



Application of Design for Lean Six Sigma to Strategic Space Management

Journal:	<i>The TQM Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	TQM-11-2022-0328.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Lean Six Sigma, Change management, Manufacturing, Leadership, Operations management

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Application of Design for Lean Six Sigma to Strategic Space Management

Abstract

Purpose - This paper outlines how Design for Lean Six Sigma methods aided a medical device manufacturing company in developing a new strategic space management and approval process for its manufacturing site.

Design/methodology/approach – The project demonstrates the application of the Design for Lean Six Sigma and structured Define, Measure, Analyse, Design, and Verify methodology in designing and implementing a process that enables the case study manufacturing site to improve its space utilisation and free up space.

Findings - The project was validated in one manufacturing department, and the Design for Lean Six Sigma methodology resulted in creating 15% new space for that area, with opportunities identified to free up 44.7% of the total manufacturing floor space and realise over €2.2 million cost savings as well as start to manufacture new products launched.

Research limitations/implications – The manuscript highlights for the first time how the Design for Lean Six Sigma methodology can be utilised for space utilisation and can be leveraged by other manufacturers. The current study's limitations are that it is a single-site case study application. Future longitudinal case studies on Design for Lean Six Sigma application in more manufacturing space utilisation projects would be useful. This study has implications for identifying best practices for Design for Lean Six Sigma methodology application in the device industry, thus improving state-of-the art for introducing new manufacturing lines.

Originality/value - This is the first published work to utilise Design for Lean Six Sigma methodology for space utilisation in a Medical Device company. This review will provide

1
2
3
4 Medical devices and other Manufacturing organisations with recommendations on utilising
5
6 Design for Lean Six Sigma and design for improved space utilisation to reduce costs.
7

8
9 **Keywords:** Medical Device, DFLSS, DMADV, Lean Six Sigma, Space Management
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The TQM Journal

1.0 Introduction

Global market competition and fluctuating customer demands require manufacturing enterprises to focus on cost reduction and efficiency improvements to increase competitiveness and sustainability. The availability and management of space in manufacturing environments are key components of providing adequate capacity to meet customer demand and provide the manufacturing site with a competitive edge over its external and internal competitors (Green *et al.*, 2010). The primary function of a manufacturing entity is to build and supply products to the customer on behalf of the organisation. Therefore, strategic manufacturing layout and space decisions are considered one of the most important design decisions as part of business operation strategies and their proven repercussion on production systems' operation costs, efficiency and productivity (Pérez-Gosende *et al.*, 2021). The floor space available to manufacturing is also a resource that can help drive a successful manufacturing strategy. Lean Six Sigma (LSS) approaches have successfully developed and improved processes within the manufacturing sphere to improve quality and reduce waste (Antony *et al.*, 2021). Many studies have discussed the advantages of applying LSS to enhance space utilisation, reduce floor space and improve flow (McDermott, 2021; McDermott and Nelson, 2022; Trubetskaya *et al.*, 2022). Kovács (2020) conducted a study in a manufacturing facility that combined Lean methods and facility layout design to achieve efficiency improvements and cost reductions. Within this study there were many benefits; minimised material workflow, travel distance of materials, material handling cost and space used for assembly; improved cycle-time and reduced the number of workstations and operators, work-in-process and inventories, space used for assembly, material workflow, travel distance of materials, material handling costs, labour cost, component supply and improved product quality, transparency, standardisation and workplace ergonomics.

However, much literature discusses using the LSS DMAIC model to improve existing process

1
2
3
4 and space utilisation problems. Define, Measure, Analyse, Design, and Verify (DMADV) is a
5
6 data-driven quality strategy that focuses on the development of new products or services
7
8 compared to existing ones (Burke and Silvestrini, 2017)(ASQ, 2022). The DMADV method or
9
10 approach is often used when implementing new strategies because of its basis in data, its ability
11
12 to identify success early, and its method, which requires thorough analysis. Industrial facility
13
14 layouts are defined as physically arranging the space and equipment within a manufacturing site.
15
16 The manufacturer is trying to design a strategic layout for a medical device manufacturer where
17
18 this research takes place. This layout will shape the production system to suitably and efficiently
19
20 fulfil the organisation's strategic objectives and gain more space to start manufacturing other
21
22 products from their parent company. In the case study organisation where this research takes
23
24 place, it is proposed to utilise the DFLSS model of DMADV to design an improved layout in
25
26 tangent with the start of the facility layout process. It is proposed that a DFLSS approach can be
27
28 utilised to develop a strategic space management and approval process in a manufacturing site.
29
30 A new process will be developed to avoid repeat capital expenditures, prevent inefficiencies on
31
32 layout relocations, and increase site readiness for capacity increases and new product
33
34 introductions. Using the DMADV methodology, the project will create a new space management
35
36 process to utilise manufacturing floor space as a strategic weapon to gain a competitive
37
38 advantage(Pérez-Gosende *et al.*, 2021). Thus, the research questions are:
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **RQ1:** How can DMADV methods be applied to a manufacturing site layout design?
46

47 **RQ2:** What are the benefits of implementing a DMADV design?
48

49
50 Section 2 outlines the literature review while Section 3 discuss the methodology taken to review
51
52 the literature, section 4 outlines the results from reviewing the literature, and section 5 and 6
53
54 discuss and concludes the results.
55
56
57
58
59
60

2. Literature Review

The importance of the manufacturing strategy as a function within organisations has been highlighted for decades (Dangayach and Deshmukh, 2001). Manufacturing is a strategic competitive factor by which companies can differentiate themselves, and it is no longer enough to manage and adapt manufacturing using short-term goals (Dombrowski et al., 2016). Therefore, manufacturing and facility line layout and the facility are considered one of the most important operations design decisions (Ghassemi Tari and Neghabi, 2018). Gupta *et al.* (2018) also highlight the importance of formulating a manufacturing strategy to gain a competitive advantage. Competitive advantage in the literature is written in the traditional sense - making products cheaper and faster (George, 2010), or as Harmon (2017) puts it, competitive advantage is the edge of firms over their competitors. It can manifest in higher sales margins or the ability to retain customers and firms most clearly understand their competitive advantage and exploit it to create a distinct image.

The treatment of manufacturing floor space as a source for competitive advantage links in with the resource-based view of competition. Conner (1991) argues that acquiring, developing, and controlling scarce resources and deploying them strategically to achieve goals has solid grounding economically. It is more profitable to focus on developing, protecting, and leveraging a firm's unique operational resources and advantages to change competition rules (Gagnon, 1999). As an expensive and scarce resource, manufacturing floor space is an important factor in manufacturing. The experience in manufacturing operations to use lean six sigma tools to improve issues with current processes and make products faster and cheaper (Garza-Reyes *et al.*, 2012) has developed a knowledge base of how these tools can be used for continuous improvement. Prahalad and Hamel (1990) built upon this by pointing out the importance of linking core competencies and the competitiveness of an organisation where operations management would not just structure

1
2
3
4 processes but would have detailed knowledge of its resources, look after them and use them
5
6 intelligently to enhance competitiveness.
7

8
9 Traditional LSS continuous improvement projects follow the Six Sigma DMAIC (Define,
10 Measure, Analyse, Improve, Control) methodology, which has been applied since the 1980s as a
11 recognised data-driven scientific method for solving complex business problems (Trubetskaya and
12 Mullers, 2021). The DMAIC methodology has been built on established scientific, engineering
13 and quality improvement techniques pioneered throughout the past few decades (McDermott and
14 Antony, 2021). A more recent Six Sigma methodology known as 'design for Six Sigma' or DFSS
15 was introduced in the late 1990s to support the design of new products, processes and services
16 (Huang *et al.*, 2010).
17

18
19 Among the ten reasons for improvement projects to fail that was put together by Antony and Gupta
20 (2019) is a selection of methodology and associated tools that are faulty. Gijo *et al.* (2021) pointed
21 out that the understanding of different DFSS methodologies, such as DMADV (Define, Measure,
22 Analyse, Design, Verify) or DMAIC (Define, Measure, Analyse, Improve, Control), among many
23 other proposed methodologies and customising it based on the organisational needs will reinforce
24 the productivity and performance. DMADV methodology is more suitable for creating new
25 processes, whereas DMAIC is suitable for solving problems within existing processes (Cudney
26 and Agustiady, 2017). When the product or service under consideration is under major design
27 change requirements or still at the initial stages of development, DMADV is the five steps that are
28 used (Salah *et al.*, 2010). Within each of the five steps, various statistical and lean tools are selected
29 as appropriate (Womack and Jones, 2003). However, some authors have proposed an 8-step
30 DFLSS toll gate process as the best practice (Chatterjee and Green, 2007). Initially, DMADV was
31 utilised for product design (Chandan *et al.*, 2022) and is well established in services design in some
32 cases using Define, Design, Optimise, Validate (IDDOV) (Furterer, 2016). Design for Lean Six
33 Sigma (DFLSS) has been described as an outgrowth of the DFSS and Lean Six Sigma approaches
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 but with the principles of Lean incorporated to aid waste reduction, improve flow and reduce non-
5
6 value add (Thomas and Singh, 2006). Antony (2012) has discussed the need as firms to improve
7
8 their processes and move towards Six Sigma to redesign their products, process and services to
9
10 "design out" defects and design-in quality. Organisations working at three or four Sigma
11
12 commonly spend between 25 and 40 per cent of their incomes fixing issues (Gaikwad *et al.*, 2022),
13
14 and DFLSS offers a method of reducing these costs while designing "right first time". Thus
15
16 utilising the voice of the customer (VoC) can enable the design of processes and products
17
18 incorporating customers, stakeholders and all relevant opinions (Ko and Hunt, 2008). The
19
20 advantages acquired from the use of the DFLSS approach are increased comprehension of
21
22 customers, assumptions, and their needs identified with products, processes or service attributes,
23
24 as well as enhanced quality to manage risks in the design process for products, processes or
25
26 services with reduced post introduction cost such as warranty about products and rework about
27
28 processes (Antony, 2002).
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **3. Methodology**

37
38 The project was initiated to create a space management and approval process for a medical device
39
40 manufacturing site. The framework adopted for the project is the DFLSS methodology of DMADV.
41
42 As the company has begun its lean transformation in recent years, there was a familiarity with
43
44 DMAIC (Define, Measure, Analyse, Improve, Control) that had the project team initially favouring
45
46 the DMAIC approach. However, as there is currently no defined process for managing manufacturing
47
48 space in the company, the project team moved to the DMADV approach, as summarised in Table 1.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: The tools used in the project.

Stage	Tool	Output
Define	Gemba Walk	Physically observe the potential of the manufacturing space
	Brainstorming & Affinity Diagram	Develop ideas and group them together
	SIPOC	Provides a clear picture of the inputs and outputs for the process
	Project Charter	Details the scope, goals, resources and deliverables for the project
Measure	Critical to Quality Tree	Used to translate the business needs into qualifiable outputs of the new process
	Data Collection Plan	This will be used to measure the current use of the manufacturing space
Analyse	Pareto Chart	This will be used to analyse the current use of the manufacturing space
	Ishikawa Cause and Effect	Used in reverse to brainstorm ideas to reach the requirements of the process
Design	Process Mapping	Design the new space management and approval process
	Gantt Chart	Used to plan implementation

Verify	Pilot Run	Validate that new process design meets runs smoothly and meets target outputs
	Change Management	Manage resistance to new process and ensure that it is meeting its target outputs
	Control Plan	Schedule ongoing review of process to ensure that it is meeting its target outputs
	Gemba	Used to physically observe the new process has the desired impact in the manufacturing area

3.1 Define

At the project's concept stage, a Gemba walk of the manufacturing areas of the site was conducted by the site leadership to observe what floor space challenges and opportunities existed. Following this, discussions were held, and affinity diagrams were used to organise the ideas. A SIPOC chart was used to determine and visualise the new process's suppliers, inputs, outputs, and customers. The SIPOC also helps the project team determine the level of resources (either capital or human) to develop the new process and ensure that these are implemented for the project.

The output from these brainstorming sessions provided the team with a project charter, which set the objectives, scope, specific project benefits, financials, deliverables, key metrics during the project and a communications plan. In addition, the project team, their roles and key responsibilities were also defined in the project charter.

3.2 Measure

During the Measure stage, the project team built upon the outputs of the future process and gathered information on the requirements of the business. This information was gathered by meeting with the customer (site leadership). Generally, the voice of the customer is based on how they experience a service or product, and the information can be vague and difficult to measure. On this basis, the voice of the customer was transformed into critical to quality (CTQ) parameters to ensure that the customer's requirements are quantified and, therefore, measurable. A CTQ Tree was used to create specific and measurable outputs from general and hard-to-measure characteristics to transform the customer's needs into quantifiable and measurable characteristics. A data collection plan was also developed. The purpose of the data was to provide detailed information on the current use of manufacturing space within site.

3.3 Analyse

Pareto charts were developed using the data from the measure phase. This provided a foundation for the team to analyse the current floor space use within the factory. The team used an Ishikawa Cause & Effect diagram to brainstorm ideas on how any new process would meet the CTQs of the new process. During this phase, the team also began sketching high-level draft process maps to develop the concepts of how each of the CTQs would be met.

3.4 Design

During the design phase, the team constructed a map of a process that would meet the CTQs. The mapping process began at a high level and more detail was added to reach the optimal process. Following this, a Gantt chart was again used to develop a plan for verifying and implementation.

3.5 Verify

1
2
3
4 The new process was verified by simulating a product transfer project and then used while
5
6 introducing a continuous flow line in an existing area. Following the verification of the process, the
7
8 standard was documented and published. A change management and communication plan were
9
10 initiated to ensure that all personnel understood the process and their role in it. A control plan was
11
12 also developed to ensure the process continued functioning as designed post-implementation.
13
14 Gemba walks of the manufacturing floor will also be used to ensure that floor space management
15
16 meets the documented standards.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **4.0 Results**

24 **4.1 Define**

25
26
27 Having realised the need for a unified space management and approval process, the operations
28
29 director assembled a project team. The core of the project team included the Facilities Manager,
30
31 Production Manager, Engineering Manager, Quality Manager, R&D Lead, and QE Manager. In
32
33 addition, this researcher (Manufacturing Supervisor) was appointed to guide the team through each
34
35 project stage. A project charter, which defined the project's scope, was determined and agreed upon
36
37 with the operations director.
38
39
40
41
42

43 The initiative's define phase included brainstorming and using a SIPOC diagram, as shown in Figure
44
45 1. The brainstorming discussions, aided by using affinity diagrams, were held with site leadership
46
47 and operations managers, and the team found that space was utilised in different ways by different
48
49 departments, depending on how that department's managers saw to use it. Space was usually used
50
51 in an ad-hoc manner, often reacting to requirements, and available space was often commandeered,
52
53 whether it was part of that manufacturing business unit. Resistance to the appropriateness of such
54
55 space utilisation was often shut down with the 'business needs' card. It became clear that such
56
57 methods of acquiring or utilising manufacturing space did not suit the customer's requirement, i.e.,
58
59
60

site leadership.

Following these initial meetings, the team worked with stakeholders to understand what context a strategic space management process would exist. Using a SIPOC map (Suppliers, Inputs, Processes, Outputs, Customers) facilitated the construction of what resources were required for the process and the expected outputs. Having completed a SIPOC, the project team then highlighted areas that would provide data as a baseline for current performance.




Figure 1: SIPOC.

4.2 Measure

Within the measure phase, the needs of the business (voice of the customer) identified in the project team's engagement with the stakeholders were mapped to a CTQ template, as shown in Figure 2. This enabled the team to develop metrics that captured the customer's voice and provided measurable targets for the new process.




Figure 2: CTQ Template.

The CTQ tool assisted the team in understanding the needs of the business and transformed these needs into specific and measurable criteria. The project team found that understanding the drivers of the needs provided more insight into the customer's requirements, which led to better servicing of those needs. For example, in the CTQ, a need to know what type of floor space is available may not always be clear and could have led the team down many different paths. However, understanding that some products require processing in class 8 clean rooms and others does not drive the need to understand whether the site has available space for either type. Of the six CTQ (Critical to Quality) metrics, the first five are the data points that the new process requires to set out a baseline for the new process. They are the total manufacturing space (m²), the space currently used by each MBU, clean room or non-clean room space, the free space currently available and the location of that free space.

The team put together a data collection plan to gather the required data, as shown in Table 2. Guiding

the team in creating the collection plan to meet the requirements of the CTQ output was the simple principle of What? Who? Where? When? & How?

Table 2: Data Collection Plan with Results.

MBU	CMA1	CMA2	CMA3	CMA4	Received	Shipped	Total, m ²	m ² CMA	m ² non- CMA
Urology	605	28	0	0	125	89	847	605	242
Plastic	496	18	0	0	113	89	716	496	220
Stents	0	15	354	0	87	89	545	369	176
Evolution	0	6	378	0	93	89	566	384	182
Area X	0	5	280	0	101	89	475	285	190
ECHO	4	4	168	0	50	89	315	176	139
Area B	0	14	0	823	35	89	961	837	124
m² used by area	1105	90	1180	823	604	623		3152	1273
m² non-used by area	155	18	0	0	44	0			
Total m² by area	1260	108	1180	823	648	623			

Using the existing drawings, the team worked with operations personnel to highlight differences between the site drawings and the actual usage of floor space. This activity included several visits to each area, and the team often found space for overflow storage of items that may not have been there on the previous occasion. The existing layout of each manufacturing area was captured, and

the floor space usage was measured. The drawings were also used to colour workspaces by the MBU that was using them at the time.

Figure 3 below shows how CMA3 had several MBUs intersecting in some areas, but it also showed how the MBU in the middle of the floor (yellow marked) retained workbenches for future use. This aligned with the issue highlighted in the original engagements with stakeholders about how space was utilised differently depending on the area and manager.



Figure 3: CMA3 Floor Drawing.

In the areas outside the manufacturing suites, it was found that the Receiving and IQC (Incoming Quality Control) areas did not have details on the space utilised by each MBU for the materials for that MBU. It was a case of use that was available. The team worked with the local area owners to measure the specific space usage by materials for each MBU. In the shipping area, it was not easy to accurately measure the floor space usage as products from all MBUs flowed through this area.

The team decided to divide the floor space equally for each MBU. The storage and processing space used in IQC, Receiving and Shipping for each MBU was measured and included in the Pareto chart. The data collection activity found that 4425 m² of manufacturing space was in use and that 217 m² was not in use. Therefore, based on the productivity of each MBU at the time of the data collection, the team were able to carry out a calculation of the output per m² for each MBU, as shown in Figure 4(a).




Figure 4: Output of the available space and potential space usage.

Figure 4(b) above shows the floor space currently in use by each MBU. Area X uses the largest floor space at 961m², and GI General uses the least floor space at 315 m². Figure 4(c) illustrates that CMA (Controlled Manufacturing Area, Class 8 Clean Room) was measured at 3152 m² and Non-CMA floor space was measured at 1273 m². As requested by site leadership, the data collection results also indicate the location of available space, as shown in Figure 4(d). The location's name indicates the type of floor space available.

4.3 Analyse

Applying the lean six sigma principles has proven beneficial in identifying how the lack of a space management process has impacted the floor layout by making the issue more visible. Next, the team set about using an Ishikawa diagram to brainstorm how the process would meet the requirements of the business, as shown below in Figure 5.




Figure 5: Ishikawa Diagram.

Utilising the outputs from the SIPOC and CTQ exercises, the team brainstormed several areas requiring mandatory information inputs for any person or department undertaking an activity that impacted the manufacturing floor space. For example, what impacted the floor drawing ID and its revision? This would highlight if there were other changes planned for that floor space. An important data point would be whether the project engaged in the new process would be consuming or creating space and the drivers behind these changes. In addition, it would be important to understand if any changes were aligned with the overall strategy for the manufacturing site. The number of departments specified in the Ishikawa diagram also highlighted the need for early collaboration between all impacted departments. The final consideration in the brainstorming was which department would own the process. Would it be facilities, as they are usually responsible for

the drawings, or would it be line support, who are usually the users of the manufacturing floor drawings? The number of potential variables that could feed into any project that impacts floor space highlighted to the team that any new process would need a guidance template so that project leads could easily follow that process.

4.4 Design

Using the information from the brainstorming sessions, the team worked on developing a strategic space planning and approval process that would include the criteria from the analysis and meet the needs of the business, as shown in Figure 6. Recognising the importance of early collaboration to the success of any project, the team set out a process that requires impacts to be shared with stakeholders early in the process before other expensive activities, such as costings and regulatory approvals, are sought. In addition, how floor space is impacted must be detailed and highlighted in future state visualisations of the floor plans.




Figure 6: Space Management & Approval Process.

One of the CTQs set out by the site leadership is that there would be adherence to a 100% strategic space planning process for all projects. Therefore the team designed the new process as a precursor that leads into the Project Management Cycle process for Business Improvement Projects (BIP).

To plan the project's next phase, the team put together a Gantt chart, as shown in Figure 8. This provided a high-level view of the next steps and the timeline of each step. These steps included building the Strategic Space Process template to guide users. Once in place, the new process, with the aid of the SSP template pack, was simulated. Following a successful simulation, the business policy document was finalised and released, and the company's project management process was updated to check for adherence to the space management and approval process. The team also planned to complete and roll out the communication and training plan in two weeks. Finally, the team planned to conduct an after-action review to take learnings from the entire process, as shown in Figure 7.




Figure 7: Implementation Plan.

4.5 Verify

The initial plan was to simulate the strategic space management process using a previous product transfer and manufacturing line re-layout that had occurred earlier in the year. The lead for that product transfer was brought on board, taken through the requirements of the process, and tasked with trialling the process. The result of this activity found that while the project was planned in great technical detail, there was a gap in the level of collaboration with the area owners across shifts. Upper management levels were aware of the changes, but manufacturing supervisors and team leads were not included. The exercise also reinforced the findings from the measure phase that there were gaps between the actual floor space usage and the drawings when the project was implemented. The project lead gave feedback that this led to a significant quantity of frustration and conflict in the days just after the floor relay out as the manufacturing team members raised issues about how their work area was laid out compared to its previous actual layout. A workshop was also conducted with several experienced project leads, and it simulated the process for a new product introduction for 2023. This activity found that the new strategic space planning and approval process worked well and was easy to follow. The team set about developing a change management plan. A training and communication plan was put together. This training plan did include how to use the strategic space plan and the why. It gave a background to the importance of manufacturing floor space, its costs, particularly in controlled cleanrooms, and how creating more free space can increase the capacity and competitiveness of the manufacturing site in Limerick. The communications also targeted all manufacturing team members on-site rather than just the leadership groups of each department. This was a deliberate measure, as the day-to-day users of the manufacturing spaces were in the best position to ensure that each section of the floor was utilised as planned and to bring about engagement for future improvements.

Several controls were put in place to maintain the gains made from implementing the new process. These controls included the development of the policy document and practical and tangible means

for all personnel to ensure adherence to the space management process. The freed space was segregated from use, and signage was put in place to identify the owner of the space and the project that made it available. The weekly 6S audits were updated to ensure that free space was segregated and its ownership and purpose identified. Unauthorised incursions on the free space were to be highlighted, and the 6S audit score was impacted only more in the safety section. The Gemba walks conducted by senior management increased in frequency from monthly in each area to weekly and senior leaders from departments such as Engineering, Facilities and Quality began to participate in the Gemba walks. The schedule for the Gemba walks was updated to include a physical review of all free sections of floor space and to ensure that adherence was maintained.

The new Strategic Space Management and Approval process were validated in practical terms in June 2022 when a redesign of the Plastic Stents manufacturing areas in CMA1 was completed. This was the first project to utilise the Strategic Space Management and Approval process. The result of the redesign led to a reduction of the floor space used by the various sections of the Plastic Stents MBU from 716 m² to 608 m², freeing up 108 m² of controlled manufacturing space. The re-layout also improved space utilisation from 138.9 units per m² to 163.6 units per m² (Table 3). The project also increased the total amount of free space from 217 m² to 323 m². The cost savings from the validation project are €280,473, and the process will produce total savings across the entire manufacturing area of €2.2 million (Table 3).

Table 2: Results Summary.

Completed	Before	After	Result
Space Saving, Plastic Stents, m ²	716	608	15%
Space Utilisation, Plastic Stents, units per m ²	139	164	18%
Free Space, Plastic Stents, m ²	0	108	-

Current Total Free Space, m ²	217	325	50%
Planned			
Designed Free Space, m ²	217	1979	-
Designed Free Space % of Total Space	4.9%	44.7%	-
Cost Savings	EUR		2,277,874

5.0 Discussion

This project demonstrated that the DMADV methodology successfully developed a new space management and approval process for a medical device manufacturing site. The key drivers of change in how space was managed in the manufacturing facility were a realisation by site leadership that there was no link between the utilisation of floor space and the site's strategic goals of attracting new business to the site and a lack of data on how efficiently that space was being utilised. The results of this project have demonstrated that the DMADV framework can be used to develop new operational processes that link in with existing processes and align the various departments towards the site's strategic goals. The current results have also confirmed the importance of the company investing resources in ensuring that staff in all departments clearly understand the company's strategic goals and how they can impact the achievement of those goals (McDermott, Antony, Sony and Looby, 2022).

This project has led to the establishment of a Lean DMADV model with the advantage of using simplified and accessible methods that can be structured to address other organisational challenges where there is a lack of strategic alignment and no clearly defined process for managing and approving the use of any company resources.

The initiative also shows a large selection of lean six sigma tools that can be utilised to achieve the

1
2
3
4 desired goals. This project was developed using the DMADV model in space management, which
5
6 is a novelty as the topic has hardly been invested in literature. Existing literature has tended to use
7
8 individual lean tools such as 6S to organise work areas at a local level, or DMAIC has been used as
9
10 a model to solve once-off-space issues (Iswanto 2015; Trubetskaya *et al.*, 2022, Ponikierska &
11
12 Stefaniak, 2017) or as previously experienced within this company, improved space utilisation had
13
14 been captured only as a by-product of once off applications of lean tools rather than being the target
15
16 of an overarching strategy. Moreover, while initially, the DMADV model was chosen over the more
17
18 familiar DMAIC model as it was recommended for designing new processes, the present results
19
20 underlined the key philosophy of the DMADV model that centres around the customers'
21
22 requirements. In this case, the business and its strategic goals provide the basis for the voice of the
23
24 customer approach that DMADV espouses rather than the short-term and incremental problem-
25
26 solving offered by DMAIC or standalone usage of tools such as 6S.

27
28
29
30
31 Gijo et al. (2021) highlight various techniques that can be used to understand the VOC, and they
32
33 distinguish between the qualitative and quantitative techniques. Of the quantitative techniques, the
34
35 Kano Model and QFD (Quality Functional Deployment) can be utilised to gather the customers'
36
37 requirements and transfer them into technical data (Gangurde and Patil, 2018). The Kano Model
38
39 offered to categorise requirements into those that must be provided and those that would create
40
41 'delight' for the customer. The Kano model has proven useful in gathering information from several
42
43 customers on several points and creating a data-based model for measuring how well those customer
44
45 needs are met. QFD (Quality Functional Deployment) also provides a method to gather various
46
47 customer data and then rate it against competitors' offerings and convert the requirements into
48
49 specifications. For this project, where one customer was identified and a relatively small number of
50
51 requirements, the team realised that simple face-to-face discussions facilitated using a CTQ tree
52
53 were hugely beneficial. The customer was in a place to participate in the exercise and agreed with
54
55 the CTQ targets at the end of the exercise. In this case, the customer either agreed with the targets
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 100% or did not agree at all.
5

6 While the use of the CTQ tree can appear less data-based than other models, it was a useful method
7
8 to eliminate assumptions and provide a clear platform to build the new process. Despite the project's
9
10 qualitative beginnings, a large amount of quantitative data was gathered during the measure phase
11
12 to set the baseline for the new process. This data will provide evidence of the impact of strategically
13
14 managing the manufacturing floor space. The floor space usage by MBU per m² directly impacts
15
16 the company's bottom line results. Harsimran (2020) puts it that DMADV is a data-intensive
17
18 approach. This perception of DMADV as data-intensive may be why it has not been used
19
20 extensively for developing organisational processes. This project has demonstrated that within the
21
22 DMADV framework, conducting interviews and using the CTQ tree can transform a strategic need
23
24 of a business where there is initially a lack of data and use it as a platform to transform it into a data
25
26 based operation.
27
28
29

30
31 The study has also demonstrated that repeated changes at the departmental level without a process
32
33 for strategic oversight can be hugely expensive. Previous changes to the layout of production lines
34
35 have had costs ranging between EUR155,000 and EUR490,000. The validation of the new process
36
37 resulted in an immediate cost saving of just over €280,000 and will reduce costs by €2.2 million by
38
39 the end of 2023 (Table 2). Without using a process designed with DMADV, the company will
40
41 potentially experience those costs as repeat expenditures and longer implementation times. When
42
43 the need for space management is identified, the application of the DMADV methodology will
44
45 ensure the design process will proceed smoothly and in a short timeline. The results in Table 2
46
47 show that 50% of floor space can be freed to be ready for building new product lines. Without using
48
49 the DMADV model, the company is faced with the potential of expensive space re-layouts every
50
51 time there is a fluctuation in demand and by using short-term activities based on DMAIC or other
52
53 models.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theoretical Implications

This is the first attempt in the literature to present a model for strategic space management using the DMADV framework. While the model's validation is limited to a single manufacturing site and has not been demonstrated to other sites or industries, it does provide a platform for further research into how strategic space management can be developed using the DMADV model.

This study has several significant implications for state of the art in terms of demonstrating how DMADV implementation can be successfully deployed in manufacturing companies. First, this study was deployed in a manufacturing company and a highly regulated manufacturing environment where changes are expensive and difficult to implement because of regulatory requirements. LSS methodology in the MedTech industry (McDermott, Antony, Sony and Healy, 2022; Trubetskaya *et al.*, 2022).

Managerial Implications

There are several managerial implications in this study. First, utilising a process based on the company's longer-term strategic goals can ensure floor space capacity can be increased, and baselines for efficiencies are set (Nelson *et al.*, 2022). By using DMADV to design for future increases in space requirement, the company can plan for demand and build it into their capacity.

Furthermore, lessons learnt from the present study for organisations show that DMADV implementation, particularly in the early stages, can take much commitment and focus from the project's sponsors. The company may need to utilise many resources, such as engineering and external contractors, to develop its goals and measure its current baseline. Without understanding the required level of commitment, companies may abandon the implementation prematurely, before realising the benefits of such an initiative. A layout design based on big data can be more efficient and effective (Kumar *et al.*, 2018). With the advent of Industry 4.0, this use of data could be integrated with the existing DMADV design to develop a maturity model that provides the company

1
2
3
4 with a more precise understanding of its resources (Antony et al., 2022).
5
6
7
8
9

10 **6.0 Conclusion**

11
12
13
14 The novelty of this relies on the integration of Lean DMADV methodology into the improvement
15
16 of floor space management. The DMADV model ensured simplicity for all participants to engage
17
18 with the medium size enterprise improvement steps (**RQ1**). The project's activity in bringing various
19
20 departments and managers together has also had the impact of reducing the barriers between those
21
22 departments and a greater understanding of the impacts each department and each employee can
23
24 have on the future of the company to achieve a structured space environment (**RQ2**). A key factor
25
26 for the success of this project is that it was conceived and supported by the senior management
27
28 emphasising the importance of leadership in Lean improvement. While this model has yet to be
29
30 validated in other scenarios, this simple approach should make it adaptable to any organisation that
31
32 needs to develop processes to transform how they utilise their operational resources. Although this
33
34 project took place in a medical device manufacturing site to strategically manage and free up space,
35
36 the method can be used in any setting where there is no defined process. Other industries where
37
38 space is limited or needs to be repurposed for use could transform the qualitative inputs into
39
40 quantitative outputs that will meet customer expectations.
41
42
43
44

45
46 A limitation of this study could be that the project did not measure the impact of the new process
47
48 on the life cycle of business improvement projects. Some expressed concerns that the new process
49
50 may be seen as another administrative hurdle for project teams to jump over. A counterargument to
51
52 this is that the process would help screen the projects and ensure that they were strategically aligned
53
54 and improve their chances of success. A further limitation is that the case study was confined to one
55
56 site, so the findings may not be generalisable.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Opportunities for future research are to deploy the learnings to the parent company of the
5
6 manufacturing site. Based on the success of the new process at a local level, digital platforms could
7
8 be utilised in other sites to replicate the face-to-face voice of the customer activities, such as surveys
9
10 and interviews, at various geographical locations in the earlier stages of the project. Future research
11
12 around layout design based on Industry 4.0 technology integrated with the existing DMADV design
13
14 to develop a maturity model is an opportunity for more investigation. Thus this will give its
15
16 leadership the ability to make the most effective decisions about the strategic utilisation of
17
18 manufacturing space.
19
20
21
22
23

24 **References**

25
26
27
28 Al-Aomar, R. (2011). Applying 5S Lean Technology: An Infrastructure for Continuous Process
29
30 Improvement. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 60, pp.1606-1611.
31

32
33
34
35 Al-Ashaab, A., Golob, M., Attia, U., Khan, M., Parsons, J., Andino, A., Perez, A., Guzman, P.,
36
37 Onecha, A., Kesavamoorthy, S., Martinez, G., Shehab, E., Berkes, A., Haque, B., Soril, M. and
38
39 Sopelana, A. (2013). The transformation of the product development process into Lean
40
41 environment using set-based concurrent engineering: A case study from aerospace industry.
42
43 *Concurrent Engineering*, 21(4), pp.268-285.
44
45
46
47

48
49 Al-Ashaab, A., Golob, M., Urrutia, U., Gourdin, M., Petritsch, C., Summers, M. and El-Nounu, A.
50
51 (2015). Development and application of Lean product development performance measurement
52
53 tool. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, 29(3), pp.342-354.
54
55
56

57
58 Albers, A., Heimicke, J., Trost, S. and Spadinger, M. (2020). Alignment of the change to agile
59
60

1
2
3
4 through method-supported evaluation of agile principles in physical product development.
5
6 *Procedia CIRP*, 91, pp.600-614.
7
8
9

10 Alexander, K. and Clarkson, P. (2002). A validation model for the medical devices industry.
11
12 *Journal of Engineering Design*, 13(3), pp.197-204.
13
14
15

16
17 Anderson, K.M., Grasman, S.E., Ayoub, K., Introne, S., and Smithwick, K. (2011). Using Lean
18
19 product development to speed time to market for medical devices. *Proceedings of the Industrial*
20
21 *Engineering Research Conference (IERC)*, pp. 1-7.
22
23
24

25
26
27 Anand, G. and Kodali, R. (2008). Development of a Conceptual Framework for Lean New
28
29 Product Development Process. *International Journal of Product Development*, 6(2), pp.190.
30
31
32

33
34 Antonini, M., Plana, D., Srinivasan, S., Atta, L., Achanta, A., Yang, H., Cramer, A., Freake, J.,
35
36 Sinha, M., Yu, S., LeBoeuf, N., Linville-Engler, B. and Sorger, P. (2021). A Crisis-Responsive
37
38 Framework for Medical device Development Applied to the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Frontiers in*
39
40 *Digital Health*, 3.
41
42
43

44
45
46 Baines, T., Williams, G., Lightfoot, H. and Evans, S. (2007). Beyond theory: An examination of
47
48 Lean new product introduction practices in the UK. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical*
49
50 *Engineers, Part B: Journal of Engineering Manufacture*, 221(11), pp.1593-1600.
51
52
53

54
55 Beninger, P. (2020). COVID-19: Regulatory Landscape of Medicinal and Medical device
56
57 Products for Human Use. *Clinical Therapeutics*, 42(8), pp.1444-1450.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Bergsland, J., Elle, O. and Fosse, E. (2014). Barriers to medical device innovation. *Medical*
5 *devices: Evidence and Research*, [online] 2014(7), pp.205-209. Available at:
6 [https://www.dovepress.com/barriers-to-medical-device-innovation-peer-reviewed-article-](https://www.dovepress.com/barriers-to-medical-device-innovation-peer-reviewed-article-MDER)
7
8 MDER [Accessed 29 November 2020].
9
10
11
12

13
14
15 Bernstein, J.I., Joshua I. (1998). Design Methods in the Aerospace Industry: Looking for
16 Evidence of Set-Based Practices, Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, available at:
17 <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/82675> (accessed 16 April 2021).
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 Bhamra, R., Nand, A., Yang, L., Albregard, P., Azevedo, G., Corraini, D. and Emiliasiq, M.
25 (2020). Is leagile still relevant? A review and research opportunities. *Total Quality Management*
26 *and Business Excellence*, pp.1-25.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Bicheno, J. (2008). *The Lean toolbox for service systems*. 1st ed. Buckingham: Picsie Books.
34

35
36 Boylan, B., McDermott, O. and Kinahan, N (2021). Manufacturing Control System Development
37 for an In Vitro Diagnostic Product Platform. *Processes*, 9(6), pp.975.
38
39
40

41
42
43 Bridgelal Ram, M., Grocott, PR and Weir, H.C.M. (2008), Issues and challenges of involving
44 users in medical device development, *Health Expectations*, 11(1), pp. 63–71.
45
46
47
48

49
50
51 Brown, A., Dixon, D., Eatock, J., Meenan, B. and Young, T. (2008). A survey of success factors in
52 New Product Development in the medical devices industry. *IEEE International Engineering*
53 *Management Conference*.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Brown, A., Eatock, J., Dixon, D., Meenan, B. and Anderson, J. (2008). Quality and continuous
5 improvement in medical device manufacturing. *TQM*, 20(6), pp.541-555.
6
7

8
9
10 Brown, A., Meenan, B. and Young, T. (2007). Marketing Innovation: Medical device prices
11 follow the experience curve. *Journal of Medical Marketing*, 7(3), pp.203-212.
12
13

14
15
16
17 Browning, T. (2003). On customer value and improvement in product development processes.
18
19
20 *Systems Engineering*, 6(1), pp.49-61.
21

22
23
24 Byrne, B., McDermott, O. and Noonan, J. (2021), Applying Lean Six Sigma Methodology to a
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Facility: A Case Study, *Processes*, 9(3), 1-34.

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Cawley, O., Richardson, I. and Wang, X. (2011), Medical device Software Development - A
Perspective from a Lean Manufacturing Plant, in O'Connor, R., Rout, T., McCaffery, F. and
Dorling, A. (Eds.), 155, presented at the SOFTWARE PROCESS IMPROVEMENT AND
CAPABILITY DETERMINATION, pp. 84-96.

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Cawley, O., Wang, X. and Richardson, I. (2010). Lean/Agile Software Development
Methodologies in Regulated Environments - State of the Art, in Abrahamsson, P. and Oza, N.
(Eds.), 65, presented at the LEAN ENTERPRISE SOFTWARE AND SYSTEMS, pp. 31-36.

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
CDRH. (2020), Classify Your Medical Device, FDA, FDA, 22 October, available at:
<https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/overview-device-regulation/classify-your-medical-device>
(accessed 15 August 2021).

1
2
3
4 Ciurana, J. (2014). Designing, prototyping and manufacturing medical devices: an overview.
5
6 *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, 27(10), pp.901-918.
7

8 Cooper, R. (1986). *Winning at new products*. 1st ed. Reading, Massachusetts.: Addison-Wesley
9
10 Publishing Company.
11
12

13
14
15 Cooper, R. and Edgett, S. (2008). Maximising Productivity in Product Innovation. *Research-*
16
17 *Technology Management*, 51(2), pp.47-58.
18
19

20
21
22 Cooper, R. and Sommer, A. (2016). The Agile-Stage-Gate Hybrid Model: A Promising New
23
24 Approach and a New Research Opportunity. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 33(5),
25
26 pp.513-526.
27
28

29
30
31
32 Costa, J., Rossi, M., Rebentisch, E., Terzi, S., Taisch, M. and Nightingale, D. (2014). What to
33
34 Measure for Success in Lean System Engineering Programs?. *Procedia Computer Science*, 28,
35
36 pp.789-798.
37
38

39
40
41 Curran, R., Kundu, A., Raghunathan, S. and Eakin, D. (2001). Costing Tools for Decision Making
42
43 within Integrated Aerospace Design. *Concurrent Engineering*, 9(4), pp.327-338.
44
45

46
47
48 Darwish, M., Shehab, E., Al-Ashaab, A. and Haque, B. (2010). Value Stream Mapping And
49
50 Analysis Of Product Development (Engineering) Processes. In: *Proceedings of the 8th*
51
52 *International Conference on Manufacturing Research ICMR 2010*. [online] Durham:
53
54 International Conference on Manufacturing Research.
55
56

57
58
59 Das, S. and Almonor, J. (2000). A concurrent engineering approach for the development of
60

1
2
3
4 medical devices. *International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing*, 13(2), pp.139-
5
6 147.

7
8
9
10 Denney, D. (2006). Stage-Gate Project-Management Process in the Oil and Gas Industry.
11
12 *Journal of Petroleum Technology*, 58(12), pp.68-71.

13
14
15
16
17 Deshpande, A. (2018). Concurrent Engineering, Knowledge Management, and Product
18
19 Innovation. *Journal of Operations and Strategic Planning*, 1(2), pp.204-231.

20
21
22
23
24 Dixon, D., Eatock, J., Meenan, B.J. and Morgan, M. (2006). Application of design of experiment
25
26 (DOE) techniques to process validation in medical device manufacture. *Journal of Validation*
27
28 *Technology*, 12(2), pp.92-100.

29
30
31
32
33
34 Driva, H., Pawar, K. and Menon, U. (2001). Performance evaluation of new product development
35
36 from a company perspective. *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, 12(5), pp.368- 378.

37
38
39
40
41 Endris, K., Khan, M. and Arias, A. (2012). Advanced process planning in Lean product and
42
43 process development. *2012 18th International ICE Conference on Engineering, Technology and*
44
45 *Innovation*.

46
47
48
49
50 European Medicines Agency. (2018). Medical devices, European Medicines Agency, Text, 26
51
52 November, available at: [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory/overview/medical-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory/overview/medical-devices)
53
54 [devices](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/human-regulatory/overview/medical-devices) (accessed 15 August 2021).

55
56
57
58
59 FDA CDRH. (2020), Design Control Guidance For Medical Device Manufacturers, US Food and
60

1
2
3
4 Drug Administration, FDA, 18 March, available at: [https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/design-control-guidance-medical-device-manufacturers)
5
6 [information/search-fda-guidance-documents/design-control-guidance-medical-device-](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/design-control-guidance-medical-device-manufacturers)
7
8 [manufacturers](https://www.fda.gov/regulatory-information/search-fda-guidance-documents/design-control-guidance-medical-device-manufacturers) (accessed 16 April 2021).
9

10
11
12
13 FDA (2021). Medical device Single Audit Program (MDSAP). *US Food and Drug*
14 *Administration*. Available online: [https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/cdrh-international-](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/cdrh-international-programs/medical-device-single-audit-program-mdsap)
15 [programs/medical-device-single-audit-program-mdsap](https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/cdrh-international-programs/medical-device-single-audit-program-mdsap)
16
17
18

19
20
21
22 Forno, A., Pereira, F., Forcellini, F. and Kipper, L. (2014). Value Stream Mapping: a study about
23 the problems and challenges found in the literature from the past 15 years about application of
24 Lean tools. *The International Journal of Advanced Manufacturing Technology*, 72(5-8), pp.779-
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

30
31
32
33
34 Freire, J. and Alarcón, L. (2002). Achieving Lean Design Process: Improvement Methodology.
35 *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 128(3), pp.248-256.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Gibbs, R. (2006). *Project management with the IBM Rational Unified Process*. 1st ed. Upper
7
8 Saddle River (NJ): IBM Press/Pearson plc.
9

10
11
12
13 Glazkova, N., Fortin, C and Podladchikova, T. (2019), Application of Lean-Agile Approach for
14
15 Medical Wearable Device Development, 14th Annual Conference System of Systems
16
17 Engineering (SoSE), presented at the 14th Annual Conference System of Systems Engineering
18
19 (SoSE), pp. 75–80.
20
21

22
23
24 Goldenberg, S. and Gravagna, J. (2018). A real-world perspective: Building and executing an
25
26 integrated customer engagement roadmap that bridges the gaps in traditional medical device
27
28 development processes. *Journal of Medical Marketing: Device, Diagnostic and Pharmaceutical*
29
30 *Marketing*
31
32

33
34
35
36 Haque, B. and James-Moore, M. (2004). Applying Lean thinking to new product introduction.
37
38 *Journal of Engineering Design*, 15(1), pp.1-31.
39

40
41
42
43 Haque, B. and James-Moore, M. (2004). Measures of performance for Lean product introduction
44
45 in the aerospace industry. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part B: Journal*
46
47 *of Engineering Manufacture*, 218(10), pp.1387-1398.
48
49

50
51
52 Hejazi, A., Bhuiyan, N. and Othman, M. (2020). Performance measurement of a Lean product
53
54 development process. *Concurrent Engineering*, 28(3), pp.198-209.
55

56
57 Högman, U. and Johannesson, H. (2013). Applying stage-gate processes to technology
58
59 development—Experience from six hardware-oriented companies. *Journal of Engineering and*
60

1
2
3
4 *Technology Management*, 30(3), pp.264-287.
5
6
7

8 Howieson, J., Lawley, M., and Selen, W. (2014). New Product Development in Small Food
9 Enterprises. *Journal of New Business Ideas and Trends*, 12(1), pp.11-26.
10
11
12

13
14
15 Ikatrinasari, Z. and Haryanto, E. (2014). Implementation of Lean Service with Value Stream
16 Mapping at Directorate Airworthiness and Aircraft Operation, Ministry of Transportation
17 Republic of Indonesia. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 7(4), pp.291-301.
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 International Organization for Standardization (2015). *ISO 9001: Quality management systems -*
25 *Requirements*, International Organization for Standardization
26
27
28

29
30
31 International Organization for Standardization (2016). *ISO 13485: Medical devices — Quality*
32 *management systems — Requirements for regulatory purposes*, International Organization for
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

International Organization for Standardization (2021). *ISO 21500: Project, programme and*
portfolio management — Context and concepts, International Organization for Standardization

Irish Business and Employers Confederation (2019). *Irish medtech hub adds more than half a*
billion euro in last 12 months. [online] Available at: <<https://www.ibec.ie/connect-and-learn/media/2019/12/04/medtech-hub-adds-more-than-half-a-billion-euro-in-last-12-months>>
[Accessed 2 March 2021].

1
2
3
4 Karlsson, C. and Ahlstrom, P. (1996). The Difficult Path to Lean Product Development. *Journal*
5 *of Production Innovation Management*, 13(4), pp.283-295.
6
7

8
9
10
11 Kearney, A.T. (2003). The Line on Design – How to Reduce Material Cost by Eliminating
12 Design Waste, White Paper, A.T. Kearney, Inc.
13
14
15

16
17
18 Khan, M., Al-Ashaab, A., Shehab, E., Haque, B., Ewers, P., Sorli, M. and Sopelana, A. (2013).
19 Towards Lean product and process development. *International Journal of Computer Integrated*
20 *Manufacturing*, 26(12), pp.1105-1116.
21
22
23

24
25
26
27 Ko, MKB and Hunt, R.A. (2008) Using QFD to drive improvement/innovation strategy in China
28 and other developing countries: creating and sustaining a project culture by lean multiple voices
29 collection and Design for Lean Six Sigma (DFLSS), Proceedings of the 14th International
30 Symposium on Quality Function Deployment. QFD Institute, Ann Arbor, MI, International
31 Symposium on Quality Function Deployment.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38
39
40
41 Krucoff, M., Brindis, R., Hodgson, P., Mack, M. and Holmes, D. (2012). Medical device
42 Innovation: Prospective Solutions for an Ecosystem in Crisis. *JACC: Cardiovascular*
43 *Interventions*, 5(7), pp.790-796.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 Lean Business Ireland. 2018. Shingo Prize Winners In Ireland. [online] Available at:
51 <<https://www.Leanbusinessireland.ie/shingo-prize-winners-ireland/>> [Accessed 4 March 2021].
52
53

54 León, H. and Farris, J., 2011. Lean Product Development Research: Current State and Future
55 Directions. *Engineering Management Journal*, 23(1), pp.29-51.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Leuenberger-Fisher, M. (2005). Health Care Business Method Patents: Prior Art, Secrecy, and
5
6 Secondary Indicia of Obviousness. *Biotechnology Law Report*, 24(2), pp.149-167.
7
8
9

10
11 Lin, W. and Fan, X. (2009). Software Development Practice for FDA-Compliant Medical
12
13 Devices, International Joint Conference on Computational Sciences and Optimization, presented
14
15 at the International Joint Conference on Computational Sciences and Optimization, pp. 388–390.
16
17
18

19
20
21 Locher, D., 2011. *Lean Office and Service Simplified*. 1st ed. New York: Productivity Press.
22
23
24

25
26 Lucke, L., Mickelson, A. and Anderson, D. (2009). Proving experience speeds medical device
27
28 time to market. *Annual International Conference of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and*
29
30 *Biology Society*.
31
32
33

34
35 Marešová, P., Klímová, B., Honegr, J., Kuča, K., Ibrahim, W. and Selamat, A. (2020). Medical
36
37 device Development Process, and Associated Risks and Legislative Aspects-Systematic Review.
38
39 *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8.
40
41
42

43
44 Martin, J.L., Norris, B.J., Murphy, E. and Crowe, J.A. (2008), Medical device development: The
45
46 challenge for ergonomics, *Applied Ergonomics*, 39(3), pp. 271–283.
47
48
49

50
51 McCaffery, F., O'Connor, R. and Coleman, G. (2006). Mapping Medical device Standards
52
53 Against the CMMI for Configuration Management. *Communications in Computer and*
54
55 *Information Science*, pp.153-164.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 McDermott, O., Antony, J., Sony, M. and Daly, S. (2022), Barriers and Enablers for Continuous
5
6 Improvement Methodologies within the Irish Pharmaceutical Industry, *Processes*, 10(1), pp. 1-
7
8 19.
9

10
11
12
13 McDermott, O., Antony, J., Sony, M. and Healy, T. (2022), Critical Failure Factors for
14
15 Continuous Improvement Methodologies in the Irish MedTech Industry, *TQM*, 34(7), pp.18-38.
16
17

18
19
20 McHugh, M., Cawley, O., McCaffery, F., Richardson, I. and Wang, X. (2013). An agile V-model
21
22 for medical device software development to overcome the challenges with plan-driven software
23
24 development lifecycles. *5th International Workshop on Software Engineering in Health Care*
25
26 *(SEHC)*.
27
28

29
30
31 McManus, H. (1998). *Identifying the Product Development Value Stream*. [Presentation]
32
33 Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
34
35

36
37
38 McManus, H. (2005) *Product Development Value Stream Mapping (PDVSM) Manual*. 1st ed.
39
40 Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
41
42

43
44
45
46 Medical device Innovation Consortium (2019). *Case for Quality Voluntary Manufacturing and*
47
48 *Product Quality Pilot Program Results*. [online] Available at: <[https://mdic.org/wp-](https://mdic.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Case-for-Quality-Pilot-Report.pdf)
49
50 [content/uploads/2019/11/Case-for-Quality-Pilot-Report.pdf](https://mdic.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/Case-for-Quality-Pilot-Report.pdf)> [Accessed 28 May 2021].
51
52

53
54
55 Medina, L.A., and Okudan-Kremer, G.E. (2011). A Model-Based Framework for NPD in a
56
57 Highly Regulated Environment. *Proceedings of the Industrial Engineering Research Conference*
58

59 Medina, L.A., Wysk, R.A., and Okudan-Kremer, G.E. (2011) A review of design for X methods
60

1
2
3
4 for medical devices: The introduction of a design for FDA approach. *Proceedings of the ASME*
5
6 *International Design Engineering Technical Conference*.

7
8
9
10 Medina, L., Dávila, S., Okudan Kremer, G. and Wysk, R. (2013a). Design for FDA: A Predictive
11
12 Model for the FDA's Decision Time for Medical devices, 4, 18th Design for Manufacturing and
13
14 the Life Cycle Conference; ASME/IEEE International Conference on Mechatronic and Embedded
15
16 Systems and Applications.

17
18
19
20 Medina, L., Kremer, G. and Wysk, R. (2013b). Supporting medical device development: a
21
22 standard product design process model. *Journal of Engineering Design*, 24(2), pp.83-119.

23
24
25
26 Medina, L.A., Kremer, G.E.O. and Wysk, R.A. (2013), Supporting medical device development:
27
28 a standard product design process model, *Journal of Engineering Design*, 24(2), pp. 83–119.

29
30
31
32 Medtech Europe. (2021), MedTech Europe's Facts and Figures 2021, MedTech Europe, available
33
34 at: <https://www.medtecheurope.org/resource-library/medtech-europes-facts-and-figures-2021/>
35
36 (accessed 30 June 2021).

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 Meybodi, M. (2013). The links between Lean manufacturing practices and concurrent
46
47 engineering method of new product development. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*,
48
49 20(3), pp.362-376.

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Moore, S. (2016). Next Generation Medical Device Manufacture; A strategic assessment. *The*
Journal of Enterprise Excellence, 1(1). Available
online: <http://thumperandchara.com/journals-vol.1.html> (accessed on 8 December 2021).

1
2
3
4
5
6 Moultrie, J., Sutcliffe, L. and Maier, A. (2015). Exploratory study of the state of environmentally
7
8 conscious design in the medical device industry. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 108, pp.363-
9
10 376.

11
12
13
14
15 Munro, D. (2018). *New Documentary Film Is Scathing Indictment Of FDA's Regulation Of*
16
17 *Medical devices*. [online] Forbes. Available at:
18
19 <[https://www.forbes.com/sites/danmunro/2018/07/29/new-documentary-film-is-scathing-](https://www.forbes.com/sites/danmunro/2018/07/29/new-documentary-film-is-scathing-indictment-of-fdas-regulation-of-medical-devices/?sh=75c1d4a726b8)
20
21 [indictment-of-fdas-regulation-of-medical-devices/?sh=75c1d4a726b8](https://www.forbes.com/sites/danmunro/2018/07/29/new-documentary-film-is-scathing-indictment-of-fdas-regulation-of-medical-devices/?sh=75c1d4a726b8)> [Accessed 8 May
22
23 2021].
24
25
26
27
28

29 Nave, D. (2002). How to compare Six Sigma, Lean and the theory of constraints. *Quality*
30
31 *Progress*, 35, pp.73-78.
32
33
34
35

36 Ocampo, J. and Kaminski, P. (2019). Medical device development, from technical design to
37
38 integrated product development. *Journal of Medical Engineering and Technology*, 43(5), pp.287-
39
40 304.
41
42
43
44

45 Ohno, T. (1988). *Toyota Production System. Beyond Large-Scale Production*. 1st ed. Portland,
46
47 OR: Productivity Press.
48
49
50
51

52 Pacheco, D., Pergher, I., Vaccaro, G., Jung, C. and ten Caten, C. (2015). 18 comparative aspects
53
54 between Lean and Six Sigma. *International Journal of Lean Six Sigma*, 6(2), pp.161-175.
55
56
57
58

59 Pahl, G., Feldhusen, J. and Grote, K. (2007). *Engineering Design*. 3rd ed. London: Springer-
60

1
2
3
4 Verlag London Limited, pp.139.
5
6
7

8 Parameswaran, U.D., Ozawa-Kirk, J.L. and Latendresse, G. (2020), To live (code) or to not: A
9 new method for coding in qualitative research, *Qualitative Social Work*, SAGE Publications,
10
11
12
13 19(4), pp. 630–644.
14
15
16

17 Petersen, K., Wohlin, C. and Baca, D. (2009), The Waterfall Model in Large-Scale Development,
18 in Bomarius, F., Oivo, M., Jaring, P. and Abrahamsson, P. (Eds.), *Product-Focused Software*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Pendyal, A. and Ross, J. (2019). The Bleeding Edge. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 322(3), pp.190.

Petticrew, M. (2001), Systematic reviews from astronomy to zoology: myths and misconceptions, *BMJ (Clinical Research Ed.)*, *BMJ*, 322(7278), pp. 98–101.

Pietzsch, J., Shluzas, L., Paté-Cornell, M., Yock, P. and Linehan, J. (2009). Stage-Gate Process for the Development of Medical devices. *Journal of Medical devices*, 3(2).

Prasad, B. (1996, 1997). *Concurrent engineering fundamentals (Volumes 1 and 2)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Prasad, G. and Rao, B. (2004). Concurrent engineering in a pharmaceutical firm: a case study of Dr Reddy's Laboratories Ltd. *International Journal of Manufacturing Technology and Management*, 6(3/4), pp.280.

1
2
3
4
5
6 Prasad, S., Zacharia, R. and Babu, J. (2008). Design for manufacturing (DFM) approach for
7
8 Productivity Improvement in Medical Equipment Manufacturing. *International Journal of*
9
10 *Emerging Technology and Advanced Engineering*, 4, pp.79-85.

11
12
13
14
15 Project Management Institute (2017). *A guide to the project management body of knowledge*. 6th
16
17 ed. Newtown Square, Pennsylvania, USA: Project Management Institute.

18
19
20
21
22 Pullan, T., Bhasi, M. and Madhu, G. (2011). Decision support tool for Lean product and process
23
24 development. *Production Planning and Control*, 24(6), pp.449-464.

25
26
27
28
29 Radeka, K. (2007). The Toyota Product Development System: Integrating People, Process and
30
31 Technology by James M. Morgan and Jeffrey K. Liker. *Journal of Product Innovation*
32
33 *Management*, 24(3), pp.276-278.

34
35
36
37
38 Raudberget, D. (2010). Practical Applications of Set-Based Concurrent Engineering in Industry.
39
40 *Journal of Mechanical Engineering*. 56(11), pp.685-695.

41
42
43
44
45 Rosenberger, P. and Tick, J. (2019). Relevance of PMBOK v6 Processes for Tailored Agile
46
47 Project Categories. *IEEE 13th International Symposium on Applied Computational Intelligence*
48
49 *and Informatics (SACI)*.

50
51
52
53
54 Rother, M. and Shook, J. (1998). *Learning to see*. 1st ed. Cambridge, Mass.: The Lean Enterprise
55
56 Institute.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Salgado, E. and Dekkers, R. (2017). Lean Product Development: Nothing New Under the
5 Sun? *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 20(4), pp. 903-933.
6
7

8
9
10 Salvato, J. and Laplume, A. (2020). Agile Stage-Gate Management (ASGM) for physical
11 products. *RandD Management*, 50(5), pp. 631-647.
12
13

14
15
16
17 Santos, I.C., Gazelle, G.S., Rocha, L.A. and Tavares, J.M.R. (2012a). Medical device
18 specificities: opportunities for a dedicated product development methodology. *Expert Review of*
19 *Medical devices*, 9(3), pp. 299–311.
20
21
22
23

24
25
26
27 Santos, I.C., Gazelle, G.S., Rocha, L.A. and Tavares, J.M.R. (2012b) An ontology model for the
28 medical device development process in Europe. *The 1st International Conference on Design and*
29 *Processes for Medical devices - PROMED 2012*
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 Schulze, A. and Störmer, T. (2012). Lean product development - enabling management factors
37 for waste elimination. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 57(1/2/3), pp.71.
38
39
40
41

42
43 Siiskonen, M. (2019). Integrated Product and Production Platforms for Pharmaceutical Products:
44 Design Thinking for the Development of Personalised Medicines. *Chalmers University of*
45 *Technology*
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 Slack, R. (1999). The Lean Value Principle in Military Aerospace Product Development. *The*
53 *Lean Aerospace Initiative (LAI) - MIT*, 1(16).
54
55
56

57
58
59 Sobek, D., Ward, A. and Liker, J. (1999). Toyota's Principles of Set-Based Concurrent
60

1
2
3
4 Engineering. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, pp.67-83.
5
6
7

8
9 Sommer, A., Hedegaard, C., Dukovska-Popovska, I. and Steger-Jensen, K. (2015). Improved
10 Product Development Performance through Agile/Stage-Gate Hybrids: The Next-Generation
11 Stage-Gate Process? *Research-Technology Management*, 58(1), pp.34-45.
12
13
14

15
16 Sommerville, I. (2004), *Software Engineering*, Pearson Education, India.
17
18

19
20 Sony, M. (2020), "Pros and cons of implementing Industry 4.0 for the organisations: a review and
21 synthesis of evidence", *Production & Manufacturing Research*, Taylor & Francis, 8(1), pp. 244–
22 272.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Sorli, M., Stokic, D., Gorostiza, A. and Campos, A. (2006). Managing product/process knowledge
31 in the concurrent/simultaneous enterprise environment. *Robotics and Computer- Integrated*
32 *Manufacturing*, 22(5-6), pp.399-408.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Stare, A. (2014). Agile Project Management in Product Development Projects. *Procedia - Social*
40 *and Behavioral Sciences*, 119, pp.295-304.
41
42
43
44
45

46 Synnes, E. and Welo, T. (2016). Enhancing Integrative Capabilities through Lean Product and
47 Process Development. *Procedia CIRP*, 54, pp.221-226.
48
49
50
51

52
53 Tyagi, S., Choudhary, A., Cai, X. and Yang, K. (2015). Value stream mapping to reduce the lead-
54 time of a product development process. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 160,
55 pp.202-212.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 Van de Burgwal, L., Ribeiro, C., Van der Waal, M. and Claassen, E. (2018). Towards improved
7
8 process efficiency in vaccine innovation: The Vaccine Innovation Cycle as a validated, conceptual
9
10 stage-gate model. *Vaccine*, 36(49), pp.7496-7508.
11
12

13
14
15 Varl, M., Duhovnik, J. and Tavčar, J. (2020). Agile product development process transformation
16
17 to support advanced one-of-a-kind manufacturing. *International Journal of Computer Integrated*
18
19 *Manufacturing*, 33(6), pp.590-608.
20
21

22
23
24
25 Vogel, D. (2006). Most are not ready for prime time in medical device software design and
26
27 development. *DesignFax Online*
28
29

30
31
32 Ward, A. and Sobek, D. (2014). *Lean product and process development*. 2nd ed. Cambridge MA:
33
34 Lean Enterprise Institute.
35

36
37
38
39 Welo, T., Lycke, A. and Ringen, G. (2019). Investigating the Use of Set-Based Concurrent
40
41 Engineering in Product Manufacturing Companies. *Procedia CIRP*, 84, pp.43-48.
42
43

44
45
46 Winter, D., Jones, C., Ward, C., Gibbons, P., McMahon, C. and Potter, K. (2013), The Application
47
48 of a Lean Philosophy During Manufacture of Advanced Airframe Structures in a New Product
49
50 Introduction (NPI) Environment, *Advances in Sustainable and Competitive Manufacturing*
51
52 *Systems*. Lecture Notes in Mechanical Engineering, Springer, Heidelberg, available at:
53
54 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-00557-7_121.
55
56

57
58
59 Womack, J., Jones, D. and Roos, D. (1991). *Machine that changed the world*, 1st ed. New York:
60

1
2
3
4 Simon and Schuster.
5
6
7

8 Womack, J. and Jones, D. (1997). Lean Thinking—Banish Waste and Create Wealth in your
9 Corporation. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 48(11), pp.1148-1148.
10
11
12
13

14 Womack, J. and Jones, D. (2003). *Lean Thinking*. 1st ed. London: Simon and Schuster.
15
16

17 Wuest, T., Liu, A., Lu, S. and Thoben, K. (2014). Application of the Stage Gate Model in Production
18 Supporting Quality Management. *Procedia CIRP*, 17, pp.32-37.
19
20
21
22

23
24 Xue, R., Baron, C. and Esteban, P. (2017). Optimising product development in industry by
25 alignment of the ISO/IEC 15288 systems engineering standard and the PMBoK guide.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
International Journal of Product Development, 22(1), p.65.