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https://www.cimdata.com/zh/memberships/aerospace-defense-plm-action-group
Problem statement
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Many A&D companies or aircraft programs are based on a “Design as Built” methodology for the design process.

As programs mature from product development, manufacturing priorities take center stage and demand adjustments to the Bill of Material (BOM).

Today’s PLM tools allow for multiple views of the BOM and Product structures but require reconciliation and complex consumption methods to demonstrate regulatory compliance.

The complexity surrounding management of multiple BOM views increases with compounding restructuring use cases.

PLM solutions don’t offer out of the box capability or best practice for robust management of accountability.

The multi-view BOM concept must facilitate a consistent representation of the same product across its lifecycle, from Design through Manufacturing, Procurement, Certification, and post production services.
Previous GPDIS presentations
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• 2016 – Bruce Hiebert, Ian Gilkerson & Benoit Planté – **Multi BOM Configuration Management**
  Focused on configuration control zones and EBOM splits on the MBOM.

• 2017 – Kenneth Swope – **PLM A&D Action Group Multi-View Bill of Materials Development and Status**
  Expanded focused to more restructuring use cases, such as manufacturing assemblies and condition of supply.

• 2018 – Aleksander Przybylo – PLM A&D Action Group
  Multi-view BOM progress report out
Workshops
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March 2017
Toulouse

September 2017
Seattle

March 2018
Paris
Session with vendors
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• One day session with vendors: Aras, Dassault Systèmes, PTC, SAP, Siemens PLM
• The good
  • All major vendors participated and were receptive
  • Vendors recognize the need for the standardization of accountability processes
• The struggles
  • Vendors push towards requirements, not collaboration
  • Difficulty of interacting with each vendor separately
Progress on the position paper

Version 2.2 published
- Major content restructure
- Completed subproject content
- Added high level requirements for each subproject
- Added Effectivity Management content

New appendices published
- Glossary
- Restructuring use cases
- Product Structures and Accountability Methods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Acronym or Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source of definition</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Difficulty to agree</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aircraft Identification Number</td>
<td>The manufacturer's permanently-applied serial number for the airframe.</td>
<td>ATA_SPEC-2000_2011-01</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Term in published glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alternate Part Number</td>
<td>An alternate part number identifies a part which fully meets required functional and 106, 2200, structural specifications of the primary part number, and is approved for use in lieu of the primary part number. Alternate part must be defined as global or local.</td>
<td>ATA_SPEC-2000_2011-01</td>
<td>Interchangeable, Optional part, Substitute, Replaceable</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Term in published glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Effectivity</td>
<td>A designation defining the product or product range; e.g., serial numbers, lot numbers, model, dates, or event at which the usage of a specific product configuration applies, a change to a specific product is to be or has been impacted, or to which a variance applies.</td>
<td>Based in EIA-649-A 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Term in published glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Interchangeable</td>
<td>Parts with the same Part Number that can be freely used on any location and unit without installation conditions: the original part can be removed and the new one can be installed in its place.</td>
<td>OWN</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of position on major topics
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• Accountability
  • System enforced accountability at and post release time
  • Ability to incrementally validate accountability (as opposed to once product is built)
  • Ability to enforce accountability across units and beyond user session

• Engineering/Assembly requirements
  • Ability to manage requirement consumption at arbitrary level (installation/fastener group/single fastener/spec/step)

• Supplier integration
  • Ability to exchange and synchronize configured structures for each OEM/supplier integration scenario (BTP/Des/D&B)

• Evolving configuration for specific AIN
  • Ability to define multiple configurations for a specific AIN (as opposed to fly-away only) with enforced accountability
Restructuring use cases
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Symbol legend (Engineering)

**Configured Items (Installations)**
- DS1-1
  - ASSY1-1.1
  - ASSY1-1.2
- DS2-1
  - ASSY1-1.3
  - PART4-1.1

**Assemblies**
- ASSY1-1
  - PART1-1.1
  - PART2-1.1
  - PART3-1.1
  - PART3-1.2

**Detail parts**
- PART1-1
- PART2-1
- PART3-1
- PART4-1

**Occurrence View**
- Aircraft
  - DS1-1
    - ASSY1-1.1
    - PART1-1.1
    - PART2-1.1
    - PART3-1.1
    - PART3-1.2
    - ASSY1-1.2.1
    - PART1-1.1
    - PART2-1.1
    - PART3-1.1
    - PART3-1.2.1
  - DS2-1
    - ASSY1-1.3.1
    - PART1-1.1
    - PART2-1.1
    - PART3-1.1
    - PART3-1.2.3
    - PART4-1.1
Restructuring use cases
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Symbol legend (Manufacturing)

No restructuring:
Installation plans are 1 to 1 with Configured Items

Restructuring:
Occurrences split between Installations Plans (and Control Stations)

Image Courtesy of The Boeing Company
Restructuring use cases

Hierarchy restructure

Merge

Make on Assembly (MOA)

Split

Manufacturing Assembly (Subtypes on following page)
Restructuring use cases
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Manufacturing Assembly

Subset

Superset

Part Number controlled

Utilized

DS3

PART5

PART6

PART7

PART8

MFG1

OP1

MFG2

OP2

1-10

IP3

PART5

PART6

PART7

PART8

MFG1

OP1

MFG2

OP2

1-5

6-10

1-10

IP3

PART5

PART6

PART7

PART8

MFG1

OP1

MFG2

OP2

1-5

6-10

1-10

IP3

PART5

PART6

PART7

PART8

MFG1

OP1

MFG2

OP2

1-5

6-10

1-10

IP3
Restructuring use cases

Alternate

DS3
PART5
Std1
Std2

IP3
OP5
OP6

Alternate can only be used in this context

(1-1)

(1-N)

Usage based

Definition based

Alternate can be used wherever the part is used

DS3
PART5
Std1
Std2

Std Assay
Std4
Std5
Std6

DS3
PART5
Std1
Std2

Std Assay
Std4
Std5
Std6

Alternate can only be used in this context

Alternate can be used wherever the part is used
Restructuring use cases

Condition of Supply

- Typical use case: omit holes

Part definition replacement

- Typical use case: End item shipped from supplier with boxed kit for final assembly

Kitting and End Items

- Manufacturing End Item consumes Configured Items instead of occurrences

- Similar to Manufacturing Assembly but can be split across Installation plans
Product structures
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- **Single structure**
  - Both upstream and downstream are constrained to a single structure (e.g. design as built)

- **Independent data sets**
  - The upstream and downstream structures are independent and can deviate independently of each other

- **Projected transient views**
  - Both upstream and downstream structures are projected views from a single authoritative graph structure
  - The views are not persistent and not configuration managed
  - Configuration management occurs on the authoritative structure

- **Projected persistent views**
  - A hybrid between “Projected transient views” and “Independent data sets”
  - The independent data sets are generated from the single structure
  - Configuration management occurs on the projected persistent views
Accountability methods

• Report based
  • Reports are executed periodically (automatically or on demand)
  • Reports generate lists of under or over consumed nodes

• Change based
  • For each upstream change, a delta is computed
  • Each node in the delta has to be consumed before the change is incorporated in the downstream structure
  • Assignment assistant verifies coherence of manufacturing change based on engineering change prior to release of manufacturing

• Accountability map
  • An additional structure is added which manages an node assignments
  • The map corresponds to the upstream structure and maps each node to a downstream container
Projected persistent views

Drawing created during the September 2017 Seattle workshop
### Product structure vs Accountability method Matrix
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Report based</th>
<th>Change based</th>
<th>Accountability map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Transient Views</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Persistent Views</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Preferred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key takeaways

- It’s the first time that competitors in the A&D industry come together and agree to share information.
- The workshops have been immensely valuable and productive.
- We all agree that there is a need for standardization of accountability processes, not just standardization of data elements.
- We are still struggling with finding the best way to involve the vendors.
As each OEM has created homegrown processes and systems to manage internal production of configured structures, the common suppliers we share struggle with the wide range of variation that is necessary. This industry group has openly shared how each OEM manages configured structure with effectivity.

The complexity and cost is significant when the supplier must create unique BOM translators, effectivity converters and configuration management differences. Each supplier typically uses dedicated personnel to manage each OEM unique work package for this reason.

These costs are ultimately driven back to the OEMs.
What’s next

• Publishing of Position paper appendices on
  • Engineering and assembly requirements
  • Supplier collaboration
  • Evolving configuration for specific AIN

• Gathering Vendor responses

• Additional workshop on
  • Effectivity management
  • Vendor specific implementations

• Establishing ongoing relationship with vendors
Questions?