

Modularity and Interface Management of Product Architectures

Juliana Hsuan Mikkola

Copenhagen Business School, IVS, Howitzvej 60, DK-2000 Frederiksberg, Denmark

Abstract- The management of innovation through modular product architecture strategies is gaining increasing importance for firms, not only in practice but also from a theoretical perspective. It is argued that the degree of modularity inherent in a given product architecture is sensitive and highly dependent upon the number of components and the interface constraints shared among the components, modules, sub-systems, and systems. This paper applies a mathematical model for analyzing dynamics and the degree of modularity of a given product architecture by taking into account the following variables: number of components, number of interfaces, new-to-the-firm component composition, and substitutability factor. The application of the modularization function is illustrated with two elevator systems from Schindler Lifts of Switzerland: traction and hydraulic elevators. The comparative analysis of the elevators captures the sensitivity and dynamics of product architecture modularity created by three types of components (standard, neutral, and unique) and two types of interfaces (fundamental and optional).

I. INTRODUCTION

Shorter product life cycles in addition to faster product development times are creating more products [19], subsequently adding complexity to the product itself in the form of more part numbers, more parts and service publications and more specialized service equipment [42]. A growing number of firms (for example, in consumer electronics, instrumentation, telecommunication, and automotive electronics industries) have embraced new approaches to the management of their new product development (NPD) and manufacturing activities [10], [11], [41], such as modularity.

Modularity (or *modularization*) is an approach for organizing complex products and processes efficiently [1], by decomposing complex tasks into simpler portions so they can be managed independently. Modularity permits components to be produced separately, or loosely coupled [27], [32], and used interchangeably in different configurations without compromising system integrity [1], [4], [6], [8], [9]. The purpose of this paper is to explore modularity and interface management of product architectures. In assessing modularization at the product architecture level, issues regarding decomposability and integration of disparate components vis-à-vis interface management of these components can not be taken for granted. Consequently, the degree of modularization inherent in a product is sensitive and highly dependent upon the number of components and the interface constraints shared among the components, modules, sub-systems, and systems. Most studies on modularization are qualitative and exploratory in nature, and there is limited evidence from the literature providing a

systematic way to analyze modularization at the detailed engineering level and how it impacts interface management of components in product architecture designs. It sounds reasonable to say that firms should understand the fundamental relationship between components and interfaces at the root of product architecture in order to manage modularity of products. Hence, the two main research questions explored in this paper are: (1) How can we systematically assess the complexities of modularization induced by components and respective interfaces embedded in architectural designs? and (2) How sensitive is modularity of a given product architecture to changes in its component composition and degree of component substitutability?

This paper applies a mathematical model, termed modularization function (MF), for gaining some understanding these questions. More specifically, MF analyzes the degree of modularization in a given product architecture by taking into consideration the following variables: number of components, number of interfaces, new-to-the-firm (NTF) component composition, and substitutability factor. The application of MF is illustrated with two elevator transmission architectures from Schindler Lifts: traction and hydraulic elevators. The paper is organized as follows. Firstly, brief literature review on modularity, product architecture, and interfaces is presented, followed by a brief discussion on the effects of substitutability and components in product architectures. Secondly, the MF is introduced along with assumptions made for formulating the mathematical model. Finally, the case of Schindler Lifts is presented.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND DEFINITIONS

A. Modularity

Literature reports modularity in many ways depending on the perspective of the analysis. Some scholars describe modularization with respect to NPD activities within a firm (e.g., [1], [14], [36], [38]), while others from a firm and end-customer perspective (e.g., [9], [13], [32], [35]). For instance, Baldwin and Clark [1] defined modularization as a process for building a complex product or process from smaller subsystems that can be designed independently yet function together as a whole. While Sanchez and Mahoney [32], Garud and Kumaraswamy [9], and Schilling [35], on the other hand, highlight how modular product architectures can permit the leveraging of a great number of product variations by mixing-and-matching different combinations of functional components.

Henderson and Clark [14] make an important distinction between architectural innovation and modular innovation.

They define architectural innovation as an innovation that “change the way in which the components are linked together, while leaving the core design concepts as untouched.” Modular innovation [3], [14], [15], on the other hand, changes only the relationships between core design concepts of a technology without changing the product’s architecture. Consistent with the model presented in this paper, *modularity refers to the scheme by which interfaces shared among components in a given product architecture are standardized and specified [32] to allow for greater substitutability and commonality sharing of components among product families.* Other terms used to describe modularity include *modular system* [1], [2], [18], *modular components* and *modular product design* [24], [25], [32], [33], [34], *modular product architecture* [20], [24], [26], [32], [39], and *remodularization* [20] (see [15] for a list of definitions). As we will see, the MF captures the dynamics of modular innovation as well as the dynamics of architectural innovation.

B. Product architecture

Product architecture is the arrangement of the functional elements of a product into several physical building blocks, including the mapping from functional elements to physical components, and the specification of the interfaces among interacting physical components. Its purpose is to define the basic physical building blocks of the product in terms of both what they do and what their interfaces are with the rest of the device [38], [39].

Product architectures can vary from modular to integral. Modular product architectures are used as flexible platforms for leveraging a large number of product variations [12], [22], [23], [29], [30], [31], enabling a firm to gain cost savings through economies of scale from component commonality, inventory, logistics, as well as to introduce technologically improved products more rapidly. Modular architectures enable firms to minimize the physical changes required to achieve a functional change. Changes to product variants often are achieved through modular product architectures where changes in one component do not lead to changes in other components.

Conversely, in integral product architectures, one-to-one mapping between functional elements and physical components of a product is non-existent, and interfaces shared between the components are coupled [38]. Changes to one component cannot be made without making changes to other components. With integral product architectures, firms may be able to customize their products to satisfying each customer’s particular needs. Costs of customized components tends to be higher due to the integral nature of product architectures where an improvement in functional performance can not be achieved without making changes to other components. As the interfaces of the customized components become standardized, its costs are significantly reduced as changes to product architecture can be localized

and made without incurring costly changes to other components.

C. Interfaces

Interfaces are linkages shared among components, modules, sub-systems of a given product architecture. Interface specifications define the protocol for the fundamental interactions across all components and interfaces comprising a technological system. Typical interface specifications for a consumer electronics product at the NPD level, for instance, often includes the tolerance specification of the components with respect to manufacturing processes, operating frequency bandwidths, maximum heat dissipation threshold, voltage and current requirements, housing dimensions, to name a few. Sanchez [31] classifies seven different types of interfaces: attachment, spatial, transfer, control and communication, environmental, ambient, and user interfaces (for interfaces relevant in software platform designs, see [21]). Interface constraints refer to restrictions imposed by the components and how interfaces are shared amongst these components in a given product architecture. When a given product architecture, of a ‘closed assembled system’ for instance, is decomposed into sub-circuits, the interface constraints of these sub-circuits can be evaluated in stages. A ‘closed assemble system’ is a system that is enclosed by sub-systems with clear boundaries, and the individual sub-system must be linked together via interface and linkage technologies [37] (e.g., cars, computers, mobile phones, etc.). Interface management also deals with the issues of component integration (or multiplexing), as opposed to decomposition (or de-integration) of a system into smaller components (for a discussion of the effect of integration of components in a system and its impact on modularization vis-à-vis supplier-buyer interdependence, see [16]).

D. Components and Substitutability

Product architecture defines the way in which components interact with each other. Depending on the level of analysis, a component can be a part, a module, a sub-system, or a system. Standard components are often off-the-shelf parts having well defined technical specifications, generally accepted as industry standards. New-to-the-firm (NTF) components, on the other hand, are usually considered as unique by a firm, as they often portray high technological risks by inducing changes at interfaces shared with other components, thus altering the configuration of a product architecture. NTF components are often developed in-house tailored to perform a specific function, hence these components offer low opportunities for reusability and commonality sharing, hence low substitutability, with other architectures. However, often the risks are well justified by the technical superiority of these components, significantly improving the overall performance of the product. The use of NTF components is strategic in nature because the integration of NTF components into a product architecture are often hard to be imitated by competitors (i.e., modular innovation), thus

creating competitive advantages for the firm, at least in the short-run. But too many NTF components hamper innovation due to the increasing complexity in interface compatibility issues with other components in the product. The challenge is to design product architectures with desirable combination of standard and NTF components, and at the same time, to induce high degree of component substitutability across product families. The potential for high substitutability is obtained when components are designed with reusability and commonality sharing in mind.

The modularization function explores the impact of substitutability of a component in product architectures through the ‘substitutability factor.’ The substitutability factor is a function of the number of product families made possible by the modular component as well as the number of interfaces required for functionality. For example, if a component of a given product architecture can be used in 10 families (or 10 times the same component), and 2 interfaces must be shared with other components/modules/sub-systems for functionality, then the substitutability factor of the product architecture is 5 components per interface. A perfect modular product architecture is comprised of standard components with high substitutability, allowing for high reusability and high commonality sharing of components. Conversely, a perfect integral product architecture is comprised of NTF components with low substitutability, allowing for low reusability and low commonality sharing of components. Hence it is assumed that the degree of modularity in a given product architecture is constraint by the composition of its components (number of standard and NTF components), interfaces shared among the components, and degree of substitutability. Consequently, a higher level of modularity can be achieved through:

- physical reduction of number of interfaces by integrating components
- standardization of interfaces
- multi-functionality of the sub-modules

III. DATA COLLECTION

The research project was initiated at Schindler Lifts between 1997 and 2000, and divided in three phases. In *phase 1* a detailed analysis on two principle types of elevators (traction and hydraulic elevators) was carried out at Schindler. This analysis considered several hundred components with respective interfaces and relationships. The description and analysis were accomplished with an object modeling technique, UML (Unified Modeling Language), originally developed for supporting object oriented software development. In *phase 2*, the assessment of traction and hydraulic elevators was supplemented by several follow-up interviews with elevator experts from R&D, system management, purchasing, and marketing. The main goal of these interdisciplinary sessions was to learn about the impact of modularity on the elevator industry as a whole. Based on the vast amount of empirical data collected in phase 1 and 2,

in *phase 3*, the modularization function is applied for analyzing the degree of modularization in a given product architecture. The basis of the analysis of the elevator industry is supported by the product architecture data derived from the UML analysis, which provides a comprehensive database displaying various information about the components and respective interfaces of elevator architectures in different levels of analysis.

IV. THE MODULARIZATION FUNCTION

One of the advantages of mathematical model is that it allows us to synthesize a complex phenomenon into equations and functions, leading to a wide range of theoretical examinations and simulations of the phenomenon. Although mathematical models are powerful for analyzing dynamic behavior of the variables, it is confined to the limited number of variables and the can become quite complex with increasing number of variables. A simple mathematical model, termed modularization function $M(u)$, Equation (1), is applied to explain the relationship between the degree of modularization of a given product architecture with respect to the composition of its components (e.g., number of NTF components), and degree of substitutability. The model was first derived to analyze the dynamics of product architecture modularity of black-box modules for automobiles (both in terms of architectural innovation and modular innovation). For function derivation and illustration of its applicability of this mathematical model with the analysis of two product architectures of Chrysler Jeeps windshield wipers controllers, see [24]. Sensitivity function, Equation (2), is used to analyze how sensitive a given product architecture is to changes in unique component composition.

$$M(u) = e^{-u^2/2Ns\delta} \quad (1)$$

$$S_u^M = \frac{u}{M} \cdot \frac{dM}{du} = -\frac{u^2}{Ns\delta} \quad (2)$$

$M(u)$	-	Modularization function
N	-	total number of components
S_u^M	-	Sensitivity function
δ	-	interface constraint factor
u	-	number of NTF components
s	-	substitutability factor

Interface constraint factor δ , Equation (3), for simplicity, is approximated approximate it as the ratio of the total number of interfaces (k_c) per the number of components (n_c) in a sub-system of a given product architecture, although there are many other ways of expressing such relationships.

$$\delta \approx \frac{\sum k_c}{n_c} \quad (3)$$

According to Equation (1), the amount of modularization in a given product architecture is a function of the composition of NTF components (u), substitutability factor (s), and interface constraints (δ), and it is assumed that $M(u)$ decreases in a non-linear fashion from a perfect-modular architecture (i.e., no NTF components or $u = 0$) to a perfect-integral architecture (i.e., no standard components or $u = N$).

Following assumptions are made in formulating the modularization function:

1. A black box is used as the unit of analysis, implying that the component's functional specifications, including interface specifications, do not change over a period of time. This assumption allows the evaluation of the architecture's configuration and components composition independently from other sub-systems.
2. A given product architecture is comprised of a combination of standard and NTF components.
3. It is argued that NTF components impose higher interface constraints. Therefore, the lower the NTF components composition in a product architecture the higher the degree of modularity.
4. Product architectures made entirely of standard components can be equally damaging as product architectures with high-NTF-component composition. It does not protect a product's technological content, and can be easily copied by the competitors. Thus, it is assumed that there should be some amount of NTF components in a given product architecture.
5. All standard components are equally critical.
6. All NTF components are equally critical.
7. All interfaces (i.e. electrical, logical, physical) are equally critical.

The assessment of degree of modularization in a given product architecture involves the following steps:

1. Define product architecture and its boundaries.
2. Decompose the product architecture into sub-circuits, so that each one of the sub-circuits can be assessed individually.
3. Assess the substitutability factor of the product architecture by counting the number of product families enabled by the black box(es), divided by the number of interfaces required by the black box(es) for functionality, in accordance with the level of analysis.
4. Count the total number of components comprising the product architecture. This can be accomplished by looking at the product's bill of materials.
5. Count the number of NTF components.
6. Compute the interface constraint factor, or the average number of interfaces per component, for each sub-circuit.
7. Plug these values into the modularization function, Equation (1) to compute the degree of modularization inherent in the product architecture.

V. ROLE OF MODULARITY IN THE ELEVATOR INDUSTRY

According to Dr. Oliver Gassmann, Head of Technology of Schindler Elevators, until the end of last century the elevators have been typical products of Utterback's [40] 'dominant design industry'. Over capacities and cost competition dominate the market rules. The product architecture of elevators has been stable over a long period due to regulations and few innovations. In addition, the number of competitors has decreased dramatically during the last 15 years. Currently, the elevator industry is characterized by a few large and a high number of small local companies. Over 80 % of the world market share belong to the seven global players. Modularity and standardized interfaces enable the small elevator companies to source from standard component manufacturers and therefore benefit from economies of scale despite their small market share. Since the 1990s, there has been a strong trend towards deregulation, similar to the telecommunication industry. The induced innovation push promoted radical new solutions with new product architectures such as 'machineroomless' elevators, self-propelling cars on self-supporting structures, and advanced traffic management systems. In our analysis we concentrate on the traditional elevator architectures which still account for over 90% of the market.

Based on the transmission principle, dominant elevator designs can be distinguished between: (1) the traction elevator (TR) with drive machine, ropes and counterweight, and (2) the hydraulic elevator (HY) with a hydraulic jack. According to market analysts there is a world market of 40,000 units of hydraulic elevators and 160,000 units of traction elevators worldwide per year, with a strong trend towards traction elevators. The elevator market is segmented into low-rise (less than 60 million), mid-rise (between 60 million and 200 million) and high-rise (greater than 220 million).

A. Description of the Elevator System

Based on UML model, several hundreds of components with respective interfaces are documented for every traction and hydraulic elevator at Schindler. The UML model allows a comfortable analysis and interpretation of the product architecture at different aggregate levels. Fig. 1 shows a partial product architecture of traction elevators at the highest level of analysis. The classification of components into 'unique', 'neutral', and 'standard' was defined by an interdisciplinary group of R&D, purchasing, and market experts. 'Unique' represents a NTF component. 'Standard' represents a component that is not new to the firm. Depending on the application, a 'neutral' component can be considered either as a standard component or a unique component. The linkage shared between the components is characterized as 'fundamental' and 'optional'. While fundamental linkages exist for all elevator variants, optional linkages are only relevant for certain variants.




Fig. 1. Partial product architecture of traction elevators (TR) at the highest level of analysis

In order to illustrate how the mathematical model can be applied, we selected the transmission sub-systems of both HY and TR elevators for a comparative analysis. The analysis of

each elevator system is carried out at two levels: sub-system level (transmission) and system level (elevator), as shown in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2. The elevator and its sub-systems.

The following assumptions are made for the sub-system level analysis:

1. For the sake of illustrating the application of the modularization function at the system level, other sub-systems (such as control, transmission, safeties, car, guide rails, shaft, and diagnostic) are assumed to have the same $\delta_{sub-system}$ interface constraint value as the transmission sub-system. Hence, $\delta_{sub-system}$ represents the average value of all sub-systems. However, a more robust analysis of the modularity should include systematic analysis of these sub-systems.
2. All NTF components are treated as black-box components.
3. Substitutability factor is approximated as the number of elevator families divided by the average number of interfaces shared by the NTF components.
4. Neutral parts can be either a standard or a NTF component. This assumption allows us to see the extent of impact these components, when treated as NTF components, have on modularity of elevators when interfaces shared with other components remain the same.

B. Comparative Analysis of Traction and Hydraulic Elevators

For both Traction Elevator (TR) and Hydraulic Elevator (HY) analysis starts at the sub-system level with their respective partial product architectures such as the one shown in Fig. 1. Since both of these elevators have fundamental and optional linkages as well as three classification of components (unique, neutral, and standard), the basic evaluation starts with only components linked by fundamental interfaces. The maximum relationship shared among the components and respective linkages is achieved when the remaining components with optional linkages are added to the product architecture. This generates a different set of interface constraint value δ , substitutability factor s , unique component composition b , and the total number of components N in the analysis. Hence a range of modularity levels can exist for the two elevators, with $M_{fundamental}(u)$ and $M(u)$ representing the basic and maximum modularity relationship respectively. A comparative analysis of HY and TR elevators is summarized in Table 1.

The graphical interpretation of modularization functions for HY and TR elevators are illustrated in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, respectively.

TABLE I
A COMPARISON OF HY AND TR ELEVATORS

HY ELEVATORS	
2 families (low-rise, mid-rise) $u = 3$ components $n_{neutral} = 16$ components	
<u>fundamental linkages</u>	<u>all linkages</u>
N = 37 components $b = 8 \%$ $s = 1.2$ components/interface $\delta = 4.02$ interfaces/component	N = 43 components $b = 7 \%$ $s = 1.2$ components/interface $\delta = 4.59$ interfaces/component
$M_{fundamental}(u) = 0.98$ $M(u)_{u+neutral} = 0.36$	$M(u) = 0.98$ $M(u)_{u+neutral} = 0.47$
TR ELEVATORS	
3 families (low-rise, mid-rise, high-rise) $u = 6$ components $n_{neutral} = 19$ components	
<u>fundamental linkages</u>	<u>all linkages</u>
N = 38 components $b = 16 \%$ $s = 0.64$ components/interface $\delta = 4.83$ interfaces/component	N = 42 components $b = 14 \%$ $s = 0.60$ components/interface $\delta = 5.01$ interfaces/component
$M_{fundamental}(u) = 0.86$ $M(u)_{u+neutral} = 0.07$	$M(u) = 0.87$ $M(u)_{u+neutral} = 0.08$




Fig. 3. Modularization functions of HY Elevators.




Fig. 4. Modularization functions of TR Elevators.

Some preliminary findings of HY and TR elevators include the following:

1. Both elevators are highly modular from a unique component composition perspective, $M_{HY}(3) = 0.98$ and $M_{TR}(6) = 0.87$.
2. HY elevators are more modular than TR elevators due to higher value of substitutability factor ($s = 1.2$), lower unique component composition ($b = 7\%$), and fewer average number of interfaces shared per component ($\delta = 4.59$). Graphically, the higher modularity of HY elevators are indicated by the relative slopes of the modularity functions, with $M_{TR}(u)$ much steeper than $M_{HY}(u)$.
3. When neutral components are allowed to vary as unique components, then TR elevators have more leverage in gaining modularity from neutral components. For instance, TR elevator has 6 unique components and 19 neutral components. When all the neutral components are treated as unique components, then modularity value, $M_{TR}(u)$, can range from 0.08 to 0.87, compared with the $M_{HY}(u)$ range of 0.47 to 0.98.
4. The modularity of both TR and HY elevators can be increased by increasing the number of families (or

5. While component modularity is captured by the neutral components, the optional linkages capture interface modularity. The optional linkages between components of the HY elevators (given in the block diagram representation) provide more opportunities for modularization than the TR elevators. This is indicated by the larger differences between the modularization functions $M(u)$ and $M_{fundamental}(u)$.
6. The relative improvement in modularity can be gained by adding more components with optional linkages in the HY elevators.

The modularization function also allows us to plot the sensitivity graphs for HY and TR elevators, as illustrated in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. The sensitivity graphs reveal that TR elevators are more sensitive to increases in the number of unique components, u . This is indicated by the steeper slopes of both HY elevator sensitivity functions, $S_{fundamental}(M;u)$ and $S(M;u)$, compared with those of TR elevators.




Fig. 5. Sensitivity graphs of HY Elevators.




Fig. 6. Sensitivity graphs of TR Elevators.

VI. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

This paper analyzed modularity vis-à-vis interface management of components in a given product architecture. We argued that in order to gain a better understanding of the modularity dynamics, we should have a systemic approach to assessing the relationships shared between components and respective interfaces in a given product architecture. A mathematical model, termed modularization function, was introduced for analyzing modularity by taking into account the following variables: number of components, number of interfaces, new-to-the-firm component composition, and substitutability factor. The applicability of modularization function was illustrated with two dominant designs of elevator systems from Schindler Lifts for comparative analysis: traction elevator and hydraulic elevator.

A. Managerial implications

Newest technology developments in the elevator industry will have a big impact on the product architecture and the degree of modularization. The leading elevator companies are developing new drive technologies, such as linear motors with integrated safety functions. This results in dramatically reduced number of components and interfaces. At the same time the substitutability and interface constraint factor will increase.

In industries with dominant design character, a strict interface management has to be applied in order to benefit from economies of scale and outsourcing potentials. These industries are changing from proprietary solutions to common standards. Similar trends can be observed in the mobile

communication industry, where the global players like Nokia, Ericsson, and Siemens cooperate in order to set standards.

The classical tradeoff between optimizing manufacturing costs through integrated design and optimizing life cycle costs through modular design will shift towards the latter one. Enabler for this trend is the transparency of life cycle costs: the reusability of modules for product variants can lead to significantly lower life cycle costs. Drivers are economies of scale and scope, maintenance synergies and improved product quality. The importance of modularity will further increase.

B. Limitations of the mathematical model

The use of mathematical models involving differential equations, such as the one introduced in this paper, is applicable for quantities that change continuously, and sometimes with functions that take on only discrete values can be treated as though they actually have derivatives and satisfy differential equations. Consequently, the mathematical model introduced in this paper is only applicable for analyzing large complex systems (such as automobiles, elevators, ships, rockets, telecommunications systems, etc.) in which the number of components is enormous involving continuous incremental changes to both the process and system itself affecting the component composition of a pre-defined product architecture (either at the production line or with the development engineering at improving its performance).

The robustness of the model is increased as we incorporate more sub-systems into our analysis of the elevator. So far, the analysis done in this paper merely provides an introduction as how the dynamics of elevator system in terms of modularity at the product architecture level can be analyzed. The model can also be extended to include other variables, although this may make the mathematical function extremely complex.

C. Future research

As this paper only reflects preliminary findings of the modularity and interface management of traction and hydraulic elevators, the validation of the mathematical model can be extended to evaluating product architectures from other industries. We expect similar results in other industries with modular systems such as automotive, aircraft/aerospace and computer industries.

As the majority of products sold in the market place involve many suppliers with distinctive knowledge and expertise, the design of product architectures should also take into consideration how it impacts the organizational design of NPD tasks vis-à-vis manufacturing design and inter- versus intra-firm learning and knowledge management. Moreover, it has been debated that outsourcing of non-core technical activities are enabled by the standardization of these non-core components with respect to the core technology. Can decisions regarding to product architecture designs provide us insights to strategic decisions regarding outsourcing,

manufacturing, and supply chain management? If so, how should firms design their organizations to match such strategies with respect to its suppliers and customers? Other areas of great interest for research include, for example, the impacts of product architecture design choices (e.g., multiplexing and de-integration of components) with respect to postponement and mass customization strategies, and cost/benefit analysis of modularity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Dr. Oliver Gassmann of Schindler Lifts for granting me the access to the company and various organizations in order to evaluate modularity management of elevators. His comments and critiques of this paper are gratefully acknowledged.

REFERENCES

- [1] C.Y. Baldwin and K.B. Clark, "Managing in an Age of Modularity," *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 84-93, Sep./Oct. 1997.
- [2] R. Boutellier, O. Gassmann and M. von Zedtwitz, *Managing Global Innovation, Uncovering the Secrets of Future Competitiveness*. 2nd ed., Springer: Berlin, Tokyo, New York, 2000.
- [3] C.M. Christensen and R.S. Rosenbloom, "Explaining the attacker's advantage: technological paradigms, organizational dynamics, and the value network," *Research Policy*, vol. 24, pp. 233-257, 1995.
- [4] H. Demsetz, "The theory of the firm revisited," in O. E. Williamson and S.G. Winter (Eds.), *The Nature of the Firm: Origins, Evolution, and Development*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, pp. 159-178, 1993.
- [5] E. Feitzinger and H.L. Lee, "Mass customization at Hewlett-Packard: the power of postponement," *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 116-121, Jan./Feb. 1997.
- [6] K. Flamm, *Creating the Computer: Government, Industry and High Technology*. Washington, DC: Bookings Institution, 1988.
- [7] B. Fulkerson, "A response to dynamic change in the market place," *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 21, pp. 199-214, 1997.
- [8] R. Garud and S. Kotha, "Using the brain as a metaphor to model flexible production systems," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 19, pp. 671-698, 1994.
- [9] R. Garud and A. Kumaraswamy, "Technological and Organizational Designs for Realizing Economies of Substitution," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 16, pp. 93-109, 1995.
- [10] O. Gassmann and M. von Zedtwitz, "Organization of Industrial R&D on a Global Scale," *R&D Management*, vol. 28, issue 3, pp. 147-161, 1998.
- [11] O. Gassmann and M. von Zedtwitz, "New Concepts and Trends in International R&D Organization," *Research Policy*, vol. 28, pp. 231-250, 1999.
- [12] J.H. Gilmore and J. Pine, "The Four Faces of Mass Customization," *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 91-101, Jan./Feb. 1997.
- [13] T.B. Gooley, "Mass Customization: How logistics makes it happen," *Logistics Management & Distribution Report*, April 1st, 1998.
- [14] R.M. Henderson and K.B. Clark, "Architectural Innovation: The Reconfiguration of Existing Product Technologies and the Failure of Established Firms," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 35, pp. 9-30, 1990.
- [15] J. Hsuan, "Impacts of supplier-buyer relationships on modularization in new product development," *European Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management*, vol. 5, pp. 197-209, 1999.
- [16] J. Hsuan, "Modularization in New Product Development: A Mathematical Modeling Approach," Copenhagen Business School Working Paper 99-4, 1999.

- [17] S. Kotha, "Mass Customization: Implementing the Emerging Paradigm for Competitive Advantage," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 16, pp. 21-42, 1995.
- [18] R.N. Langlois and P.L. Robertson, "Networks and innovation in a modular system: Lessons from the microcomputer and stereo component industries," *Research Policy*, vol. 21, pp. 297-313, 1992.
- [19] H. Lee, "Postponement for mass customization: Satisfying customer demands for tailor-made products," in J. Gattorna (ed.), *Strategic Supply Chain Alignment: Best practice in supply chain management*. Gower Publishing Limited, Chapter 5, pp. 77-91, 1998.
- [20] M. Lundqvist, N. Sundgren and L. Trygg, "Remodularization of a Product Line: Adding Complexity to Project Management," *Journal of Product Innovations Management*, vol. 13, pp. 311-324, 1996.
- [21] M.H. Meyer and A.P. Lehnerd, *The Power of Product Platform: Building Value and Cost Leadership*. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1997.
- [22] M.H. Meyer and J.M. Utterback, "The Product Family and the Dynamics of Core Capability," *Sloan Management Review*, Spring, pp. 29-47, 1993.
- [23] M.H. Meyer, P. Tertzakian and J.M. Utterback, "Metrics for Managing Research and Development in the Context of the Product Family," *Management Science*, vol. 43, issue 1, pp. 88-111, 1997.
- [24] J.H. Mikkola, "Modularization Assessment of Product Architecture," DRUID Working Paper 00-4, 2000.
- [25] J.H. Mikkola, "Product Architecture Design: Implications for Modularization and Interface Management," LINK Working Paper WP 00-11, 2000.
- [26] J. Momme, M.M. Moeller and H.H. Hvolby, "Linking modular product architecture to the strategic sourcing process: Case studies of two Danish industrial enterprises," *International Journal of Logistics: Research and Applications*, vol. 3, issue 2, pp. 127-146, 2000.
- [27] J. Orton and K. Weick, "Loosely coupled systems: A reconceptualization," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 15, pp. 203-223, 1990.
- [28] J. Pine, *Mass Customization – The New Frontier in Business Competition*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1993.
- [29] D. Robertson and K. Ulrich, "Planning for Product Platforms," *Sloan Management Review*, pp. 19-31, Summer 1998.
- [30] R. Sanchez, "Strategic Product Creation: Managing New Interactions of Technology, Markets, and Organizations," *European Management Journal*, vol. 14, issue 2, pp. 121-138, 1996.
- [31] R. Sanchez, "Modular Architectures in the Marketing Process," *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 63, Special Issue, pp. 92-111, 1999.
- [32] R. Sanchez and J.T. Mahoney, "Modularity, Flexibility, and Knowledge Management in Product and Organisation Design," *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 17, Winter Special Issue, pp. 63-76, 1996.
- [33] S.W. Sanderson and M. Uzumeri, *Managing Product Families*. Irwin/McGraw-Hill, 1997.
- [34] S. Schaefer, "Product design partitions with complementary components," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 38, pp. 311-330, 1999.
- [35] M.A. Schilling, "Toward a general modular systems theory and its application to interfirm product modularity," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 25, issue 2, pp. 312-334, 2000.
- [36] Y.J. Tseng, "A modular modeling approach by integrating feature recognition and feature-based design," *Computers in Industry*, vol. 39, pp. 113-125, 1999.
- [37] M.L. Tushman and L. Rosenkopf, "Organizational determinants of technological change: toward a sociology of technological evolution," *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 311-347, 1992.
- [38] K.T. Ulrich, "The role of product architecture in the manufacturing firm," *Research Policy*, vol. 24, pp. 419-440, 1995.
- [39] K.T. Ulrich and S.D. Eppinger, *Product Design and Development*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1995.
- [40] J.M. Utterback, *Mastering the Dynamics of Innovation: How Companies Can Seize Opportunities in the Face of Technological Change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1994.
- [41] R.I. van Hoek, B. Vos and H.R. Commandeur, "Restructuring European Supply Chains by Implementing Postponement Strategies," *Long Range Planning*, vol. 32, issue 5, pp. 505-518, 1999.
- [42] C.F. von Braun, *The Innovation War*. Prentice-Hall Inc, 1997.