for design and development a substantial portion of the unit’s life cycle costs. In contrast, for mass-produced products like vacuum cleaners the design costs are shared by potentially millions of identical products, which makes the design and development costs per unit relatively small. For the assessment of cost implications of architectural decisions this issue is also relevant when product architectures allow sharing of portions (platforms, modules, components) of a product across product families, and, therefore, allow the sharing of their development costs. The savings through the re-use of designs affect both development cost and time (Nobeoka and Cusumano 1995; Reinertsen 1997; Siddique 2001; Siddique and Repphun 2001).

Figure 9 summarizes the mechanisms by which individual (and combinations of) product architecture characteristics express their relationship to performance measures such as product development costs and time.




Figure 9. Product Architecture Characteristics Effects on Product Development Costs and Time

2.2.3 Product Architecture Effects on Costs of the Production Phase

With respect to the impact of product architecture decisions on costs that occur during the production phase two sub-sets of processes require separate discussion: (1) manufacturing and assembly, and (2) logistics.

To understand how the first dimension of product architecture, i.e., the size and number of components (function-component allocation scheme) affects manufacturing and assembly costs it is helpful to review the basic idea behind design for manufacturing (DFM) and design for assembly (DFA) guidelines. Both guidelines help the designer to focus on product characteristics that consume avoidable resources during manufacturing and assembly, but each with a different rationale. DFM aims at simplifying manufacturing processes, which results—in addition to lower investment—in reduction of process variability and ultimately in faster process rates and higher yields, and thus lower cost. In contrast, DFA generally emphasizes part count reduction, the use of only one assembly direction and the preference of symmetrical parts (Boothroyd et al. 2002). Empirical evidence exists that supports both claims individually. In case of automobile rear lamp production, for instance, it has been found that complex products requiring complex manufacturing processes result in higher costs compared to simpler parts producible with simpler processes (Banker et al. 1990). On the other hand, in an analysis of the costs of electromechanical assemblies it has been found that the assembly cost savings through part count reductions can be significant (Boer and Logendran 1999). Part count reduction is generally seen as a cost reduction tool (Schonberger 1986; Galsworth 1994). These findings result in cost curves that increase in opposite directions with respect to the optimal number, and thus complexity, of modules into which a product should be decomposed. The minimum of the sum of the two curves depends on their specific shapes (Figure 10).




Figure 10. Manufacturing and assembly cost behavior with respect to number of modules

The argument for products requiring simpler manufacturing processes rests essentially on the idea that these processes perform faster and more reliably than their more complex counterparts. Assuming that simpler products require simpler manufacturing processes, this means the product feature complexity affects the efficiency of the process which in turn directly affects the costs via process speeds and yields. In other words, a design that allows processes to be robust is more likely to consume fewer resources. With respect to product architecture, this observation means that the designer

should strive to keep the size of modules or chunks below a complexity level that makes them difficult to manufacture. On the other hand, the argument for products requiring fewer parts (and, as a consequence, fewer manufacturing processes and assembly steps) to achieve lower costs is immediately obvious, as long as the reduction of the number of processes is not paid for with lower yields in the remaining ones. A shift from one manufacturing process to another to reduce part count can have a dramatic impact on assembly time and cost. For example, the instrument panel for the cockpit of the commercial aircraft Boeing 767-4ER used to be manufactured from 296 sheet metal parts and assembled with 600 rivets. A move to precision casting has reduced the part count to 11 and the assembly time from previously 180 hours to 20 hours (Vollrath 2001). In sum, the product's function-component allocation, i.e., its number and size (complexity) of components, affects both manufacturing and assembly costs, typically in opposing directions, and designers need to develop an understanding of the relative importance of these cost elements in their particular environment.

From a unit cost perspective there is one other effect of product architecture on production costs: this is the use of common components across product families. If the fixed cost portion of manufacturing and assembly can be distributed across a larger number of units, the unit production costs decrease. However, the magnitude of these savings needs to be compared with the potential cost penalties for over-designing a sub-unit or module. For example, products whose costs are dominated by materials costs, i.e., variable costs, such as automotive wire harnesses, may not gain much through the use of commonality (Thonemann and Brandeau 2000). More generally, the resource use-rate typically decreases with component commonality, but the cost-rate (per cost driver) often increases (Labro 2004). The final outcome then depends on the specific circumstances.

In addition to the product architecture characteristic number and complexity of chunks, the characteristics of the interfaces between the chunks influence the production costs. Interfaces preferred from the low cost production perspective are such that they minimize complexity and uncertainty within the production process. This means, the better the process is known and the more likely it can be performed successfully, and the lower the total number of different processes in the production system is, the lower the expected production costs. The nature and intensity of the interfaces can also be relevant to the production. For example, electronic interfaces consisting of only a plug and a socket may be easier to assemble error-free than a complex mechanical rod connection.

The second subset of production costs is concerned with the aspects of logistics. For the purpose of this chapter, logistics costs encompass costs for storage, transportation, inventory, and work-in-process (WIP). Storage and transportation need to be considered between suppliers and plant, inside the plant, and between plant and customers. Product architecture decisions—the specification of the product's function-component allocation and its interfaces—are most likely to affect these costs to the extent to which they determine packing space and product protection requirements.

Product architecture differences also impact the costs for inventory and WIP. The more a product architecture allows late customization or postponement strategies, the more it can contribute to savings in storage and WIP costs through pooling effects. Parts commonality has been identified as a way to reduce the safety stock level for a given service level (Collier 1982). Others have shown, however, that while the stock for a common part can be lower compared to the unique parts it replaces, the safety stock of the remaining unique components increases if a certain service level is to be maintained (Baker et al. 1986). These findings have been confirmed for an arbitrary number of

products and joint distribution as long as the costs for the product-specific components (that are replaced by a common one) are the same (Gerchak et al. 1988). For the two-product case, cost ratios have been derived that bound the advantage of the use of common components (Eynan and Rosenblatt 1996). Another strategy to reduce inventory is to move the common inventory as much upstream in the supply chain as possible to wait with the product customization as much as possible. This strategy might require a re-sequencing of the operations (Lee and Tang 1998). The key product architecture characteristic for this strategy is the interface reversibility. If it is low, an operation reversal may not be possible because the technical nature of the operations prohibits a reversal (e.g., in the case of steel components welding has be completed before painting). In sum, the use of common parts can reduce inventory, but it needs to be investigated with the specific demand pattern, the relative costs of the components, and other product architecture constraints in mind.

The product architecture’s effect on time can have an additional impact on costs via the detour of increasing demand volatility. Because demand volatility increases upstream (‘bullwhip-effect’), product architectures can reduce this effect if they allow for parallelization of production to achieve short lead times. Long lead times, together with high levels of demand uncertainty, can amplify the bullwhip-effect and create significant additional costs in the supply chain (Levy 1994).

Overall, a complete assessment of the impact of architectural characteristics on production costs should incorporate manufacturing, assembly, and logistics costs, and evaluate how to balance these different effects. Figure 11 summarizes the effects of individual product architecture characteristics on production cost and time.




Figure 11. Product Architecture Characteristics Effects on Production Costs and Time

2.2.4 *Product Architecture Effects on Costs of the Use Phase*

In general, three types of costs occur during product use: the costs for operation, the costs for maintenance, and all external costs incurred by the operation of the product.

Most products require some input to operate them. The costs for these inputs can be for fuel or utilities like energy, water, or pressurized air, or costs incurred by the product's characteristic, for instance labor requirements for a machine operation. While it is very difficult to make a general statement about the relationship between product architecture characteristics and operation costs, some issues can be pointed out. Operating costs typically contain two types: costs for standard operation and costs for preparation activities, for example training. The training of personnel is analogous to the setup of a machine: a process necessary to begin operation. Similar to the production arena, if the set-up time, i.e. training time, can be reduced, then the system's productivity increases. A product architecture can contribute to this reduction in 'set-up time' by utilizing common components across members of a product family (which requires proper function-component alignment). For example, aircraft producers are trying to install similar, if not identical, cockpits into airplanes of different sizes to reduce the airlines' need to retrain their crews (Anonymous 2005). Similarly, if it is not the operator that changes (as in the airplane case) but the task that the product has to accomplish (e.g., a machine tool that is planned to produce a variety of components) then a product architecture that supports to reconfigure the product quickly is advantageous (Landers et al. 2001). Proper function-component alignment and high degrees of interface reversibility are key in this situation to improve the productivity of the product by reducing its set-up costs and, thus, its operating costs as measured by units produced per time unit.

With respect to maintenance costs that occur during a product's use phase two major questions are relevant. First, what is the likelihood that maintenance (and its costs) will occur during the product's use phase and, second, what will be the anticipated costs for this maintenance procedure? Grouping parts with similar expected lifetimes together is likely to reduce the repair and replacement costs by minimizing the required parts replacement processes (Dahmus and Otto 2001). A proper module definition (function-component allocation) can help achieving this goal. In addition, a product architecture that allows easy and fast access for maintenance and repair requires less time to execute the actual maintenance procedure and, consequently, leads to lower maintenance costs. The product architecture characteristic interface reversibility is the important design variable in this case. Also, in case that a product has multiple identical parts (function component allocation) fewer parts need to be stocked in inventory (compared to unique parts) for providing the same level of availability (Perera et al. 1999). Like risk pooling across products, this strategy translates into lower spare part inventory costs as part of the maintenance costs. Note that the different elements of maintenance costs described above may react differently to the same product architecture design decision.

Finally, the operation of any product may also cause so-called external costs, e.g., damages to public health or the environment through emissions. A link between product architecture design decisions and external costs is very difficult, if at all, to establish and goes beyond the scope of this work. Figure 12 recapitulates the effects of individual product architecture characteristics on costs in the product use phase.




Figure 12. Product Architecture Characteristics Effects on Use Phase Costs and Time

2.2.5 Product Architecture Effects on Costs of the Retirement Phase

In the last phase of a product’s life cycle, costs are created through activities like disassembly or disposal. In addition to these direct costs, external costs, like degradation of the environment or the air quality, can occur.

To estimate disassembly costs as a function of the product architecture is very difficult, particularly since it is often unclear which disassembly sequences is the most economically viable one. The reverse of the assembly process may, or may not, be the most cost effective way to disassemble the product. Researchers have suggested a number of scoring processes to compare disassembly efforts for different designs. Some suggest comparing disassembly costs for different designs on a relatively high level of aggregation. Emblemvag and Bras (1994), for instance, propose to list all activities the disassembly of various products would require, compute the costs for each activity per time unit, determine the time each design requires each activity, and compare the results. This type of analysis, however, does not reveal specifically what architectural features make one design more costly to disassemble than another. To answer this type of question more detailed analyses are required. Das et al. (2000), for example, propose to compute a disassembly effort index based on seven factors, such as time, tools, fixtures, access, instruct, hazard, and force requirements. The fact that both the score for each of these factors as well as the weights among them are based on qualitative assessments demonstrates the difficult nature of the task to estimate disassembly costs unambiguously. Others have extended this work to include bulk recycling in addition to disassembly activities (Sodhi and Knight 1998). However, while the product architecture affects disassembly costs (via the dimensions function-component allocation scheme and interface reversibility), its impact on bulk recycling is only relevant together with the

specific values of the materials involved. Finally, while determining the costs to landfill a product (or parts of it) is relatively straightforward, the results, however, are unlikely to depend on architectural characteristics of the product (leaving material consideration aside). Figure 13 summarizes the product architecture’s effects on cost in the product retirement phase.




Figure 13. Product Architecture Characteristics Effects on Retirement Phase Costs

This section has demonstrated that the designer responsible for defining the product’s architecture faces a difficult task. Since the analysis for product architecture costing requires a decision on which life cycle phase to include, the designer must develop an understanding of the longitudinal trade-offs that product architecture design decisions face between life-cycle phase and within individual life-cycle phases. The second step of the roadmap presented in this section provides a guideline to develop this understanding.

2.3. Step 3: Determine relevant Cost Allocation Rules and their Impact on Cost Analyses

Once the various cost types that can occur over a product’s life and the relationships between product architecture design decisions and these costs are identified, the third step of the roadmap requires to determine the rules for the cost allocation procedures. Particularly relevant for the results of any cost analysis are the—often implicit—assumptions on the analysis boundaries, on the overhead allocation mechanisms, and on the dynamics of the process under investigation.

2.3.1 Unit of Analysis

Typically, product unit costs are chosen for cost comparisons of assembled products. There are, however, other units of analysis that could be selected alternatively: product families, product programs, departments, factories, companies, or entire economies. The order of this list of potential levels of analysis indicates an increasing distance from the physical object itself. While a cost analysis focusing on a product makes it easy to assess costs that are directly related to the product (e.g., material consumption), it makes the allocation of more ‘distant’ costs (e.g., factory guards) very difficult. On the other hand, for cost analyses on a company level, almost all costs are somewhat ‘direct’ (Figure 14).




Figure 14. Different levels of cost analysis

The direct-indirect cost classification depends on the choice of the cost object. “A useful rule of thumb is that the broader the definition of the cost object, the higher the proportion of its total costs are its direct costs—and the more confidence management has in the accuracy of the resulting cost amounts. The narrower the definition of the cost object, the lower the proportion of its total costs are its direct costs—and the less confidence management has in the accuracy of resulting cost amounts.” (Horngren and Foster 1991:28) Since product architecture costing is concerned with the cost effects that product architecture choices trigger, it is logical to focus the cost analysis on a level where product architectures can be distinguished, i.e., on the product or product family level. This in turn creates the above mentioned allocation problem of how to allocate the significant indirect cost portion, often called ‘overhead.’ Overhead usually encompasses costs with various levels of ‘indirectness.’ For the interpretation of cost consequences of

product architecture design decisions it is very important to understand the mechanisms by which these overhead costs are allocated.

2.3.2 Allocation of Overhead Costs

The accounting literature employs two distinctions for costs: direct versus indirect costs and fixed versus variable costs (Horngren and Foster 1991). While the first uses the cost traceability to separate direct from indirect costs, the second uses the dependency with regards to changes in production volume as a measure to classify fixed and variable costs.

Author(s)	Total Costs (=100%)			Activities considered	Industry
	Direct Materials	Direct Labor	Manufact. Overhead (MO)		
(Banker et al. 1995)	65.4%	8.9%	25.7%	Plant level study	Electronics, Machinery, Automobile components (mean values of 32 facilities)
(Foster and Gupta 1990)	54.3%	6.6%	39.1%	Procurement, Production, Support	Electronics (mean values of 37 facilities)
(Galsworth 1994) [p.85]	40%-65%		35%-60%	Total Costs: Function cost: 40% Variety cost: 25% Control cost: 35%	Manufacturing
(Hundal 1997)	45%-65%	8%-20%	22%-40%	Not specified	Aerospace, Computers, Electronics, General Equipm., Automobiles
(Miller and Vollmann 1985)	20%-40%		60%-80%	Overhead Costs: G & A 20% Indirect Labor 12% Engineering 15% Equipment 20% Materials OH 33%	Electronics

Table 1. Overhead costs found in recent studies

In the production arena, costs that are typically considered variable are costs for direct labor, materials, and utilities. In contrast, machinery, tooling, and building costs are usually considered fixed costs. These distinctions, however, are not clear-cut, but

depend on the chosen time horizon, the chosen manufacturing technology, and the chosen accounting principle. A change in the chosen time horizon can turn the same costs from fixed into variable costs. Labor costs are typically viewed in short time frames as fixed costs whereas in the long run they are typically treated as variable in nature. The choice of a manufacturing technology may determine whether a specific or a generic tool is deployed. A shear as a cutting tool that can be used to produce other products as well exhibits variable cost behavior whereas a specific cutting die that does the same job, but can only be used for this specific product, becomes fixed costs. Finally, certain accounting principles can shift costs from the fixed cost category into the variable cost category, and vice versa. The assumption, for example, that free machine capacity can be employed for other jobs turns the allocated machine cost effectively into variable cost whereas the assumption that the machine is dedicated to a specific product results in fixed cost behavior.

In sum, what is typically called overhead is a broad category with often fuzzy boundaries. It is, however, a category that becomes increasingly important due to increasing product and process complexity, shrinking direct labor content, shorter product life cycles, and increasingly heterogeneous markets (Miller and Vollmann 1985; Doran and Dowd 1999; Cokins 2000). Table 1 gives an overview of the magnitude of some overhead costs found in recent studies.

One characteristic feature of overhead costs is their lack of direct dependency on production volume. Activities that support in various ways the actual production processes do not necessarily vary in direct proportionality with the production volume. It has been argued that the costs for these activities vary with the intensity or frequency of these activities. For example, the time and manpower to write a purchasing order does not vary with the number of equal parts ordered, but each order incurs an average cost for the transaction ‘write purchasing order.’ This insight triggered the development of activity-based costing (ABC) (Kaplan 1991; Kaplan and Cooper 1998). ABC promotes a cost allocation process in proportion to the activities consumed by the products produced. The basic idea of ABC is to calculate the costs of activities (cost drivers) and ‘charge’ products with the time with which they consume an activity times the use rate per time unit. The cost drivers can be on various levels in the firm: “While some activity cost drivers are unit-related (such as machine and labor hours), as conventionally assumed, many activity cost drivers are batch-related, product-sustaining, and customer-sustaining” (Cooper and Kaplan 1992:4).³

While ABC represents an invaluable step towards a better understanding of how to allocate what used to be called ‘overhead,’ it is still helpful to review some of the assumptions that underlie even ABC with respect to product variety. More specifically, these assumptions are concerned with linearity of activity-cost relationships, with different types of variety, and sequence-dependent variety costs.

³ Some have criticized ABC as guiding to poor short-run decisions, and suggested the Theory-of-Constraints (TOC) as a better tool for short-run cost allocations. TOC assumes all costs other than direct material as fixed (Goldratt and Cox 1984). Then, to maximize profitability, TOC recommends to maximize the throughput. TOC promotes finding the bottleneck in an existing system and adjusting all other production to it to eliminate inventory. In the debate about whether ABC or TOC is the superior way of interpreting costs, various authors argue to understand both methods as opposing ends of a continuum with respect to planning time horizon: ABC for long-range planning, TOC for short-term decisions (Fritzsche 1997; Cooper and Kaplan 1998; Kee 1998). Since the choice of the product architecture is a rather long-term decision, ABC is the more relevant method for the purpose of this paper.

ABC argues that many overhead costs are related to activity type and activity frequency rather than production volume. Standard ABC typically assumes a linear relationship between activity and cost. The limits of this assumption, however, become apparent in case of product variety. Product variety often causes additional work in activities such as planning, control, monitoring, and coordination (Lingnau 1999). Not only does this cost propagation effect make it more difficult to trace individual costs, it often creates also an additional allocation problem: if product variety creates costs above the sum of the costs of the individual products, how are these variety-related extra costs allocated to the individual products?

To make matters more complicated, product variety can also take on different forms each of which has a different effect on costs. For example, Ittner and MacDuffie (1994) defined three levels of product variety in their study of overhead costs in automotive assembly plants: core or fundamental variety (model mix complexity), intermediate variety (parts complexity), and peripheral variety (option complexity). They find empirical support only for the latter two affecting overhead costs, “.. reflecting the considerable logistical, coordination, and supervisory challenges that accompany an increase number of parts and more complex manufacturing tasks.” (Ittner and MacDuffie 1994:29) Another approach to specify product variety has been followed by Anderson (1995). She measures the impact of product mix heterogeneity on manufacturing overhead costs by identifying seven independent product attributes, using engineering specifications. By measuring on the attribute-level, Anderson finds that increased overhead cost “is associated with increases in the number and severity of setups and increased heterogeneity in process specifications (expected downtime) and quality standards (defect tolerance heterogeneity) of a plant’s product mix” (Anderson 1995:383).

Finally, how product variety is distributed over time can affect the effort to balance and sequence a production line. For example, taking a production perspective a study of product variety finds that “[o]ption variability has significantly greater negative impact on productivity than option content in automobile assembly” (Fisher and Ittner 1999:785). In this case, variety’s impact on indirect and overhead labor is much greater than it is on direct labor. The authors explain this with the built-in slack in automotive assembly lines that allows handling option variation in the first place. They point out that because these costs are born through the variability complexity it is difficult to allocate these excess costs to any specific product.

With respect to the question of how the link between product architecture characteristic and cost is influenced by the cost allocation procedure some general observations can be made. A product architecture that allows operations conducted closer on a per-unit basis allows more precise cost allocation. For example, a process that produces only one part at a time allows easy allocation of all non-direct costs (setup, purchasing, etc.). In contrast, product architectures that cause complex logistical, balancing, sequencing, or quality processes may make the cost allocation more difficult. Within limits, these arguments call for products with architectures consisting of fewer, more modular-like components (dimension function-component allocation) and with high levels of interface standardization.

2.3.3 *Process Dynamics*

The third issue of the roadmap's third step: 'determination of cost allocation rules,' is concerned with the extent to which the processes under consideration are considered static or dynamic. There are two cases of non-static situations: (i) a one-time change followed by a static period, and (ii) a change over longer periods of time. In the first case, the relevant issue is the ratio of 'ramp-up period' to 'normal production period.' If, for example, an entire production run will extend over several years and the ramp-up takes only a few days, the cost analysis focus can be put on the system costs assuming it in its static condition. In contrast, if the production run is relatively short and the ramp-up takes up a significant portion of it, the systems costs are not well represented by the production run alone. In some production environments the ramp-up time can represent a significant fraction of total production time. For example, it can take up to six months to bring an automotive assembly plant up to full production load (Almgren 2000).

Cost changes over longer periods of time can occur in two ways: the change itself can either be constant or variable. The case in which the change is (for the most part) constant is often caused by what has come to be known as the learning curve effect. The argument is that with accumulating production volume workers and engineers are getting better in what they are doing. They improve the processes and their work environment in a manner that continuously improves their overall productivity. Often times the learning effect is measured as a constant fraction of cost reduction e.g., 20%, with every cumulative doubling of the production volume. Empirical evidence has been presented that this effect indeed exists (Anderson 1995). Activity-based costing systems can help to detect these learning effects (Andrade et al. 1999).

In the second case of changing unit costs the change itself is dynamic, i.e., unit costs do not change by a constant rate but follow dynamic patterns. An example of this phenomenon is the case of non-constant unit costs as a result of different ways of sequencing different products through jointly used production processes. Flexible manufacturing systems (FMS), for example, can manufacture different products on the same machine. The set-up time, however, may depend on what product has been produced prior to the one under consideration. Will the same tool be used? If not, is the tool change time dependent on what tool was used for the previous product? This problem has been addressed through the use of activity-based costing systems in conjunction with production planning models (Koltai et al. 2000).

With respect to the effects of product architecture choice on unit cost, the phenomenon described in this section cannot be determined with product architecture data alone, but requires data (or assumptions) on the production environment including scheduling and the production program information.

2.4. Select Cost Model appropriate for the Design Decision at hand

The fourth step of the roadmap for product architecture costing requires the selection of one or several cost models that are appropriate for the design decision at hand. A number of cost models have been developed to help designers to assess the economic consequences of design decisions. The existing models can be grouped into three categories: parametric, analogous, and analytical. Parametric models aim at establishing scaling factors of cost drivers found through analysis of historical data. Regression

analysis is a typical method to extract such scaling factors. Due to the simplicity in use, parametric techniques are used in many industries (Bielefeld and Rucklos 1992; Uppal 1996). In addition, non-parametric methods such as neural networks have also been applied to find design variable-cost relationships (Bode 2000).

The underlying idea for analogous models is to search for similarities between the design at hand and a large number of historical cases stored in databases. To be able to compare products on multiple levels (product, subassembly, part, etc.) hierarchically structured approaches have been developed (Liebers and Kals 1997; Rehman and Guenov 1998; Ten Brinke et al. 2000). Other approaches focus more on abstract elements like features (Brimson 1998; Leibl et al. 1999).

Finally, cost models in the third category, analytical cost models, come in two very different flavors. One category is represented by abstract mathematical models, often used to generate insights into general questions. Their emphasis is mostly on structural trade-off modeling, while the functions of relationships between individual design decisions and costs are typically assumed to be known in their shape (Roemer et al. 2000; Thonemann and Brandeau 2000; Krishnan and Gupta 2001). The other flavor of analytical models is represented by detailed technical cost models of (mostly) manufacturing processes to estimate the associated costs (Clark et al. 1997; Locascio 1999; Locascio 2000; Kirchain 2001). Technical cost models model manufacturing processes based on the process physics and establish links between a few critical design parameters and the process dynamics, which in turn determine the costs. In the interest of brevity, the existing cost modeling techniques are not discussed here in detail. For details the interested reader is referred to recent reviews (Asiedu and Gu 1998; Layer et al. 2002).

Instead of presenting the different cost models in detail, this section presents four criteria to help thinking about making the appropriate cost model selection when assessing cost implication of product architecture design decisions. First, does the technique or model require a substantial data set of similar cases? Regression analyses or neural networks, for example, usually require sufficient cases to be able to produce relevant cost predictions. Second, how large is the number of acceptable cost drivers? Most cost modeling techniques allow only a limited number of cost drivers. To some extent this question is related to the previous one in that the number of available cases restricts the number of acceptable cost drivers. Third, how large are the acceptable differences between the product architecture candidates under investigation? This criterion is particularly relevant if substantially different product architectures are to be analyzed. Modeling techniques that build on a set of known cases are usually limited when applied to entirely new cases. Finally, what certainty level is required for the input data? As indicated earlier, cost analyses in early design stages typically lack detailed and accurate product design data. The assessment of the cost models along this fourth criterion reveals the underlying modeling philosophy. Some models use search procedures to find relevant data among existing cases (e.g., analogous models) whereas others build the cost analysis for every case anew (e.g., process-based cost models). Depending on the goal of the product architecture analysis and the available data, different methods are advantageous. Table 2 summarizes the assessment of the various cost modeling approaches with respect to product architecture costing.

Cost Estimation Models \ Application Criteria		Data Set Requirement (minimum case base)	Acceptable Number of Cost Drivers	Acceptable Difference in Architecture Decomposition	Required Certainty of Data Input
Parametric	Regression Analysis	Large	Low	Small	Medium
	Complexity-theory based	Medium	Low	Small	High
Analogous	Neural Networks	Large	Low	Small	Medium
	Feature-based	Medium	Low	Small	High
	Expert systems	Large	Medium	Medium	High
Analytical	Abstract modeling	Small	Small	Small	None
	Process-based cost models	Small	Medium	Large	Medium

Table 2. Assessment of various cost estimation models along four application criteria

3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

This chapter has introduced a roadmap for product architecture costing. Each step of the roadmap prior to the actual modeling of a specific situation, i.e., (1) to assess differences of product architecture candidates, (2) to identify relevant product life cycle phase(s) and their product architecture-cost relationships, (3) to determine relevant cost allocation rules, and (4) to select cost models appropriate to the situation at hand have been discussed in detail. This comprehensive discussion of how individual product architecture characteristics affect specific cost elements over a product’s life cycle can serve as a guideline when formulating various tradeoffs. For example, a manufacturer of long-living products, e.g., a ship builder, might want to trade-off costs for building the ship with the costs for operating it. In contrast, a manufacturer of mass-produced consumer goods might be more interested in the cost trade-off between the costs for parts fabrication and the costs for assembly. For any given firm, the determination of the relevant trade-offs is impacted by such factors as the firm’s business model, its warranty policies, and its competitive and legal environment. The roadmap also provides an overview of how cost allocation rules can affect cost analyses results, and thus the cost advantage of one product architecture over another. Finally, the roadmap includes a categorization of existing cost models, and illustrates which one to select depending on the size of the available data set, the given data set’s level of variation and accuracy, and the number of acceptable cost drivers.

This roadmap for product architecture attempts to provide a comprehensive consideration of the relevant questions when conducting an analysis of the cost consequences of product architecture differences. The relationships identified and cost

models presented can now serve as stepping stones for the development of user-friendly design guidelines as well as of more complex optimization models (cf. Figure 1). Below follow some thoughts on how these next steps could proceed.

The development of product architecture design guidelines that lead the designer towards 'better' product architectures, given the requirements that the product faces, can be envisioned similar to the development of the well-known DFM/DFA guidelines. The DFM/DFA guidelines represent the condensed experience across many cases of design changes with respect to manufacturing and assembly. Similarly, a database containing the results of many specific product architecture-cost analyses could be used to search for more general patterns of cost effects that are due to differences in product architecture. As a step in this direction a firm might build a repository of their own cost data and associate the data with the corresponding product architecture characteristics. This way the firm might populate the product architecture-cost space with more of its own data points. Over time, this would offer the chance to introduce internal learning into the product architecture design process (Anderson and Sedatole 1998) and would foster the construction of product architecture design guidelines.

The product architecture-cost relationships identified by the roadmap can also inform the process of building more complex models that can support the product architecture development process more dynamically. While knowing the cost effects, allocation rules, and cost models discussed in this chapter allows evaluating cost consequences of differences along individual product architecture characteristics, this knowledge does not automatically feed back into the product architecture design process. If it were possible to turn product architecture characteristics into variables that exist across the entire solution space—which they currently often do not—they could be used to find optimal architectures, optimal with respect to the cost determined as relevant. With respect to the product architecture development process, this would replace the process of selecting among product architecture candidates with one that helps designers to develop more cost effective product architectures by giving immediate feedback to product architecture design suggestions. One particularly promising extension of this research direction on product architecture costing is the treatment of uncertainty. While uncertainty is inherent in any estimation of future data, the way in which it is modeled might provide additional insights for the product architecture selection and development decisions. While deterministic cost models can be augmented with sensitivity analyses, more sophisticated measures of risk and uncertainty could advance the cost modeling tools, and by extension, the product architecture creation.

4. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For helpful comments and discussions on cost modeling the author would like to thank Joel Clark, Frank Field, Randolph Kirchain, and Rich Roth. In addition, the paper benefited from helpful comments from three anonymous reviewers. Research funding from the International Motor Vehicle Program at MIT is gratefully acknowledged.

5. REFERENCES

- Ahmadi, R., T. A. Roemer and R. H. Wang, 2001, Structuring Product Development Processes, *European Journal of Operational Research* **130**: 539-558.
- Almgren, H., 2000, Pilot production and manufacturing start-up: the case of Volvo S80, *International Journal of Production Research* **38**(17): 4577-4588.
- Anderson, S. W., 1995, Measuring the Impact of Product Mix Heterogeneity on Manufacturing Overhead Cost, *The Accounting Review* **70**(3): 363-387.
- Anderson, S. W. and K. L. Sedatole, 1998, Designing Quality into Products: The Use of Accounting Data in New Product Development, *Accounting Horizons* **12**(3): 213-233.
- Andrade, M. C., R. C. Pessanha Filho, A. M. Espozel, L. O. A. Maia and R. Y. Qassim, 1999, Activity-based costing for production learning, *International Journal of Production Economics* **62**: 175-180.
- Anonymous, 2005, Aircraft families / Commonality: Maximum benefits from today's most modern aircraft, Retrieved July 16, 2005, 2005, from <http://www.airbus.com/en/aircraftfamilies/commonality.html>.
- Asiedu, Y. and P. Gu, 1998, Product life cycle cost analysis: state of the art review, *International Journal of Production Research* **36**(4): 883-908.
- Baker, K. R., M. J. Magazine and H. L. W. Nuttle, 1986, The Effect of Commonality on Safety Stock in a Simple Inventory Model, *Management Science* **32**(8): 983-988.
- Baldwin, C. Y. and K. B. Clark, 2000, *Design Rules. Volume 1: The Power of Modularity*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Baldwin, C. Y. and K. B. Clark, 2003, Where Do Transactions Come From? A Perspective from Engineering Design, paper presented at Saint-Gobain Centre for Economic Research, Paris, France.
- Banker, R. D., S. M. Datar, S. Kekre and T. Mukhopadhyay, 1990, Cost of Product and Process Complexity. in: *Measures for Manufacturing Excellence*, R. S. Kaplan. Harvard Business School Press. Boston, Massachusetts: 269-290.
- Banker, R. D., G. Potter and R. G. Schroeder, 1995, An empirical analysis of manufacturing overhead cost drivers, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **19**: 115-137.
- Bhimani, A. and P. S. Muelder, 2001, Managing Processes, Quality, and Costs: A Case Study, *Journal of Cost Management* **15**(2): 28-32.
- Bielefeld, J. R. J. and G. D. Rucklos, 1992, Cost Scaling Factors: How accurate are they? *Cost Engineering* **34**(10): 15-20.
- Biersdorfer, J. D., 2001, Module Lineup Gives A Little Organizer Big Ambitions. The New York Times. New York, NY: E7.
- Blanchard, B. S. and W. J. Fabrycky, 1998, *Systems Engineering and Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Blischke, W. R. and D. N. P. Murthy, 1994, *Warranty Cost Analysis*, Marcel Dekker, Inc., New York.
- Bode, J., 2000, Neural networks for cost estimation: simulations and pilot application, *International Journal of Production Research* **38**(6): 1231-1254.
- Boer, M. and R. Logendran, 1999, A methodology for quantifying the effects of product development on cost and time, *IIE Transactions* **31**(4): 365-378.

- Boothroyd, G., P. Dewhurst and W. A. Knight, 2002, *Product design for manufacture and assembly*, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- Brimson, J. A., 1998, Feature Costing: Beyond ABC, *Journal of Cost Management* **12**(1): 6-12.
- Buede, D. M., 2000, *The Engineering Design of Systems - Models and Methods*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Carney, D., 2004, Platform flexibility. *Automotive Engineering International*. **112**: 147-149.
- Chakravarty, A. K. and N. Balakrishnan, 2001, Achieving product variety through optimal choice of module variations, *IIE Transactions* **33**: 587-598.
- Clancy, D. K., 1998, Strategic Design Cost Analysis, *Cost Engineering* **40**(8): 25-30.
- Clark, J. P., R. Roth and F. R. Field, 1997, Techno-Economic Issues in Materials Selection. in: *ASM Handbook*, G. E. Dieter. ASM International. Materials Park, OH, **20 Materials Selection and Design**: 255-265.
- Cokins, G., 2000, The Changing Face of Cost Management in the Auto Industry, *Journal of Cost Management* **14**(5): 13-15.
- Collier, D. A., 1982, Aggregate Safety Stock Levels and Component Part Commonality, *Management Science* **28**(11): 1297-1303.
- Cooper, R. and R. S. Kaplan, 1992, Activity-Based Systems: Measuring the Costs of Resource Usage, *Accounting Horizons*(9): 1-12.
- Cooper, R. and R. S. Kaplan, 1998, The Promise - and Peril - on Integrated Cost Systems, *Harvard Business Review*(July-August): 109-119.
- Dahmus, J. B., J. P. Gonzalez-Zugasti and K. N. Otto, 2001, Modular Product Architecture, *Design Studies* **22**(5): 409-424.
- Dahmus, J. B. and K. N. Otto, 2001, Incorporating Lifecycle Costs into Product Architecture Decisions, ASME 2001 Design Engineering Technical Conferences, Pittsburgh, PA, ASME.
- Das, S. K., P. Yedlarajiah and R. Narendra, 2000, An approach for estimating the end-of-life product disassembly effort and cost, *International Journal of Production Research* **38**(3): 657-673.
- Doran, D. T. and J. E. Dowd, 1999, Depreciation and Amortization Cost in Activity Based Costing Systems, *Journal of Cost Management* **13**(5): 34-38.
- Emblemsvag, J. and B. Bras, 1994, Activity-based costing in design for product retirement, *Advances in Design Automation*, ASME.
- Eppinger, S. D., D. E. Whitney, R. P. Smith and D. A. Gebala, 1994, A Model-Based Method for Organizing Tasks in Product Development, *Research in Engineering Design*(6): 1-13.
- Esawi, A. M. K. and M. F. Ashby, 2003, Cost estimates to guide pre-selection of processes, *Materials & Design* **24**: 605-616.
- Eynan, A. and M. J. Rosenblatt, 1996, Component commonality effects on inventory costs, *IIE Transactions* **28**: 93-104.
- Fisher, M. L. and C. D. Itner, 1999, The Impact of Product Variety on Automobile Assembly Operations: Empirical Evidence and Simulation Analysis, *Management Science* **45**(6): 771-786.
- Fisher, M. L., K. Ramdas and K. T. Ulrich, 1999, Component Sharing in the Management of Product Variety: A Study of Automotive Braking Systems, *Management Science* **45**(3): 297-315.

- Fixson, S. K., 2005, Product architecture assessment: a tool to link product, process, and supply chain design decisions, *Journal of Operations Management* **23**(3/4): 345-269.
- Foster, G. and M. Gupta, 1990, Manufacturing Overhead Cost Driver Analysis, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* **12**: 309-337.
- Fritzsche, R. B., 1997, Activity-Based Costing and the Theory of Constraints: Using Time Horizons to Resolve Two Alternative Concepts of Product Cost, *Journal of Applied Business Research* **14**(1): 83-89.
- Galsworth, G. D., 1994, *Smart, Simple Design*, Oliver Wight Publications, Essex Junction, Vermont.
- Gerchak, Y., M. J. Magazine and A. B. Gamble, 1988, Component Commonality with Service Level Requirements, *Management Science* **34**(6): 753-760.
- Goldratt, E. M. and J. Cox, 1984, *The Goal - A Process of ongoing Improvement*, North River Press, Great Barrington, MA.
- Gonzalez-Zugasti, J. P., K. N. Otto and J. D. Baker, 2000, A Method for Architecting Product Platforms, *Research in Engineering Design* **12**: 61-72.
- Gulati, R. K. and S. D. Eppinger, 1996, The Coupling of Product Architecture and Organizational Structure Decisions. Working Paper. Cambridge, MA, MIT Sloan School of Management: 31.
- Henderson, R. M. and K. B. Clark, 1990, Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms, *Administrative Science Quarterly* **35**: 9-30.
- Horngren, C. T. and G. Foster, 1991, *Cost accounting: a managerial emphasis*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Hu, W. and C. Poli, 1997, To injection mold, to stamp, or to assemble? - Part II: A Time-to-Market perspective, ASME Design Engineering Technical Conferences, Sacramento, CA, ASME.
- Hundal, M. S., 1997, Product Costing: A Comparison of Conventional and Activity-Based Costing Methods, *Journal of Engineering Design* **8**(1): 91-103.
- Ittner, C. D. and J. P. MacDuffie, 1994, Exploring the sources of international differences in manufacturing overhead. Philadelphia, PA, The Wharton School: 53.
- Jiao, R. J. and M. M. Tseng, 2000, Understanding product family for mass customization by developing commonality indices, *Journal of Engineering Design* **11**(3): 225-243.
- Kaplan, R. S., 1991, New Systems for Measurement and Control, *The Engineering Economist* **36**(3): 201-218.
- Kaplan, R. S. and R. Cooper, 1998, *Cost and effect: using integrated cost systems to drive profitability and performance*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Kee, R., 1998, Integrating ABC and the Theory of Constraints to Evaluate Outsourcing Decisions, *Journal of Cost Management* **12**(1): 24-36.
- Kirchain, R. E., 2001, Cost Modeling of Materials and Manufacturing Processes, *Encyclopedia of Materials: Science and Technology*: 1718-1727.
- Knight, W. A., 1998, Group Technology, Concurrent Engineering and Design for Manufacture and Assembly. in: *Group Technology and Cellular Manufacturing: A State-of-the-Art Synthesis of Research and Practice*, N. C. Suresh and J. M. Kay. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Boston: 15-36.

- Koltai, T., S. Lonzano, F. Guerrero and L. Onieva, 2000, A flexible costing system for flexible manufacturing systems using activity based costing, *International Journal of Production Research* **38**(7): 1615-1630.
- Krishnan, V. and S. Gupta, 2001, Appropriateness and Impact of Platform-Based Product Development, *Management Science* **47**(1): 52-68.
- Labro, E., 2004, The Cost Effects of Component Commonality: A Literature Review Through a Management-Accounting Lens, *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management* **6**(4): 358-367.
- Landers, R. G., B.-K. Min and Y. Koren, 2001, Reconfigurable Machine Tools, *CIRP Annals*.
- Layer, A., E. Ten Brinke, F. van Houten, H. J. J. Kals and S. Haasis, 2002, Recent and future trends in cost estimation, *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing* **15**(6): 499-510.
- Lee, H. L. and C. S. Tang, 1998, Variability Reduction Through Operations Reversal, *Management Science* **44**(2): 162-172.
- Leibl, P., M. S. Hundal and G. Hoehne, 1999, Cost Calculation with a Feature-based CAD System using Modules for Calculation, Comparison and Forecast, *Journal of Engineering Design* **10**(1): 93-102.
- Levy, D. L., 1994, Chaos Theory and Strategy: Theory, Application, and Managerial Implications, *Strategic Management Journal* **15**: 167-178.
- Liebers, A. and H. J. J. Kals, 1997, Cost Decision Support in Product Design, *CIRP Annals* **46**(1): 107-112.
- Lingnau, V., 1999, Management Accounting and Product Variety. in: *Optimal Bundling*, R. Fuerderer, A. Herrmann and G. Wuebker. Springer. Berlin: 133-155.
- Locascio, A., 1999, Design Economics for Electronics Assembly, *The Engineering Economist* **44**(1): 64-77.
- Locascio, A., 2000, Manufacturing Cost Modeling for Product Design, *The International Journal of Flexible Manufacturing Systems* **12**: 207-217.
- MacCormack, A., J. Rusnak and C. Y. Baldwin, 2004, Exploring the Structure of Complex Software Designs: An Empirical Study of Open Source and Proprietary Code. Harvard Business School Working Paper. Boston, MA: 39.
- Meyer, M. H. and A. P. Lehnerd, 1997, *The Power of Product Platforms*, The Free Press, New York.
- Michaels, J. V. and W. P. Woods, 1989, *Design to Cost*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Miller, J. G. and T. E. Vollmann, 1985, The hidden factory, *Harvard Business Review* **63**(5): 142-150.
- Nobeoka, K. and M. A. Cusumano, 1995, Multiproject Strategy, Design Transfer, and Project Performance: A Survey of Automobile Development Projects in the US and Japan, *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* **42**(4): 397-409.
- Ostwald, P. F. and T. S. McLaren, 2004, *Cost analysis and estimating for engineering and management*, Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Pahl, G. and W. Beitz, 1996, *Engineering Design - A Systematic Approach*, Springer, London.
- Park, J. and T. W. Simpson, 2003, Production Cost Modeling to Support Product Family Design Optimization, ASME 2003 Design Engineering Technical Conferences, Chicago, Illinois, ASME.

- Perera, H. S. C., N. Nagarur and M. T. Tabucanon, 1999, Component part standardization: A way to reduce the life-cycle cost of products, *International Journal of Production Economics* **60-61**: 109-116.
- Pimmler, T. U. and S. D. Eppinger, 1994, Integration Analysis of Product Decompositions. unpublished Working Paper. Cambridge, MA, MIT Sloan School of Management: 39.
- Pine, B. J. I., 1993, *Mass Customization*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Rehman, S. and M. D. Guenov, 1998, A Methodology for Modeling Manufacturing Costs at Conceptual Design, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* **35**(3-4): 623-626.
- Reinertsen, D. G., 1997, *Managing the Design Factory*, The Free Press, New York.
- Robertson, D. and K. T. Ulrich, 1998, Planning for Product Platforms, *Sloan Management Review*(Summer): 19-31.
- Roemer, T. A., R. Ahmadi and R. H. Wang, 2000, Time-cost trade-offs in overlapped product development, *Operations Research* **48**(6): 858-865.
- Sanderson, S. and M. Uzumeri, 1995, Managing product families: The case of the Sony Walkman, *Research Policy* **24**(5): 761-782.
- Sands, J., W. Loughlin and F. Lu, 1998, Equipment Standardization under Acquisition Reform, *Journal of Ship Production* **14**(2): 110-123.
- Schonberger, R. J., 1986, *World Class Manufacturing - The Lesson of Simplicity Applied*, The Free Press, New York.
- Siddique, Z., 2001, Estimating Reduction in Development Time for Implementing a Product Platform Approach, ASME 2001 Design Engineering Technical Conferences, Pittsburgh, PA, ASME.
- Siddique, Z. and B. Repphun, 2001, Estimating Cost Savings when Implementing a Product Platform Approach, *Concurrent Engineering: Research and Application* **9**(4): 285-294.
- Siddique, Z., D. W. Rosen and N. Wang, 1998, On the Applicability of Product Variety Design Concepts to Automotive Platform Commonality, ASME Design Engineering Technical Conferences, Atlanta, GA, ASME.
- Simpson, T. W., 2004, Product Platform Design and Optimization: Status and Promise, *Artificial Intelligence for Engineering Design, Analysis and Manufacturing* **18**: 3-20.
- Simpson, T. W., J. R. A. Maier and F. Mistree, 2001, Product platform design: method and application, *Research in Engineering Design* **13**(1): 2-22.
- Smith, P. G. and D. G. Reinertsen, 1991, *Developing Products In Half The Time*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York.
- Sodhi, M. and W. A. Knight, 1998, Product Design for Disassembly and Bulk Recycling, *CIRP Annals* **47**(1): 115-118.
- Sudjianto, A. and K. N. Otto, 2001, Modularization to Support Multiple Brand Platforms, ASME Design Engineering Technical Conferences, Pittsburgh, PA, ASME.
- Ten Brinke, E., E. Lutters, T. Streppel and H. J. J. Kals, 2000, Variant-based cost estimation based on Information Management, *International Journal of Production Research* **38**(17): 4467-4479.
- Terwiesch, C. and C. H. Loch, 1999, Managing the Process of Engineering Change Orders: The Case of the Climate Control System in Automobile Development, *Journal of Product Innovation Management* **16**: 160-172.

- Thomke, S. H., 1997, The role of flexibility in the development of new products: An empirical study, *Research Policy* **26**: 105-119.
- Thonemann, U. W. and M. L. Brandeau, 2000, Optimal Commonality in Component Design, *Operations Research* **48**(1): 1-19.
- Ulrich, K. T., 1995, The role of product architecture in the manufacturing firm, *Research Policy* **24**: 419-440.
- Ulrich, K. T. and S. D. Eppinger, 2000, *Product Design and Development*, McGraw-Hill, Boston.
- Ulrich, K. T. and S. A. Pearson, 1993, Does product design really determine 80% of manufacturing cost? Cambridge, MA, MIT Sloan School of Management: 31.
- Ulrich, K. T. and S. A. Pearson, 1998, Assessing the Importance of Design through Product Archaeology, *Management Science* **44**(3): 352-369.
- Ulrich, K. T. and K. Tung, 1991, Fundamentals of Product Modularity. MIT Sloan School of Management Working Paper. Cambridge, MA, MIT Sloan School of Management. **WP #3335-91**: 14.
- Uppal, K. B., 1996, Estimating Engineered Equipment Costs, *AACE Transactions* **40**: EST.10.1-EST.10.6.
- Vollrath, K., 2001, Flugzeug der Zukunft fliegt mit Feinguss. VDI nachrichten. Duesseldorf: 19.
- von Hippel, E., 1990, Task partitioning: An innovation process variable, *Research Policy* **19**(5): 407-418.
- Weustink, I. F., E. Ten Brinke, A. H. Streppel and H. J. J. Kals, 2000, A generic framework for cost estimation and cost control in product design, *Journal of Materials Processing Technology* **103**: 141-148.
- Wilhelm, B., 1997, Platform and Modular Concepts at Volkswagen - Their Effects on the Assembly Process. in: *Transforming Automobile Assembly - Experience in Automation and Work Organization*, K. Shimokawa, U. Juergens and T. Fujimoto. Springer. Berlin: 146-156.
- Zhang, Y. and J. K. Gershenson, 2003, An Initial Study of Direct Relationships between Life-cycle Modularity and Life-cycle Cost, *Concurrent Engineering: Research and Application* **11**(2): 121-128.