AN APPROACH TOWARDS IDENTIFICATION OF COMMON COMPONENTS IN PRODUCT FAMILY

Davor Pavlic[1], Mikko Vanhatalo[2] and Antti Pulkkinen[2]

[1] KONCAR – Instrument transformers, Inc., Research and Development Center, Croatia
[2] Institute of Production Engineering, Tampere University of Technology, Finland

ABSTRACT

The overall goal of the research is to produce a Design for X (DFX) method which can be used to increase the commonality in the product family. The research presented in this article is based on commonality index calculation methods known in the literature. These methods are used to measure the existing commonality and to identify the components with highest influence to the commonality. From the commonality point of view results of three methods (CI, TCCI, PCI) have high values regardless of the used method. The commonality index calculated on the product family level does not identify how the components influence on the commonality. Therefore the calculations of commonality index should be applied on the function levels to identify the components which have the greatest influence in the value of the commonality. The study made to the case product family during this research bred two different kinds of new architectures. The first one was structurally similar to the existing one but it had major enhancement in the part level. The second one was essentially a new concept of the product family. It actually increased the number of parts per product variant but when considering the whole product family the new architecture reduced the total number of components.

Keywords: Commonality index, product family, product variant, functions

1   INTRODUCTION

Product family is a set of products, which are beneficially created from a common set of components. It is developed for obtaining a range of product variants, which are able to cover certain market segments ([1], p. 20). An important matter during the development of the product family is the intention to higher producibility, meaning fewer parts to manufacture; smaller number of items; easier data management; stock reduction and simpler material handling in the manufacturing.

One of the tasks in the development of product family is to define the common components in the product variants. Analyzing only the technical documentation is not enough to perceive the commonality levels of the components in the product family. Therefore the key factor of the product family development is to identify the components which are reused in the product variants and which are not.

In this research an industrial case was used for the analyses of commonality in a product family. The company had already made improvements to the existing product family, but the improvements were made based on assumptions and tacit knowledge. There was not any actual analysis carried out for basis of the improvement. Thus they were not able to repeat the improvements in a different product family and therefore the company was looking for a systematic method to be used in the development of product families.

The overall goal of the research is to produce a DFX method which can be used to increase the commonality in the product family. The research presented in this article describes the first step of the product family development method and it is based on the commonality index calculation methods known in the literature. It is assumed that a method for calculating commonality indexes can be implemented in order to increase the commonality of the product family. These methods are used to measure the existing commonality and to identify the components with highest influence to the commonality. Identified components which decrease the value of commonality index has to be further analysed and redesigned. The redesign process results with new consolidated components that merge the set of similar existing components. Thus, the commonality is increased in product family and the

new components are reused more often in product variants than the replaced components were. The objective of this research is to identify the guidelines for analysing the group of existing products with a focus to increase the commonality in product family.

2 OVERVIEW OF COMMONALITY INDICES

In this chapter the four commonality indices used in the research are presented. Those are the commonality index (CI) by Martin and Ishii [2], the total constant commonality index (TCCI) by Wacker and Trevelan [3], the product line commonality index (PCI) by Kota et al., [4] and the component part commonality ($CI^{(C)}$) by Jiao and Tseng [5]. Thevenot and Simpson [6] have made a detailed comparison overview of the commonality indices.

2.1 Commonality index (CI)

The Commonality Index is a measure of unique parts used in the total number of product variants.

$$CI = 1 - \frac{u - \max p_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{v_n} p_j - \max p_j} \tag{1}$$

u = number of unique parts,

p_j = number of parts in product j,

v_j = final number of product variants offered.

2.2 Total constant commonality index (TCCI)

The Total Constant Commonality Index relates the total number of distinct component j has over a set of end items (d) to the number of immediate parents component j has over a set of end items of product structure level (Φ_j).

$$TCCI = 1 - \frac{d - 1}{\sum_{j=1}^{d} \Phi_j - 1} \tag{2}$$

d = total number of distinct component j has over a set of end items,

Φ_j = number of immediate parents component j has over a set of end items of product structure level.

2.3 Product line commonality index (PCI)

The Product Line Commonality index provides a percent common of non-differentiating components. It penalizes those differences that should be common, given the product mix ([4], p406).

$$PCI = \frac{\sum_{i=n}^{P} n_i \cdot f_{1i} \cdot f_{2i} \cdot f_{3i} - \sum_{i=1}^{P} \frac{1}{n_i^2}}{P \cdot N - \sum_{i=1}^{P} \frac{1}{n_i^2}} \cdot 100 \tag{3}$$

P = total number of non differentiating components that can potentially be standardized across models,

N = number of products in the product family,

n_i = number of product in the product family that have component i,

f_{1i} = ratio of the greatest number of models that share component i with identical size and shape to the greatest possible number of models that could have shared component i with identical size and shape (ni),

f_{2i} = ratio of the greatest number of models that share component i with identical materials and manufacturing processes to the greatest possible number of models that could have shared component i with identical materials and manufacturing processes (ni),

f_{3i} = ratio of the greatest number of models that share component i with identical assembly and fastening schemes to the greatest possible number of models that could have shared component i with identical assembly and fastening schemes (ni),

2.4   Component part commonality index (CI$^{(C)}$)

The Component Part Commonality Index represents the degree to which common part costs have been distributed across all products in a product family ([5], p. 235). It depends on more dimensions than only repetition, such as the cost or price of each component part, the volume o the final product and the quantity per operation ([5], p. 229).

$$CI^{(C)} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{d}\left[P_j \sum_{i=1}^{m}\Phi_{ij}\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(V_i Q_{ij}\right)\right]}{\sum_{j=1}^{d}\left[P_j \sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(V_i Q_{ij}\right)\right]}$$

(4)

d = total number of distinct component parts used in all the product structures of a product family,

j = index of each distinct component part,

P_j = price of each type of purchased parts or the estimated cost of each internally made component,

m = total number of end products in a product family,

i = index of each member product of a product family,

V_i = volume of end product I in the family,

$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\Phi_{ij}$ = number of immediate parents for each distinct component part dj over all the products levels

of product i of the family,

Q_{ij} = quantity of distinct component part dj required by the product i.

3   METHODOLOGY FOR IDENTIFICATION OF COMMON COMPONENTS

The methodology we present in this article begins with the analysis of internal and external variety among the products. External variety is defined from the existing group of products and it represents the necessary variety seen from the customers' viewpoint. The required internal variety is defined based on the external variety, so that it represents the necessary variety seen from the company's viewpoint. The realised internal variety is defined at the latest phase of product family development.

After the external and the internal varieties are defined the commonality index is calculated. For the analysing of the existing product variants the function-assembly decomposition structure was established. It became the basis of the analysis. The initial value of commonality indices was calculated using the methods from Martin & Ishii [2], Wacker and Trelevan [3], and Kota et al. [4].

Based on the collected data the new commonality index was calculated toward the method proposed by Jiao & Tseng [5]. The new commonality index was used to indicate the trend of the components effects on the value of commonality index. Some components increase and some decrease the value of the commonality index. The aim was to identify components which decrease the commonality index. Those components should be redesigned to increase the commonality index.

The process of identification, analysis and redesign of components is repeated until the level of re-usage of the components is high enough within the product family. Those components are now candidates for modules in product variants. The methodology of identification of common components in product family will be explained in detail in the following chapters.

3.1 Determination of external variety

In the beginning of the product family analysis two different types of varieties has to be examined. Firstly the variety what the company is offering to the markets (the existing product variety at the moment) and secondly the product variety what is actually needed to fulfil the customers requirements in the future [7]. An example of the external variety is presented in Figure 1. The external variety is documented in catalogues, technical specifications, brochures etc. The realised variety (the product variants which have been sold in the past) is instrumental in the identification of the needed variety. Usually companies are operating in certain market segments, but the realised variety truly shows the requisite variety from the customer point of view.

Figure 1. Existing product variety - product variety which company offers to the market

After the external variety is found out, it is compared to the realised product variety. The outcome illustrates how well the offered variety meets the variety required by the markets. In the case product family there exist large amount of redundant variety, which can be easily seen form the Figure 2. In the Figure 2 the green marks represent the variety which the company is offering, and the yellow dots represent the products which have been produced in the past. In this kind of a situation the external variety should be reduced, as every item in the PDM system is an additional costs and therefore it is important to exclude all unnecessary components from the system.


Figure 2. The realised and the external variety of product family

3.1.1 The parameters

Two types of parameters (independent and dependent) are defined for the visualisation of the difference between the external and the realised varieties. These parameters present the customer requirements for the product. The independent parameters do not influence to any other parameters whereas the dependent parameters influence and are influenced by other parameters. The Figure 1 presents the link between three different parameters of the product variants' external variety.

Visualization of existing variety has the benefit of discovering overlapping areas. Overlapping areas represent the unnecessary product variety that should be minimized. From the customer's viewpoint, unnecessary variety increases the difficulty of making the decision about the right variant and from the companies' viewpoint in increases the costs when maintaining the unnecessary variety.

3.2 Determination of internal variety

The limits of needed internal variety can be seen from the determined external variety. The realised product variety indicates the area where to focus in the development process. In the Figure 2 the yellow square highlights the focus area. The product variants which are covered by this area are the best-selling ones and thus should redesigned first. These variants are the base for designing product platform or modular structure for the product family.

The variants which are outside of the focus area should be taken under consideration after the main variants are developed. The development of these less produced variants should be founded on the new design of the main variants. Hereby the commonality remains at high level. This development process is very iterative and the development order follows the pattern of the realised variants. The fewer times the variant has been produced, the later it should be included to the developed product family, meaning designers have to focus on the areas which benefit most the company.

The new external variety is defined based on the decision about the internal variety. It is possible that the external variety stays the same, but the internal variety is improved in sense of reducing the overlapping area. Also by significant changes in the structure of the product the external variety can be encompassed with less product variants.

3.3 Determination of functions in product variants

Analyse of the product variants is based on functions of the products and on the solutions of the functions. Solution of a function is a component which is an assembly or a part. The components are classified in three different types: identical, variant, and unique. The identical components are the ones which are always the same in all the variants in which they are used. Variant components are the components fulfilling the same function in multiple variants but the material, shape, or size can vary. The unique components represent component which is used only in one variant.


Figure 3. Levels of functions

Each product has functions which can be classified on multiple levels as shown in the Figure 3. The level until which it is necessary to define the functions depends on the differences between the product variants. The first level consists of the functions which have identical and/or variant components in

product variants. For the functions with identical components deeper levels are not compulsory, since the solutions of the sub functions are also identical in the product variants. The functions with variant components on the first level have to be decomposed into second or deeper levels. The decomposition repeats until the level where only identical or unique components exist.

3.4 Function-assembly decomposition structure

The function structure presented by Pahl and Beitz [8] represents the relations between the functions in the product. These relations are based on the material, energy and signal flows between the functions, thus the relations between the components are not expressed. The systematic analysis of commonality indices requires information about the components relations, i.e. a structure which integrates the relations between the functions and the components.

The Function-assembly decomposition structure in the Figure 4 represents the structure with characteristics of functions and hierarchy of components in the product. The functions are presented in various levels. The rules of creating the function-assembly decomposition structure are:

- The functions at the first level:
  - represents all functions which have identical components in product variants;
  - represents all functions which have variant components in product variants;
  - the quantity number is needed if the solution of the function is used more than once in the same level.
- The functions at the lower levels:
  - exist if the functions at the higher levels have variants components in product variants;
  - the levels of functions are subdivided until the components are identical or unique in product variants.


Figure 4. Function-assembly decomposition structure

The goal of defining the function-assembly decomposition structure is to create a structure by which all the product variants can be represented. Such structure enables the analysing of the product variants with equal criteria. The functions are categorised in three different levels: basic, special, and auxiliary functions. The basic functions are the functions which exist in every product. The special functions are the ones which originate from the customer requirements. They constitute the differences between the product variants. The auxiliary functions are needed to execute the special functions.

3.5 Relations between the functions and components

Heretofore we have been explaining the external and internal varieties and the functions and function structure of the product variants. The functions identified in the function-assembly decomposition structure have to be related with the components used in the product variants. The matrix presented in the Figure 5 illustrates this relation and from it can be seen how many component variants there exists per one function.

Figure 5. Function assembly matrix

Based on the functions and components a data table is created for collecting all the information needed for commonality index calculations.

3.6 Data table

Table for gathering information for commonality index calculations consist of product variants' data (Table 1). The data is classified as functions, components and product variants. The functions and components are presented in rows and the product variants in columns. The functions at the lowest levels of each branch in the function-assembly decomposition structure are placed in the first column. The second column contains components which represent the physical solutions of the listed functions. The third column contains the price of each purchased component or the estimated cost of each internally manufactured component.

The product variants have two types of data. The first type of data is the number of produced product variants and it is placed in the first row. The second type is the data about the components' characteristics used in the product variants and they are placed in three columns of the components. The first column (left) shows the identification of immediate parent, the second (middle) one shows the number of immediate parents in the variant, and the third (right) column presents the required quantity of the component used to fulfil the function. The last row in the table indicates the number of unique components in the product variant.

Table 1. Data of the product variants and their components and functions

Function	Component	Costs	Product variant 1 — 20			Product variant 2 — 1			Product variant 3 — 1			Product variant 4 — 51			No. Of different parents	No of component repetition in different assemblies within all variatns
Function 11	Component 11_a	320	A1	1	2							A1	1	2	1	3
	Component 11_b	500				A2	1	2							1	3
	Component 11_c	660							A3	1	2				1	3
Function 12	Component 12_a	176	A4	1	1							A4	1	1	1	3
	Component 12_b	256				A5	1	1							1	3
	Component 12_c	320							A6	1	1				1	3
Function 13	Component 13_a	13	A7	1	2							A7	1	2	1	3
	Component 13_b	23,2				A8	1	2							1	3
	Component 13_c	32							A9	1	2				1	3
Function 14	Component 14	24	A10	1	2	A11	1	2	A12	1	2	A13	1	2	4	9
Function 21	Component 21_a	20	A14	1	1	A14	1	1	A14	1	1	A14	1	1	1	9
	Component 21_b	22	A15	1	1	A15	1	1	A15	1	1	A15	1	1	1	9
Function 22	Component 22	21,4	A16	2	2	A16	2	2	A16	2	2	A16	2	2	1	18
Function 31	Component 31	5	A17	1	1	A17	1	1	A17	1	1	A17	1	1	1	9
Function 32	Component 32	102										A18	1	2	1	6
Function 4	Component 4	100										A19	1	2	1	6
Function 51	Component 51_a	4										A20	1	2	1	6
	Component 51_b	3													1	3
	Component 51_c	2										A21	1	2	1	3
	Component 51_d	2													1	3
Function 52	Component 52	200	A22	1	1	A22	1	1	A22	1	1	A22	1	1	1	9
Function 6	Component 6	20										A23	1	2	1	6
Function 7	Component 7	4										A24	1	3	1	6
			9			**9**			**9**			**15**				

The two far right columns of the Table 1 are used for calculating the data from the product variant columns. In the first column are calculated the number of different parents for each component. The calculation is the sum of different immediate parents presented in the first (left) columns of product variants. In the second column are calculated the number of component repetition in different assemblies. The calculation is the sum of number of immediate parents presented in the second (middle) columns of product variants.

3.7 Commonality index of the product family

The first three mentioned commonality indices (CI, TCCI, and PCI) were used in the calculations of the commonality of the product family. All the results of the calculations, shown on the Figure 6, have value over 70%. From the commonality point of view these results of the analysed product family have high values regardless of the used method. One reason for high commonality index values is, that all of these three methods tread the components equally regardless the cost, size or complexity. Therefore product family with large number of small components which have higher possibility to be reused in the variants increase the commonality index. The closer examination of the product family revealed that most of the common parts were geometrically small or inexpensive parts, i.e. they have minor influence in the production.

Figure 6. Commonality indices

The commonality index calculated on the product family level does not identify how an individual component influences on the commonality. Therefore the calculations of commonality index should be applied on the function levels to identify the components which have the greatest influence. The CI$^{(C)}$ method was chosen in purpose to accentuate the parameters of the components in the commonality calculations.

3.8   Identification of components' effect on the commonality

The CI$^{(C)}$ method was used to calculate the commonality index of the product family and to identify the components' effect on the commonality. The value of commonality index is not relative, thus in cannot be compared with the results of the previous methods. On the other methods the values were limited between 0 and 1, but in the CI$^{(C)}$ method the upper limit is varying.

The commonality index was calculated separately for all the components of the functions at the lowest levels in the function-assembly decomposition structure. This value was then compared to the average value of the product family to see the effect on the commonality. By increasing the values of the components' parameters the new values of commonality index were calculated. When the new commonality index values are higher than the average value the component has a positive trend i.e. the component increases the commonality while components parameters are increased (component 51_a in Figure 7). The components with positive trend are identified as components which should be kept as they are. Other components decrease the commonality and those should be further analysed and redesigned.


Figure 7. Positive and negative trends of the components on the commonality

In practice it is not possible that all the components increase the commonality index at the same time. Reason for this is the fact that in the ideal situation (from the commonality point of view) all the components would be used in all of the product variants and then the commonality index does not change when the components' parameters are increased. In the ideal situation the trend of every variant would be same, meaning e.g. that in the Figure 7 all commonality index values would be 7,45 regardless of the values of the parameters.

4   RESULTS

All three commonality index calculation methods (CI, TCCI, and PCI) tread the components equally regardless the cost, size or complexity. Those methods are measuring the same characteristics of the components in the product family, but from slightly different point of view. From the commonality point of view these results of the analysed product family have high values regardless of the used method. Therefore product family with large number of small components which have higher possibility to be reused in the variants increase the commonality index. The commonality index calculated on the product family level does not identify how the components influence on the commonality. Therefore the calculations of commonality index should be applied on the function levels to identify the components which have the greatest influence in the commonality value.

The study made to the case product family during this research bred two different kinds of new architectures. The first one was structurally similar to the existing one but it had major enhancement in the part level. The commonality in the product family was better, meaning there were fewer parts to produce. The second one was essentially a new concept of the product family. It actually increased the number of parts per product variant but when considering the whole product family the new architecture reduced the total number of components.

5   CONCLUSION

Without the detailed analyses it would not have been possible to come up with the mentioned results. It is now obvious that the detailed analyses are a mandatory when genuinely developing the product family. And an efficient method for analysing the product family is the usage of the commonality indexes. They reveal, when correctly used, the weak points of the product family in a sense of producibility. Some indexes showed the overall commonality whereas other indexes took the features (masses, costs, etc.) also into consideration. Hence usage of just one index might lead the development into wrong direction.

It was also noticed that the number of the components increased in an individual products in many cases, when increasing the commonality index values, but on the product family level the overall situation improved. This means that when developing the producibility of the product family, it is not always most important trying to reduce the number of the parts in a single product or module, but analyse the commonality over the whole product family. Also the difference of the parts effects to the overall commonality have to be taken into account in the calculations.

REFERENCES

[1]   Andreasen, M.M., McAloone, T., Mortensen, N.M., 2001. *Multi-Product Development – platforms and modularization.* Lyngby, ISBN 87-90130-34-0

[2]   Martin, M. and Ishii, K., 1996. Design for Variety: a Methodology for Understanding the Costs of Product Proliferation. *In:* K. Wood, ed. *Design Theory and Methodology – DTM '96, Irvine, CA, ASME, Paper No. 96-DETC/DTM-1619*

[3]   Wacker, J.G. and Trelevan, M., 1986. Component Part Standardization: An Analysis of Commonality Sources and Indices. *Journal of Operations Management*, 6 (2), pp. 219 - 244

[4]   Kota, S., Sethuraman, K. and Miller, R., 2000. A Metric for Evaluating Design Commonality in Product Families. *ASME Journal of Mechanical Design*, 122 (4), pp. 403-410

[5]   Jiao, J. and Tseng, M.M. 2000. Understanding Product Family for Mass Customization by Developing Commonality Indices. *Journal of Engineering Design*, 11 (3), pp. 225-243

[6]   Thevenot H.J and Simpson T.W. Commonality indices for product family design: a detailed comparison. *Journal of Engineering Design*, 2006, 17(2), 99-119

[7]   Anderson, D. and Pine, J. *Agile Product Development for Mass Customization*, 1997 (McGraw Hill, ISBN: 0786311754)

[8]   Pahl, G. and Beitz, W. *Engineering Design: Systematic Approach 2nd edition,* 1996

Contact: Mikko Vanhatalo
Tampere University of Technology
Institute of production Engineering
PO Box 589, 33101 Tampere
Finland
Tel: Int +358 3 3115 3612
Fax: Int +358 3 3115 2753
mikko.vanhatalo@tut.fi