



Cross-Discipline Lifecycle Collaboration (CDLC)

prostep ivip Recommendation

Cross-Discipline Lifecycle Collaboration (CDLC)

Abstract

The prostep ivip Association's Cross-Discipline Lifecycle Collaboration (CDLC) working group is a community of manufacturers, suppliers, software vendors and process and tool experts, who are all facing the challenge of improving digital transparency and continuity and thus cross-discipline collaboration in the product development process.

This document summarizes best practices for cross-discipline collaboration (processes, roles, data model, architecture) and recommendations of the working group for setting up federated architectures and enabling end-to-end data continuity and traceability.

The recommendations presented here are derived from the lessons learned from three demonstrators developed by Aras, PTC and Contact Software, based on an industrial change process use case and a Mars Rover dataset.

Disclaimer

prostep ivip Recommendations (PSI Recommendations) are recommendations that are available for anyone to use. Anyone using these recommendations is responsible for ensuring that they are used correctly.

This PSI Recommendation reflects prevailing state-of-the-art at the time of publication. Anyone using PSI Recommendations must assume responsibility for his or her actions and acts at their own risk. The prostep ivip Association and the parties involved in drawing up the PSI Recommendation assume no liability whatsoever.

The prostep ivip Association encourages anyone encountering an error or the possibility of an incorrect interpretation when using the PSI Recommendation to contact the prostep ivip Association (psi-issues@prostep.org) immediately so that errors can be rectified.

Copyright

- I. All rights on this PSI Recommendation, in particular the copyright rights of use and sale such as the right to duplicate, distribute or publish this PSI Recommendation remain exclusively with the prostep ivip Association and its members.
- II. This PSI Recommendation may be duplicated and distributed unchanged, for instance for use in the context of creating software or services.
- III. It is not permitted to change or edit this PSI Recommendation.
- IV. A suitable notice indicating the copyright owner and the restrictions on use must always appear.

Table of Contents

1 Motivation	2
2 Mission of the CDLC working group	3
3 Use case	4
4 Reference process, concepts and requirements	5
4.1 Reference process	5
4.2 Cross-disciplinary ECM context, phases and roles	5
4.3 Use case	8
4.4 Requirements	8
4.5 Traceability concept - a key enabler	9
5 Logical data model	11
5.1 Change objects	11
5.2 Data link types	11
5.3 Overall logical data model	12
6 Federated architecture and linked data concept	14
7 Supporting technologies and standards	17
8 Demonstrators	19
8.1 Aras demonstrator	19
8.2 PTC demonstrator	25
8.3 Contact Software demonstrator	27
9 Summary and recommendations	33
9.1 Summary	33
9.2 Meeting specified requirements	34
9.3 Recommendations	34
10 Next steps	36
Abbreviations	37
Definitions	37
CDLC datamodel – Detailed Diagrams	43
References	49

Tables

Table 1 Interoperability requirements	9
Table 2 Rating of architecture concepts	16
Table 3 Proven formats for facilitating data exchange across disciplines	18

Figures

Figure 1	Collaboration required in systems engineering	2
Figure 2	Established silos hinder collaboration along the V-model	3
Figure 3	Implementing collaboration using cross-discipline data linking	3
Figure 4	Members of the CDLC working group	4
Figure 5	Overview of the use case and disciplines involved	4
Figure 6	Overview of the cross-disciplinary change process	5
Figure 7	Dependencies in a cross-disciplinary ECM process	6
Figure 8	ECM process level overview	6
Figure 9	Cross-disciplinary dependencies in the ECM process	7
Figure 10	Rover range extension ECM use case	8
Figure 11	Traceability concept overview	10
Figure 12	Trace link examples	10
Figure 13	Overview of change objects and relationships	11
Figure 14	Overview of data link types	12
Figure 15	Overview of the cross-discipline logical data model	12
Figure 16	Detailed view of logical data model	13
Figure 17	Centralized PLM architecture	14
Figure 18	Monolithic PLM architecture	15
Figure 19	Federated PLM architecture	15
Figure 20	Overview the CDLC demonstrators' architecture	19
Figure 21	Aras demonstrator architecture	20
Figure 22	Building the CDLC platform using Aras Innovator	20
Figure 23	CDLC federation layer in Aras Innovator	21
Figure 24	Transfer of updated requirements and system definitions from Cameo Modeler	21
Figure 25	RFLP Overview of visual representation	22
Figure 26	Cross-disciplines product tree	22
Figure 27	Cross-discipline product graph	23

Figure 28 Finding synchronized data	23
Figure 29 Master change workflow (for CR and CO stages)	24
Figure 30 Graphical impact analysis	24
Figure 31 Master change (workflow) with affected items	25
Figure 32 PTC demonstrator architecture	26
Figure 33 Linking master change request to Integrity and Bugzilla issues	26
Figure 34 Integrity requirements display in Windchill	27
Figure 35 Integrity requirements tree	27
Figure 36 Infrastructure of the CONTACT demonstrator	28
Figure 37 Linked data management	29
Figure 38 Cross-discipline system model in the collaboration layer	29
Figure 39 Specification editor in CIM Database PLM	30
Figure 40 Excerpt from the cross-discipline parts list (left) and a synchronization mask of a Software-as-a-Part whose external content is managed in Bitbucket (right)	30
Figure 41 ECM project template with predefined ECM phases and tasks	31
Figure 42 Graphically supported affected item analysis	31
Figure 43 Change folder in the collaboration layer	31
Figure 44 Agile task management	32
Figure 45 Synchronization of tasks between collaboration (CONTACT Elements) and domain layer (Jira)	32
Figure 46 Figure 46 Software-as-a-Part in CONTACT Elements and the corresponding commit in Bitbucket	33
Figure 47 Overview of the Integrated Collaboration Framework (ICF)	36
Figure 48 Superordinate use cases in CDLC	43
Figure 49 Artifacts with cross-disciplinary linkage	44
Figure 50 Illustration of the correlations of the change artifacts on the different levels.	44
Figure 51 Enterprise artifacts and their relations	45
Figure 52 Hardware artifacts in the context of change	46
Figure 53 Software artifacts in the context of change	47
Figure 54 Systems Engineering artifacts in the context of change	48