

A value network development model and implications for innovation and production network management

Citation for published version (APA):

Vermeulen, B., & Kok, de, A. G. (2013). *A value network development model and implications for innovation and production network management*. (BETA publicatie : working papers; Vol. 426). Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.

Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2013

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

www.tue.nl/taverne

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

openaccess@tue.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

A value network development model and implications for innovation and production network management

B. Vermeulen, A.G. de Kok

Beta Working Paper series 426

BETA publicatie	WP 426 (working paper)
ISBN	
ISSN	
NUR	804
Eindhoven	July 2013

A value network development model and implications for innovation and production network management

B. Vermeulen^{a,1,*}, A.G. de Kok^b

^a*Institute of Economics, University of Hohenheim, Stuttgart, Germany.*

^b*School of Industrial Engineering, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands.*

Abstract

In managing their value network, firms have to balance current and future value concerns and own and network partners' concerns. Firms generate immediate value through manufacturing and selling the current generation of products together with other firms in its production network and generate future value by developing a new generation of products with other firms and research institutes in its innovation network. Product innovation and production often take place simultaneously and recurrently. We take the discernible production and innovation activities to occur in co-evolving network layers. We formulate a biphase value network development model that lays out the temporal pattern of production and innovation activities in the value network. We introduce terminology to pinpoint temporal interactions between the innovation and production activities. We study several exemplary complications in the cross-table of inter- and intragenerational interactions versus interactions within and across network layers.

Keywords: value network, network management, network development, innovation network, production network, temporal complication

*Corresponding author. University of Hohenheim, Institute of Economics, Room 231, Wollgrasweg 23, D-70599, Stuttgart, Germany. Telephone number: +49-711-459-24483. Email: b.vermeulen@uni-hohenheim.de.

¹The first author gratefully acknowledges financial support of the Dutch science foundation NWO, grant 458-03-112, and of the DACH research program *Innovation Networks for Regional Development* partly funded by the German science foundation DFG, grant PY 70/8-1.

1. Introduction

Firms are embedded in networks in which value is created and appropriated co-opetively with their suppliers, customers and other organizations (Brandenburger & Nalebuff, 1996; Håkansson & Snehota, 1989; Achrol, 1997). Firms generate immediate value through manufacturing and selling the current generation of products together with other firms in its production network and generate future value by developing a new generation of products with other firms and research institutes in its innovation network. From the perspective of production, managing relationships with current network partners for low cost/ high quality component supply and high profit product sales is a crucial competence. From the perspective of innovation, being able to engage in and manage relationships with current and also new partners to access knowledge to create new products and thereby create future value is a crucial competence (cf. Ritter & Gemünden, 2003; Ritter et al., 2004). So far, the innovation network management literature has considered knowledge creation as its main focus and thus largely dismissed explicit consideration of the actual production. Similarly, the production network management literature has generally reduced product research and development as to tailor operational efficiency. Our perspective is that, in managing their value network, firms have to balance current and future value concerns and own and network partners' concerns. Value networks change due to developments in the industry and interactive (re)actions of firms in the network (cf. Håkansson & Snehota, 1989; Ford & Mouzas, 2008; Halinen & Törnroos, 1998; Allee, 2000; Kothandaraman & Wilson, 2001). Although there are strategic, economic and operational reasons for a firm to manipulate its network, much of the value network development is to accommodate changes in the technology and thereby capabilities that span the value network. The evolution of a value network is technologically inter-punctuated by technological breakthroughs and tipping of main market segments to certain product technology (cf. Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998; Halinen et al., 1999; Gilsing, 2005; Oksanen et al., 2010). Following a breakthrough, there is a period of turmoil in which innovation networks investigate and develop competing products based on the new generation of product technology. Production networks manufacture and commercialize the new products, thereby driving technological and market convergence, which leads to consolidation of a particular product-market segment, often even a dominant design. Recent network management theories focus on management of networks during

establishment, the actual product research & development and the ultimate production (e.g. Möller & Svahn, 2009; Aarikka-Stenroos & Sandberg, 2012). While the population of the innovation and production networks may differ, future producers are often involved in research and development. Given this overlap, we take the discernible production and innovation activities to take place in *separate layers of the same value network*. In this conceptual paper, we study value network development as outcome of network management activities of individual firms in each of these layers, hereby acknowledging the technologically defined position of firms in and structural features of the network. By studying innovation and production network management in conjunction, we find temporal and interdisciplinary managerial complications.

In Section 2, we formulate our biplex value network development model that lays out the temporal pattern of production and innovation activities in the value network. We introduce terminology to pinpoint temporal interactions of activities in the innovation and production network layers. Members manage the value network to balance production activities for immediate value and innovation activities for future value. In contrast to the various product life-cycle, technology life-cycle and ecological industry life-cycle models, we stress that innovation and production are not *strictly successive* activities, but often take place *simultaneously*. Furthermore, both discontinuous product innovation and changes to the production portfolio generally occur *recurrently*. The topology of and capabilities present in the current value network are *antecedents* to the future value network. In Section 3, we discuss several strategic network management complications present in the cross-table of inter- and intragenerational complications versus within and across the product and innovation network. We hereby take a strategic network management perspective explicitly acknowledging the technological foundation of relationships. In Section 4, we conclude.

2. Biplex network development model

In literature, it is argued that a value network takes a form based on the purpose it serves. Möller & Svahn (2003) distinguish networks that serve production innovation, product innovation, or business renewal. Others distinguish networks that serve exploring new and those that serve exploiting old technology (Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998; Gilsing, 2005). Kambil (2008) distinguishes networks based on whether the network aims to serve a new or

an existing market and whether the network does so with a new or existing product technology.

In our perspective, there are two main reasons to engage in relationships²: firstly, the production and sales of a well-defined product to generate immediate value and, secondly, the research and development of new product technology (and complementary production technology) to generate value in the future³. We argue that these two main reasons to engage in relationships shape two elementary network forms: the *innovation* network, which serves research and development of product technology, and the *production* network, which focuses on efficient production of the selected, relatively well-defined product design. We discuss each of the elementary networks separately first, with emphasis on the management concerns. We then discuss their inter-relationship in Subsection 2.3 and discuss three theoretical interactions between these two networks in Subsection 2.4. In Section 3, we discuss several concrete cases in which network management copes with these theoretical interactions.

2.1. Innovation network

Under the assumption that Schumpeterian technology competition drives industry developments, firms recurrently look for product innovations to restore profit margins. In developing new products, firms collaborate to tap into alternative knowledge bases and to attune capabilities, at first to explore and later to exploit technological and market opportunities. This notion is widely shared in fields such as industrial purchasing and marketing (cf. Håkansson & Snehota, 1995), social network studies of innovation (cf. Soh & Roberts, 2003; Gilsing, 2005), economic analysis of innovation (cf. Pyka & Küppers, 2002) and strategic management (cf. Dyer & Singh, 1998). According to the network embeddedness principle (Håkansson & Snehota, 1995), capabilities derive their value from the combination with capabilities owned by others in the network. Furthermore, capabilities can be cross-fertilized to create new capabilities. To create an *innovative* product, firms first explore the capabilities available in their current and adjacent industries, then narrow down innovation targets to pursue, and then -at low level-

²We omit super-network activities, like standardization and format establishment.

³This is the network counterpart of a firm's exploitative efforts to ensure current viability and, at the same time, explorative efforts to ensure future viability (March, 1991; O'Reilly III & Tushman, 2008).

attune and cross-fertilize capabilities (cf. Chesbrough, 2003). The innovation network takes different forms and develops differently when firms are engaged in flexibly reconfiguring capabilities than when the firms are engaged in creating, absorbing, and cross-fertilizing capabilities (cf. Belussi & Arcangeli, 1998). Clearly, with the challenges and network forms, also the management concerns and activities change (cf. Möller & Svahn, 2009). We distinguish two innovation network stages based on activities in interfirm relationships. The reconnaissance stage is characterized by *monitoring for and reconnaissance of* options in developing technology and market. With gradual (formal) commitment of partners to certain R&D trajectories, the innovation network gets established gradually, relationship by relationship. The recombination stage is characterized by *recombination and synergistic attuning* of capabilities in realizing experimental product and production technology according to an envisaged product design. Despite the linear chronology of the terms, innovation network formation may cycle through pre- and post-establishment while con- and deconstructing (parts of) the innovation network.

Monitoring and reconnaissance occur both at the firm population level, by browsing the population of possible and actual network members, as well as at the level of these firms' knowledge and capability pools. Firms exchange ideas about the product design with different potential component suppliers and potential customers. Firms iteratively select potential vertical partners with whom there is basic consensus. With these, they engage in preliminary recombination of technological knowledge to establish (indications of) feasibility. So, there are technology-based 'generative rules' that govern the formation of relationships (and coordination within those relationships) (Kogut, 2000). As such, there is co-evolution of the technology and the network developing and producing the product⁴ (cf. Stolwijk et al., 2013). However, technology development is a process of trial-and-error (Nelson & Winter, 1982). Upon repeated failures in experimental recombinations, the preliminary product concept is rejected and relationships possibly abandoned. Firms then engage in new rounds of reconnaissance, now communicating also the failures and new product ideas. This process continues until technological feasibility and market viability have been established to a degree such that it is acceptable to all participants to pursue further formal-

⁴This is a widespread observation and found in disciplines like strategic management (cf. Sanchez & Mahoney, 1996) and evolutionary economics (cf. Orsenigo et al., 2001).

ization. Until that time, firms are hesitant to dedicate resources to a single solution.

Over the course of time, firms move from monitoring and reconnaissance to recombination and attuning, with which the innovation network of firms crystallizes. By the process just described, the firms in the network, firstly, share the consensus on what product technology is to be developed and, secondly, have already established basic technological feasibility and market viability. Firms come to know which product technology and production capabilities are required. The horizontal and diagonal redundancy in the network that may have been present during reconnaissance reduces (through explicit formal severance or simply dying out of communication) as the value of information exchange drops. With this, firms generally select one out of possibly multiple potential vertical partners for further recombination. Within this relatively fixed network of capabilities, firms start to synergistically attune the product technology and capabilities (cf. Schilling, 2000). In this, pursuing product modularity may well be a deliberate strategy (cf. Baldwin & Clark, 2000).

The product becomes decomposed into market viable, technologically feasible and manufacturable components. Firms are selected in and out of the innovation network based on their conviction of viability and feasibility, and their production capabilities. So, the network now starts to feature the vertical relationships that reflect the product and production technological dependencies (Kogut, 2000; Hite & Hesterly, 2001; Walker et al., 1997). With phasing in of production, marketing and sales of the new product, the production network takes shape.

2.2. Production network

Apart from those specialized in research exclusively, firms in a manufacturing industry are continuously engaged in production to generate payoff. Firms only engage in (large scale) production if there is a sure market demand and if the product is properly defined such that investments in production technology do not become obsolete by design changes later. Whenever multiple firms are involved in production, the production process must be decomposed and tasks divided. For this, the component specifications must be codified and transferred, and the interface between component and assembly defined (cf. Macher & Mowery, 2004; Sanchez & Mahoney, 1996; Baldwin & Clark, 2000). Generally, given this well-defined nature of interfaces and the profit-based nature of competition in the mature phase of the product

life-cycle, firms manage their supplier and customer portfolio based on cost economies. As the production network serves exploitation of existing ideas, the network structure is generally defined by the product technology decomposition. Diseconomies of scope may however limit vertical specialization or promote vertical integration (Hoetker, 2006). Moreover, firms need not comply with emerging product designs and take their vertically specialized production role, but may rather vertically integrate to dedicate themselves to proprietary technology for horizontally differentiated products (cf. Argyres & Bigelow, 2010). So, the production network is shaped by the product technology decomposition, which is mediated by both cost economies and the competitive differentiation strategy.

When producing a dominant product design, technological activities are limited to incremental problem-solving (Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998) routinized in the production process. As such, communication with innovation network partners is generally limited.

Note that there is a stage in which products in one technology generation are phased out and products in the next technology generation are phased in. In this cross-phasing stage, there is a temporary boom in ties as the production network consists of firms working on either one or both of the product technology generations. Those firms producing old technology exclusively should prepare for a switch or consider an exit.

2.3. *Two-layered model*

Our contention is that, over the industry evolution, the value network features innovation relationships during particular periods and possibly features changes in production relationships upon cross-phasing product generations. Each value network has a (changing) *mix* of production and innovation activities (cf. Lamming et al., 2000; Möller & Svahn, 2003). In understanding how the value network evolves, however, we need to understand how the innovation network and production network evolve *interactively*. To study the interaction, empirically, it is necessary to establish whether cont(r)acts, communications and transactions pertain to either innovation or production. Luckily, it is generally obvious to both sender as well as receiver which hat is on when communications and transfers take place. So, as depicted in Figure 1, one can hence distinguish the product innovation from the production network layer in the value network. By looking at the considerations in the network formation decisions (who (not) to contact, why (not) to engage in interaction, etc), we also get a clear view *on how the innovation and produc-*

tion network decisions affect one another.




Figure 1: A graphical illustration how a value network is made up of a product innovation and a production network layer each consisting of firms and their interactions.

We propose our bplex network development model for this 'disentangled' evolution of both networks⁵ and their interaction. Explicit in this bplex network development model is that the innovation and production network co-exist during particular intervals of the industry evolution, that value networks must conduct both activities proficiently (Benner & Tushman (2003) call this 'ambidexterity') to assure continuity and hereto adapt the capabilities to changes in technology and market demand. The bplex model serves as a conceptual framework to reflect on the complications in organizing both regular production as well as R&D of new product technology.

We contend that firms are *continuously* producing products to sell, while they *intermittently* (but generally recurrently) generate *radically new* products. The development of product technology of generation $g + 1$ and production of the products based on technology generation g occur simultaneously. In the production phase (and hence network), there is also incremental product and process innovation that fine-tunes technology locally.

We thus propose the bplex network development model depicted in Figure 2, which is an abstract temporal layout of both activities.

⁵We use 'network' rather than 'network layer' whenever confusion between the value network as a whole and a separate layer is unlikely.




Figure 2: A graphical impression of the biplex network development model with production (innovation) activity plotted in the continuous (dashed) line.

While innovation and production may have their own autonomous organizational rationales, there are two phases (labeled 'introduction' and 'establishment') during which there is definitely close interaction between the two networks.

During the *introduction* phase, firms arrange production facilities to manufacture the product based on the new technology generation. Firms draw up contracts for delivery with suppliers and customers, thereby formalizing the new production network. The old product is also phased out, such that contracts may be discontinued. We thus see a cross-phasing from the old generation production network into the new generation production network. Furthermore, facilities, communication structures, and contacts in place for radical innovation research are discontinued, such that the value network is rid of the innovation partners that do not coincide with production partners. During the *establishment* phase, firms start radical research by engaging in reconnaissance and early recombination with a wide variety of firms. The contacted firms may belong to the pool of current production partners, previous innovation partners (e.g. universities), and also firms yet external to the value network or even current industry. As described before, firms move and are moved in and out of the innovation network. The firms in the network gradually reach consensus on the product definition, establish market viability, and prove technological feasibility.

As particular firms may be member of both the innovation and production network, network management actions like (dis)integration or switches in one

network may have an immediate impact on the other network. Figure 3 contains an illustration of how the two layers of the value network develop over time. By signing contracts, fixing production schedules and placing orders with suppliers, the switch from innovation to production is relatively clear-cut. The coming into existence of the next generation innovation network may well be more gradual.




Figure 3: A simple illustration how the (two layers of the) value network change(s) over time.

2.4. Temporal interactions

By adopting an explicit distinction between the innovation and the production network (as layers in the value network) and studying the temporal layout of innovation and production activities, we find several temporal interactions of innovation and production activities: recurrence, simultaneity, and antecedence.

Firstly, there is *recurrence*. Over the lifespan of an industry, there generally are several generations of product technology, where each generation goes through its product life-cycle. Technological breakthroughs may enable

the development of a new generation of product technology and thus extend the industry life-cycle. So, firms active in an industry are faced with recurrent product development activities and recurrent phasing-in of new products into production (and phasing-out of outdated products out of production).

Secondly, there is *simultaneity*. In striving for continuity, firms should be engaged both in exploiting existing capabilities efficiently to generate current value, as well as developing new capabilities to assure future value creation. Our contention is that innovation and production activities do not occur clear-cut successively and there hence is also no clear temporal interleaving in the membership of the production and the innovation network. Firms may well be involved in both activities at the same time, such that the firm is member of a production as well as an innovation network simultaneously. The two value network layers co-exist and co-evolve. Regardless of whether the production and innovation network are working on the same or different generation of product technology, network management decision in one network are well likely to affect the other network.

Thirdly, there is *antecedence* in the formation of the innovation network (cf. Halinen & Törnroos, 1998; Kogut, 2000; Rosenkopf & Tushman, 1998; Zirpoli & Camuffo, 2009). In the formation of the innovation network, firms rely on current production partners and use existing transaction and communication infrastructures. Firms elaborate on the existing technology paradigm or prefer to rely on firms with critical resources (like a physical network) (cf. Fleury & Fleury, 2007). Innovativeness is served if firms in the innovation network are not restricted in their partner or product technology choices by future production facilities. Furthermore, there also is antecedence in the formation of the production network as firms in the innovation network take into account future production performance. This does not mean they should stick to manufacturers in the current production network. However, collaboratively developing particular product technology with one supplier or customer and then switching to another as soon as actual production starts may be opportunistic and have unfavorable social consequences for future innovation projects. Hence, the current innovation network structure and population carries over to the production network structure and population as well, to some extent.

The three temporal interaction concepts are related in a graphical model in Figure 4. In the next section, we study complications in network management arising from these temporal features of network development.




Figure 4: Graphical model of the temporal interaction concepts.

3. Biplex network management complications

Current innovation and production management literature provides regular management strategies concerned with the network for the *current* product technology generation and either innovation or production respectively. However, given the development of the two value network layers and given the various temporal complications (simultaneity, recurrence, and antecedence), when and how should a firm manage (a particular layer in) its value network? Simultaneity calls for network management strategies that attend to both the innovation *and* production concerns. Recurrence and antecedence call for network management strategies that take into account the effect of changes to the current network on future options and how to overcome the effects of past choices on current options. In the present section, we provide a non-exhaustive list of network management issues that become apparent by looking at temporal interactions between the two network layers at the same time or from one to the next generation (between different and within the same layer). Table 1 contains the exemplary network management issues we discuss in this paper.

3.1. *Conflicting concerns*

Whenever a firm changes its value network, e.g. by altering the members or changing the governance over capabilities, this may affect both the

	intra-generational	inter-generational
within innovation network		recurrence: anticipating feed-forward (3.3)
within production network		recurrence: production flexibility (3.4)
across network layers	simultaneity: conflicting concerns (3.1)	antecedence: technological role (3.2), recurrence: separate facilities (3.5)

Table 1: The exemplary temporal network management issues per combination and between parentheses the number of the subsection in which we discuss the particular issue.

production and the innovation network when both activities occur simultaneously. Whenever concerns are aligned in both network layers, e.g. removal of a subpar supplier, this may not be a problem. However, the concerns in the innovation and production network may be opposed. Whenever R&D and production are conducted simultaneously, the cost-based view dominant in management of the production network and the capability-based view dominant in management of the innovation network may arrive at conflicting recommendations for the value network change.

An obvious situation in which there is conflict of concerns is that of supplier management. On the one hand, cost and efficiency concerns in the production network may call for squeezing suppliers or pure transaction cost economic governance forms, but, on the other hand, the financial health, willingness to share knowledge and collaborative stance of suppliers may be needed in the innovation network (now or in the future) (cf. Macher & Mowery, 2004). In this case, firms better maintain a co-opetitive attitude towards (potential) network partners as it is beneficial for long term competitiveness of the value network and its members.

Another situation in which there is a conflict of concerns is in deciding on the governance over certain capabilities. Due to simultaneity, there may be *ambiguity* as to what governance form to pick. This is the case, for instance, when there is high asset specificity (which calls for integration according to the TCE) and high technological uncertainty (which calls for flexibility according to the capability-based view). Consequently, in changing the gov-

ernance over capabilities up- or downstream in the value network, firms have to give priority to static efficiency and cost-based rationales in the production layer over dynamic efficiency and capability-based rationales in the innovation layer or vice versa.

While this ambiguity calls for giving the concerns in one layer the priority over those in the other layer, the governance decision is also *conditional*, i.e. depending on the current status and conditions (cf. Cacciatori & Jacobides, 2005). For example: when a firm is vertically specialized, it may seek alliances to tap into certain knowledge bases, but when already vertically integrated, that same firm may not divest the internal capabilities and vertically specialize to engage in the same alliances.

Evidently, while ambiguity and conditionality are evident complications in the governance decision within the biplex network development model, this is not an exhaustive list. Furthermore, ambiguity and conditionality (and several other types of general management complications) in fact also occur *within* individual layers.

3.2. Technological role and comprehension

Antecedence refers to how the production network emerges out of the innovation network, or how an innovation network for new R&D is formed out of the current production network by relying on existing partners and infrastructure. An example of how such antecedence affects network development is found in the case that the technological foundation of the value network may persist. After all, in value network management decisions, a firm is influenced by the technological role it fulfills and the comprehension of technological developments it has (cf. Harland et al., 2001). Furthermore, firms are contacted on the basis of this role and existing capabilities, also while establishing an innovation network for the next generation of technology, so this role may persist over successive life-cycles. Consequently, previously existing technological and organizational capabilities determine the newly established innovation network (Zirpoli & Camuffo, 2009).

Particularly problematic is that antecedence may in fact limit a value network's chances of survival. With specialization in a technological role, firms narrow their scope of capabilities and thereby forfeit the ability to create new knowledge through further internal recombination (e.g. Leonard-Barton, 1992; Brusoni, 2003; Rosenkopf & Almeida, 2003; Cacciatori & Jacobides, 2005) or to adjust to system changes (which is known as the 'modularity trap', see Chesbrough & Kusunoki (2001)). Apart from giving up on inter-

nal recombination options and absorptive capacity, with specialization comes also selective perception and corporate filters (Henderson & Clark, 1990). Both the lack of being able to escape the technological role and the limited comprehension decreases the absorptive capacity and locks in firms. So, the current value network constrains the technology that can be absorbed (Christensen & Rosenbloom, 1995; Orsenigo et al., 2001; Jacobides & Winter, 2005) and, under extensive vertical specialization, incumbents are likely to fail to make the transition to a new industry after a technological discontinuity (cf. Soh & Roberts, 2003; Henderson & Clark, 1990; Afuah, 2001; Belussi & Arzangeli, 1998).

Consequently, firms need to review effects of (intended) adjustments to own component technology (and related capabilities) to product technology developed and produced elsewhere in the value network. The greater the scope of firms taken into account, the more extensive the 'network horizon' (Anderson et al., 1994), and the more power is (to be) exerted in reorganizing and possibly reorienting the value network. Firms in the network have different levels of power in orchestration, mobilization, and persuasion. This also relates to the aforementioned technological role: system integrators or specialized component suppliers have more (bargain) power than commodity suppliers. However, while integrators of system technologies like cars and lithography equipment have considerable oversight and orchestration power, a value network is, in general, not under control of an individual firm. Value networks, arguably those developing and producing low-tech and highly modular product technology, are loosely coupled and thereby mostly self-organizing through attempts of individual firms to manage and manipulate the network (Ritter et al., 2004; Harland et al., 2001). While power to orchestrate a value network facilitates a timely response, alignment of strategies of partners and attuning of product technology, this power may be used to coerce firms to comply with certain system standards and is thereby a liability for key players in the network. After all, whenever technological discontinuities are recurrent, the value network needs to adopt new capabilities and needs to adjust to the capability topology of the new technological system. In anticipation of technological discontinuities, a value network may possibly best disintegrate to facilitate decentralized technology search in a loosely coupled innovation network. A system integrator (or other key component manufacturer) may refuse to relegate technological decisions to other firms and is thereby effectively limiting the technology search space. Employ-

ing a wide network horizon and exercising orchestration power may hamper the value network from adopting new capabilities and from morphing to accommodate new product technologies. As such, establishing the appropriate horizon and managing firms across this horizon is a strategically crucial competence (Holmen & Pedersen, 2003; Möller & Halinen, 1999). Conclusively, taking a technologically specialized scope and narrow network horizon may cause overlooking potential technological incompatibilities as well as miss technological opportunities, but taking a broad horizon and a technological integrative perspective may be a source of lock-in.

3.3. Anticipating feed-forward in product-market strategy

Ultimately, the product that is developed in the innovation network needs to be produced. As such, there is a feed-forward of the design choices made during innovation into the future production network. Anticipating this feed-forward, firms have to align the product-market strategy. An innovation network targeting the main market segment with price competition (focused price competition strategy) may work towards a modular design and a vertically specialized production network that facilitates outsourcing for scale and scope economies. An innovation network targeting a specialized high-quality-high-price niche (focused niche strategy), should work towards a superiorly performing, synergistically integrated solution (cf. Argyres & Bigelow, 2010) that provides a tenable position given the substitution by mainstream products. To achieve such synergistic optimization, tight vertical governance or even vertical integration in the innovation network may be required.

Our contention is that firms in the innovation network should explicitly communicate the future product-market strategy and anticipate the feed-forward of technological choices in the product-market strategy (cf. Ford & Mouzas, 2010).

However, while the future production network, facilities and activities should be anticipated, firms should transcend their current technological role and decomposition of production tasks so as to overcome antecedence. Failing to rid oneself of the current role may lock-in the value network in current technology and insufficiently leverage the opportunities of breakthrough technology.

3.4. Production flexibility

In managing purely the production network, there still is inter-generational interaction. The choices in the arrangement for the production of one gen-

eration propagates into the production of the next generation. If the two generations of products are technologically different, either the transition in production arrangement is dynamically inefficient or production of at least of generation is statically inefficient. While cost economies and production efficiencies are managerial priorities in production network management, a 'focused factory' (Skinner, 1974) -i.e. a dedicated production network in our perspective- is dynamically inefficient with recurring disruptive product innovation. The switching time in production then forms a liability (cf. Langois & Robertson, 1989). Moreover, sticking too much to current production facilities forms a definite source of lock in. On the other hand, maintaining a 'strategic flexibility' (Hayes & Pisano, 1994; Gerwin, 1993) to absorb undefined turmoil or preparing for a wide range of products to produce hurts static efficiency during technological stable periods. We argue that, in order to be cost competitive, production networks need to be able to make timely switches from producing one to the next generation of products, i.e. the production network needs to have a *cross-generational flexibility*. One immediate implication for network management is that firms may need to un sentimentally switch production partners in cross-phasing.

3.5. *Separate facilities per layer*

We argued that value networks should be dynamically efficient in innovation and statically efficient with cross-generational flexibility in production. However, is that even possible, *given the interactions due to simultaneity?* If the current production network is also used for experimentation and manufacturing of early designs of the next generation, the static efficiency of production decreases. Moreover, one is already involving the current producers, such that the current production network is an antecedent of the innovation network (see Subsection 3.2). As products may then be designed for the production facilities at hand, innovative product development is hampered.

One possible way to overcome the adverse effects of the recurrence and simultaneity on network efficiency is to have two relatively independent production arrangements. On the one side, the value network needs a relatively independent research and development infrastructure with flexible production facilities with freedom to adjust the partner pool, and, on the other side, a relatively statically efficient network of interconnected mass-scale production facilities with 'merely' *cross-generational* manufacturing flexibility.

4. Conclusions

In this paper, we started from the notion that firms manage their value network and thereby balance current and future value generation concerns (i.e. production versus innovation) and balance own and network partners' concerns. Current value is generated and appropriated in the production network layer and future value is generated in the innovation network layer. We then formulated a biplex value network development model that basically is a temporal layout of innovation and production network activities, given that industries evolve by recurring radical product technology breakthroughs. From this network development model it is obvious that there are several temporal complications that firms encounter in managing their innovation and production network layers. We then studied several evident issues in the cross-table of inter- and intragenerational complications versus within versus across network layers. Interesting first implications are that recurrence calls for the installation of merely cross-generational production flexibility and separate innovation experimentation facilities. Furthermore, simultaneity gives rise to ambiguity in governance. Antecedence calls for strategic alignment already in the innovation network. We know that the list of issues discussed is by no means exhaustive, but is a clear indication that network management of a firm would benefit from taking explicitly into account the two value network layers and the simultaneity and recurrence/antecedence of its innovation and production activities.

Each of the cells in the cross-table, Table 1, provides topics for further research. Moreover, the biplex development model itself may be further refined with different phases in innovation and production network development. We already hinted on the reconnaissance and recombination phases in the innovation network development.

An interesting avenue for further research is to relate the activities in the biplex model to technological events and (anticipated) activities of competing networks, to be more explicit about managerial options and priorities. Innovation network management may, for instance, be different when an innovation network is the inventor of a radically new technology from when it is merely established in response to an invention by a competing network.

References

Aarikka-Stenroos, L., & Sandberg, B. (2012). From new-product development to commercialization through networks. *Journal of Business Re-*

- search*, 65, 198–206.
- Achrol, R. (1997). Changes in the theory of interorganizational relations in marketing: towards a network paradigm. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25, 56 – 71.
- Afuah, A. (2001). Dynamic boundaries of the firm: Are firms better off being vertically integrated in the face of a technological change? *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1211 – 1228.
- Allee, V. (2000). Reconfiguring the value network. *Journal of Business Strategy*, (pp. 36 – 39).
- Anderson, J., Håkansson, H., & Johanson, J. (1994). Dyadic business relationships within a business network context. *Journal of Marketing*, 58, 1 – 15.
- Argyres, N., & Bigelow, L. (2010). Innovation, modularity, and vertical deintegration: Evidence from the early u.s. auto industry. *Organization Science*, 21.
- Baldwin, C., & Clark, K. (2000). *Design Rules: The Power of Modularity*. MIT Press.
- Belussi, F., & Arcangeli, F. (1998). A typology of networks: Flexible and evolutionary firms. *Research Policy*, 27, 415 – 428.
- Benner, M., & Tushman, M. (2003). Exploitation, exploration, and process management: The productivity dilemma revisited. *The Academy of Management Review*, 28, 238 – 256.
- Brandenburger, A., & Nalebuff, B. (1996). *Co-Opetition*. Harper Collins.
- Brusoni, S. (2003). *Authority in the Age Of Modularity*. Working Paper SPRU.
- Cacciatori, E., & Jacobides, M. (2005). The dynamic limits of specialization: Vertical integration reconsidered. *Organization Studies*, 26, 1851 – 1883.
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open Innovation: The new Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Harvard Business School Press.

- Chesbrough, H., & Kusunoki, K. (2001). The modularity trap: Innovation, technology phase shifts and the resulting limits of virtual organizations. In I. Nonaka, & D. Teece (Eds.), *Managing Industrial Knowledge* (pp. 202 – 230). Sage.
- Christensen, C., & Rosenbloom, R. (1995). Explaining the attacker's advantage: Technological paradigms, organizational dynamics, and the value network. *Research Policy*, *24*, 233 – 257.
- Dyer, J., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*, 660 – 679.
- Fleury, A., & Fleury, M. (2007). The evolution of production systems and conceptual frameworks. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, *18*, 949 – 965.
- Ford, D., & Mouzas, S. (2008). Is there any hope? the idea of strategy in business networks. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, *16*, 64 – 78.
- Ford, D., & Mouzas, S. (2010). Networking under uncertainty: Concepts and research agenda. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *39*, 956 – 962.
- Gerwin, D. (1993). Manufacturing flexibility: A strategic flexibility. *Management Science*, *39*, 395 – 410.
- Gilsing, V. (2005). *The Dynamics of Innovation and Interfirm Networks: Exploration, Exploitation and Co-Evolution*. Edward Elgar.
- Håkansson, H., & Snehota, I. (1989). No business is an island: The network concept of business strategy. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *5*, 187 – 200.
- Håkansson, H., & Snehota, I. (1995). *Developing Relationships in Business Networks*. Routledge.
- Halinen, A., Salmi, A., & Havila, V. (1999). From dyadic change to changing business networks: An analytical framework. *Journal of Management Studies*, *36*, 779 – 794.
- Halinen, A., & Törnroos, J. (1998). The role of embeddedness in the evolution of business networks. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *14*, 187 – 205.

- Harland, C., Lamming, R., Zheng, J., & Johnsen, T. (2001). A taxonomy of supply networks. *The Journal of Supply Chain Management*, *37*, 21 – 27.
- Hayes, R., & Pisano, G. (1994). Beyond world-class: The new manufacturing strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, .
- Henderson, R., & Clark, K. (1990). Architectural innovation: The reconfiguration of existing product technologies and the failure of established firms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *35*, 9 – 30.
- Hite, J., & Hesterly, W. (2001). The evolution of firm networks: From emergence to early growth of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, *22*, 275 – 286.
- Hoetker, G. (2006). Do modular products lead to modular organizations? *Strategic Management Journal*, *27*, 501 – 518.
- Holmen, E., & Pedersen, A. (2003). Strategizing through analyzing and influencing the network horizon. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *32*, 409 – 418.
- Jacobides, M., & Winter, S. (2005). The co-evolution of capabilities and transaction costs - explaining the institutional structure of production. *Strategic Management Journal*, *26*, 395 – 413.
- Kambil, A. (2008). Purposeful abstractions: Thoughts on creating business network models. *Journal of Business Strategy*, *29*, 52 – 54.
- Kogut, B. (2000). The network as knowledge: Generative rules and the emergence of structure. *Strategic Management Journal*, *21*, 405 – 425.
- Kothandaraman, P., & Wilson, D. (2001). The future of competition: Value-creating networks. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *30*, 379–389.
- Lamming, R., Johnsen, T., Zheng, J., & Harland, C. (2000). An initial classification of supply networks. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *20*, 675 – 691.
- Langlois, R., & Robertson, P. (1989). Explaining vertical integration: Lessons from the american automobile industry. *The Journal of Economic History*, *49*, 361 – 375.

- Leonard-Barton, D. (1992). Core capabilities and core rigidities: A paradox in managing new product development. *Strategic Management Journal*, *13*, 111 – 125.
- Macher, J., & Mowery, D. (2004). Vertical specialization and industry structure in high technology industries. *Advances in Strategic Management*, *21*, 317 – 355.
- March, J. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science*, *2*, 71 – 87.
- Möller, K., & Halinen, A. (1999). Business relationships and networks: Managerial challenge of network era. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *28*, 413 – 427.
- Möller, K., & Svahn, S. (2003). Managing strategic nets: A capability perspective. *Marketing Theory*, *3*, 201 – 226.
- Möller, K., & Svahn, S. (2009). How to influence the birth of new business fields - network perspective. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *38*, 450 – 458.
- Nelson, R. R., & Winter, S. G. (1982). *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Harvard University Press.
- Oksanen, P., Hallikas, J., & Sissonen, H. (2010). The evolution of value networks. *International Journal of Networking and Virtual Organisations*, *7*, 381 – 398.
- O'Reilly III, C., & Tushman, M. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 185 – 206.
- Orsenigo, L., Pammolli, F., & Riccaboni, M. (2001). Technological change and network dynamics: Lessons from the pharmaceutical industry. *Research Policy*, *30*, 485 – 508.
- Pyka, A., & Küppers, G. (2002). *Innovation Networks: Theory and Practice*. Edward Elgar.

- Ritter, T., & Gemünden, H. (2003). Network competence: Its impact on innovation success and its antecedents. *Journal of Business Research*, *56*, 745 – 755.
- Ritter, T., Wilkinson, I., & Johnston, W. (2004). Managing in complex business networks. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *33*, 175 – 183.
- Rosenkopf, L., & Almeida, P. (2003). Overcoming local search through alliances and mobility. *Management Science*, *49*, 751 – 766.
- Rosenkopf, L., & Tushman, M. (1998). The coevolution of community networks and technology: Lessons from the flight simulation industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, *7*.
- Sanchez, R., & Mahoney, J. (1996). Modularity, flexibility, and knowledge management in product and organization design. *Strategic Management Journal*, *17*, 63 – 76.
- Schilling, M. (2000). Toward a general modular systems theory and its application to interfirm product modularity. *The Academy of Management Review*, *25*, 312 – 334.
- Skinner, W. (1974). Focused factory. *Harvard Business Review*, .
- Soh, P., & Roberts, E. (2003). Networks of innovators: A longitudinal perspective. *Research Policy*, *32*, 1569 – 1588.
- Stolwijk, C., Ortt, J., & den Hartig, E. (2013). The joint evolution of alliance networks and technology. a survey of the empirical literature. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, *80*, 12871305.
- Walker, G., Kogut, B., & Shan, W. (1997). Social capital, structural holes and the formation of an industry network. *Organization Science*, *8*, 109 – 125.
- Zirpoli, F., & Camuffo, A. (2009). Product architecture, inter-firm vertical coordination and knowledge partitioning in the auto industry. *European Management Review*, *6*, 250 – 264.

Working Papers Beta 2009 - 2013

nr.	Year	Title	Author(s)
426	2013	A value network development model and Implications for innovation and production network management	B. Vermeulen, A.G. de Kok
425	2013	Single Vehicle Routing with Stochastic Demands: Approximate Dynamic Programming	C. Zhang, N.P. Dellaert, L. Zhao, T. Van Woensel, D. Sever
424	2013	Influence of Spillback Effect on Dynamic Shortest Path Problems with Travel-Time-Dependent Network Disruptions	Derya Sever, Nico Dellaert, Tom Van Woensel, Ton de Kok
423	2013	Dynamic Shortest Path Problem with Travel-Time-Dependent Stochastic Disruptions: Hybrid Approximate Dynamic Programming Algorithms with a Clustering Approach	Derya Sever, Lei Zhao, Nico Dellaert, Tom Van Woensel, Ton de Kok
422	2013	System-oriented inventory models for spare parts	R.J.I. Basten, G.J. van Houtum
421	2013	Lost Sales Inventory Models with Batch Ordering And Handling Costs	T. Van Woensel, N. Erkip, A. Curseu, J.C. Fransoo
420	2013	Response speed and the bullwhip	Maximiliano Udenio, Jan C. Fransoo, Eleni Vatamidou, Nico Dellaert
419	2013	Anticipatory Routing of Police Helicopters	Rick van Urk, Martijn R.K. Mes, Erwin W. Hans
418	2013	Supply Chain Finance. A conceptual framework to advance research	Kasper van der Vliet, Matthew J. Reindorp, Jan C. Fransoo
417	2013	Improving the Performance of Sorter Systems By Scheduling Inbound Containers	S.W.A. Haneyah, J.M.J. Schutten, K. Fikse
416	2013	Regional logistics land allocation policies: Stimulating spatial concentration of logistics firms	Frank P. van den Heuvel, Peter W. de Langen, Karel H. van Donselaar, Jan C. Fransoo
415	2013	The development of measures of process harmonization	Heidi L. Romero, Remco M. Dijkman, Paul W.P.J. Grefen, Arjan van Weele

414	2013	<u>BASE/X. Business Agility through Cross-Organizational Service Engineering</u>	Paul Grefen, Egon Lüftenegger, Eric van der Linden, Caren Weisleder
413	2013	<u>The Time-Dependent Vehicle Routing Problem with Soft Time Windows and Stochastic Travel Times</u>	Duygu Tas, Nico Dellaert, Tom van Woensel, Ton de Kok
412	2013	<u>Clearing the Sky - Understanding SLA Elements in Cloud Computing</u>	Marco Comuzzi, Guus Jacobs, Paul Grefen
411	2013	<u>Approximations for the waiting time distribution In an M/G/c priority queue</u>	A. Al Hanbali, E.M. Alvarez, M.C. van der van der Heijden
410	2013	<u>To co-locate or not? Location decisions and logistics concentration areas</u>	Frank P. van den Heuvel, Karel H. van Donselaar, Rob A.C.M. Broekmeulen, Jan C. Fransoo, Peter W. de Langen
409	2013	<u>The Time-Dependent Pollution-Routing Problem</u>	Anna Franceschetti, Dorothée Honhon, Tom van Woensel, Tolga Bektas, Gilbert Laporte.
408	2013	<u>Scheduling the scheduling task: A time Management perspective on scheduling</u>	J.A. Larco, V. Wiers, J. Fransoo
407	2013	<u>Clustering Clinical Departments for Wards to Achieve a Prespecified Blocking Probability</u>	J. Theresia van Essen, Mark van Houdenhoven, Johann L. Hurink
406	2013	<u>MyPHRMachines: Personal Health Desktops in the Cloud</u>	Pieter Van Gorp, Marco Comuzzi
405	2013	<u>Maximising the Value of Supply Chain Finance</u>	Kasper van der Vliet, Matthew J. Reindorp, Jan C. Fransoo
404	2013	<u>Reaching 50 million nanostores: retail distribution in emerging megacities</u>	Edgar E. Blanco, Jan C. Fransoo
403	2013	<u>A Vehicle Routing Problem with Flexible Time Windows</u>	Duygu Tas, Ola Jabali, Tom van Woensel
402	2013	<u>The Service Dominant Business Model: A Service Focused Conceptualization</u>	Egon Lüftenegger, Marco Comuzzi, Paul Grefen, Caren Weisleder

401	2012	Relationship between freight accessibility and Logistics employment in US counties	Frank P. van den Heuvel, Liliana Rivera, Karel H. van Donselaar, Ad de Jong, Yossi Sheffi, Peter W. de Langen, Jan C. Fransoo
400	2012	A Condition-Based Maintenance Policy for Multi-Component Systems with a High Maintenance Setup Cost	Qiushi Zhu, Hao Peng, Geert-Jan van Houtum
399	2012	A flexible iterative improvement heuristic to Support creation of feasible shift rosters in Self-rostering	E. van der Veen, J.L. Hurink, J.M.J. Schutten, S.T. Uijland
398	2012	Scheduled Service Network Design with Synchronization and Transshipment Constraints For Intermodal Container Transportation Networks	K. Sharypova, T.G. Crainic, T. van Woensel, J.C. Fransoo
397	2012	Destocking, the bullwhip effect, and the credit Crisis: empirical modeling of supply chain Dynamics	Maximiliano Udenio, Jan C. Fransoo, Robert Peels
396	2012	Vehicle routing with restricted loading capacities	J. Gromicho, J.J. van Hoorn, A.L. Kok, J.M.J. Schutten
395	2012	Service differentiation through selective lateral transshipments	E.M. Alvarez, M.C. van der Heijden, I.M.H. Vliegen, W.H.M. Zijm
394	2012	A Generalized Simulation Model of an Integrated Emergency Post	Martijn Mes, Manon Bruens
393	2012	Business Process Technology and the Cloud: Defining a Business Process Cloud Platform	Vasil Stoitsev, Paul Grefen
392	2012	Vehicle Routing with Soft Time Windows and Stochastic Travel Times: A Column Generation And Branch-and-Price Solution Approach	D. Tas, M. Gendreau, N. Dellaert, T. van Woensel, A.G. de Kok
391	2012	Improve OR-Schedule to Reduce Number of Required Beds	J.T. v. Essen, J.M. Bosch, E.W. Hans, M. v. Houdenhoven, J.L. Hurink
390	2012	How does development lead time affect performance over the ramp-up lifecycle?	Andres Pufall, Jan C. Fransoo, Ad de Jong

389	2012	Evidence from the consumer electronics industry	Andreas Pufall, Jan C. Fransoo, Ad de Jong, Ton de Kok
388	2012	The Impact of Product Complexity on Ramp-Up Performance	Frank P.v.d. Heuvel, Peter W.de Langen, Karel H. v. Donselaar, Jan C. Fransoo
387	2012	Co-location synergies: specialized versus diverse logistics concentration areas	Frank P.v.d. Heuvel, Peter W.de Langen, Karel H. v.Donselaar, Jan C. Fransoo
386	2012	Proximity matters: Synergies through co-location of logistics establishments	Frank P. v.d.Heuvel, Peter W.de Langen, Karel H.v. Donselaar, Jan C. Fransoo
385	2012	Spatial concentration and location dynamics in logistics:the case of a Dutch province	Zhiqiang Yan, Remco Dijkman, Paul Grefen
384	2012	FNet: An Index for Advanced Business Process Querying	W.R. Dalinghaus, P.M.E. Van Gorp
383	2012	Defining Various Pathway Terms	Egon Lüftenegger, Paul Grefen, Caren Weisleder
382	2012	The Service Dominant Strategy Canvas: Defining and Visualizing a Service Dominant Strategy through the Traditional Strategic Lens	Stefano Fazi, Tom van Woensel, Jan C. Fransoo
381	2012	A Stochastic Variable Size Bin Packing Problem With Time Constraints	K. Sharypova, T. van Woensel, J.C. Fransoo
380	2012	Coordination and Analysis of Barge Container Hinterland Networks	Frank P. van den Heuvel, Peter W. de Langen, Karel H. van Donselaar, Jan C. Fransoo
379	2012	Proximity matters: Synergies through co-location of logistics establishments	Heidi Romero, Remco Dijkman, Paul Grefen, Arjan van Weele
378	2012	A literature review in process harmonization: a conceptual framework	S.W.A. Haneya, J.M.J. Schutten, P.C. Schuur, W.H.M. Zijm
377	2012	A Generic Material Flow Control Model for Two Different Industries	H.G.H. Tiemessen, M. Fleischmann, G.J. van Houtum, J.A.E.E. van Nunen, E. Pratsini

	Improving the performance of sorter systems by scheduling inbound containers	Albert Douma, Martijn Mes
375 2012	Strategies for dynamic appointment making by container terminals	Pieter van Gorp, Marco Comuzzi
374 2012	MyPHRMachines: Lifelong Personal Health Records in the Cloud	E.M. Alvarez, M.C. van der Heijden, W.H.M. Zijm
373 2012	Service differentiation in spare parts supply through dedicated stocks	Frank Karsten, Rob Basten
372 2012	Spare parts inventory pooling: how to share the benefits	X.Lin, R.J.I. Basten, A.A. Kranenburg, G.J. van Houtum
371 2012	Condition based spare parts supply	Martijn Mes
370 2012	Using Simulation to Assess the Opportunities of Dynamic Waste Collection	J. Arts, S.D. Flapper, K. Vernooij
369 2012	Aggregate overhaul and supply chain planning for rotables	J.T. van Essen, J.L. Hurink, W. Hartholt, B.J. van den Akker
368 2011	Operating Room Rescheduling	Kristel M.R. Hoen, Tarkan Tan, Jan C. Fransoo, Geert-Jan van Houtum
367 2011	Switching Transport Modes to Meet Voluntary Carbon Emission Targets	Elisa Alvarez, Matthieu van der Heijden
366 2011	On two-echelon inventory systems with Poisson demand and lost sales	J.T. van Essen, E.W. Hans, J.L. Hurink, A. Oversberg
365 2011	Minimizing the Waiting Time for Emergency Surgery	Duygu Tas, Nico Dellaert, Tom van Woensel, Ton de Kok
364 2011	Vehicle Routing Problem with Stochastic Travel Times Including Soft Time Windows and Service Costs	Erhun Özkan, Geert-Jan van Houtum, Yasemin Serin
363 2011	A New Approximate Evaluation Method for Two-Echelon Inventory Systems with Emergency Shipments	Said Dabia, El-Ghazali Talbi, Tom Van Woensel, Ton de Kok

362	2011	Approximating Multi-Objective Time-Dependent Optimization Problems	Said Dabia, Stefan Röpke, Tom Van Woensel, Ton de Kok
361	2011	Branch and Cut and Price for the Time Dependent Vehicle Routing Problem with Time Window	A.G. Karaarslan, G.P. Kiesmüller, A.G. de Kok
360	2011	Analysis of an Assemble-to-Order System with Different Review Periods	Ahmad Al Hanbali, Matthieu van der Heijden
359	2011	Interval Availability Analysis of a Two-Echelon, Multi-Item System	Felipe Caro, Charles J. Corbett, Tarkan Tan, Rob Zuidwijk
358	2011	Carbon-Optimal and Carbon-Neutral Supply Chains	Sameh Haneyah, Henk Zijm, Marco Schutten, Peter Schuur
357	2011	Generic Planning and Control of Automated Material Handling Systems: Practical Requirements Versus Existing Theory	M. van der Heijden, B. Iskandar
356	2011	Last time buy decisions for products sold under warranty	Frank P. van den Heuvel, Peter W. de Langen, Karel H. van Donselaar, Jan C. Fransoo
355	2011	Spatial concentration and location dynamics in logistics: the case of a Dutch province	Frank P. van den Heuvel, Peter W. de Langen, Karel H. van Donselaar, Jan C. Fransoo
354	2011	Identification of Employment Concentration Areas	Pieter van Gorp, Remco Dijkman
353	2011	BOMN 2.0 Execution Semantics Formalized as Graph Rewrite Rules: extended version	Frank Karsten, Marco Slikker, Geert-Jan van Houtum
352	2011	Resource pooling and cost allocation among independent service providers	E. Lüftenegger, S. Angelov, P. Grefen
351	2011	A Framework for Business Innovation Directions	Remco Dijkman, Irene Vanderfeesten, Hajo A. Reijers
350	2011	The Road to a Business Process Architecture: An Overview of Approaches and their Use	K.M.R. Hoen, T. Tan, J.C. Fransoo G.J. van Houtum
349	2011	Effect of carbon emission regulations on transport mode selection under stochastic demand	Murat Firat, Cor Hurkens
348	2011	An improved MIP-based combinatorial approach for a multi-skill workforce scheduling problem	R.J.I. Basten, M.C. van der Heijden, J.M.J. Schutten
		An approximate approach for the joint problem of level of repair analysis and spare parts stocking	R.J.I. Basten, M.C. van der Heijden,

347	2011	Joint optimization of level of repair analysis and spare parts stocks	J.M.J. Schutten Ton G. de Kok
346	2011	Inventory control with manufacturing lead time flexibility	Frank Karsten, Marco Slikker, Geert-Jan van Houtum
345	2011	Analysis of resource pooling games via a new extension of the Erlang loss function	Murat Firat, C.A.J. Hurkens, Gerhard J. Woeginger
344	2011	Vehicle refueling with limited resources	Murat Firat, C.A.J. Hurkens, Gerhard J. Woeginger
343	2011	Optimal Inventory Policies with Non-stationary Supply Disruptions and Advance Supply Information	Bilge Atasoy, Refik Güllü, TarkanTan
342	2011	Redundancy Optimization for Critical Components in High-Availability Capital Goods	Kurtulus Baris Öner, Alan Scheller-Wolf Geert-Jan van Houtum
341	2010	Analysis of a two-echelon inventory system with two supply modes	Joachim Arts, Gudrun Kiesmüller
339	2010	Analysis of the dial-a-ride problem of Hunsaker and Savelsbergh	Murat Firat, Gerhard J. Woeginger
338	2010	Attaining stability in multi-skill workforce scheduling	Murat Firat, Cor Hurkens
335	2010	Flexible Heuristics Miner (FHM)	A.J.M.M. Weijters, J.T.S. Ribeiro
334	2010	An exact approach for relating recovering surgical patient workload to the master surgical schedule	P.T. Vanberkel, R.J. Boucherie, E.W. Hans, J.L. Hurink, W.A.M. van Lent, W.H. van Harten
333	2010	Efficiency evaluation for pooling resources in health care	Peter T. Vanberkel, Richard J. Boucherie, Erwin W. Hans, Johann L. Hurink, Nelly Litvak
332	2010	The Effect of Workload Constraints in Mathematical Programming Models for Production Planning	M.M. Jansen, A.G. de Kok, I.J.B.F. Adan
331	2010	Using pipeline information in a multi-echelon spare parts inventory system	Christian Howard, Ingrid Reijnen, Johan Marklund, Tarkan Tan

330	2010	Reducing costs of repairable spare parts supply systems via dynamic scheduling	H.G.H. Tiemessen, G.J. van Houtum
329	2010	Identification of Employment Concentration and Specialization Areas: Theory and Application	F.P. van den Heuvel, P.W. de Langen, K.H. van Donselaar, J.C. Fransoo
328	2010	A combinatorial approach to multi-skill workforce scheduling	Murat Firat, Cor Hurkens
327	2010	Stability in multi-skill workforce scheduling	Murat Firat, Cor Hurkens, Alexandre Laugier
326	2010	Maintenance spare parts planning and control: A framework for control and agenda for future research	M.A. Driessen, J.J. Arts, G.J. v. Houtum, W.D. Rustenburg, B. Huisman
325	2010	Near-optimal heuristics to set base stock levels in a two-echelon distribution network	R.J.I. Basten, G.J. van Houtum
324	2010	Inventory reduction in spare part networks by selective throughput time reduction	M.C. van der Heijden, E.M. Alvarez, J.M.J. Schutten
323	2010	The selective use of emergency shipments for service-contract differentiation	E.M. Alvarez, M.C. van der Heijden, W.H. Zijm
322	2010	Heuristics for Multi-Item Two-Echelon Spare Parts Inventory Control Problem with Batch Ordering in the Central Warehouse	B. Walrave, K. v. Oorschot, A.G.L. Romme
321	2010	Preventing or escaping the suppression mechanism: intervention conditions	Nico Dellaert, Jully Jeunet.
320	2010	Hospital admission planning to optimize major resources utilization under uncertainty	R. Seguel, R. Eshuis, P. Grefen.
319	2010	Minimal Protocol Adaptors for Interacting Services Teaching Retail Operations in Business and Engineering Schools	Tom Van Woensel, Marshall L. Fisher, Jan C. Fransoo.
318	2010	Design for Availability: Creating Value for Manufacturers and Customers	Lydie P.M. Smets, Geert-Jan van Houtum, Fred Langerak.

317	2010	Transforming Process Models: executable rewrite rules versus a formalized Java program	Pieter van Gorp, Rik Eshuis.
316	2010	Getting trapped in the suppression of exploration: A simulation model	Bob Walrave, Kim E. van Oorschot, A. Georges L. Romme
315	2010	A Dynamic Programming Approach to Multi-Objective Time-Dependent Capacitated Single Vehicle Routing Problems with Time Windows	S. Dabia, T. van Woensel, A.G. de Kok
314	2010		
313	2010		
312	2010	Tales of a So(u)rcerer: Optimal Sourcing Decisions Under Alternative Capacitated Suppliers and General Cost Structures	Osman Alp, Tarkan Tan
311	2010	In-store replenishment procedures for perishable inventory in a retail environment with handling costs and storage constraints	R.A.C.M. Broekmeulen, C.H.M. Bakx
310	2010	The state of the art of innovation-driven business models in the financial services industry	E. Lüftenegger, S. Angelov, E. van der Linden, P. Grefen
309	2010	Design of Complex Architectures Using a Three Dimension Approach: the CrossWork Case	R. Seguel, P. Grefen, R. Eshuis
308	2010	Effect of carbon emission regulations on transport mode selection in supply chains	K.M.R. Hoen, T. Tan, J.C. Fransoo, G.J. van Houtum
307	2010	Interaction between intelligent agent strategies for real-time transportation planning	Martijn Mes, Matthieu van der Heijden, Peter Schuur
306	2010	Internal Slackening Scoring Methods	Marco Slikker, Peter Borm, René van den Brink
305	2010	Vehicle Routing with Traffic Congestion and Drivers' Driving and Working Rules	A.L. Kok, E.W. Hans, J.M.J. Schutten, W.H.M. Zijm
304	2010	Practical extensions to the level of repair analysis	R.J.I. Basten, M.C. van der Heijden, J.M.J. Schutten
303	2010	Ocean Container Transport: An Underestimated and Critical Link in Global Supply Chain Performance	Jan C. Fransoo, Chung-Yee Lee
302	2010	Capacity reservation and utilization for a manufacturer with uncertain capacity and demand	Y. Boulaksil; J.C. Fransoo; T. Tan
300	2009	Spare parts inventory pooling games	F.J.P. Karsten; M. Slikker; G.J. van Houtum
299	2009	Capacity flexibility allocation in an outsourced supply chain with reservation	Y. Boulaksil, M. Grunow, J.C. Fransoo
298	2010	An optimal approach for the joint problem of level of repair analysis and spare parts stocking	R.J.I. Basten, M.C. van der Heijden, J.M.J. Schutten

297	2009	Responding to the Lehman Wave: Sales Forecasting and Supply Management during the Credit Crisis	Robert Peels, Maximiliano Udenio, Jan C. Fransoo, Marcel Wolfs, Tom Hendriks
296	2009	An exact approach for relating recovering surgical patient workload to the master surgical schedule	Peter T. Vanberkel, Richard J. Boucherie, Erwin W. Hans, Johann L. Hurink, Wineke A.M. van Lent, Wim H. van Harten
295	2009	An iterative method for the simultaneous optimization of repair decisions and spare parts stocks	R.J.I. Basten, M.C. van der Heijden, J.M.J. Schutten
294	2009	Fujaba hits the Wall(-e)	Pieter van Gorp, Ruben Jubeh, Bernhard Grusie, Anne Keller
293	2009	Implementation of a Healthcare Process in Four Different Workflow Systems	R.S. Mans, W.M.P. van der Aalst, N.C. Russell, P.J.M. Bakker
292	2009	Business Process Model Repositories - Framework and Survey	Zhiqiang Yan, Remco Dijkman, Paul Grefen
291	2009	Efficient Optimization of the Dual-Index Policy Using Markov Chains	Joachim Arts, Marcel van Vuuren, Gudrun Kiesmuller
290	2009	Hierarchical Knowledge-Gradient for Sequential Sampling	Martijn R.K. Mes; Warren B. Powell; Peter I. Frazier
289	2009	Analyzing combined vehicle routing and break scheduling from a distributed decision making perspective	C.M. Meyer; A.L. Kok; H. Kopfer; J.M.J. Schutten
288	2009	Anticipation of lead time performance in Supply Chain Operations Planning	Michiel Jansen; Ton G. de Kok; Jan C. Fransoo
287	2009	Inventory Models with Lateral Transshipments: A Review	Colin Paterson; Gudrun Kiesmuller; Ruud Teunter; Kevin Glazebrook
286	2009	Efficiency evaluation for pooling resources in health care	P.T. Vanberkel; R.J. Boucherie; E.W. Hans; J.L. Hurink; N. Litvak
285	2009	A Survey of Health Care Models that Encompass Multiple Departments	P.T. Vanberkel; R.J. Boucherie; E.W. Hans; J.L. Hurink; N. Litvak
284	2009	Supporting Process Control in Business Collaborations	S. Angelov; K. Vidyasankar; J. Vonk; P. Grefen
283	2009	Inventory Control with Partial Batch Ordering	O. Alp; W.T. Huh; T. Tan
282	2009	Translating Safe Petri Nets to Statecharts in a Structure-Preserving Way	R. Eshuis
281	2009	The link between product data model and process model	J.J.C.L. Vogelaar; H.A. Reijers
280	2009	Inventory planning for spare parts networks with delivery time requirements	I.C. Reijnen; T. Tan; G.J. van Houtum
279	2009	Co-Evolution of Demand and Supply under Competition	B. Vermeulen; A.G. de Kok B. Vermeulen, A.G. de Kok
278	2010	Toward Meso-level Product-Market Network Indices for Strategic Product Selection and (Re)Design Guidelines over the Product Life-Cycle	

		R. Seguel, R. Eshuis, P. Grefen
277	2009	An Efficient Method to Construct Minimal Protocol Adaptors
276	2009	Coordinating Supply Chains: a Bilevel Programming Approach
		Ton G. de Kok, Gabriella Muratore
275	2009	Inventory redistribution for fashion products under demand parameter update
		G.P. Kiesmuller, S. Minner
274	2009	Comparing Markov chains: Combining aggregation and precedence relations applied to sets of states
		A. Basic, I.M.H. Vliegen, A. Scheller-Wolf
273	2009	Separate tools or tool kits: an exploratory study of engineers' preferences
		I.M.H. Vliegen, P.A.M. Kleingeld, G.J. van Houtum
272	2009	An Exact Solution Procedure for Multi-Item Two-Echelon Spare Parts Inventory Control Problem with Batch Ordering
		Engin Topan, Z. Pelin Bayindir, Tarkan Tan
271	2009	Distributed Decision Making in Combined Vehicle Routing and Break Scheduling
		C.M. Meyer, H. Kopfer, A.L. Kok, M. Schutten
270	2009	Dynamic Programming Algorithm for the Vehicle Routing Problem with Time Windows and EC Social Legislation
		A.L. Kok, C.M. Meyer, H. Kopfer, J.M.J. Schutten
269	2009	Similarity of Business Process Models: Metics and Evaluation
		Remco Dijkman, Marlon Dumas, Boudewijn van Dongen, Reina Kaarik, Jan Mendling
267	2009	Vehicle routing under time-dependent travel times: the impact of congestion avoidance
		A.L. Kok, E.W. Hans, J.M.J. Schutten
266	2009	Restricted dynamic programming: a flexible framework for solving realistic VRPs
		J. Gromicho; J.J. van Hoorn; A.L. Kok; J.M.J. Schutten;

Working Papers published before 2009 see: <http://beta.ieis.tue.nl>