


DERI – DIGITAL ENTERPRISE RESEARCH INSTITUTE



## PRINCIPLES OF SENSEFUL ENGINEERING SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Uwe Keller      Alois Reitbauer  
Roland Mungenast

DERI TECHNICAL REPORT 2007-01-07  
JANUARY 2007

DERI – DIGITAL ENTERPRISE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

**DERI Galway**  
University Road  
Galway, Ireland  
[www.deri.ie](http://www.deri.ie)

**DERI Innsbruck**  
Technikerstrasse 21a  
Innsbruck, Austria  
[www.deri.at](http://www.deri.at)

**DERI Korea**  
267 Deokil Bldg (Saltlux)  
Yeonggun-Dong, Chongno-Gu  
Seoul, Korea  
[www.deri-korea.org](http://www.deri-korea.org)

**DERI Stanford**  
Serra Mall  
Stanford, USA  
<http://www.deri.us>



## DERI TECHNICAL REPORT

DERI TECHNICAL REPORT 2007-01-07, JANUARY 2007

# PRINCIPLES OF SENSEFUL ENGINEERING SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Uwe Keller<sup>1</sup>

Alois Reitbauer<sup>2</sup>

Roland Mungenast<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract.** Engineering of products is a complex, ubiquitous task. Nowadays, these tasks have two important domain-independent aspects: (i) they are knowledge-intensive and (ii) collaborative endeavors. For such processes, information systems used within the industry today provide selective solutions rather than a principled approach towards efficient and holistic support for engineers during the overall process or across different processes. In particular, it is up to individuals to (manually) create and manage their own information space to increase the efficiency of their personal work process. This space is not represented explicitly in a dedicated system and it cannot be shared with others. Furthermore, support systems are usually passive, i.e. the user has to repeatedly ask for information, rather than getting notified about relevant information whenever it is available.

For this reason, we propose a novel approach towards a generic engineering support environment that combines Semantic Web technologies, Semantic Desktops, Group Memory Systems and Multi-Agent Systems to overcome the problems. It aims at transferring the principles underlying the Semantic Web into an enterprise. This report provides a motivation for our research, discusses economical relevance, identifies requirements and systematically derives the conceptual architecture and elements of the solution. Finally, the technical implementation of the proposed architecture is discussed in greater detail.

**Keywords:** Engineering Support System, Semantic Web, Semantic Desktop, Group Memory System, Activity Management, Multi-Agent System, Space-based computing

---

<sup>1</sup>Digital Enterprise Research Institute (DERI) Innsbruck, University of Innsbruck, Technikerstraße 21a, A-6020 Innsbruck, Austria. E-mail: uwe.keller@deri.at

<sup>2</sup>ProFactor Produktionsforschungs GmbH, Im Stadtgut A2, A-4407 Steyr-Gleink, Austria. E-mail: alois.reitbauer@profactor.at

<sup>3</sup>ProFactor Produktionsforschungs GmbH, Im Stadtgut A2, A-4407 Steyr-Gleink, Austria. E-mail: roland.mungenast@profactor.at

**Acknowledgements:** This work was supported by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation, and Technology under the project SENSE (FIT-IT contract FFG 810807)

Copyright © 2007 by the authors

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Problem Statement . . . . .	1
1.2	What we do not aim at! . . . . .	3
1.3	A Need for a Change: Economic Perspective on the Automotive Industry . . . . .	4
1.4	Structure of the Document . . . . .	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Main Challenges</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Proposed Solution: The SEnSE System</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Design Principles . . . . .	7
3.2	System Architecture . . . . .	8
<b>4</b>	<b>Related Work</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>11</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Problem Statement

Engineering of products is a complex and ubiquitous task; it occurs within enterprises across all industries and faces products of increasing complexity. As shown in Fig. 1, already for the process of designing a single product, involved artifacts are numerous and highly inter-dependent. Information about design elements (or parts) is created and managed by different people using their favorite tool. People can take very different roles in the process (e.g. mechanical engineer, software developer, product designer, project manager, financial controller etc.) and therefore generate information about parts of the product that reflect their specific roles. The result is an extensive use of various data formats to represent certain information about the single parts of the product. At the same time, there is neither a single uniform data format that could suitably serve all the people involved in the process, nor is it possible to impose the use of such a uniform, generic format since the used tools are not natively designed to serve an integrated, process-wide environment. Hence, traditional database systems are not applicable for data management in this setting [7].




Figure 1: A Typical Scenario when Designing a Product.

Design decisions for certain parts of a product must be based on all relevant information. This includes information about all other parts that are in some way directly or indirectly related to the element under consideration. A decision on how an element has to be designed might affect (or be constrained by) all these other parts: for instance, if there is a need to change the diameter and material of a screw for cost reasons, all regions around the respective drill wholes where this screw is supposed to be used as well as all physical connections to other parts of the product have to be checked to see if there would be any subsequent problems (e.g. geometric, mechanical, physical ones etc.) with the new design. Design in this respect can be understood as high-dimensional multi-parameter optimization problem with constraints stemming from different areas (see Fig. 2). The product design team altogether tries to find an optimal solution to the given constraints. Search in the solution space is *knowledge-driven* and requires *intensive communication and*




Figure 2: Product Design as a high-dimensional Optimization Problem.

*collaboration:*

Information in general is distributed across different legacy systems that are rarely integrated or even inter-operable. Therefore, it is not easy for individuals to identify and to get needed information for a specific task. It is often necessary to talk to a series of people to eventually find out the desired information. Furthermore, design decisions can often not be taken by individuals alone, but must be taken by a group of experts. Typically, those people are not located at the same site, but work at different places, even in different time zones. Face-to-face communication is therefore not always possible and time-lags to identify relevant information or to discuss design issues for resolving a concrete problem may arise.

In fact, the overall situation is even more complicated in a real-world scenario, since companies typically invent various products and maintain product variants or versions (in re-design processes) over time. In particular, when re-designing a product, a lot of documentation on the single parts of the product is already available and needs to be taken into account. Especially, at this stage it is very valuable to know about former design decisions. Therefore, efficient management and support of the knowledge needs of people involved in a design process is crucial and getting more and more importance nowadays.

For knowledge-intensive, collaborative processes, information systems used within the industry today are insufficient for providing efficient and holistic support during a process as well as across different processes. Especially, it is up to individuals to (manually) create and manage their own information space to increase the efficiency of their work process. This space is neither explicitly represented (and hence not documented) nor managed by a dedicated system. It cannot be communicated and not be shared with others. Furthermore, support systems are usually passive, i.e. the user has to repeatedly ask for information, rather than getting notified about relevant information whenever it is available. This shifts the burden of information gathering to the end-user rather than into a “smart” information space and therefore absorbs a lot of useful attention of the end-user from the actual problem solving process. This situation is depicted in Fig. 3.

For this reason, we propose a novel approach towards developing a generic engineering support environment that combines ideas underlying the Semantic Web, Semantic Desktops, Group Memory Systems and Multi-Agent Systems into a coherent environment to overcome the problems and improves the current situation for individuals involved in engineering process (see Fig. 3) towards the situation shown in Fig. 8.




Figure 3: The Perspective of an Individual in the Process.

## 1.2 What we do not aim at!

**Deep Information Integration.** Information Integration [11, 3] is an exciting area of research within the data management community that studies how to combine data residing at different sources, and to provide users with a unified view of these data. Thereby, information usually is represented in a very detailed manner and information integration systems have to deal with such fine-grained representations of information objects. In contrast, work in enterprises still is massively document-driven; in particular, in product engineering processes most information about product parts is represented in terms of documents (e.g. reports or specifications). The representation of information is therefore rather coarse-grained, i.e. different information junks can be intermixed in a document. Support for retrieving efficiently documents that contain relevant information (and perhaps suitable pointers inside a document) is therefore the most basic service requested from any holistic engineering support system. Post-processing of the document to extract the right content is then up to the human user. In fact, experiences reported in [8] show that this kind of support is most relevant to people in engineering scenarios. Furthermore, it is unlikely that documents will ever be replaced by finer-grained knowledge representation within companies. Therefore, we strive for dealing with documents and document parts as our atomic resources about which knowledge is stored in the first place. More fine-grained representations of knowledge (such as tuples residing in relation databases) clearly should be supported as well, however, they are not considered as the primary level of knowledge representation in our setting. This perspective facilitates scalability and corresponds to what most Semantic Web applications actually do at present.

**Automated Product Design.** As mentioned above, product design can be seen as an optimization problem in a high-dimensional search space (see Fig. 2). Given a suitable formal representation of the problem (e.g. design options) on a computer, one can use algorithms to *automatically* search an optimal solution within




Figure 4: Organizational Hierarchy in the Automotive Industry

the design space (given certain constraints on valid designs). In contrast, we do not aim at such automated search procedures, but rather at facilitating a *group of humans* that collaboratively perform this search (outside a computer) more efficiently and to reach an optimal solution faster.

Nevertheless, please note that for both aspects, the system proposed in this document *in principle* allows to integrate such finer-grained and sophisticated methods (e.g. automated search in the design space). However, they are not our main target of investigation.

### 1.3 A Need for a Change: Economic Perspective on the Automotive Industry

A prominent example of an industry that has an increasing need for efficient collaborative and concurrent engineering processes is the automotive industry: the organizational hierarchy within the automotive manufacturing process can be seen as a pyramid with the OEM (*Original Equipment Manufacturer*, such as Daimler-Chrysler or Audi) on top (see Fig. 4). Cars are assembled by putting systems like the cockpit, motor, etc. together. These systems are manufactured by partners in Tier 1 who get their components to produce Tier-1-systems from Tier-2-suppliers.

Two major recent trends in this industry are that the overall number of produced cars and also the number of variants is going up, and the lifetime of car-types is shortening. This results in a dynamic market, where the number of cars per type of car is going down, and forces companies to (a) reduce the costs in the development process for each car type and (b) shorten the time-to-market for new products and product variants. To control the resulting complexity in manufacturing as well as in design and development, OEMs are shifting part of their activities down the organizational hierarchy to their suppliers.

Experts predict for the automotive industry that along the life cycle significant parts of the added value will be shifted from OEM to suppliers [10]. In the near future, only the positioning of the brand is done almost solely by the OEM. The development phase is already supported by suppliers, and when it comes to production then the supplier have even more value added than the OEM (see Figure 5). Nowadays, the main part of the value adding contribution in module production and assembly are performed by *supplier networks*. Up to 2015, pre- and serial-development will be also clearly dominated by such networks. The requirements concerning efficient collaborative engineering processes will improve dramatically, since the decision support, conflict and change management will affect the overall value adding network.

A study from Mercer Management Consulting entitled „Future Automotive Industry Structure FAST 2015” [4] shows that the number of suppliers worldwide will decline. Today there exist about 5.500 suppliers, until 2015 2.500 companies will not be on the market anymore. The Top 10 Tier-1-suppliers will cover




Figure 5: Predicted Shift of Responsibility over the Development Lifecycle [10]




Figure 6: Future Structure of Tier-1-suppliers in the Automotive Industry [15]

about 40% (today 27%) of the whole supplier volume (see Figure 6). Although the number of suppliers will decline the variety of versions will increase and product life cycles also become shorter. The result is that the suppliers have to be very flexible to survive and to effectively organize cooperate, both, within their organizations as well as with external partners inside the network.

#### 1.4 Structure of the Document

In the following sections we present responsibilities and the design of the single SENSE system components in greater detail and under a technical perspective. This document is further structure as follows:

Section 2 identifies the main challenges and requirements that any generic engineering support systems should satisfy. From these requirements, we derive in Section 3 the conceptual elements of our proposed solution for a support environment that is capable of providing a holistic and enduring support for individuals both within an active engineering process, as well as across distinct engineering processes within an organization that are spread over time. We present the conceptual architecture of the proposed system. Further, we compare our approach with relevant related work in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 summarizes our approach and gives a brief account to future work.

## 2 Main Challenges

From our discussion of the problem context in Section 1, we derive the following main challenges that engineering support environments should properly address:

- (i) **Explicit representation and management of information spaces:** individuals in the engineering process are knowledge workers. They work within their personal information space. A prerequisite for finding relevant information inside this space is the availability of an explicit representation of such a space. Explicit representation and management by a dedicated tool is therefore necessary and desirable.
- (ii) **Organization and access of information spaces according to suitable mental models (or world views):** Information spaces can get large and finding the right information can become a bottleneck. Creating some structure within the space, allows to deal with the information more efficiently. But suitable structures depend on the individuals using a space. Efficient access of information is facilitated by structures that correspond to an individual's "natural" understanding of the domain (i.e. world view or domain model). Hence, (a) domain models are needed to structure information spaces, (b) the structure of personal information spaces should be customizable for individuals and (c) these models should be machine-processable to enable machine-support when accessing information.
- (iii) **Support for the maintenance of various information spaces & distinction between private and shared spaces:** Information spaces of individuals are distinct and should not interfere (if not explicitly stated). Usually, there is information that is specific to an individual and not intended to be shared with others. Further, there is a lot of information that is meant to be shared with others for collaborative tasks. Individuals are therefore interested in including such shared information into their personal information space whenever it is relevant to them, i.e. on a demand basis. Hence, (a) information spaces can be shared or private, and (b) structured by controlled overlapping for collaboration purposes.
- (iv) **Pro-active support:** information spaces can become very large over time. Therefore, even when being structured properly, an individual might not be able to keep track of the (global) state of his information space at a specific moment in time and therefore miss relevant information that comes into being (i.e. from a shared source) or only detect the information unnecessarily late. Instead of requiring an individual to explicitly ask the system for the current state of the information space at any point in time (to explore the space), a pro-active environment is desirable, that informs individuals about (small) changes of the current state of their information space. Such notifications should be optional (i.e. applied on a on-demand basis), selective and specified by the client. We consider this elementary form of pro-activeness as a minimal requirement. Beyond it, more complex forms of pro-activeness might be useful. In general, this will require detailed task-specific (and perhaps company or product specific knowledge) which is not reusable across companies. Therefore, the respective pro-active support functionality will then have to be encapsulated inside a dedicated software component (instead of being a generic functionality supported by the basic system).
- (v) **Task-centered support:** At any moment in time during the process, individuals are concerned with a particular, well-defined task. This implies, that only parts of the overall personal (and global) information space are relevant. Therefore, it is desirable that all irrelevant information is faded out, since (a) individuals have limited cognitive capacity, (b) they should focus as intensively as possible on their

task (not being distracted by other things at that moment). Furthermore, restricting the overall information space to a relevant subset at a particular moment in time facilitate scalability of algorithms that are concerned with accessing the domain models (e.g. ontology reasoning). Therefore, tasks should be used as a central means for scoping within the system, whenever this is possible.

- (vii) The system should **support the documentation of design decisions** (that have been taken during a design process throughout time) to generate a corporate memory: in fact, this aspect has been identified as one of the most useful features of support for engineering tasks in [8].
- (viii) The **system can not replace existing tools**, but rather has to act as a glue between existing ones: people are used to work with specific tools. Often these tools are highly specialized to support a particular task (but not the overall process) and have been developed with a lot of intellectual and monetary effort. Hence, **various forms of legacy data** (e.g existing documents, entries in databases) **have to be integrated** into information spaces. These data sources often have fundamentally different nature (e.g. file systems vs. databases), which must be accessed by different interaction protocols and are distributed over various the world.

### 3 Proposed Solution: The SEnSE System

So far, we have argued that current tools to support engineering processes are not sufficient, identified main reasons and extracted the major challenges that need to be addressed by an environment that aims at providing holistic support within and across engineering processes. In this section, we outline our proposal for an environment, that combines the ideas underlying Semantic Web, Semantic Desktops, Group Memory Systems, and Agent-based Systems in order to tackle the challenges discussed in Sec. 2. In this paper, we focus on motivating and identifying the main elements and conceptual ideas underlying our system (Sec. 3.1) and discuss their combination to a conceptual system architecture (Sec. 3.2).

#### 3.1 Design Principles

A review of the requirements from Sec. 2, leads to the following conceptual elements of a holistic support environment:

Requirements (i) *Explicit representation and management of information spaces* and (ii) *Organization and access of information spaces according to suitable mental models (or world views)* ((a) and (c)) motivate the use of ontologies [14], as formalized, machine-processable representation of domain models. Ontologies are the fundamental semantic data model underlying the system.

Requirement (ii)(b) can be achieved considering ontology networks (i.e. a collection of ontologies that are interrelated by suitable mappings, e.g. [9]) instead of a single upper-level ontology. The formulation of mappings is up to the user as well as dedicated administrators of the corporate knowledge space. Clearly, suitable tools should simplify the definition of mappings as much as possible (e.g. by means of simple GUI gestures, such as the Drag-and-Drop metaphor). Clients always operate on their personal information space through their own ontology. Already pre-defined (default) ontologies in an enterprise could serve as a simplifying starting point for the development of a personal ontology.

Requirement (iii) *Support for the maintenance of various information spaces & distinction between private and shared spaces* motivates the development of a dedicated ontology management component, which is capable of identifying ontologies, of managing multiple ontologies and of sharing ontologies amongst a group of people. The latter might involve concurrent changes of the ontology. Conceptually, the component provides multiple spaces as semantic communication and collaboration channels between all other components of the system. Fine-grained access-control and the support of (partial) imports of ontologies (via mappings) together allow to construct hierarchies of (partially) overlapping information spaces and together cover the desiderata (iii)(a) and (b).

We address requirement (iv) *Pro-active support* by an ontology management component that provides publish-subscribe capabilities on changes of ontologies. The most relevant changes are the creation or deletion of instances in an ontology, however, changes at the terminological level should be supported too (e.g. the change of the description of a particular class). Furthermore, the use of an agent-infrastructure allows to encapsulated and integrate more specific and domain-dependent support functionality into the environment. An example of such a functionality is an engineering rational framework.

Requirement (v) *Task-centered support* is covered by a dedicated domain model: the explicit representation of possible tasks of individuals within an engineering process and the relation of these tasks to people, to resources and other activities. For any individual, a specification of the current task should be available at any point in time. Subsequently, all components and agents in the environment will exploit this information.

Requirement (vii) *documentation of design decisions* is resolved on the agent layer by means of a suitable set of agents that collaboratively implement an engineering rational framework.

Finally, requirement (viii) *No replacement of existing tools and integration of existing legacy systems* is taken into account by the use of an agent-based architecture and a specific type of adapter components (called *Semantic Facades*) that provide a semantic perspective on the data residing in a legacy data source. Semantic Facades for standard data sources (such as relation databases, file systems or web servers) and data formats (e.g. PDF, spreadsheet formats, XML, RDF) must be provided by the environment. All actors outside of the environment (e.g. human users, legacy systems or remote support environments) are integrated via dedicated agents. Agents exploit ontologies for communication. Communication between agents can happen in two ways: synchronously by means of a standard message-based paradigm, as well as asynchronously (and decoupled in time and reference) by means of a (semantic) space. Instead of hiding knowledge spaces of individuals inside an agent at the agent layer, we strive for an explicit dedicated ontology management component (based on a distributed infrastructure) that can be accessed outside the agent-framework as well.

## 3.2 System Architecture

Conceptually, the architecture of the proposed generic support system consists of three layers (see Fig. 7), that successively abstract from the actual technical infrastructure available to support individuals today:

- The *Web Layer* addresses the problem of how to retrieve data objects stores in physical data sources. It implements the Web identification scheme for naming resources and allows to retrieve data ele-




Figure 7: Conceptual Layering of the Support Environment.

ments given their URL. Technical knowledge about underlying (heterogeneous) interaction protocols, distribution of resources and alike are hidden from the upper layers.

- The *Semantic Layer* essentially provides a semantic perspective (i.e. a semantic network) on the collection of resources that are available inside the environment. Semantic networks are rooted in ontologies. This layer provides capabilities to manage (multiple) information spaces (i.e. ontologies) and exploits Semantic Facades to integrate semantic networks from legacy data sources. The semantic layer can be seen as a fundamental infrastructure component for semantic-enabled collaboration based on a very simple conceptual abstraction, namely ontologies.
- The *Agent Layer* provides advanced services to the end-user. Here, we specifically aim at the implementation of an engineering framework, i.e. a software system that allows people to document and efficiently retrieve design decisions that have been taken during engineering processes. Besides the engineering rational framework, many further services are desirable in practice. They can be integrated in a modular way at the agent layer. A concrete example is a system for the management of corporate competency [16].

## 4 Related Work

In the following, we briefly overview some related work and concepts that have inspired our approach and that have similar goals.

**Semantic Web.** The Semantic Web [2] conceptually can be seen as an augmentation of the current Web by a semantic layer that allows machines to take into account the actual meaning of data available on the Web to provide better end-user services, such as improved information retrieval. The basic underlying concepts are semantically annotated resource graphs and ontologies: Considering the Web as a collection of resources (data objects identified by URIs), RDF (*Resource Description Framework*) allows to build semantic graphs interlinking these Web resources on top of the current Web. The links are based on vocabulary from ontologies [14], i.e. shared formalized domain models. These models are described by means of ontology

languages, e.g the Web Ontology Language (OWL). A recent characterization of the goals of the Semantic Web by Nova Spivack which nicely shows the similarity to our objectives is as follows

*„In short, the Semantic Web aims to make software smarter, not just for its own sake, but in order to help make people, and groups of people, smarter. In the original Semantic Web vision this fact was under-emphasized, leading to the impression that Semantic Web was only about automating the world. In fact, it is really about facilitating the world” [13].*

This motivates to apply similar principles and techniques developed within the Semantic Web community during the last years within our setting. However, whereas the Semantic Web idea originally refers to the Web at a large scale, we aim at applying similar principles on a significantly smaller scale, namely within or across a few enterprises.

**Semantic Desktops.** Semantic Desktops [12] are a first step towards bringing the Semantic Web on a personal computer: the underlying idea is to use of ontologies, metadata annotations, and Semantic Web protocols on desktop computers to enable integration of desktop applications and the Web, and therefore a much more focused and integrated personal information management as well as focused information distribution and collaboration on the Web beyond sending emails. Recently, [5] envisioned the concept of a *Networked* or *Social Semantic Desktops* as the ultimate result of a convergence of three very active recent research fields: Peer-to-Peer Computing, Social Networking and Semantic Web. Essentially, Social Semantic Desktops extend the idea of Semantic Desktops by a strong collaborative dimension based on a highly decentralized infrastructure.

Our proposal can be seen as a specific instantiation and extension of Semantic Desktops, where we (i) add a task-specific dimension (e.g. support is strictly based on an explicit representation of a current task to be performed), (ii) target at a specific domain and therefore aim at providing more domain-specific support (e.g. an engineering rational framework), and (iii) use a specific set of technologies to realize the system, that do not have to be the standard technologies used within the Semantic Desktop Community (e.g. using a Semantic Wiki as a communication / collaboration channel).

**Organizational Memory Systems.** Organizational memory systems (OMS) [1, 6] have been proposed as a general approach to enable integration of dispersed and unstructured organizational knowledge by enhancing its access, dissemination and reuse amongst the members of an organization and the organization's information systems. More recently, [16] proposed to narrow organizational memory systems to the concept of *group memory systems* (GMS): systems to manage heterogeneous and distributed knowledge embedded in business process activities. Therefore, GMS can be understood as a specialized version of OMS that deal with knowledge at a smaller scale. The system proposed in [16] focuses on capturing and sharing knowledge about internal competencies, in particular on human “knowledge sources”. They are understood as information systems in the classical sense, i.e. passive knowledge stores. In contrast, the environment proposed here (although sharing many objectives with OMS and GMS) has a strong pro-active nature (besides providing a passive corporate memory). A dedicated agent layer allows to add desired domain-specific support functionality. Furthermore, we aim at explicit task-oriented support for individuals in an engineering process. At the same time, our use case requires the instantiation of the agent layer for a specific functionality, namely an engineering rational framework.

In summary, our system in a way tries to combine the ideas underlying all these approaches into a coherent




Figure 8: Using a Semantic-based Environment for Dedicated Human-centered Support

system and to tailor them towards the specific desiderata of product engineering. The idea of scoping is central here. Therefore, it embodies a novel approach towards support for engineering processes that is based on solid existing work.

## 5 Conclusion

To enhance the support for collaborative, concurrent engineering processes in distributed teams, we propose a novel approach to create engineering support systems. Our approach combines concepts underlying the Semantic Web, Semantic Desktops, Group Memory Systems and Agents into a coherent engineering support environment. A particularly important use case for the proposed system is the realization of an agent-based *engineering rationale framework*, i.e. a system that helps engineers to document and retrieve design decisions for parts of a product.

The proposed environment is able to provide a more effective and holistic support for distributed, concurrent engineering processes, with the following features: (i) Decreased complexity of finding and interacting with the right information, (ii) semantic-based organization and access of information spaces, (iii) personalized and customizable organization of the information space for every individual, (iv) decreased complexity of identifying the right people, (v) pro-active and (vi) task-centered support for individuals during the process, (vii) documentation of design decisions throughout time to generate a corporate memory. The proposed system changes the situation that individuals have to face within the process from the one that is shown in Fig. 3 to the situation that is illustrated in Fig. 8.

Conceptually, the system transfers the principles underlying the Semantic Web architecture into enterprises. One fundamental principle thereby is to not replace the existing tools and systems, but rather to build an agent-based environment which integrates them gradually and allows stepwise enrichment of the overall

process support beyond the capabilities of the single tools.

Economically, our approach is expected to provide as measurable advantages (i) a reduction of development time and the time-to-market (especially for re-design processes, which become increasingly important), (ii) reduction of costs, while at the same time providing (iii) improved process quality and quality of the resulting design, and (iv) the construction and management of a cooperate knowledge base. The latter aspect is especially interesting for companies to address the problem of losing knowledge of experienced people leaving the company, since a lot of knowledge is not stored explicitly in any IT system inside a company. These information spaces exist mostly in people's minds today. For new staff of project members a cooperate knowledge base reduces the required effort to become familiar with projects and all relevant information for their daily business.

So far, we implemented a first prototype of the system. The prototype is not functionally complete yet, since it focuses on one major aspect of the overall system, namely the use and sharing of ontologies between users. Concerning the legacy data sources, the prototype is capable of integrating information from various file systems. Future work is the extension of the prototype to support event subscription and notification mechanisms for information spaces, extended support of important legacy data sources (e.g. various popular document formats, relational databases), as well as the implementation of agent layer functionality, especially an agent-based engineering rationale framework. A particularly interesting problem is how to simplify the definition of mappings between shared and personalized ontologies for a user by means of very simple graphical gestures.

## Acknowledgments

The reported work was funded by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation, and Technology under the project SENSE (FIT-IT contract FFG 810807).

## References

- [1] Andreas Abecker, Ansgar Bernardi, Knut Hinkelmann, Otto Kühn, and Michael Sintek. Toward a technology for organizational memories. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 13(3):40–48, 1998.
- [2] Tim Berners-Lee, Jim Hendler, and Ora Lassila. The semantic web. In *Scientific American*, volume 501, pages 28–37. 2001.
- [3] Diego Calvanese, Giuseppe De Giacomo, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Riccardo Rosati. Logical foundations of peer-to-peer data integration. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, pages 241–251, 2004.
- [4] Jan Dannenberg and Christian Kleinhans. The Coming Age of Collaboration in the Automotive Industry: For automakers, its all about brand management. *Mercer Management Journal*, 17:88 – 94, June 2004.
- [5] Stefan Decker and Martin R. Frank. The networked semantic desktop. In *WWW Workshop on Application Design, Development and Implementation Issues in the Semantic Web*, 2004.
- [6] Rose Dieng. Guest editor's introduction: Knowledge management and the internet. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 15(3):14–17, 2000.

- [7] Michael J. Franklin, Alon Y. Halevy, and David Maier. From Databases to Dataspaces: a New Abstraction for Information Management. *SIGMOD Record*, 34(4):27–33, 2005.
- [8] Thomas R. Gruber and Daniel M. Russell. Generative design rationale: Beyond the record and replay paradigm. 1994.
- [9] Peter Haase and Boris Motik. A mapping system for the integration of owl-dl ontologies. In *Proceedings of the Internat. ACM workshop on Interoperability of Heterogeneous Information Systems (IHIS'05)*, pages 9–16, 2005.
- [10] Rainer Kurek. *Erfolgsstrategien für Automobilzulieferer : wirksames Management in einem dynamischen Umfeld, in German*. Springer, 2004.
- [11] Maurizio Lenzerini. Data Integration: A Theoretical Perspective. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems (PODS)*, pages 233–246, 2002.
- [12] Leo Sauermann, Ansgar Bernardi, and Andreas Dengel. Overview and outlook on the semantic desktop. In Stefan Decker, Jack Park, Dennis Quan, and Leo Sauermann, editors, *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on The Semantic Desktop at the ISWC 2005 Conference*, 2005.
- [13] Nova Spivack. The Meaning and Future of the Semantic Web. Web-Blog: *Minding The Planet*, November 6 2006. Available at <http://tinyurl.com/yynb93>.
- [14] Steffen Staab and Rudi Studer, editors. *Handbook on Ontologies*. International Handbooks on Information Systems. Springer, 2004.
- [15] Georg Sticher, CEO Boston Consulting Group Munich Germany. Outlook on the automotive industry. Invited speech at industry conference *Automotive 2004*, 2004.
- [16] José Vasconcelos, Chris Kimble, Feliz Gouveia, and Daniel Kudenko. A Group Memory System for Corporate Knowledge Management: An Ontological Approach. In *Proceedings of 1st European Conference on Knowledge Management (ECKM)*, pages 91–99, September 2000.