

A review of reference architectures for digital manufacturing: Classification, applicability and open issues

Jan Kaiser, Duncan Mcfarlane, Gregory Hawkridge, Pascal André, Paulo Leitão

▶ To cite this version:

Jan Kaiser, Duncan Mcfarlane, Gregory Hawkridge, Pascal André, Paulo Leitão. A review of reference architectures for digital manufacturing: Classification, applicability and open issues. Computers in Industry, 2023, 149, pp.103923. 10.1016/j.compind.2023.103923. hal-04085152

HAL Id: hal-04085152 https://nantes-universite.hal.science/hal-04085152

Submitted on 29 Apr 2023 $\,$

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés. Contents lists available at ScienceDirect





Computers in Industry

journal homepage: www.sciencedirect.com/journal/computers-in-industry

A review of reference architectures for digital manufacturing: Classification, applicability and open issues



Jan Kaiser^{a,*}, Duncan McFarlane^a, Gregory Hawkridge^a, Pascal André^b, Paulo Leitão^c

^a University of Cambridge, Institute for Manufacturing, 17 Charles Babbage Rd, Cambridge CB3 OFS, United Kingdom

^b University of Nantes, Laboratory of Digital Sciences of Nantes, 2 Chemin de la Houssinière, 44322 Nantes, France

^c Polytechnic Institute of Bragança, Research Center in Digitalization and Intelligent Robotics (CeDRI), 5300-253 Bragança, Portugal

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Reference architecture Digital manufacturing Applicability Industry 4.0 Internet of things Cyber-physical systems

ABSTRACT

The industrial application of digital technologies in manufacturing can result in an increased efficiency of processes and an opportunity to integrate production, logistics and maintenance functions. However, increasingly interconnected manufacturing information means progressively more complex systems. Therefore, there is an ever growing need to provide structure in the design and development of such information systems which is the role of a system architecture. So called 'reference architectures' guide the design of system architectures used in particular applications. Reference architectures are models of information functions and their connections that provide a structured template with common terminology. Over the last decades, various reference architectures reference architectures are scarce and it is difficult to compare and analyse them due to their various levels of application and different uses. In this study, we review and classify reference architectures used to support digital systems in manufacturing. Contributions of the paper include proposing criteria for a model to be referred to as a 'reference architecture', an overview and classification of the different perspectives on reference architectures in the literature, and a guideline to support practitioners, developers and academics in selecting a reference architecture.

1. Introduction

Digital technologies have revolutionised manufacturing. Their application yields more efficient industrial processes, improved product designs and enhanced capabilities of logistics and maintenance applications through a constant flow of information (Derigent et al., 2020). As manufacturing information systems become more interconnected and complex, there is a growing need for (system) architectures to guide their design and development (Pedone and Mezgár, 2018). The role of so called 'reference architectures' is to provide a structured template for forming such system architectures, and to provide specifications for system characteristics, design guidelines and standards. A large number of reference architectures for digital manufacturing have been proposed over the last decades (Derigent et al., 2020; Bader et al., 2019; Han, 2020; Megow, 2020; Soares et al., 2021). Although they are intended to simplify the design process, industrial applications are scarce. It is difficult to compare and evaluate reference architectures because they address various levels of application and different uses. In this study, we review the different ways that reference architectures are discussed and give practitioners, developers and academics a guideline to understand

and select one based on their needs. Many existing methodologies to classify and compare reference architectures only focus on a particular domain and do not separate genuine reference architectures from system architectures, platforms or frameworks. While we concentrate on reference architectures, the proposed approach can also be modified to classify system architectures and analyse their relationship to platforms and frameworks. The key limitations we address include the lack of a distinction between reference architectures, system architectures, platforms and frameworks, the shortage of reported applications of reference architectures, and the need for frame of reference capable of classifying reference architectures across domains.

1.1. Digital manufacturing

Digital manufacturing describes 'the application of digital information [from multiple sources, formats, owners] for the enhancement of manufacturing processes, supply chains, products and services' (McFarlane et al., 2020). This subsection describes various paradigms related to digital manufacturing introduced in the literature. These paradigms

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2023.103923

Received 16 December 2022; Received in revised form 7 April 2023; Accepted 11 April 2023 Available online 21 April 2023

0166-3615/© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

^{*} Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* jk823@cam.ac.uk (J. Kaiser).

have provided guidance on the use of digital systems in manufacturing over the last 40 years. In early work in manufacturing control systems, there were two main paradigms discussed, namely Computer Integrated Manufacturing (CIM) and Holonic Manufacturing Systems (HMS). CIM aims to increase the efficiency of manufacturing processes through an integration of enterprise functions (Doumeingts et al., 1995; Yu et al., 2015). The holonic domain describes formations of autonomous and cooperative entities named holons, which characterise the whole spectrum of manufacturing entities. In recent years, several new paradigms have been introduced: the German government launched the Industry 4.0 initiative to digitally transform the manufacturing domain through disruptive technologies (Rojko, 2017). So called Smart Manufacturing aims to enhance the application of networked information-based technologies to manufacturing and supply chain operations (Davis et al., 2012; Li et al., 2018; Mittal et al., 2019). The Internet of Things (IoT) uses a unique addressing scheme to enable collaboration among its components (Atzori et al., 2010). The Industrial Internet of Things (IIoT) concentrates on manufacturing processes and incorporates machine to machine (M2M) and industrial communication technologies for automation applications (Sisinni et al., 2018). Another way of modelling interconnected manufacturing systems is through the Cyber-physical Systems (CPS) paradigm. CPS embody collaborating computational elements which are connected to their surrounding physical world and its processes (Monostori, 2014; Pivoto et al., 2021). In this study, we concentrate on reference architectures which directly relate to these paradigms.

1.2. Reference architectures: a metamodelling perspective

The development, customisation and implementation of digital manufacturing systems has become increasingly complex for a variety of reasons. These systems are characterised by a tight coupling between elements and require an integrated view that includes both the digital and physical space. Formal modelling techniques can be used to aid the design and development of such systems. We have adopted the so called 'metamodelling approach' proposed by Karsai et al. (2000), which introduces an abstraction of the underlying model through a higher level of modelling, that contains information about its structure. Using this approach from a digital manufacturing perspective, reference architectures can be thought of as metamodels. In the literature, the term 'reference architecture' is applied to a variety of models, including system architectures, frameworks and platforms (Ding et al., 2021; Traganos et al., 2021). While these models relate to one another, there are significant differences which can, and has, led to ambiguity in the meaning of the term 'reference architecture'. This subsection introduces the main modelling levels and provides a distinction between the different types of models relevant to this study.

While for digital manufacturing three modelling levels can be identified as shown in Fig. 1(a), which include the reference architecture, system architecture and the physical system, there are also other types of models discussed in the literature, such as platforms, frameworks and abstractions of reference architectures. Although it is beyond scope of this paper to study these other model types in detail, we note in Fig. 1(b) a rough indication of their relative position compared to the three modelling levels presented in Fig. 1(a): the system level represents the physical implementation of system components and interactions. The model level contains the system architecture, an abstraction of the specific underlying implemented system. Frameworks are more abstract than system architectures since they organise components and their interactions generally, and thus, they cannot be assigned to the model level. A higher level of abstraction is provided at the meta level which includes template structures in form of reference architectures. Platforms expand the technical aspects of reference architectures with business and operational views. Reference architectures can also be further generalised to meta abstractions, which consist of organisational approaches and ontologies. However, in most cases developers start on

the meta or model level and transition to lower levels of abstraction when designing systems. We next provide the *working* definitions of the key terms used in this paper, starting with reference architectures because they represent the core of this study.

Reference architecture. *Reference architectures guide the design of system architectures by providing a structured template with common terminology.* They comprise a collection of characteristics of digital manufacturing systems, such as the relationship between control elements (e.g. hierarchical, or heterarchical) or how the system is decomposed into elements (e.g. service-oriented, or object-oriented). This is augmented with design guidelines, template solutions and standards. The characteristics of a reference architecture are dimensions, components or layers in conjunction with a certain longevity, whereby central publications and standards are accessible and referenced since their release. Reference architectures do not describe principles, concepts or technologies, such as agents (Paolucci and Sacile, 2005) and services (Papazoglou and Heuvel, 2007), which are utilised during the realisation of systems, although technologies can represent an essential feature of reference architectures.

System. A digital manufacturing system is a real-world implementation of physical and digital components, which includes machines, sensors, controllers and software. A system is a deployment of physical and digital components embodying the structures, relationships and interactions defined in the system architecture (using appropriate technologies). For example, this level is where a developer implementing a holonic system would choose whether to use the Java Agent Development Framework (JADE) or Erlang to achieve the desired system behaviour.

System architecture. System architectures conceptualise the structure and function of an implemented system through an abstract description of its assets and how they relate to one another. System architectures represent the model of an implemented system, which is dedicated to a specific task. Common models are Petri nets, flowcharts and diagrams, which map the relations between machines, sensors and controllers within the implemented system. There are three main characteristics of system architectures, namely they define the components of the implemented system, the relationships and interactions among those components, and the rules to manage those relationships and interactions. For example, the system architecture for a holonic manufacturing cell would include the holon specifications, diagrams to describe the relations and interactions between those holons, their interface descriptions, the communication patterns and relevant protocols. While reference architectures generally describe all system elements and their interactions that could be considered for different applications, system architectures consist of a subset of these elements selected for a specific application.

Framework. Frameworks for digital manufacturing are reference architectures that have partially or fully prescribed sets of components or interaction patterns. Frameworks describe specific instances of a reference architecture with strict design and implementation rules, and they can be used to develop multiple application-specific system architectures. Frameworks are characterised by constrained structures that outline the organisation of components and the interactions between them. While platforms tend to describe fully integrated solutions that consider the problem at large, frameworks are toolsets targeted at ad-hoc solutions for specific applications (e.g. IoT frameworks).

Platform. *Platforms for digital manufacturing combine design guidelines with an appropriate digital ecosystem.* Digital ecosystems describe the collaboration of stakeholders to exploit skills and knowledge for achieving a common goal (Otto et al., 2016). These platforms provide flexibility to enterprises by relying on services and technical components to orchestrate interactions between organisations and applications, and support the integration of new technologies (Directorate-General for Communications Networks Content and Technology and European Factories of the Future Research Association (EFFRA), 2015; Fraile et al., 2019; Gerrikagoitia et al., 2019). Apart from technical aspects, platforms include an operational and business view. Besides the





Fig. 1. (a) The three levels of the proposed metamodelling approach. (b) Rough indication of the relative position of platforms, frameworks and meta abstractions compared to the three levels of the metamodelling approach.

involvement of stakeholders (e.g. industry and software vendors) digital manufacturing platforms are characterised by the level of openness and standardisation, and a technical view. This technical view includes generic design guidelines or a reference architecture.

Meta abstraction. *Meta abstractions are organisational approaches and ontologies which provide core abstractions for reference architectures.* The meta abstraction layer contains the main interoperability features of a reference architecture. Ontologies define concepts and properties of reference architectures and the relations that hold between them (Giese et al., 2007; Horridge et al., 2011). Meta abstractions describe a set of core characteristics of the digital manufacturing system, such as service orientation or a holonic design approach. Reference architectures combine a subset of these characteristics augmented with design guidelines, terminologies, and technology recommendations. Meta abstractions are characterised by the selected type of organisation as well as the design concepts and principles.

There are several alternative modelling approaches that can be used to describe the relations between architectures and systems. Most notably, the UML metamodelling approach (Object Management Group, 2017) is widely adopted in research and industry, especially in the software development domain. Despite some similarities, there are two key differences upon comparison, specifically the proposed metamodelling levels are linked through specialisation and inheritance rather than instantiation, and there is no formalism for the reference architectures discussed in this study.

1.3. Paper outline

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 identifies relevant models in the literature that refer to the term 'reference architecture', reviews previous approaches to classify, align and compare reference architectures, and examines applications of reference architectures in the literature. Section 3 proposes the methodology for classifying and analysing reference architectures. Section 4 performs the classification of selected reference architectures, its validation, and an analysis of the applicability of reference architectures, which is followed by a discussion of the results in Section 5. We conclude this paper by proposing future research endeavours.

2. Background

Reference architectures for digital manufacturing provide structure in the design of digital systems. Various research interests that fall

under this topic ranging from technical issues, such as interoperability, to aspects concerning the whole enterprise. Much work has been done on classifying reference architectures. One of the limitations of this work to date has been the lack of a differentiation between the different types of models that are referred to as 'reference architectures', and the small number of reported industrial applications. In this study a literature survey on reference architectures is conducted. Publications. including scientific contributions, standard documents and technical reports, were deemed to be relevant to this study if they propose a model which is termed 'reference architecture' by the authors or another publication. This section outlines research gaps in the study of architectures for industrial digital systems and establishes the focus of this study. We begin by presenting relevant models that are referred to as 'reference architectures', which is followed by a review of existing approaches to classify, align and compare reference architectures. Finally, the applicability problem is described.

2.1. Proposed models for digital manufacturing

Over the last decades, numerous models for digital manufacturing have been proposed and have frequently been referred to as 'reference architectures'. We have gathered relevant models for our study based on two necessary criteria: (1) the model addresses at least one of the digital manufacturing paradigms, and (2) the model is being referred to as a 'reference architecture'. Table 1 presents an overview of the models proposed in the literature.

Although the models proposed in Table 1 differ vastly in their features and the areas of manufacturing they address, they can be organised in terms of the digital manufacturing paradigms introduced in Section 1.1. In what follows, an overview of the key models related to those themes is provided.

Computer Integrated Manufacturing (CIM). Initial attempts to develop a digital manufacturing reference architecture were made as CIM began to emerge in the 1980s (Rembold et al., 1985). Whereas most models only focus on specific aspects of CIM, two models address a global enterprise integration (Doumeingts et al., 1995): PERA (Williams, 1994) integrates control and enterprise systems through a hierarchical model of production and business processes including components of the control and information system. It characterises a core element of ANSI/ISA-95 (IEC 62264) (IEC, 2003), which forms the basis for several successors. CIMOSA (Kosanke, 1995) models the lifecycle of the integrated enterprise by separating functional, information, resource and organisational concerns.

Jose Construct Computer Co	No	Model	Voor	Dublication
1 Computer Media Manufacture international (CAM) 1979 Description of the CPSP (SPS) 3 Compared Computer Media Manufacture (CAM) 1984 Description Computer Media Manufacture (CAM) 4 Resolvelation of CAM) 1984 Description Compared Media 5 Moniformity Management and Control System 1984 Manufacture (PSP) 7 Integrated Manufacture (CAM) 1991 Description (PSP) 8 Compared Manufacture (CAM) 1991 Description (PSP) 8 Compared Integrated Manufacture (CAM) 1991 Description (PSP) 9 GAM Integrated Manufacture (CAM) 1992 Valleger et al. (PSP) 10 Packe Entreprise Reference Architecture (PSP) 1991 Description (PAR) 11 Static Reference Architecture (PAR) 1992 Manufacture (PSP) 12 Adaptor Apath State Architecture (PAR) 1991 Description (PSP) 13 Adaptor Apath State Architecture (PAR) 1991 Manufacture (PSP) 14 Holdo: Compored Architecture (PAR) 2000 Christ and Media (PSP) 15 Adaptor Apath State Architecture (PAR) 2001 Edita (PSP) 16 Adaptor Apath State Architecture (PAR) 2000 Edita (PSP) 17 Description Architecture (PA	110.	Model	Teai	rubication
2 Integrant (Longent: Adde Manufacturing (LAM) 1941 Demange int at (LVP) 3 Kownodep book Row Row Lines Supervision in CM 1968 Domainge int at (LVP) 5 Manufacturing Management and Carlot System 1968 More (1969) 6 Comparer Integrate Manufacturing System 1968 More (1969) 7 Higgered Manufacturing Manufacturing Open System 1962 Kanada (1960) 8 Comparer Integrate Manufacturing Open System 1962 Kanada (1960) 9 Comparer Integrate Manufacturing Open System 1962 Kanada (1960) 10 Sachine Carlot Staff Andream 1962 Vallargie et al. (1962) 11 Sachine Carlot Staff Andream 1962 Vallargie et al. (1962) 12 Pordart Rosearce Order Staff Andream (PROSA) 1997 Clear and Starge (1997) 13 Adaptive Agent Andream (SA) 1997 Clear and Margine Agent Ag	1	Computer-Aided Manufacturing - International (CAM-I)	1979	Doumeingts et al. (1995)
3 Opplex start issuit and Arrobs intervalue (UKA) 1994 Clear and Database (1999) 5 Manufacturing Management and Courcel System 1988 Manufacturing Management and Courcel System 6 PROCOS Generic CM Architecture 1988 Manufacturing Management and Courcel System 7 argues to MACSI Bana Manufacturing Management and Courcel System 1992 Kanake (1987) 8 Computer Integrated Manufacturing Open System 1992 Kanake (1987) 9 G&AI Integrated Manufacturing Open System 1992 Willinger (1994). IEC (2005) 11 Statichase CDSSA 1997 Clean and Taxes (1997) 12 Product Resource OPA Staff Architecture (FDAA) 1997 Clean and Taxes (1997) 13 Statichase CDSSA 2000 Feature at al. (1996) 10000 14 Adaptive Monale Control Architecture (FDAA) 2001 Feature at al. (1997) 100000 15 Defauster trait at al. (1990) Manufacturing Leader at al. (1990) 10000000 1000000 16 Adaptive Monale Control Architecture (FDAA) 2000 Feature at al. (1990) 1000000000000000000000	2	Integrated Computer-Aided Manufacturing (ICAM)	1981	Doumeingts et al. (1995)
a descripting large	3	Graphs with Results and Actions Interrelated (GRAI)	1984	Chen and Doumeingts (1996)
Second Second Second Second Second Parameter Second Param	4	(ECDDIT Project 022)	1988	Doumeingts et al. (1995)
3 0.00/53 main (1987) 1988 main (1987) 6 PROCOS Generic CM Architecture 1981 Domnedger r.al. (1995) 7 Integrated Manufacturing Paning and Control 1991 Domnedger r.al. (1995) 8 Comparts Integrated Manufacturing Open System 1992 Wallame (1995) 9 Oth Norgand Manufacturing Open System 1992 Wallame (1995) 10 Parket Entrytice Reference Architecture (RAA) 1997 Chen and Tesis (1997) 11 Statictific COD System Architecture (RAA) 1997 Chen and Tesis (1997) 12 Parket Entrytice Reiderence Architecture (RAA) 1997 Chen and Tesis (1997) 13 Manufacturing (Manufacturing (National)) 200 Chen and Tesis (1997) 14 Manufacturing (Manufacturing (National)) 200 Chen and Markata CoD) 15 Apprior Holman Componention Into Into (TULIOT) 2012 TULI CD(2) 26 Statutation (RAB) 2000 Partie at (2009) 27 Statutation (RAB) 2014 Manufacturing (National) 28 Variantia et al. (2014) 2014 Manufacturing (National) 29 Statutational Manufacturing (Statuting (Statut	E	(ESPRIT Project 932)	1099	More (1090)
9 PROCEON Guerrie CM Architecture 1988 Mone (1989) 7 Insegrated Mandtecturing Planking and Cottod 1991 Konskin (1989) 8 Computer Integrated Mandtecturing Open System 1992 Konskin (1989) 9 Openpter Integrated Mandtecturing Open System 1993 Wallacs (1994), EC (2003) 10 Openpter Integrated Mandtecturing (RAM) 1997 Can and Deeg (1997) 12 Parabari Resource Order Sulf Architecture (RAM) 1998 Mandtec al. (1998), EC (2012) 12 Mandtecturing (MacAbarity) (EC (1997) Mandtec al. (1998), EC (2012) Mandtec al. (1998), EC (2012) 13 Mandtecturing (MacAbarity) (EC (1997) Mandtec al. (2009) Can and Marking (EC (1997) 14 Mandtecturing (MacAbarity) (EC (1997) Mandtec al. (2009) Can and Marking (EC (1997) 15 Mandtecturing (MatAbarity) (EC (1997) 2008 Parabarity (EC (1997) 16 Malagive (Malabits) (Social (Cal (1907)) 2018 Cal (2009) 17 Delegate Mahi-Agen System (CAHACA) 2018 Cal (2012) 17 Delegate Mahi-Agen System (CAHACA) 2018 Cal (2012	5	(MMCS)	1900	MIOSS (1989)
negrets Manufacturing Planning and Control 1991 Downledge et al. (1993) 8 Computer integrined Manufacturing Open System 1992 Konake (1995) 9 GRAI Integrined Manufacturing Open System 1992 Villangir et al. (1992) 9 GRAI Integrined Manufacturing Open System 1992 Villangir et al. (1992) 11 Densite Integrined Manufacturing Open System 1991 Villangir et al. (1992) 12 Product Researce Order Sall Architecture (PROSA) 1994 Manufacturing (Manufacturing Manufacturing Man	6	PROCOS Generic CIM Architecture	1088	Moss (1980)
System (MANACS) System (MANACS) System (MANACS) System (MANACS) 8 Computer Lingergrade Manufacturing Ques System Architerater (CMANAS) 1992 Kalander State Manufacturing Ques System Architerater (CMANAS) 9 GAAL Lategrade Manufacturing Ques System Architerater (CMANAS) 1993 Williams (1994), EC (2003) 10 Packer Experime Machinecture (PROSA) 1993 Bussel et al. (1997) 12 Probact Resource Order Salf Architecture (PROSA) 2006 Linitia and Lange (1997) 12 Manufacturing (MacAborthy)/ES (1992)-1 Manufacturing (1994), ES (1992) Manufacturing (1994), ES (1992) 13 Madpire Adopted Architecture (IROSA) 2006 Linitia and Africture (2000) 14 Holesic Componention URAN 2007 Linitia and Africture (2000) 15 Machiter (2007) 2012 Linitia and Africture (2000) 16 Adopter Adopted Agrice Machine (IANA) 203 Maure et al. (2013) 17 Delegate Madufacturing (PastSystem (CPRS) 2013 Maure et al. (2015) 20 Surver all (PastSystem (CPRS) 2014 Maude et al. (2015) 21 Maure et al. (2015) <td>7</td> <td>Integrated Manufacturing Planning and Control</td> <td>1900</td> <td>Doumeingts et al. (1995)</td>	7	Integrated Manufacturing Planning and Control	1900	Doumeingts et al. (1995)
9Compare Internet Manufacturing Open System192Nearbed (198)9GRA Integrated Method (GM)192Vallespir et al. (1992)10Parkas Excerptor Reference Architecture197Nearbed (1982)11Parkas Excerptor Reference Architecture (FROA)197Nearbed (1982)12Adaptire Againe Useral (GA)197Nearbed (1982)13Adaptire Againe Useral (GA)2000Clim and Meridania (2000)14Bolaine Component Bessi Architecture (HCDA)2000Clim and Meridania (2000)14Bolaine Component Bessi Architecture (HCDA)2000Clim and Meridania (2000)15Adaptire Againe Useral Simulation Inscriptic2000Peridace (1980)16Manufacturing (MeridA)2000Peridace (1980)17Matheman et al. (1994)2010Peridace (1980)18Peridace, Resource, Order and Simulation Inscriptic2012Prior (2012)19International Telecommunication Useral2013Baterion (2000)20International Telecommunication (SMCC)2014Haterion (2014)21International Telecommunication (SMCC)2014Haterion (2014)22Virtual Peridace Reference (1014)2013Haterion (2014)23Virtual Peridace Reference (1014)2014Haterion (2014)24Clise Internet Telescope and Advecture2014Haterion (2014)25Clise Internet Telescope and Advecture2015Haterion (2014)26Clise Internet Telescope and Advecture2015 <td>,</td> <td>System (IMPACS)</td> <td>1991</td> <td>bounding as et al. (1996)</td>	,	System (IMPACS)	1991	bounding as et al. (1996)
a Architecture (CMOSA) 194 Multany (1947) 9 GKAL Insegrated Mediol (GMO) 1992 Vallappi et al. (1992) 10 Purdue Exceptive Reference Architectures 1993 Williams (1997) 11 Start-Hie (CM System Architecture (SIA) 1997 Can and Tasag (1997) 12 Particle Constraints 1998 Multany (1994), FLS 64 (1995), FLC 6012) 13 Manufacturing (MetablogD)//LEC 64 (94-1) 1999 Multany (1994), FLS 64 (1995), FLC 6012) 14 Holonic Componenchased Architecture (IGRA) 2000 Chin and McFellane (2000) 16 Adaptive Folionic Control Architecture (IGRA) 2000 Ventioner et al. (2000) 17 Holonic Componenchased Architecture (IGRA) 2000 Ventioner et al. (2000) 18 Hondraw Folionic Control Architecture (IGRA) 2012 Davis et al. (2001) 20 Smart Muniferuting Isolationic MonICit 2012 Davis et al. (2012) 21 Lor Architecture for Model (IGRAM / IGRA) 2013 Heater et al. (2013) 22 Smart Muniferuting Platform 2014 Gaus System (2014) 23 Smart Muniferuting Platform 2014 Gaus System (2014) 24 Gaus System (2014) 2014 Gaus System (2014) 25 Gystem Architecture for ADpla	8	Computer Integrated Manufacturing Open System	1992	Kosanke (1995)
9GRA inspirad Machael (GM)1962Valespie et al. (1999)11Fundos Easopées Reference Achieteure (GA)1970Clan and Tang (1977)12Prodet Resource Order Staff Achieteure (FROA)1980Resource of (1997)12Prodet Resource Order Staff Achieteure (FROA)1980Resource of (1997)13Hadpire Achieteure of RoA)2000Clair and McSenite (2000)14Hoiner Component-Based Achieteure (FROA)2000Clair and McSenite (2000)15Hadpire Achieteure (FROA)2005Lettion and Restriv (2004)16Hadpire Achieteure (FROA)2005Lettion and Restriv (2004)17Deloget Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)2006Lettion and Restriv (2004)17Deloget Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)2005Lettion and Restriv (2004)17Deloget Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)2013Bauer staf (2013)28Sanath Mandiacturing Platform2013Bauer staf (2013)29Sanath Mandiacturing Platform2014Clair (2013)20Sanath Mandiacturing Stafform2014Clair (2013)21Sanath Mandiacturing Stafform2014Clair (2013)22Sanath Mandiacturing Stafform2014Clair (2013)23Sanath Mandiacturing Stafform2014Clair (2013)24Caron of Architecturing Stafform2015Restrive (2014)25Sanath Mandiacturing Stafform2015Restrive (2014)26Caron of Architecturing Stafform2015Restrive (2015) <td< td=""><td>0</td><td>Architecture (CIMOSA)</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	0	Architecture (CIMOSA)		
10Purdue Enterprise Reference Architecture1993William (1994), BC (2003)11Stati-Hie CDM System Architecture (SA)1997Cans and Targe (1997)12Product Resource Order Stati Architecture (ROA)1990Maternan et al. (1999), BC (2012)13Adaptire Agara-Isand Architecture (ROA)1990Cans and McSulaer (2013)14Holonic Comportansiskal Architecture (ROA)2000Cathor and McSulaer (2006)15Open Architecture for Holonic Cooperation and2000Retcher et al. (2000)16Adaptire Holonic Control Architecture (MACON)2006Vertrates et al. (2000)17Delagisk Mult Argent System (ANA)2006Vertrates et al. (2012)20Sant Manafacturing Ladeethy Collition (SMLC)2007Part at (2113)21Delagisk Mult Argent System (ANA)2013Materie et al. (2013)23Wirnel Foreine Model (07-AFM/IOTA)2013Materie et al. (2013)24Wirnel Foreine Model (07-AFM/IOTA)2013Materie et al. (2013)25Wirnel Foreine Model (07-AFM/IOTA)2013Materie et al. (2014)26Wirnel Foreine Model (07-AFM/IOTA)2013Materie et al. (2014)27Garce Materie Model (07-AFM/IOTA)2013Materie et al. (2014)28Wirnel Foreine Model (07-AFM/IOTA)2015Perfore Architecture (07-AFM/IOTA)29Wirnel Foreine Model (07-AFM/IOTA)2015Perforeine Architecture (07-AFM/IOTA)20Control of Performation Materie Architecture (07-AFM/IOTA)2015Perforeine Architectur	9	GRAI Integrated Method (GIM)	1992	Vallespir et al. (1992)
OPERAL/LSA.55/LEC.6226411OPERAL/LSA.55/LEC.621212Product Resource Order Staff Architecture (IROA)1998Brande et al. (1999). ILC.0012)12Mandarota Agabes de Architecture of IROA)2000Tellin and Machimane tal. (1999). ILC.0012)13Mandarota Agabes de Architecture of IROA)2000Tellin and Machimane tal. (2000)14Mandarota Control Architecture (IROACOR)2006Lettis and Restriv (2006)15Adaptive IROANCE Control Architecture (IROACOR)2006Lettis and Restriv (2006)17Delegee Multi-Agent System (DAMS)2012Derive et al. (2009)18Product. Resource, Order and Simulation (SALC)2012Derive et al. (2013)20Simulation (IROACOR)2012Derive et al. (2013)21Hernanional Teleforma Machine (IROANCOR)2013Heldereet et al. (2013)22Simulation (SALC)2014Gaeo Systems (2014)23Wirnal Fort Rook (IROANCOR)2014Gaeo Systems (2014)24Class Int - Errorismic (SIROFR)2014Gaeo Systems (2014)25Simulation (SALC)2015Resource (2014)26Order-Errorismic (SIROFR)2014Gaeo Systems (2014)27Simulation (SALC)2015Resource (2014)28Order-Errorismic (CIROR)2015Resource (2014)29Huard Errorismic (CIROR)2015Resource (2015)29NotocitiSimulation (SALC)2015Resource (2015)20Dynamitecture (RANC)2015Resou	10	Purdue Enterprise Reference Architecture	1993	Williams (1994), IEC (2003)
11Slarik CMA System Architecture (GLA)1997Chean de lat. (1999), IEC (2012)13Adaptive Agent-based Architecture (IFGA)1999Matura et al. (1999), IEC (2012)14Holens Component-Based Architecture (IFGA)2000Chin and McIarlane (2000)15Open Architecture (IFGA)2000Interior et al. (2000)16Adaptive Holenic Component-Based Architecture (IFGA)2006Leinis and McIarlane (2000)16Adaptive Holenic Component-Based Architecture (IACA)2006Leinis and Bachine (2007)17Delegate Mathick Set System (DAAS)2006Verstracte et al. (2008)18Product, Resource, Order and Simalation Isoarchie2009Pujo et al. (2007)19International Teleconnumication Union IoT (TU-bit)212TU-f (2012)10International Holenone Model (GFAMA / IoT-A)213International Component Based (GFAMA / IoT-A)21Stracture (FORS)214Monister (2017)22Optical Physical Production Systems (CMFS)214Monister (2014)23Virtual Port Stora (VFS)214Monister (2014)24Optical Physical Production Systems (CMFS)216Heleneur (2015)25Optical Physical Production Systems (CMFS)215Heleneur (2015)26Optical Physical Production Systems (CMFS)216Heleneur (2015)27SGSG215Production Systems (2015)28Optical Physical Production Systems (CMFS)216Heleneur (2015)29Nathite Consortium (CD) Iodiarial		(PERA)/ISA-95/IEC 62264		
12Product Resource Order Saff Architecture (PROSA)1998Bussel et al. (1998)13Adaptiv Agent Ased Architecture (PICRA)2000Chira and McFarlane (2000)14Ifoloait Component-Based Architecture (PICRA)2000Percher et al. (2000)15Open Architecture for Hollegent (PICRA)2000Percher et al. (2000)16Open Architecture (Introdo)2008Verstrade et al. (2000)17Obligate Multi-Agent System (DMAS)2008Verstrade et al. (2009)18Drade, Perceurce, Order and Simulation Isoarchite2012Davis et al. (2012)29Start Multi-Architecture (MACS)2012Ulti-T CO12)20Start Multi-Architecture (MACS)2012Davis et al. (2013)21International Telecommunication Usion Iof (TIC-IoT)2012Ulti-T CO12)22Start Multi-Architectural Reference Model (Gr-AMM / IoT-A)2013Bauer et al. (2013)23Virtual Fort Kasox (VFK)2013Bauer et al. (2013)24Starveillame Active Perroviatic (STRFR)2014Balcet et al. (2013)25Dysamit Architecture (ROSA)2015Barbos et al. (2015)26Opcomit Architecture (ROSA)2015Barbos et al. (2015)27SCSc2015Barbos et al. (2015)28AbACDR ² 2015Barbos et al. (2015)29Industrial Internet Consortian (IIC) Industrial Internet2016Heatsare et al. (2015)29Industrial Internet Consortian (IIC) Industrial Internet2016Heatsare et al. (201	11	Stair-like CIM System Architecture (SLA)	1997	Chen and Tseng (1997)
13Adaptive Agent-based Architecture (IGAN)1999Matura et al. (1999), IEC (2012)14Holenic Component-Based Architecture (IGAN)2000Chirn and MeferInee (2000)15Open Architecture (IGAN)2000Hetcher et al. (2006)16Adaptive Holenic Control Architecture (IGAN)2008Verturee et al. (2006)17Delegate Multi-Agent System (DMAS)2008Verturee et al. (2008)18Stantive Medication Control Architecture (IADACOR)2012ILI (2012)19International Telecommunication Union IoT (TUI-IoT)2012ILI (2012)19International Telecommunication Union IoT (TUI-IoT)2012Buser et al. (2013)21International Telecommunication Union IoT (TUI-IoT)2013Buser et al. (2013)22Survettam (Beferenze Model (IAT-AMM / IoT-A)2013Buser et al. (2013)23Virtual Fort Incore (YFK)2013Montalect et al. (2014)24Cisco IoT2014Cisco System (2014)25Survettam (Beferenze Model (IAT-AMM / IoT-A)2015Buser et al. (2015)26Montalect (INF)2014Cisco System (2014)27Survettam (INF)2014Cisco System (2014)28Cisco IoTCisco System (2015)Liszo System (2015)29Montalect (INF)2015Liszo System (2015)20Open et al. (2015)Liszo System (2015)21Vertuce Integration Architecture (INA)2015Harbon et al. (2015)22Partitecture for Manufacturing System (CPA)	12	Product Resource Order Staff Architecture (PROSA)	1998	Brussel et al. (1998)
Mutuality Idea (MetaMorph)/IEC 61499-1Control and MetaFrame (2000)15Open Architecture for Holonic Cooperation and Autonomy (OMCA)Defect # all (2000)16Adaptive Holonic Control Architecture (ADACON)2006Latitude metaFrame (2000)17Defects MetaFrame (ADACON)2006Latitude metaFrame (2000)18Materico (2005)2012Defects MetaFrame (2007)19International Teleconsmutication Lusion International System (2007)201221International Teleconsmutication Lusion Internation I	13	Adaptive Agent-based Architecture for Intelligent	1999	Maturana et al. (1999), IEC (2012)
14Holanic Component.Read Architecture (HDA)2000China McFardane (2000)Autorue Holanic Control Architecture (ADACOP)2000Pietcher et al. (2009)10Delgate Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)2008Vertratecter et al. (2009)11Delgate Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)2009Pipo et al. (2007)12Delgate Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)2009Pipo et al. (2007)13Parduet, Resource, Order and Simulation Isaanchic2009Pipo et al. (2007)24Smart Manufacturing Parloning (D-MAS)2012Davis et al. (2013)25Smart Manufacturing Parloning (D-FARM/IoT-I)2012Davis et al. (2013)26Smart Manufacturing Leadenbilly (D-FARM/IoT-I)2013Bauer et al. (2013)27Smart Manufacturing Leadenbilly (D-FARM/IoT-I)2013Holewert et al. (2013)28Smart Manufacturing Scheduling2014Gaso (D-I)29Smart Manufacturing Scheduling2014Monstori (2014)20Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPP8)2014Monstori (2014)29Goto IControl of Fredbild Manufacturing2015Ratoes et al. (2015)29Inducring Internet Consortium (ICI) Inducting2015Ratoes et al. (2015)20Inducring Internet Consortium (ICI) Inducting2015Ratoes et al. (2015)20Inducring Internet Consortium (ICI) Inducting2015Frenze et al. (2016)20Inducring Internet Consortium (ICI) Inducting2015Frenze et al. (2015)21Neutrical Internet Consortium (Manufacturing (MetaMorph)/IEC 61499-1		
15Open Architecture for Jackitecture (ADACOR)2000Heather at al. (2000)16Adaptive Holonic Control Architecture (ADACOR)2006Leifaio and Restriv (2006)17Delegate Multi-Sent System (O-ASA)2008Westratet et al. (2009)18Product, Resource, Order and Simulation Isoarchic2009Pilo et al. (2009)19International Telecommunication Unio Iof (TU-IoT)2012TU-F (2012)20Sarart Mundicaturing Loadenhip Coalition (SMLC)2013Burst et al. (2013)21International Telecommunication (SIRPER)2013Muttellec et al. (2013)22Sarart Mundicaturing Edenthip Coalition (SMLC)2013Muttellec et al. (2013)23Virtue Fort Kone (VFK)2013Muttellec et al. (2013)24Gaso IoT2014Gaso Systems (2014)25Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPFS)2014Pach et al. (2015)26Op-ranite Architecture for an Optimised and Rescive2014Pach et al. (2015)27SCSC2015Lee et al. (2015)28AbACOG ² 2015Larar et al. (2015)29Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing2015Harboa et al. (2015)20Industrial Internet Consortium (ICI) Industrial Internet2015Harboa et al. (2015)29Industrial Mundicaturing Edenthic2015Harboa et al. (2015)20Industrial Mundicaturing Edenthic2015Harboa et al. (2015)20Industrial Mundicaturing Edenthic2016Harboa et al. (2015) <td>14</td> <td>Holonic Component-Based Architecture (HCBA)</td> <td>2000</td> <td>Chirn and McFarlane (2000)</td>	14	Holonic Component-Based Architecture (HCBA)	2000	Chirn and McFarlane (2000)
Autonew (AMEA)16Adaptive House Control Achitecture (ADACON)2006Leitio and Restriv (2006)17Delgate Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)2009Verture et al. (2009)18Product, Resource, Order and Sinuliation Isoarchie2009Pioje et al. (2007)20International Telecommunication Union for (TU-JoT)2012TU-T (2012)20Sumart Manufacturing Deladership Coalition (SMLC)2012Bauer et al. (2013)21International Telecommunication UNIAN2013Mortellec et al. (2013)22Sinard Manufacturing Platform2013Mortellec et al. (2013)23Virtual Port Konx (VFK)2014Caceo Systems (2014)24Sinard Manufacturing Stems (CDFS)2014Caceo Systems (2014)25Caceo LorCareo Systems (CDFS)2014Caceo Systems (2014)26Opamini Architecture Stems (CDFS)2015Learen et al. (2015)27FGC2015Learen et al. (2015)28ADACON ² 2015Learen et al. (2015)29Future Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet2015Learen et al. (2015)20Vertical Integration Architecture (IRA)2015Perture at al. (2015)21Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Perture at al. (2015)23Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Perture at al. (2015)24Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Perture at al. (2015)25Careo Architecture (IRA)2015Ferent at al. (2015)	15	Open Architecture for Holonic Cooperation and	2000	Fletcher et al. (2000)
16Adaptive Holonic Control Architecture (JAOAOR)2006Leife and Restrive (2006)17Delegate Multi, Segen System (VAAS)2009Vestratet et al. (2009)18Product, Resource, Order and Simulation Isoarchic2009Pio'et al. (2009)19International Telecommunication Union for (TU-iof)2012TU-T (2012)20Sharar Manufacturing Jedenboly Collinon (SALC)2012Davis et al. (2013)21International Telecommunication Union for (TU-iof)2013Murriher et al. (2013)22Sharar Manufacturing Jedenboly Collinon (SALC)2013Murriher et al. (2013)23Unior Telecommunication Union System (CPRS)2014Conce Systems (CORI)24Offson For2014Conce Systems (CORI)25Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPRS)2014Conce Systems (CORI)26Opymain Architecture for an Optimised and Restrive2015Leat al. (2015)27SC205Leat al. (2015)201428Optimised Start Start2015Leat al. (2015)29Partice Iternet Technologies for Manufacturing2015Leat al. (2015)29Industrial Internet Consortium (ICI) Industrial Internet2015Productial (2015)30Marcial Architecture (IRA)2015Productial (2015)31Saart Manufacturing Revorker (SMN)2015Productial (2015)32Vertral Internet Consortium (ICI) Industrial Internet2015Productial (2015)33Marcial Architecture (IRA)2016Heinet al.		Autonomy (OAHCA)		
17 Delegate Multi-Agent System (D-MAS) 2008 Vertraiter et al. (2009) 18 Product, Resource, Order and Simulation Isoarchic 2009 Pujo et al. (2009) 20 International Telecommunication Union IoT (UT-VoT) 2012 Duits et al. (2012) 20 Smart Manufacturing Fladership Coalition (SMLC) 2013 Rater et al. (2013) 21 IoT Archinecturing Fladership Coalition (SMLC) 2013 Morellec et al. (2013) 22 Surveillance Active Ferroviarie (SRPER) 2013 Morellec et al. (2013) 23 Virtual Fort Kaos (VFN) 2013 Morellec et al. (2013) 24 Classo IoT Classo IoT Classo IoT 25 Classo IoT Classo IoT Classo IoT 26 Option-IoT Archinecture for an Optimised and Reactive 2014 Pach et al. (2015) 27 SC 2015 Lezaro et al. (2015) 28 ALACOR ⁱ 2015 Lezaro et al. (2015) 29 Patture Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Papazofou et al. (2015) 201 Industrial Internet Consortium (ICI) Industrial Internet 2015 Papazofou et al. (2015) 201 National Institute of Stana Kordies (KPA KS) 2016 Industrial Internet Consortium (2015) 202 Verial Integrati	16	Adaptive Holonic Control Architecture (ADACOR)	2006	Leitão and Restivo (2006)
18 Product, Resource, Order and Simulation Ionen/cic 2009 Piot al. (2009) 19 International Telecommunication Union IoT (TU-IoT) 2012 TU-T (2012) 20 Smart Manufacturing Iaderbing Coalition (SMR) 2012 Davis et al. (2013) 21 IoT Architecturing Iaderbing Coalition (SMR) 2013 Montellec et al. (2013) 22 Surveillance Active Ferroviatre (SURPER) 2013 Holtevent et al. (2013) 23 Virtual Fort Koon (VPK) 2014 Caso Systems (2014) 24 Caso IoT 2014 Caso Systems (2014) 25 Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPPS) 2014 Monostori (2014) 26 Dynamic Architecture for an Optimised and Ractive (2015) Lac et al. (2015) Lace et al. (2015) 27 Sc 2015 Lac et al. (2015) Lace et al. (2015) 28 ADACOR ¹ 2015 Paramet (2015) Lace et al. (2015) 29 Future (Errorian) 2015 Paramet (2015) Lace et al. (2015) 31 Smart Manufacturing Henropic (ACMASF) 2015 Paramet (2015) 32 Vertical Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Indu	17	Delegate Multi-Agent System (D-MAS)	2008	Verstraete et al. (2008)
Structure (PROSIS) Unit elementation Union IoT (ITU-107) 2012 District (2012) 20 Smart Manufacturing Leadership Coalition (SMLC) 2012 Dataset al. (2012) 21 IoT Architecturing Platform Unit al. (2012) Dataset al. (2013) 21 IoT Architecturing Reference Model (IoT-ARM/IoT-A) 2013 Mortellec et al. (2013) 22 Starveillance Active Perovising (SIRPER) 2014 Mortellec et al. (2013) 23 Virtual Fort Knox (VFK) 2014 Mortellec et al. (2013) 24 Cisco IoT Dynamic Architecture (ISRPER) 2014 Mortellec et al. (2014) 25 Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPPS) 2014 Pachet al. (2014) 26 Dynamic Architecture (IRR Reactive Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPPS) 2015 Barboa et al. (2015) 27 SC SC 2015 Barboa et al. (2015) 28 ADACOR ¹ 2015 Patrice al. (2015) 29 Reference Architecture (IRIA) 2015 Patrice al. (2015) 21 Maxtrial Internet Consortium (ICI) Industrial Internet Consortium (ICI) Industrial Internet Consortium (ICI) Industrial I	18	Product, Resource, Order and Simulation Isoarchic	2009	Pujo et al. (2009)
19 International Telecommunication Union for (ITU-JoT) 2012 PUT (2012) 20 Smart Manufacturing Leadership Coalition (SMLC) 2012 Davis et al. (2013) 21 Iof Architectural Reference Model (lof-ARM /IbT-A) 2013 Biner et al. (2013) 22 Surveillance Active Ferroviair's (SNRER) 2013 Hoirevert et al. (2013) 23 Virtual For Koox (VR) 2014 Koos Systems (2014) 24 Caseo for 2014 Moneticity (2014) 25 Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPPS) 2014 Moneticity (2014) 26 Dynamic Architecture for an Optimised and Reactive 2015 Lace et al. (2015) 27 SC 2015 Lace et al. (2015) 28 ADACOR* 2015 Lace et al. (2015) 29 Bachora et al. (2015) Earner et al. (2015) 201 Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet 2015 Industrial Internet Consortium (2015) 31 Smart Manufacturing Networks (SNN) 2015 Freze et al. (2015) 32 Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA) 2015 Freze et al. (2015) 33 WO20 IoT 2015 Freze et al. (2015) 34 Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference 2016 It an diardity Colich		Structure (PROSIS)		
20 Smart Manufacturing Leadership Cosition (SML2) 2012 Data's et al. (2012) 1 107 Architectural Reference Model (Gr-ARM / IoT-A) 2013 Morelide et al. (2013) 21 107 Architectural Reference Model (Gr-ARM / IoT-A) 2013 Morelide et al. (2013) 22 Surveillance Active Ferrovisine' (SURPEN) 2013 Morelide et al. (2013) 23 Virtual Fort Koox (VFK) 2014 Monestori (2014) 24 Case of T 2014 Relotive et al. (2014) 25 Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPPS) 2014 Pach et al. (2014) 26 Dynamic Architecture (For Anguites Scheduling (ORCA-PMS) 2015 Earlow et al. (2015) 27 SC SC 2015 Barboas et al. (2015) 28 Puture Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Barboas et al. (2015) 29 Ruture Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Perce al. (2015) 31 Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN) 2015 Perce al. (2015) 32 Vertical Integration Architecture (IVA) 2015 Perce al. (2015) 33 WSO2 loT 2015 Perce al. (2015) 34 Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference 2016 Intuational Callosis 35 Hodorit Hybrid Control Mo	19	International Telecommunication Union IoT (ITU-IoT)	2012	ITU-T (2012)
101 Architectural Reference Model (lof-ARM / IoT-A) 2013 Bauer et al. (2013) 22 "surveillance Active Ferrovisir" (SURPER) 2013 Holewert et al. (2013) 23 Virnual For Koox (VFK) 2014 Closo Systems (2014) 24 Closo IoT 2014 Monsoliti (2014) 25 Oyber-Physical Production Systems (CPFS) 2014 Monsoliti (2014) 26 Oyamic Architecture for an Optimised and Reactive 2014 Monsoliti (2014) 26 Control of Fenzible Manufacturing Scheduling User al. (2015) Scheduling 27 SC Control of Fenzible Manufacturing 2015 Lazzor et al. (2015) 28 Puture Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet Janson et al. (2015) Janson et al. (2015) 29 Funture Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet Papazogiou et al. (2015) Janson et al. (2015) 30 Mintorpocentric (SMN) 2015 Papazogiou et al. (2015) 31 Mantopocentric (SMN) 2016 Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) 32 Virola Integration Architecture (IRA) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Inte	20	Smart Manufacturing Leadership Coalition (SMLC)	2012	Davis et al. (2012)
21 101 Arcmitectura Reference Model (101-ArcM / 101-M) 2013 Mattelle et al. (2013) 22 Surveillance Active Ferrovisine" (SURPER) 2013 Motibile et al. (2013) 23 Virtual Fort Knox (VFK) 2014 Caso 107 24 Cisco 107 2014 Caso 2014 25 Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPPS) 2014 Monostori (2014) 26 Dynamic Architecture for an Optimized and Reactive Control of Flexible Manufacturing Scheduling (ORCA-PMS) 2015 Babos et al. (2015) 27 SC 2015 Babos et al. (2015) Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet 2015 Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 28 ADACOR ¹ 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 2015 29 Puture Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Industrial Internet Consortium (2015) 210 Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 31 Samet Manufacturing Oxel (ACPA4SF) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Initiative (VIA) 32 Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)	01	Smart Manufacturing Platform	0010	
22 Surveining Active Perrovaire (SUPER) 2013 Material et al. (2014) 23 Virtual Focko (VFK) 2014 Cisco Systems (2014) 24 Cisco Ior 2014 Montolic (2014) 25 Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPFS) 2014 Montol (2014) 26 Dynamic Architecture for an Optimised and Reactive 2014 Pach et al. (2015) 27 SC 2015 Lace et al. (2015) 28 ADACOR ² 2015 Lace et al. (2015) 29 Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Lace et al. (2015) 10dustria Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 20 Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 21 Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 21 Industrial Anchitecture (IRA) 2016 Pirou et al. (2016) 22 Vertical Integration Architecture (IVA) 2016 Industrial Quite(Chain Initiative (2016) 23 WS02 IoT 2016 Industrial Quite(Chain Initiative (2016) 24 Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference 2016 Industrial Quite(Chain Initiative (2016) 25 CJ Architecture (INKA) 2	21	IoT Architectural Reference Model (IoT-ARM / IoT-A)	2013	Bauer et al. (2013)
23Vitable Polity Nubber (VRV)2013Industried et al. (2013)24Cisco IOTCisco IOT2014Cisco IOA25Cyber-Physical Production Systems (CPPS)2014Pach et al. (2014)26Dynamic Architecture for an Optimised and Reactive2014Pach et al. (2014)27SC2015Barbosa et al. (2015)28ADACOR ¹ 2015Barbosa et al. (2015)29Puture Internet Technologies for Manufacturing2015Barbosa et al. (2015)29Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet2015Papazoglou et al. (2015)30Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet2015Papazoglou et al. (2015)31Snart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Peres et al. (2015)32Vertical Integration Architecture (IVA)2015Peres et al. (2015)33WSO2 IoT2015Prive et al. (2016)34Anthroporentic Cyber-Physical Reference2016Indriago et al. (2016)35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing2016Indriago et al. (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CAN)2016Indriago et al. (2016)37Industrial Value Chain Inference Architecture (IVRA)2016Indriago et al. (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Inference Architecture (IVRA)2016Indriago et al. (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Indriago et al. (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) <t< td=""><td>22</td><td>Surveillance Active Ferroviaire (SURFER)</td><td>2013</td><td>Mortellec et al. (2013)</td></t<>	22	Surveillance Active Ferroviaire (SURFER)	2013	Mortellec et al. (2013)
25 Chorn Physical Production Systems (CPPS) 2014 Chord Systems (CP) 26 Dynamic Architecture for an Optimised and Reactive 2014 Pach et al. (2014) 27 SC 2015 Lacon Systems (CP) 28 ADACOR ⁵ 2015 Lacon System (CD) 28 ADACOR ⁵ 2015 Lacon Status 29 Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Lazon et al. (2015) 30 Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet 2015 Patzero et al. (2015) 31 Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN) 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 32 Vertical Integration Architecture (IIA) 2015 Pressect al. (2015) 33 WSO2 IoT 2016 Pitrue et al. (2016) 34 Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference 2016 Industrial Internet Consortium (2016) 35 CPS Architecture for INTEGEN AMARIACTING 2016 Industrial Value Chain Individue (2016) 36 Holonic Hybrid Control Model (If*CM) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Individue (2016) 36 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Individue (2016) 37 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVR	23	VITUAL FOIT KNOX (VFK)	2013	Holtewert et al. (2013)
25 Operating Architecture for an Optimised and Reactive Control of Flexible Manufacturing Scheduling (ORCA-FMS) 2015 Lee et al. (2014) 27 SC 2015 Lee et al. (2015) 28 ADACOR ¹ 2015 Leave t al. (2015) 29 Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing Industries (FTMAN) 2015 Leave t al. (2015) 30 Industries (FTMAN) 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 31 Snart Manufacturing Networks (SMN) 2015 Presented (2015) 32 Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA) 2015 Presented (2015) 33 WSO2 lof 2016 Privu et al. (2016) 34 Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing 2016 Liu and Jiang (2016) 35 CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing 2016 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (VRA) 36 Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016) 37 Industrial Data Space (DS) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016) 38 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (VRA) 2016 Initiative (2016) 39 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 2016 Initiative (2016) 30 National Institute of Stan	24	Cuber Divided Production Systems (CDDS)	2014	Monostori (2014)
20Dyname if matched with Native (1997)DescriptionControl of Flexible Manufacturing Scheduling (DRCA-FMS)2015Lee et al. (2015)23DACOR2015Barbosa et al. (2015)24ADACOR2015Lazaro et al. (2015)25Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing Industrie (ITTMAN)2015Papazoglou et al. (2015)30Industria (Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet Reference Architecture (IRA)2015Papazoglou et al. (2015)31Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Perez et al. (2015)32Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Perez et al. (2016)33WSO2 IoT2016Pirvu et al. (2016)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference Architecture for Smart Factories (ACFA4SF)2016Industrial Nate (2016)35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing to 20162016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H*CM)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lut et al. (2016)34Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Lut et al. (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lut et al. (2016)30National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lut et al. (2016)41Optr	25	Dynamic Architecture for an Ontimised and Reactive	2014	Pach et al. (2014)
275C2015Lee et al. (2015)28ADACOR22015Lazzo et al. (2015)29Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet Reference Architecture (IIRA)2015Lazzo et al. (2015)30Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet Reference Architecture (IIRA)2015Papzoglou et al. (2015)31Snart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Perce et al. (2015)32Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Percenantle (2015)33WSO2 IoT2015Premantle (2015)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference Architecture for Smart Factories (ACPA4SF)2016Liu and Jiang (2016)35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing Tarchitecture for Manufacturing Strice (Data Data Space (DS))2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2015)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016)40NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing Soytem Surfacture (NIST SOA)2016Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016)41Phatiform Industrie 4.0°2016Jimenze et al. (2017)Liu et al. (2016)42Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (NISA)2017Varga et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic	20	Control of Flexible Manufacturing Scheduling (ORCA-FMS)	2014	
28ADACOR ² 2015Barboss et al. (2015)29Industries (PTIMAN)Lazzor et al. (2015)30Industries (PTIMAN)2015Industrial Internet Consortium (101) Industrial Internet31Industrial Internet Consortium (101) Industrial Internet2015Perescental Consortium (2015)31Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Pérez et al. (2015)32Vertical Intergration Architecture (VIA)2015Pérez et al. (2015)33MSO2 IoT2016Pirou et al. (2016)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference2016Pirou et al. (2016)35Holonic Hybrid Control Model (HCMA)2016Indrago et al. (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (HCMA)2016Industrial National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)37Industrial Data Space (IDS)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Industrial Collob)41Phatform Industrie 4.072016Industria Internet et al. (2017)42Service-oriented Holoni Architecture (POLLUX)2016Internet et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holoni Architecture (NISA)2017Varga et al. (2017)44Arrowhed Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System (NIST)2016Junernet et al. (2017)46Service-oriented Hol	27	5C	2015	Lee et al. (2015)
29 Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing 2015 Lazaro et al. (2015) 30 Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet Reference Architecture (IIRA) 2015 Industrial Internet Consortium (2015) 31 Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN) 2015 Papazoglou et al. (2015) 32 Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA) 2015 Preazet al. (2015) 33 WS0 JoT 2015 Fremandic (2015) 34 Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference Architecture for Smart Factories (ACPA4SF) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Editering 35 CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing 2016 Industrial (2016) 36 Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Infitiative (2016) 38 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Infitiative (2016) 39 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 2016 Lu et al. (2016a) 39 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 2016 Junee et al. (2017) 41 Platform Industrie 4.0° 2016 Junee et al. (2016a) 42 Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (PULLUX) 2016 Junee et al. (2017) 43 Gervice-oriented Holonic Annufacturing System (SoHMS) 2017 Var	28	ADACOR ²	2015	Barbosa et al. (2015)
Industrie (FITMAN)Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial InternetSet industrial Internet Consortium (2015)30Industrial Internet Consortium (2015)Industrial Internet Consortium (2015)31Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Pérez et al. (2015)32Verical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Pérez et al. (2015)33WSO2 IoT2015Pérez et al. (2015)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference2016Pirvu et al. (2016)36Holionic Hybrid Control Model (H*CM)2016Indiago et al. (2016)37Industrial Data Space (IDS)2016Indiago et al. (2016)38Industrial Data Space (IDS)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016)30Natificture (NIST SOA)2016Lu et al. (2016)41Platform Industrie 4.0°2016Jienez et al. (2017)42Platform Industrie 4.0°2016Jienez et al. (2017)43Service-Oriented Holonic Manufacturing System2016Jienez et al. (2017)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kasser et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical System (NIST)2018Almadie tal. (2016)47Reference Architecture (Modal Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017Kasser et al.	29	Future Internet Technologies for Manufacturing	2015	Lazaro et al. (2015)
30Industrial Internet Consortium (IC) Industrial Internet2015Industrial Internet Consortium (2015)31Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Perce et al. (2015)32Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2016Perce et al. (2015)33WSO2 IoT2016Pirvu et al. (2016)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference2016Pirvu et al. (2016)35CPS Architecture for Smart Factoris (CPA4SF)1016Indriago et al. (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM)2016Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)39Industrial Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Industrial Value Chain Institute (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016)39NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing2016Industrial Value Chain Institute (2016)30Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016)41'Istorm Industrie 4.0°2016Industrial Value Chain Efference42Daynice Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX)2016Jencere Architecture (IST SOA)43Service-Oriented Holonic Manufacturing System2016Jencere Architecture (IST SOA)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System (SIST2017Varga et al. (2017)46Service-Oriented Jonies Manufacturing (STAM)2017Kessner et al. (2017)		Industries (FITMAN)		
Reference Architecture (IIRA)Reference Architecture (IIRA)31Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Papazoglou et al. (2015)32Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Premantle (2015)33MSO2 IoT2016Pirvu et al. (2016)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference2016Liu and Jiang (2016)35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing2016Indiariag et al. (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H*CM)2016Indiariag et al. (2016)37Industrial Valae Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Valae Chain Initiative (2016)38Industrial Valae Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Lu et al. (2016)39National Institure of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016)40NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing2016Lu et al. (2016)41Plattorm Industrie 40°2016Jimenez et al. (2017)43Service-Oriented Holonic Manufacturing System2017Varga et al. (2017)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System S(NIST)2017Varga et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST)2017Kasner et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture for Manufacturing (STAM)2017Kasner et al. (2017)48Sututgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (30	Industrial Internet Consortium (IIC) Industrial Internet	2015	Industrial Internet Consortium (2015)
31Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)2015Papazoglou et al. (2015)32Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Pricez et al. (2015)33WS02 IoT2016Pricez et al. (2015)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference2016Pirue et al. (2016)35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing2016Indriago et al. (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H*CM)2016Indriago et al. (2016)37Industrial Data Space (IDS)2016Otto et al. (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016a)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)41Plattform Industrie 4.0°2016Jimence et al. (2017)42Pynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (IVEA)2016Jimence et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System2016Jimence et al. (2017)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (INSA)2017Varga et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST2017Griffor et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017Kassner et al. (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2018Almadi et al. (2018)50		Reference Architecture (IIRA)		
32Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)2015Pérez et al. (2015)33WSO2 IoT2016Fremantle (2015)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference2016Pirvu et al. (2016)35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing2016Indirago et al. (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)37Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Lu et al. (2016a)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)30National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)31Staritecture (IVRA)2016Lu et al. (2016b)33Architecture (INST SOA)2016Jimenez et al. (2017)34Optimer (NIST SoA)2016Jimenez et al. (2017)35Staritecture (INST SoA)2017Varga et al. (2017)36Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Varga et al. (2017)37Infligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Varga et al. (2017)36Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Varga et al. (2017)37Infligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Varga et al. (2017)38Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Kasner et al. (2018)39S	31	Smart Manufacturing Networks (SMN)	2015	Papazoglou et al. (2015)
33WS02 loT2015Fremantle (2015)34Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference2016Pirvu et al. (2016)35CPS Architecture for Smart Factories (ACPA4SF)2016Liu and Jiang (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM)2016Indriago et al. (2016)37Industrial Data Space (IDS)2016Otto et al. (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Lu et al. (2016a)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)40NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing2016Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016)41'Platform Industrie 4.0'2016Pederal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016)42Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX)2016Quintanilla et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System2017Varga et al. (2017)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System NichT2017Kesser et al. (2017)46Suttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (STAM)2017Kesser et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture for Manufacturing (STAM)2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiange (2018)51Activity Resou	32	Vertical Integration Architecture (VIA)	2015	Pérez et al. (2015)
34 Anthropocentric Cyber-Physical Reference 2016 Pirvu et al. (2016) Architecture for Smart Factories (ACPASF) 35 CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing 2016 Indirago et al. (2016) 36 Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM) 2016 Indirago et al. (2016) 37 Industrial Data Space (IDS) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA) 2016 Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016) 38 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA) 2016 Lu et al. (2016a) 39 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 2016 Lu et al. (2016b) 34 Matring Ecosystem (SME) 2016 Lu et al. (2016b) 40 NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing 2016 Lu et al. (2017b) 41 "Plattform Industrie 4.0" 2016 Jimenez et al. (2017) 42 Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX) 2016 Jimenez et al. (2017) 43 Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System 2017 Varga et al. (2017) 44 Arrowhead Framework 2017 Varga et al. (2017) 45 Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA) 2017 Wei et al. (2017) 46 NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST 2017 Keister et al. (2017)<	33	WSO2 IoT	2015	Fremantle (2015)
Architecture for Smart Pactories (ACPA4SF)35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing2016Liu and Jiang (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM)2016Otto et al. (2016)37Industrial Data Space (IDS)2016Otto et al. (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Lu et al. (2016a)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)40NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing Architecture (INST SOA)2016Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016)41'Plattform Industrie 4.0'2016Jimenez et al. (2017)201642Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX)2016Quintanilla et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System (SoHMS)2017Varga et al. (2017)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System NIST FCPS2017EC (2017)48Sutugart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Aliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) Ling Ling Ling Ling Ling Ling Ling Ling	34	Anthropocentric Cyber–Physical Reference	2016	Pirvu et al. (2016)
35CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing2016Liu and Jiang (2016)36Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM)2016Indrago et al. (2016)37Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Lu et al. (2016a)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)39Mational Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016b)40NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing Architecture (NIST SOA)2016Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (201641'Plattform Industrie 4.0'2016Jimenez et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System (SoHMS)2017Varga et al. (2017)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Wei et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST F-CPS)2017Kassner et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017Kassner et al. (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C Beireuce2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) 201852Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) High Level		Architecture for Smart Factories (ACPA4SF)		
36 Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM) 2016 Indirage et al. (2016) 37 Industrial Data Space (IDS) 2016 Otto et al. (2016) 38 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA) 2016 Lu et al. (2016a) 39 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 2016 Lu et al. (2016a) 39 Smart Manufacturing Ecosystem (SME) Lu et al. (2016b) 40 NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing 2016 Lu et al. (2017b) 41 "Plattform Industrie 4.0" 2016 Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016 42 Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX) 2016 Quintanilla et al. (2017) 43 Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System 2017 Varga et al. (2017) 44 Arrowhead Framework 2017 Varga et al. (2017) 45 Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA) 2017 Wei et al. (2017) 46 NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST 2017 Griffor et al. (2017) 47 Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0) 2017 Kassner et al. (2017) 48 Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (ST	35	CPS Architecture for Intelligent Manufacturing	2016	Liu and Jiang (2016)
37 Industrial Value Space (IDS) 2016 Otto et al. (2016) 38 Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA) 2016 Lu et al. (2016a) 39 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 2016 Lu et al. (2016b) 39 National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) 2016 Lu et al. (2016b) 40 NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing 2016 Lu et al. (2016b) Architecture (NIST SOA) 2016 Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016) 41 'Plattform Industrie 4.0' 2016 Quintanilla et al. (2017) 42 Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX) 2016 Quintanilla et al. (2017) 43 Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System 2017 Varga et al. (2017) 44 Arrowhead Framework 2017 Wei et al. (2017) 45 Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA) 2017 Wei et al. (2017) 46 NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST 2017 Griffor et al. (2017) 48 Stuttgart IT Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0) 2017 Kessner et al. (2017) 48 Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manuf	36	Holonic Hybrid Control Model (H ² CM)	2016	Indriago et al. (2016)
38Industrial Value Chain Reference Architecture (IVRA)2016Industrial Value Chain Initiative (2016)39National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)2016Lu et al. (2016a)39NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing Architecture (NIST SOA)2016Lu et al. (2016b)41'Plattform Industrie 4.0'2016Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016)42Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX)2016Jimenez et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System (SoHMS)2017Varga et al. (2017)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Wei et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST F-CPS)2017Kassner et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) High Level Architecture (ILA)2018Marques et al. (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	37	Industrial Data Space (IDS)	2016	Otto et al. (2016)
39 Natona Institute of standards and Technology (NBT) 2010 Lafe et al. (2010a) 40 NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing 2016 Lu et al. (2016b) 41 'Plattform Industrie 4.0' 2016 Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016) 42 Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX) 2016 Jimenez et al. (2017) 43 Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System 2016 Quintanilla et al. (2016) 44 Arrowhead Framework 2017 Varga et al. (2017) 45 Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA) 2017 Wei et al. (2017) 46 NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST 2017 Griffor et al. (2017) 47 Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0) 2017 IEC (2017) 48 Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM) 2018 Ahmadi et al. (2018) 50 8C 2018 Jiang (2018) 1 51 Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI) 2018 Valckenaers (2019) 52 Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) 2018 Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018) 54	30	National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST)	2016	Industrial value Chain Initiative (2016)
40NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing Architecture (NIST SOA)2016Lu et al. (2016b)41'Plattform Industrie 4.0'2016Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016)42Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX)2016Jimenez et al. (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System (SoHMS)2016Quintanilla et al. (2016)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Wei et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST F-CPS)2017Kei al. (2017)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kasner et al. (2018)508C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTT) High Level Architecture (HLA)2018ISO/TR (2018)54Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)	39	Smart Manufacturing Ecocystem (SME)	2010	Lu et al. (2010a)
Note of the office office of an instruction of the office office office office of the office offic	40	NIST Service-Oriented Smart Manufacturing	2016	L_{11} et al. (2016b)
 Hittinetter Industrie 4.0° Plattform Industrie 4.0° Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX) Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System Quintanilla et al. (2017) Quintanilla et al. (2016) (SoHMS) Hattenework Control Architecture (IISA) Varga et al. (2017) Varga et al. (2018) <	40	Architecture (NIST SOA)	2010	
121 Interfact in the line of	41	'Plattform Industrie 4 0'	2016	Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (2016)
12Dynamic (f) and control interfacture (f OLDOR)2016Output and (2017)43Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System2016Quintanilla et al. (2016)44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Wei et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST2017Griffor et al. (2017)46Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)47Reference Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)2018Manques et al. (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	42	Dynamic Hybrid Control Architecture (POLLUX)	2016	Jimenez et al. (2017)
Additional activity resource Toronic Information and potential of the Correspondence of Correspondence o	43	Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing System	2016	Quintanilla et al. (2016)
44Arrowhead Framework2017Varga et al. (2017)45Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Wei et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST F-CPS)2017Griffor et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) High Level Architecture (HLA)2018ISO/TR (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)		(SoHMS)		<i>f</i> , <i>(</i> , <i>)</i>
45Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)2017Wei et al. (2017)46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST F-CPS)2017Griffor et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) High Level Architecture (HLA)2018ISO/TR (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	44	Arrowhead Framework	2017	Varga et al. (2017)
46NIST Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems (NIST F-CPS)2017Griffor et al. (2017)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckanears (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) High Level Architecture (HLA)2018ISO/TR (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	45	Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture (IMSA)	2017	Wei et al. (2017)
F-CPS)47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI) High Level Architecture (HLA)2018ISO/TR (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	46	NIST Framework for Cyber–Physical Systems (NIST	2017	Griffor et al. (2017)
47Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)2017IEC (2017)48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)2018Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)		F-CPS)		
48Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)2017Kassner et al. (2017)493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)2018Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	47	Reference Architecture Model Industry 4.0 (RAMI 4.0)	2017	IEC (2017)
493C2018Ahmadi et al. (2018)508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)2018Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	48	Stuttgart IT Architecture for Manufacturing (SITAM)	2017	Kassner et al. (2017)
508C2018Jiang (2018)51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)2018Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	49	3C	2018	Ahmadi et al. (2018)
51Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)2018Valckenaers (2019)52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)2018Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	50	8C	2018	Jiang (2018)
52Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)2018Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018)High Level Architecture (HLA)53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	51	Activity Resource Type Instance Architecture (ARTI)	2018	Valckenaers (2019)
High Level Architecture (HLA)2018ISO/TR (2018)53Big Picture2018Marques et al. (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)	52	Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (AIOTI)	2018	Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation (2018)
53Big Picture2018ISO/TR (2018)54Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent2018Marques et al. (2018)		High Level Architecture (HLA)		
54 Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent 2018 Marques et al. (2018)	53	Big Picture	2018	ISO/TR (2018)
	54	Embedded Agent CPS Architecture (Embedded Agent	2018	Marques et al. (2018)

(continued on next page)

J. Kaiser et al.

Table 1 (contin	ued).		
No.	Model	Year	Publication
55	Integration of Informatisation and Industrialisation (iI&I)	2018	Li et al. (2018)
56	Internet of Things Reference Architecture (IoT RA)	2018	ISO/IEC (2018)
57	Blockchain enabled CPS Architecture (BCPS)	2019	Lee et al. (2019)
58	Digital Manufacturing on a Shoestring (Shoestring)	2019	McFarlane et al. (2020), Hawkridge et al. (2022)
59	Industrial Internet Integrated Reference Model (I3RM)	2019	Fraile et al. (2019)
60	Laboratory for Handling, Assembly and Pneumatics Smart Factory (LASFA)	2019	Resman et al. (2019)
61	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) Web of Things (WoT)	2019	Lagally et al. (2021)
62	Aligned Reference Architecture for Digital Factories (ARADF)	2020	Soares et al. (2020)
63	Cyber–Physical Architecture of Internet of Things (CPA IoT)	2020	Farsi et al. (2020)
64	High Level Architecture for the Factory Of the Future (HLA FOF)	2020	Havard et al. (2020)
65	Industry 4.0 Virtual Automation Bus Architecture (BaSys)	2020	Kuhn et al. (2020)
66	KSTEP	2020	Han (2020)
67	Manufacturing Blockchain of Things (MBCoT) Architecture	2020	Zhang et al. (2020)
68	Reference Architecture Model Edge Computing (RAMEC)	2020	Willner and Gowtham (2020)
69	Scandinavian Smart Industry Framework (SSIF)	2020	Han (2020)
70	Smart Manufacturing Standards Landscape (SM2)	2020	ISO/IEC (2020)
71	Zero Defects Manufacturing Platform (ZDMP)	2020	Nazarenko et al. (2020)
72	Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC) Factory+	2021	Coles et al. (2021)
73	Digital Twin as a Service (DTaaS) Architecture Reference Model	2021	Aheleroff et al. (2021)
74	IBM Industry 4.0 Reference Architecture (IBM I4.0)	2021	IBM (2021)
75	ISO-IEC Joint Working Group - Unified Reference Model for Smart Manufacturing (ISO-IEC JWG21)	2021	IEC (2022)
76	Q-Holonic-Based Architecture (QHAR)	2021	Macherki et al. (2021)
77	Reference Model for Smart Factories (RMSF)	2021	Soares et al. (2021)
78	National Bureau of Standards (NBS) Model	N/A	Doumeingts et al. (1995)

Holonic Manufacturing Systems (HMS). The holonic paradigm was introduced in the 1990–2010s to increase the resilience of manufacturing systems to rapid changes in their environment. Early adoptions to the manufacturing domain was performed by Christensen (1994). Based on this initial architecture, PROSA (Brussel et al., 1998) was developed, which specifies four types of holons for the different resources and roles that exist on the production line. Besides, two other reference architectures have been proposed: HCBA (Chirn and McFarlane, 2000) provides autonomous, modular and cooperative building blocks to enable a reconfigurable manufacturing system. ADACOR (Leitão and Restivo, 2006) relies on a supervisor holon to alternate between a centralised and a decentralised architecture, thus leading to rapid responses to unexpected disturbances.

Emerging digital technologies. For the last 25 years, a range of new technologies have been developed to support the design of manufacturing information systems, such as services (Papazoglou and Heuvel, 2007), digital twins (Tao et al., 2018) and software agents (Paolucci and Sacile, 2005). Most notably, services represent a key feature for numerous reference architectures that aim towards a horizontal integration. They facilitate the design of networked systems through a standardbased loosely coupled form of distributed computing. For example, IBM Industry 4.0 (IBM, 2021) leverages services to ease the integration with external applications.

Industry 4.0 and Smart Manufacturing. While the ISA-95 standard envisions a strict vertical integration of manufacturing and enterprise systems, two main paradigms, namely Smart Manufacturing (Davis et al., 2012; Li et al., 2018; Mittal et al., 2019) and Industry 4.0 (Roiko, 2017), aim to achieve a horizontal integration by developing decentralised connected information systems. Such systems enhance the flexibility and efficiency across the value chain (Davis et al., 2012; Mittal et al., 2019). RAMI 4.0 (IEC, 2017) supports the design of components through standards and the specification of lifecycle, technical

and organisational functions. It encapsulates assets, such as machines and products, into an administration shell, providing a standardised interface and data storage. NIST SME (Lu et al., 2016a) provides an overview of relevant standards for digital manufacturing systems. This model separates between business, production and product functions through devoted lifecycles. Both RAMI 4.0 and NIST SME are built upon ISA-95 and augment it with features for a horizontal integration, such as lifecycle models and decentralisation.

Internet of Things (IoT) and Cyber-physical Systems (CPS). Several approaches have focused on developing connected information systems: IoT deals with the integration of technologies with communication systems. Besides general IoT models, multiple reference architectures explicitly include the development of manufacturing systems. Above all, IIRA (Industrial Internet Consortium, 2015) is a standard-based open architecture that identifies four main concerns, namely business, usage, functional and implementation, to aid the development of IIoT applications. Conversely, CPS focus on the development of components for decentralised information systems. 5C (Lee et al., 2015) comprises five levels to characterise CPS components, including interfaces, analytics and self-configuration.

2.2. Industrial applications of reference architectures

Although numerous 'reference architectures' are proposed in the literature, reports of industrial applications are scarce. Gomez-Gasquet et al. (2010) derive requirements for the design of an agent-based production scheduling system based on the functional view of CIMOSA. Unver (2013) designs a solution based on ISA-95 that integrates the planning level with the shopfloor. This solution serves as a repository of operational and enterprise data. Swert et al. (2006) extend PROSA for the purpose of railroad control, while Barbosa et al. (2016)



Fig. 2. The various relations of reference architectures to different digital manufacturing paradigms. Manufacturing control includes both CIM and holonic reference architectures.

implement ADACOR using JADE and OPC UA for a small-scale production system. Kruger and Basson (2017) use Erlang to concretise PROSA for a holonic controller of a manufacturing cell. Martínez et al. (2020) adopt the IoT-ARM domain model for the virtualisation of autonomous underwater vehicles. Alexakos et al. (2019) develop a system architecture based on IIRA for a small-scale living lab for smart energy using open-source technologies. In an attempt to concretise RAMI 4.0, Grangel-Gonzalez et al. (2016) create a semantic map of the administration shell with a Resource Description Framework. Melo et al. (2021) propose a control device for Industry 4.0 applications that integrates the asset, integration and communication layer of RAMI 4.0 via OPC UA. Contreras et al. (2017) argue that for a complete Industry 4.0 application, additional strategies need to be combined with RAMI 4.0. The authors use OPC UA and AutomationML in combination with a holonic approach to develop a digital manufacturing system. Moreover, Ye and Hong (2018) also rely on OPC UA and AutomationML to derive a framework for manufacturing solutions based on RAMI 4.0. Finally, Hawkridge et al. (2021) and Kaiser et al. (2022a) demonstrate the application of the Shoestring reference architecture.

While these examples show that some reference architectures have been applied in practice, this on its own is not a suitable indicator for their applicability. That is, a reference architecture without any publications about its application can be as applicable as one with multiple scientific papers. We identify three potential explanations: first, some work may be confidential and thus not reported in the literature. Additionally, industrial applications are not described in scientific publications but in technical and commercial reports. Third, a set of reference architectures may not be properly aligned with actual industrial needs.

2.3. Classification and comparison approaches

There are a number of approaches suggested in the literature that are helpful in trying to classify digital manufacturing reference architectures: Monostori (2014) relates CPS to other digital manufacturing paradigms, such as digital factories and holonic manufacturing. Weyrich and Ebert (2016) categorise RAMI 4.0 and IIRA as IoT reference architectures, whereas Kassner et al. (2017) separate these two models by describing three distinct classes, abstract frameworks, cross-domain reference architectures, and concrete manufacturing IT architectures. Li et al. (2018) and Soares et al. (2021) developed similar classes for Smart Manufacturing reference architectures. Moghaddam et al. (2018) approach a consistent reference architecture that rationalises and envelopes the views of numerous models. Bader et al. (2019) select reference architectures based on the total number of searches through internet search engines. Finally, Kaiser et al. (2022b) classifies reference architectures based on common features sets.

Three main approaches for comparing and aligning reference architectures can be identified: the first approach selects a small subset of reference architectures and performs a feature analysis which is

followed by an alignment of functions and components (Pedone and Mezgár, 2018; Megow, 2020; Pivoto et al., 2021; Fraile et al., 2019; Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation, 2018; Moghaddam et al., 2018; Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, 2018; Nakagawa et al., 2021). The alignment is severely influenced by the reference architecture that is chosen as a baseline. That is, the set of candidate models for the comparison mainly describe similar levels and uses. The second approach introduces a feature map (Soares et al., 2020; Guth et al., 2018; Nakagawa et al., 2021), which is created based on commonalities among selected reference architectures. The third approach reduces reference architectures to their core dimensions (Han, 2020; Soares et al., 2020). These so called 'skeleton models' form the basis for the comparison. While the second and third approach are more general and thus allow for a larger subset of reference architectures to be compared, an in-depth analysis becomes increasingly difficult. To maximise the subset of reference architectures, this study applies qualitative evaluation measures.

Comparing and evaluating reference architectures is challenging because they address different levels and uses. Specifically, proposed models may relate to a different metamodelling level shown in Fig. 1(a) and might characterise system architectures or frameworks. Furthermore, many reference architectures are related to other models and provide templates for various applications, which yields a cumbersome separation and classification. Fig. 2 illustrates a set of reference architectures including their relationships to different digital manufacturing paradigms. While some reference architectures can be solely linked to one paradigm, others provide additional views and enable the developer to deal with different aspects of a digital manufacturing domain. For example, RAMI 4.0 issues the organisation of systems within an enterprise but also includes a functional view on connected devices.

2.4. Research gaps

There has been a lot of research on reference architectures, including their classification, comparison and analysis. However, there are a number of key limitations of the work to date, which we aim to address in this study: first, current approaches lack a clear distinction between reference architectures, system architectures, platforms and frameworks. Second, approaches reported in previous studies have not had sufficient detail to allow for the classification of reference architectures across multiple digital manufacturing domains. Further, there is a need for a general classification approach, which is capable of classifying a wide range of (heterogeneous) reference architectures. Finally, the shortage of industrial applications has not been addressed so far despite the large number of proposed models. The rationale behind this study is to provide a clear distinction between 'genuine' reference architectures and system architectures, frameworks and platforms. We further classify and analyse the applicability of the genuine reference architectures to help developers improve their applicability and practitioners to select one based on their needs.



Fig. 3. Axes for classifying reference architectures.

3. Methodology

This section outlines the methodology of this study. Specifically, we propose a frame of reference to allow for the classification of reference architectures, and introduce measures to compare them. To guide practitioners in selecting a reference architecture based on their needs, we further analyse their applicability for industrial use.

Concretely, the methodology consists of four steps:

- 1. Definition: define selection criteria to separate reference architectures from system architectures, platforms and frameworks
- 2. Classification: classify reference architectures using a general frame of reference independent from a particular model
- 3. Validation: validate the classification by comparing reference architectures that belong to the same category
- 4. Analysis: analyse the applicability of reference architectures

Each of the individual steps of the proposed methodology are now outlined.

3.1. Definition of selection criteria

As indicated earlier, not every model that is termed 'reference architecture' meets the characteristics of a reference architecture. Here, we apply the definitions and characteristics of reference architectures, system architectures, platforms and frameworks stated in Section 1.2 to filter the list of proposed models for manufacturing information systems. We classify each proposed model in terms of a set of options each with its own characteristics. Models which do not meet all characteristics of any option will be rejected and are not considered for further investigation.

3.2. Classification frame of reference

A first guidance for adopting an appropriate reference architecture is provided through a frame of reference, which helps to classify digital manufacturing reference architectures. This classification frame, which is illustrated in Fig. 3, consists of four axes, each representing an indicator for applicability. A *class* of reference architectures is a 4D tuple containing one tick label of each axis. A *category* of reference architectures combines multiple classes. We argue that classes remain mutually exclusive and unweighted to simplify the selection process for practitioners. Therefore, based on the chosen axes, there are 36 different classes. Only the topmost view depicting the main features of a *reference architecture is considered for the classification*. Some standardised reference architectures also include additional models, which, for instance, represent the data flow among components. However, these additional models are not always provided and can thus not be compared across reference architectures. In the following, the classification axes are described in detail.

Level of Abstraction. The level of abstraction axis is based on the metamodelling approach and subdivides reference architectures into three distinct classes: *concrete* reference architectures entail detailed design and implementation guidelines, which innately yield standards recommendations. While *constrained* reference architectures prescribe standards, design instructions or certain system characteristics, *abstract* ones are neither limited by standards nor design and implementation rules.

Level of Integration. The level of integration helps to identify the application area of reference architectures. There are two main levels of integration, *operation* and *enterprise*. For the former, reference architectures concentrate on the integration at an operation level for the design of manufacturing information systems. For the latter, the focus lies on the integration of enterprise functions and processes.

Architecture Topology. The architecture topology groups reference architectures subject to their respective system design process. It is based on the design methodologies for engineering systems (Moses, 2010), namely top-down structured, layered and network-based. While a top-down approach is inherently ill-suited for a reference architecture due to its inflexibility, a network-based reference architecture yields a system that consists of a decentralised network of connected components. Conversely, a layered-based reference architecture describes a hierarchical design process where elements of a layer can be seen as part of group and parents can readily change, thus leading to more development paths from top to bottom. If a reference architecture combines both topologies, only the key features are considered for the classification. For example, ADACOR can form both hierarchical (layered) and heterarchical (network) structures, but, essentially, its key feature are interconnected holons enabling the formation of these structures. Therefore, ADACOR would be classified as network-based.

Level of Acceptance. The level of acceptance characterises the maturity of reference architectures. A given reference architecture has been *accepted* for a conference or for publication in an academic journal, *adopted* by developers or practitioners to design and implement digital manufacturing systems, or *standardised* by means of an official standard document.

Reference architectures can only be analysed relatively. However, not all classes can be compared to one another. While the architecture topology and the level of integration and abstraction address inherently different features, the key elements of a reference architecture do not change with increasing maturity. Hence, the classes of standardised, adopted and accepted reference architectures can be merged to a category. To validate the proposed classification, the reference architectures of these resulting categories are compared.

3.3. Validation measures

To validate the classification, we compare reference architectures within the same category. Multiple classes are merged into categories to increase the set of reference architectures that can be compared. However, practitioners should rely on the classes when selecting a reference architecture to meet their requirements more accurately. Two general validation measures are defined which are applicable to all reference architectures:

- Meta conformity: the extent to which the meta abstractions of all reference architectures of a given category are similar in terms of their type of organisation and design concepts
- (2) Feature overlap: the degree to which the characteristics of reference architectures within a given category address overlapping features of digital manufacturing systems

Relying on one of the three comparison and alignment approaches presented in Section 2.3 is not feasible in this study. A detailed feature mapping and an alignment of functions are out of scope for the extensive list of models considered in this study. Furthermore, skeleton models can only be developed for layered-based reference architectures because the network-based ones neither have dimensions nor views.

3.4. Analysing the applicability of reference architectures

For a better understanding of reference architectures and how practitioners and developers can select one based on their needs, we compare the applicability of reference architectures in this study. The *applicability of a reference architecture* refers to *the capability of the reference architecture to be adopted and applied in practice.* One interpretation of the applicability is the overall number of design decisions that need to be made. We define four criteria that indicate the applicability of a reference architecture:

- (1) *Range of development pathways*: indicating how straightforward the design process is when using a reference architecture
- (2) *Size of application area*: describing how broadly a reference architecture can be applied
- (3) Availability of standards and implementation guides: outlining whether a reference architecture includes standards and implementation guides
- (4) *Provision of submodels*: defining whether a reference architecture proposes additional submodels models that prescribe certain system features (e.g. representation of the data flow between systems) or behavioural characteristics

For example, a reference architecture has a large range of development pathways if few design guidelines are provided and many design decisions are required to fully describe a system. The inclusion of standards, design guidelines, submodels, or the prescription of certain behavioural characteristics of systems increase the applicability of a reference architecture, since the design is more prescribed and less decisions have to be made by the developer. We differentiate between structural and process standards. Guidelines are essentially process standards. Conversely, a high abstraction tends to increase the area of application. The applicability of reference architectures is maximised for a small range of development pathways and a large area of application in combination with standards, design guidelines and submodels.

4. Results

A wide range of models that are commonly termed 'reference architectures' has been reviewed in this study. We provided a distinction between genuine reference architectures and system architectures, frameworks and platforms by outlining their key characteristics. Out of 78 model proposals 36 'genuine' reference architectures are identified,

Computare	in	Inductor	110	(2022)	102023
Computers	ın	inaustrv	149	(2023)	103923

Table 2

System	Frameworks	Platforms
architectures		
CPA IoT (Farsi	3C (Ahmadi	FITMAN (Lazaro
et al., 2020)	et al., 2018)	et al., 2015)
Embedded Agent	Meta-Morph	IDS (Otto et al.,
CPSA (Marques	(Maturana et al.,	2016)
et al., 2018)	1999; IEC, 2012)	
HLA FOF	Factory+(Coles	NIST F-CPS
(Havard et al.,	et al., 2021)	(Griffor et al.,
2020)		2017)
BaSys (Kuhn	ACPA4SF (Pirvu	'Plattform
et al., 2020)	et al., 2016)	Industrie 4.0'
		(Federal Ministry
		for Economic
		Affairs and
		Energy, 2016)
MBCoT (Zhang	Arrowhead	SMLC (Davis
et al., 2020)	Framework	et al., 2012)
	(Varga et al.,	
	2017)	
MMCS (Moss,	D-MAS	SMN
1989)	(Verstraete	(Papazoglou
	et al., 2008)	et al., 2015)
POLLUX	ORCA-FMS	VFK (Holtewert
(Jimenez et al.,	(Pach et al.,	et al., 2013)
2017)	2014)	
SURFER	GIM (Vallespir	ZDMP
(Mortellec et al.,	et al., 1992)	(Nazarenko
2013)		et al., 2020)
VIA (Pérez	GRAI (Chen and	
et al., 2015)	Doumeingts,	
	1996)	
	H ² CM (Indriago	
	et al., 2016)	
	IoT ARM (Bauer	
	et al., 2013)	
	LASFA (Resman	
	et al., 2019)	
	OAHCA (Fletcher	
	et al., 2000)	
	PROCOS (Moss,	
	1989)	
	PROSIS (Pujo	
	et al., 2009)	
	SoHMS	
	(Quintanilla	
	et al., 2016)	
	SITAM (Kassner	
	ot al 2017)	

and classified using a frame of reference independent from a particular model or digital manufacturing domain. The resulting classes are valid since the reference architectures they contain are similar in terms of their features and meta abstractions. Analysing the applicability of reference architectures within those classes reveals that reference architectures which include detailed design guidelines and standards require the least effort when being adopted by developers.

4.1. Selection of reference architectures

Before conducting the classification, the list of models proposed in the literature that are labelled 'reference architectures' is filtered. Table 2 shows a list of those models that are not reference architectures but in fact are system architectures, frameworks and platforms. In Table 3 the remaining models which are genuinely reference architectures according to the definitions in Section 1.2 are further classified using Fig. 3. Since for a handful of models publications are not available, these models do not satisfy all criteria of a reference architecture and are therefore not considered for further study.

Table 3

Classification of reference architectures and the resulting ten categories (A-J).

	Network-based		Layered-based		
	Operation	Enterprise	Operation	Enterprise	
	ARTI (Valckenaers, 2019) PROSA (Brussel et al., 1998) QHAR (Macherki et al., 2021)	-	5C (Lee et al., 2015) BCPS (Lee et al., 2019) Cisco IoT (Cisco Systems, 2014)	8C (Jiang, 2018) ARADF (Soares et al., 2020) CIMOSA (Kosanke, 1995)	
41			CPS-A IM (Liu and Jiang, 2016)	DTaaS (Aheleroff et al., 2021)	
Abstract			Layered-basedOperationEnterprise5C (Lee et al., 2015)8C (Jiang, 2018)BCPS (Lee et al., 2019)ARADF (Soares et al., 2020)Cisco IoT (Cisco Systems, 2014)CPS-A IM (Liu and Jiang, 2016)2016)DTaaS (Aheleroff et al., 2022016)IVRA (Industrial Value Chai Initiative, 2016)IRA (Li et al., 2018)RMSF (Soares et al., 2021)SLA (Chen and Tseng, 1997)EAIOTI HLA (Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation, 2018)IIRA (Industrial Internet Consortium, 2015)IOT RA (ISO/IEC, 2018)IRKA (Industrial Internet Consortium, 2015)IoT RA (ISO/IEC, 2018)IMSA (Wei et al., 2017)RAMEC (Willner and Gowtham, 2020)IMSA (Wei et al., 2017)WSO2 IoT (Fremantle, 2015)KSTEP (Han, 2020)Shoestring (McFarlane et al., 2022)IBM Industry 4.0 (IBM, 202IRA/Thingsboard* (Alexakos et al., 2019)	IVRA (Industrial Value Chain Initiative, 2016) il&I (Li et al., 2018) RMSF (Soares et al., 2021)	
	А		E	Enterprise 8C (Jiang, 2018) ARADF (Soares et al., 2020) <i>CIMOSA</i> (Kosanke, 1995) DTaaS (Aheleroff et al., 2021) IVRA (Industrial Value Chain Initiative, 2016) it&I (Li et al., 2018) RMSF (Soares et al., 2021) SLA (Chen and Tseng, 1997) H Big Picture (ISO/TR, 2018) <i>IIRA</i> (Industrial Internet Consortium, 2015) I3RM (Fraile et al., 2019) IMSA (Wei et al., 2017) KSTEP (Han, 2020) SME (Lu et al., 2016a) PERA/ISA-95 (Williams, 1994) IEC, 2003) RAMI 4.0 (IEC, 2017) SM2 (ISO/IEC, 2020) I IBM Industry 4.0 (IBM, 2021) <i>IIRA/Thingsboard*</i> (Alexakos et al., 2019) J	
Abstract Constrained	ADACOR ² (Barbosa et al., 2015)	NIST SOA (Lu et al., 2016b)	AIOTI HLA (Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation, 2018)	Big Picture (ISO/TR, 2018)	
	ADACOR (Leitão and Restivo, 2006)		ITU-IoT (ITU-T, 2012)	<i>IIRA</i> (Industrial Internet Consortium, 2015)	
	HCBA (Chirn and McFarlane, 2000)		IoT RA (ISO/IEC, 2018)	I3RM (Fraile et al., 2019)	
Constrained			RAMEC (Willner and Gowtham, 2020)	IMSA (Wei et al., 2017)	
			WSO2 IoT (Fremantle, 2015)	KSTEP (Han, 2020) SME (Lu et al., 2016a) PERA/ISA-95 (Williams, 1994; IEC, 2003)	
				RAMI 4.0 (IEC, 2017)	
	В	D	F	I	
	WoT (Lagally et al., 2021)	-	Shoestring (McFarlane et al., 2020; Hawkridge et al., 2022)	IBM Industry 4.0 (IBM, 2021)	
Abstract Constrained	ADACOR/JADE* (Barbosa et al., 2016) PROSA/Erlang* (Kruger and Resear, 2017)			IIRA/Thingsboard* (Alexakos et al., 2019)	
	C		G	J	

Accepted

Adopted/concretised using a specific approach or technology* Standardised

4.2. Classification of reference architectures

Out of the 36 models identified as reference architectures, which are classified in Table 3, half of them concentrate on the integration of enterprise functions. These reference architectures are abstract, such as CIMOSA and IVRA, or constrained, including IIRA, RAMI 4.0 and ISA-95. They are generally layered-based rather than network-based. Such layered-based approaches enable a straightforward identification and specification of functions of digital manufacturing systems within the context of their enterprise. In contrast, layered-based reference architectures that focus on the integration at an operation level generally revolve around the concepts of CPS and IoT, specialising on the development of highly interoperable components. Examples include the abstract 5C reference architecture as well as the standardised IoT RA and ITU-IoT. Further, most network-based reference architecture deal with the integration at an operation level and are based on the holonic paradigm, such as PROSA, ADACOR and HCBA. While network-based reference architectures are constrained by certain system characteristics, layered-based ones merely contain standard specifications or characterise standards themselves. It is noteworthy to mention that only a fraction of reference architectures comprise detailed design and implementation guidelines. However, abstract and constrained approaches can be systematically concretised by combination with a particular technology, such as using Erlang for PROSA, which greatly reduces the effort of designing systems.

Over the years, several reference architectures have become predecessors or feature providers for subsequent models. As illustrated in Fig. 4, ISA-95, RAMI 4.0 and IIRA provide core elements for various subsequent reference architectures, while PROSA, ADACOR and the 5C reference architecture have evolved into proper predecessors. It is important to note that adding features or using a reference architecture as a basis for a new one does not yield different architecture topologies. Such pathways may only alter the level of abstraction and integration of a reference architecture.

4.3. Validation of the classification approach

To validate the classification, the reference architectures within the same category are compared and evaluated using the measures defined in Section 3.3. As mentioned above, we merge standardised, adopted and accepted reference architectures with the other classes, because the different features reference architectures possess do not change with increasing maturity. Since reference architectures can only be assessed relatively, the empty classes and those, which only contain a single reference architecture, cannot be validated. In the following, the reference architectures of the categories containing more than one reference architecture are evaluated.

A: Abstract—Network-based—Operation. All meta abstractions for the given reference architectures describe the same core characteristic, namely the holonic paradigm. ARTI generalises PROSA for non-manufacturing applications by replacing holons with activity types and instances, but ARTI resembles many features of its predecessor (Valckenaers, 2019). While PROSA and ARTI dedicate different holons to specific tasks, QHAR introduces the Q-Holon, a generic element capable of representing any entity or actor by configuring its attributes and operations. However, the Q-Holon can be mapped



Fig. 4. Evolution of digital manufacturing reference architectures and their successors.

to the holons suggested by PROSA and ARTI (Macherki et al., 2021). Thus, QHAR shares the majority of their features. The activity types and instances of ARTI are not separate entities but modelled via the attributes of the Q-Holon.

B: Constrained—Network-based—Operation. All meta abstractions are characterised by the holonic design approach. ADACOR² extends ADA-COR through a 2D self-organisation model (Barbosa et al., 2015). While ADACOR uses a supervisor in conjunction with the basic holons for coordinating and optimising the operation in decentralised topologies, HCBA only relies on product and resource holons. Specifically, HCBA characterises an inherently distributed approach, whereas both ADACOR² and ADACOR are capable of forming hierarchical and heterarchical systems.

C: Concrete—Network-based—Operation. Both PROSA/Erlang and ADA-COR/JADE are based on a holonic design approach. The basis for WoT forms a consumer-thing interaction, where consumers are computational devices and things represent an abstraction of a virtual or physical resource. The things described by WoT are similar to resource holons, whereas the behaviours of staff, product and supervisor holons are performed by the consumer. WoT was designed for a plethora of IoT applications, while ADACOR/JADE and PROSA/Erlang focus on the manufacturing domain. Furthermore, WoT does not prescribe a specific technology, whilst the concrete ADACOR and PROSA instances demand the use of JADE and Erlang.

E: Abstract—Layered-based—Operation. Every reference architecture in this category characterises a hierarchical core structure which shares similarities with the OSI model (ITU-T, 1994). 5C and Cisco IoT describe the system development in terms of layers: the lower layers deal with connectivity and converting data to information, whereas the upper layers handle analytics and decision making. Cisco IoT includes one additional bottom layer describing the various physical devices that can be interacted with. Further, CPS-A IM reduces the features of the other reference architectures to three layers. The main difference is that processing and interpreting data is not handled on edge. Finally, BCPS restructures the 5C layers and details the impact of blockchain technology (Lee et al., 2019).

F: Constrained—Layered-based—Operation. All meta abstractions in this category are characterised by a hierarchical architecture based on the OSI model. While the application, service support and network layer are equal between the AIOTI HLA functional model and ITU-IoT, the latter provides additional features, such as a layer for describing device

and gateway capabilities and security capabilities that span across all layers (Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation, 2018). Similar to ITU-IoT, the IoT RA also includes cross-domain aspects such as connectivity and interoperability. In contrast to ITU-IoT and AIOTI HLA, IoT RA provides a more detailed view by separating the user domain from the application. Furthermore, WSO2 IoT has levels and cross-cutting functions similar to ITU-IoT and IoT RA. Finally, the crosscutting concerns and layers of RAMEC resemble many features of the other reference architectures in this category, but RAMEC provides additional hierarchy levels to distinguish where the data processing takes place.

H: Abstract-Layered-based-Enterprise. While all reference architectures describe hierarchies for the design of digital manufacturing systems, there are some differences when analysing the feature overlap. 8C extends 5C by adding integrated product and value chains, the role of the customer during the product design, and the product traceability record. There is an overlap between the cyber dimension of ARAFDF and the first five layers of 8C, whereas only the integration of product and value chains can be directly aligned. The generic views proposed by CIMOSA for developing enterprise models are represented by various aspects of other reference architectures in this category. Moreover, DTaaS uses a 3D model to capture key aspects of the digital twin. Generally, the information is arranged differently compared to other reference architectures in this category. For instance, 8C includes the digital twin concept in a layer. The layers of DTaaS can be aligned with the product lifecycle of the other reference architectures. Its iterative value lifecycle can be compared to the lifecycles presented by ARAFDF and 8C (Aheleroff et al., 2021). Next, IVRA consists of a collection of communicating autonomous units containing an asset, an activity and a management view. The organisation of those units is hierarchical and their levels, integrated product and value chains can be mapped to the cyber, lifecycle and physical dimension of ARAFDF and the 8C layers (Soares et al., 2020). iI&I models the maturity of enterprise integration through the use of information and industrial technologies in business and organisational processes. It reuses the management view of IVRA, and its organisation and business dimensions depict many features of 8C and ARAFDF (Li et al., 2018). RMSF extends ARAFDF and thus it also shows similarities to 8C, DTaaS and iI&I (Soares et al., 2021). Lastly, the project lifecycle, realisation and views of SLA can be aligned to the core dimensions of CIMOSA. SLA also characterises central aspects of other reference architectures. For example, the information and organisation subsystems can be mapped to the human and cyber dimensions of ARAFDF.

Table 4

Analysis of the applicability of the ten reference architecture categories (A-J). Each of the four criteria indicates how applicable the reference architectures within a category are.

Applicability criteria	А	В	С	D	Е	F	G	Н	Ι	J
Range of development	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	-	-	+
pathways										
Size of application area	-	-	0	-	+	+	-	-	+	0
Availability of standards	-	-	+	-	-	0	+	0	0	0
and implementation guides										
Provision of submodels	+	+	+	0	-	0	+	0	+	0

- : lowers the applicability of reference architectures within that category

 $\boldsymbol{0}$: has neither a positive nor negative effect on applicability

+: increases the applicability

I: Constrained—Layered-based—Enterprise. The meta abstractions of all reference architectures in this category constitute hierarchies. Additionally, there is a large feature overlap when comparing reference architectures. Big Picture organises standards in three dimensions, enterprise levels, lifecycle and value chain. Since Big Picture is based on ISA-95, its dimensions can be completely mapped onto RAMI 4.0 (Megow, 2020; ISO/TR, 2018). IIRA consists of four viewpoints describing business objectives for the system, activities to create intended functionalities, interfaces and interactions, and technologies for the implementation. The functional and business viewpoints of IIRA can be aligned with the layers and lifecycle of RAMI 4.0 (Fraile et al., 2019). I3RM integrates complementary features of RAMI 4.0, IIRA, and SME, thus showing various overlaps with these reference architectures. Besides, while IMSA and KSTEP share the same layers and dimensions with RAMI 4.0, the latter adopts different standards for the lifecycle and telecommunication axis (Han, 2020; Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, 2018). SME and SM2 describe the same hierarchy levels and similar layers compared to RAMI 4.0. Finally, ISA-95 is used as the basis for every reference architecture in this category, except for IIRA and I3RM. IIRA's functional viewpoint overlaps with the lower levels of ISA-95, whereas the business viewpoint is only loosely connected to the top level.

J: Concrete—Layered-based—Enterprise. Both reference architectures are hierarchical and service-oriented, and represent the system in three levels, namely edge, plant, and enterprise, each modelling similar features. One major difference is that while IBM Industry 4.0 includes a data storage and analytics service on both the enterprise and plant level, IIRA/Thingsboard separates the storage from analytics functions.

In summary, applying the classification frame of reference results in well separated categories for a large set of reference architectures, because each category contains reference architectures that are comparable to one another. Specifically, the reference architectures for each category share the same meta abstraction and show a significant feature overlap.

4.4. Applicability analysis

By the *applicability* of a reference architecture we mean the capability of a reference architecture to be adopted and applied in practice. To support practitioners in understanding and selecting appropriate reference architectures, we analyse the applicability of reference architectures in each category using the criteria defined in Section 3.4. Although this analysis provides first insights into the applicability of a wide range of reference architectures, more work needs to be done in structuring this analysis, for example, by conducting a systematic implementation comparison, which is beyond the scope of this study. In what follows, the applicability of reference architectures within the categories is qualitatively evaluated. The applicability analysis is summarised in Table 4. Reference architectures which are most applicable can be found in Category C, while category H consists of those that are least applicable. The variation of applicability of reference architectures within each category is low, which has also been shown by the validation of the classification in Section 4.3.

The range of development pathways is larger for layered-based topologies since there are more paths from top to bottom, thus leading to more design decisions that need to be made. Consequently, network-based reference architectures are generally more applicable than layered-based ones. This effect is less eminent for reference architectures that only have few layers, such as Shoestring and IBM Industry 4.0, compared to multi-dimensional models, like RAMI 4.0 and IIRA.

Regarding the size of application area, IoT reference architectures in the categories E and F are more applicable than network-based approaches and those focused on the integration of enterprise functions, because the IoT paradigm inherently covers a wider range of applications. Moreover, reference architectures that include a vast number of layers, such as RAMI 4.0 and Big Picture, are capable of representing more features of digital systems compared to smaller reference architectures. Therefore, they enable the design of a larger variety of systems. Conversely, most network-based reference architectures focus on manufacturing control, and would require much effort if designers sought to adopt these for a different application.

Approximately half of classified reference architectures provide standards or some form of implementation guides. Specifically, concrete reference architectures, such as WoT and Shoestring, provide the most implementation and development guidelines, thus reducing the overall number of design decisions significantly. In contrast, layered-based reference architectures with an operational or enterprise focus, such as RAMI 4.0 and ISA-95, seldom include design guidelines but often propose to use a wide range of standards, which facilitates the design process. Besides design guidelines, concrete reference architectures in the categories C, G and J also rely on technology recommendations to support the implementation. For example, Shoestring proposes a service-oriented architecture, whereas the ADACOR/JADE concretisation leverages agents to implement the holonic behaviour.

The provision of submodels, which prescribe certain system features or behavioural characteristics, increase the applicability of reference architectures, since fewer design decision have to be made. Specifically, these submodels or behavioural characteristics provide guidance in the form of design constraints. While many layered-based enterprise reference architectures include various submodels, those based on a network topology are typically constrained by certain behavioural characteristics. For example, ISA-95 contains a submodel for the data flow among resulting digital systems, whereas ADACOR requires the developer to implement the behaviour of an adapting control structure. Conversely, IoT reference architectures in the categories E and F rarely include submodels or specific behavioural characteristics, which yields a lower applicability.

Practitioners can use this applicability analysis as a guide to select a specific reference architecture based on their needs. For example, to build a standalone machine monitoring system, a developer may be interested in a highly applicable reference architecture, since these provide more design guidelines. Additionally, the features of more abstract reference architectures, such as the integration with enterprise functions, are not required to design this standalone system. Therefore, based on Table 4, the reference architectures in classes C and G can be selected since these have the highest level of applicability.

5. Discussion

In this section the findings and limitations of the classification and applicability analysis are discussed. Additionally, we compare the proposed classification approach to previous ones, and describe implications for practitioners and academics in the form of recommendations to increase the applicability of reference architectures.

5.1. Findings

The definitions and characteristics described in this study provide a rough guideline to separate reference architectures from system architectures, frameworks and platforms. However, the boundaries in terms of level of abstraction between those different types of models are not sharp, especially for system architectures and frameworks, which makes a segregation between them difficult. Furthermore, the frame of reference is capable of classifying a wide range of reference architectures despite their varying areas of application and different uses. Additionally, the proposed measures and criteria are appropriate tools for comparing and analysing the applicability of a large number of reference architectures. However, they can only assess the topmost view that describes the key features of a reference architecture.

This study is subject to the following limitations: first, we only focus on reference architectures and do not provide insights into platforms or frameworks for digital manufacturing. Further, due to the wide range of considered models, a deep comparison and alignment is not feasible. Thus, if particular features of a reference architecture are of interest, concentrating on a small subset of models should be preferred. Besides, a more accurate applicability analysis requires a structured implementation comparison and a quantitative evaluation of reference architecture designs, which is beyond the scope of this study.

5.2. Comparison with existing classification and alignment approaches

Compared to previous approaches to classify and align reference architectures, we have proposed a classification frame of reference independent from a particular model or digital manufacturing domain. Similar to Monostori (2014), this study conducts a survey of reference architectures across multiple digital manufacturing domains. While Weyrich and Ebert (2016) classify and compare reference architectures for IoT applications based on the standards they contain, we analyse standards to examine the maturity and applicability of reference architectures. Compared to Bader et al. (2019), who select IoT models based on the number of internet searches, this paper selects models that relate to any of the digital manufacturing paradigms. Although Kassner et al. (2017) differentiate between abstract and concrete models, which is similar to the level of abstraction axis proposed in this paper, their study lacks a clear distinction between the different types of models they discuss. Additionally, multiple approaches classify reference architectures based on common features (Soares et al., 2021; Li et al., 2018; Moghaddam et al., 2018; Kaiser et al., 2022b), whereas this study only performs a feature analysis for validation. In contrast to a functional alignment (Pedone and Mezgár, 2018; Megow, 2020; Pivoto et al., 2021; Fraile et al., 2019; Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation, 2018; Moghaddam et al., 2018; Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, 2018; Nakagawa et al., 2021), the development of a feature map (Soares et al., 2020; Guth et al., 2018; Nakagawa et al., 2021), or skeleton models (Han, 2020; Soares et al., 2020), the analysis performed in this study leverages measures and a set of criteria. We acknowledge that these are only capable of a high-level analysis of features and the applicability of reference architectures. However, for a broad literature survey as it was conducted in this study, it is difficult to apply one of the above approaches due to the range and heterogeneity of considered models.

5.3. Implications for practice

There are several implications for practitioners and academics who aim to adopt a reference architecture or develop a new one. Specifically, we provide a *set of recommendations to help increase the applicability of reference architectures* in the digital manufacturing domain. These recommendations are an immediate result from the classification and applicability analysis conducted in this study:

- Domain-specific reference architectures (Industry 4.0, IoT, manufacturing control, CPS) are easier to adopt than more general reference architectures. A successful application of general reference architectures, such as RAMI 4.0, may require additional strategies for a complete system, or developers may only leverage specific features, such as the administration shell, to build system components.
- Reference architectures should be open, that is, they should follow standards and resulting systems should be able to interface with those derived from other reference architectures. Since contemporary information systems consist of various types of components and interfaces, providing interoperability should be a key feature of reference architectures.
- Reference architectures should be joined to cover a larger domain. For example, RAMI 4.0 could be combined with ADACOR to supplement the high level business and operational views with concrete specifications of the system behaviour. Moreover, system design can become simpler using several combined reference architectures and standards instead of a single one that covers all aspects of digital manufacturing, because it requires less effort to divide the design process into subproblems. Additionally, joined reference architectures yield a larger area of application.
- Reference architectures should make use of appropriate technologies and standards to help narrow the range of development pathways. Specifically, abstract and constrained reference architectures can be concretised by making design decisions and developing detailed implementation rules, including specific system characteristics. Conversely, concrete reference architectures become constrained or abstract through not considering development guidelines.

6. Conclusions

This paper set out to compare and analyse reference architectures relevant to digital manufacturing systems. We have reviewed and classified a wide range of models that are referred to as 'reference architectures'. In particular, we have defined selection criteria that a model (used in system design) needs to satisfy in order to be referred to as a 'reference architecture'. Additionally, an overview of the different ways people discuss reference architectures in the literature has been provided. The contributions of this study are threefold: first, a clear distinction between reference architectures, system architectures, platforms and frameworks for digital manufacturing is provided. Second, a frame of reference is presented and validated, which allows for the classification of a wide range of reference architectures, and guides practitioners into a reasonably small set of reference architectures to consider. Third, an applicability analysis of reference architectures that belong to the same category is performed.

Compared to previous classification approaches, we have proposed a frame of reference capable of classifying a wide range of reference architectures independent from a particular model or digital manufacturing domain. In contrast to existing alignment and comparison methodologies, this study relies on measures and a set of criteria to compare reference architectures and analyse their applicability.

There are several implications for practitioners. Practitioners should focus on highly applicable reference architectures when aiming to develop systems since these are easier to adopt. Reference architectures achieve a high applicability by being domain-specific, following standards that enable interoperability among systems, and utilising appropriate technologies. Besides, these implications can also be used to increase the applicability of newly created reference architectures.

Due to the wide range of considered models, an in-depth comparison and analysis of reference architectures is not feasible. More insights can be gained from concentrating on a small subset of reference architectures and conducting a structured implementation comparison. Besides, two pathways arise from the proposed metamodelling approach: first, this study concentrates on the reference architecture view within the proposed metamodelling approach. However, little research has been done to compare and analyse system architectures. Specifically, the manner in which platforms and frameworks relate to system architectures requires further investigation. Second, there is a need to analyse how other types of platforms and frameworks relate to the ones focused on digital manufacturing and align these to the proposed metamodelling approach.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council, United Kingdom (EPSRC: EP/R032777/1).

References

- Aheleroff, S., Xu, X., Zhong, R.Y., Lu, Y., 2021. Digital twin as a service (DTaaS) in industry 4.0: An architecture reference model. Adv. Eng. Inform. 47, http: //dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2020.101225.
- Ahmadi, A., Sodhro, A.H., Cherifi, C., Cheutet, V., Ouzrout, Y., 2018. Evolution of 3C cyber-physical systems architecture for industry 4.0. In: 8th Workshop on Service Orientation in Holonic and Multi-Agent Manufacturing. SOHOMA, http: //dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03003-2_35.
- Alexakos, C., Komninos, A., Anagnostopoulos, C., Kalogeras, G., Savvopoulos, A., Kalogeras, A., 2019. Building an industrial IoT infrastructure with opensource software for smart energy. In: 2019 First International Conference on Societal Automation. SA.
- Alliance for Internet of Things Innovation, 2018. High Level Architecture (HLA) Release 4.0 AIOTI WG03-IoT Standardisation.
- Atzori, L., Iera, A., Morabito, G., 2010. The Internet of Things: A survey. Comput. Netw. 54, 2787–2805. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.comnet.2010.05.010.
- Bader, S.R., Maleshkova, M., Lohmann, S., 2019. Structuring reference architectures for the industrial internet of things. Future Internet 11, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ fi11070151.
- Barbosa, J., Dias, J., Pereira, A., Leitão, P., 2016. Engineering an ADACOR based solution into a small-scale production system. In: IEEE International Symposium on Industrial Electronics. 2016-November. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc, pp. 28–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ISIE.2016.7744860.
- Barbosa, J., Leitão, P., Adam, E., Trentesaux, D., 2015. Dynamic self-organization in holonic multi-agent manufacturing systems: The ADACOR evolution. Comput. Ind. 66, 99–111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2014.10.011.
- Bauer, M., Boussard, M., Lucent, A., Bui, N., Carrez, F., 2013. Internet of Things -Architecture IoT-A Deliverable D1.5 - Final architectural reference model for the IoT v3.0.
- Brussel, H.V., Wyns, J., Valckenaers, P., Bongaerts, L., Peeters, P., 1998. Reference architecture for holonic manufacturing systems: PROSA. Comput. Ind. 37, 255–274.
 Chen, D., Doumeingts, G., 1996. The GRAI-GIM reference model, architecture and
- methodology. In: Architectures for Enterprise Integration. pp. 102–126. Chen, Y., Tseng, M.M., 1997. A stair-like CIM system architecture. IEEE Trans. Compon.
- Packag, Manuf, Technol. 20, 101. Chirn, J.L., McFarlane, D.C., 2000. A holonic component-based approach to reconfig-
- urable manufacturing control architecture. In: Proceedings International Workshop on Database and Expert Systems Applications, DEXA. 2000-January. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. pp. 219–223. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ DEXA.2000.875030.

- Christensen, J.H., 1994. Holonic manufacturing systems: Initial architecture and standards directions. In: First European Conference on Holonic Manufacturing Systems.
- Cisco Systems, 2014. The internet of things reference model.
- Coles, R., Godbehere, A., Grigals, A., Ragunathan, G., 2021. AMRC factory+. https://factoryplus.app.amrc.co.uk/.
- Contreras, J.D., Garcia, J.I., Pastrana, J.D.D., 2017. Developing of industry 4.0 applications. Int. J. Online Eng. 13, 30–47. http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijoe.v13i10. 7331.
- Davis, J., Edgar, T., Porter, J., Bernaden, J., Sarli, M., 2012. Smart manufacturing, manufacturing intelligence and demand-dynamic performance. Comput. Chem. Eng. 47, 145–156. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compchemeng.2012.06.037.
- Derigent, W., Cardin, O., Trentesaux, D., 2020. Industry 4.0: contributions of holonic manufacturing control architectures and future challenges. J. Intell. Manuf. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10845-020-01532-x.
- Ding, K., Fan, L., Liu, C., 2021. Manufacturing system under I4.0 workshop based on blockchain: Research on architecture, operation mechanism and key technologies. Comput. Ind. Eng. 161, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2021.107672.
- Directorate-General for Communications Networks Content and Technology and European Factories of the Future Research Association (EFFRA), 2015. Platforms for connected factories of the future.
- Doumeingts, G., Vallespir, B., Chen, D., 1995. Methodologies for designing CIM systems: A survey. Comput. Ind. 25, 263–280.
- Farsi, M., Latsou, C., Erkoyuncu, J.A., Morris, G., 2020. RFID application in a multiagent cyber physical manufacturing system. J. Manuf. Mater. Process. 4, 103. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/jmmp4040103.
- Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, 2016. PROGRESS REPORT Digitization of Industrie - Plattform Industrie 4.0.
- Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy, 2018. Alignment Report for Reference Architectural Model for Industrie 4.0/Intelligent Manufacturing System Architecture - Sino-German Industrie 4.0/Intelligent Manufacturing Standardisation Sub-Working Group.
- Fletcher, M., Garcia-Herreros, E., Christensen, J., Deen, S., Mittmann, R., Allee, R.R., 2000. An open architecture for holonic cooperation and autonomy. In: 10th IEEE International Conference on Databases and Expert System Applications and Workshop on Holonic and Multi-Agent Systems.
- Fraile, F., Sanchis, R., Poler, R., Ortiz, A., 2019. Reference models for digital manufacturing platforms. Appl. Sci. (Switzerland) 9, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ app9204433.
- Fremantle, P., 2015. A reference architecture for the internet of things. http://dx.doi. org/10.13140/RG.2.2.20158.89922.
- Gerrikagoitia, J.K., Unamuno, G., Urkia, E., Serna, A., 2019. Digital manufacturing platforms in the industry 4.0 from private and public perspectives. Appl. Sci. 9, 2934. http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/app9142934.
- Giese, H., Karsai, G., Lee, E., Rumpe, B., Schätz, B., 2007. Model-based engineering of embedded real-time systems.
- Gomez-Gasquet, P., Esteban, F.C.L., Pereyra, R.D.F., Fons, V.A., 2010. The design of an agent-based production scheduling software framework for improving planningscheduling collaboration. In: 9th IFIP WG 5.5 International Conference on Balanced Automation Systems for Future Manufacturing Networks. BASYS, pp. 301–308. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-14341-0_35.
- Grangel-Gonzalez, I., Halilaj, L., Auer, S., Lohmann, S., Lange, C., Collarana, D., 2016. An RDF-based approach for implementing industry 4.0 components with Administration Shells. In: IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation, ETFA. 2016-November. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc, http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ETFA.2016.7733503.
- Griffor, E.R., Greer, C., Wollman, D.A., Burns, M.J., 2017. Framework for Cyber-Physical Systems: Volume 1, Overview. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, http://dx.doi.org/10.6028/NIST.SP.1500-201.
- Guth, J., Breitenbücher, U., Falkenthal, M., Fremantle, P., Kopp, O., Leymann, F., Reinfurt, L., 2018. A detailed analysis of iot platform architectures: Concepts, similarities, and differences. Internet Everything 81–101. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1007/978-981-10-5861-5_4.
- Han, S., 2020. A review of smart manufacturing reference models based on the skeleton meta-model. J. Comput. Des. Eng. 7, 323–336. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jcde/ qwaa027.
- Havard, V., Sahnoun, M., Bettayeb, B., Duval, F., Baudry, D., 2020. Data architecture and model design for Industry 4.0 components integration in cyberphysical production systems. Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. B http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 0954405420979463.
- Hawkridge, G., McFarlane, D., Kaiser, J., de Silva, L., Terrazas, G., 2022. Designing shoestring solutions: An approach for designing low-cost digital solutions for manufacturing. In: Borangiu, T., Trentesaux, D., Leitão, P., Cardin, O., Joblot, L. (Eds.), Service Oriented, Holonic and Multi-Agent Manufacturing Systems for Industry of the Future. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 249–262.
- Hawkridge, G., Mukherjee, A., McFarlane, D., Tlegenov, Y., Parlikad, A.K., Reyner, N.J., Thorne, A., 2021. Monitoring on a shoestring: Low cost solutions for digital manufacturing. Annu. Rev. Control 51, 374–391. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.arcontrol. 2021.04.007.

- Holtewert, P., Wutzke, R., Seidelmann, J., Bauernhansl, T., 2013. Virtual fort knox federative, secure and cloud-based platform for manufacturing. Procedia CIRP 7, 527–532. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2013.06.027.
- Horridge, M., Knublauch, H., Rector, A., Stevens, R., Wroe, C., Jupp, S., Moulton, G., Drummond, N., Brandt, S., 2011. A practical guide to building OWL ontologies using Protégé 4 and CO-ODE tools Edition 1.3.
- IBM, 2021. Industry 4.0 reference architecture. https://www.ibm.com/cloud/ architecture/architectures/industry-40/reference-architecture.
- IEC, 2003. IEC 62264-1:2003 Enterprise-control system integration Part 1: Models and terminology.
- IEC, 2012. IEC 61499-1:2012 Function blocks Part 1: Architecture.
- IEC, 2017. IEC/PAS 63088:2017 Smart manufacturing Reference architecture model industry 4.0 (RAMI4.0).

IEC, 2022. IEC CD 63339 ED 1 - Unified Reference Model for Smart Manufacturing.

Indriago, C., Cardin, O., Rakoto, N., Castagna, P., Chacòn, E., 2016. H2CM: A holonic architecture for flexible hybrid control systems. Comput. Ind. 77, 15–28. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2015.12.005.

Industrial Internet Consortium, 2015. Industrial internet reference architecture.

- Industrial Value Chain Initiative, 2016. Industrial value chain reference architecture.
- ISO/IEC, 2018. ISO/IEC 30141:2018 Internet of Things (IoT) Reference architecture.
- ISO/IEC, 2020. ISO/IEC TR 63306-1:2020 Smart manufacturing standards map (SM2) Part 1, Framework.
- ISO/TR, 2018. ISO/TR 23087:2018 Automation systems and integration The Big Picture of standards.
- ITU-T, 1994. Recommendation ITU-T X.200:1994 Open system interconnection -Model and notation.
- ITU-T, 2012. Recommendation ITU-T Y.2060:2012 Overview of the Internet of things.
- Jiang, J.R., 2018. An improved cyber-physical systems architecture for Industry 4.0 smart factories. Adv. Mech. Eng. 10, http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/ 1687814018784192.
- Jimenez, J.F., Bekrar, A., Zambrano-Rey, G., Trentesaux, D., Leitão, P., 2017. Pollux: a dynamic hybrid control architecture for flexible job shop systems. Int. J. Prod. Res. 55, 4229–4247. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00207543.2016.1218087.
- Kaiser, J., Ling, Z., Yilmaz, G., McFarlane, D., Hawkridge, G., 2022a. Configurable solutions for low-cost digital manufacturing: a building block approach. In: 2022 IEEE 27th International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation. ETFA, pp. 1–9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ETFA52439.2022.9921538.
- Kaiser, J., McFarlane, D., Hawkridge, G., 2022b. Review and classification of digital manufacturing reference architectures. In: Borangiu, T., Trentesaux, D., Leitão, P., Cardin, O., Joblot, L. (Eds.), Service Oriented, Holonic and Multi-Agent Manufacturing Systems for Industry of the Future. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 231–247.
- Karsai, G., Nordstrom, G., Ledeczi, A., Sztipanovits, J., 2000. Specifying graphical modeling systems using constraint-based metamodels. In: IEEE Lntemational Symposium on Computer-Aided Control System Design MM2-5. Vol. 2. p. 20.
- Kassner, L., Gröger, C., Königsberger, J., Hoos, E., Kiefer, C., Weber, C., Silcher, S., Mitschang, B., 2017. The stuttgart IT architecture for manufacturing an architecture for the data-driven factory. In: Enterprise Information Systems (ICEIS) 2016. Revised Selected Papers. Vol. 291. Springer Verlag, pp. 53–80. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1007/978-3-319-62386-3_3.

Kosanke, K., 1995. CIMOSA - Overview and status. Comput. Ind. 27, 101-109.

- Kruger, K., Basson, A., 2017. Erlang-based control implementation for a holonic manufacturing cell. Int. J. Comput. Integr. Manuf. 30, 641–652. http://dx.doi. org/10.1080/0951192X.2016.1195923.
- Kuhn, T., Antonino, P.O., Schnicke, F., 2020. Industrie 4.0 virtual automation bus architecture. In: Muccini, H., Avgeriou, P., Buhnova, B., Camara, J., Caporuscio, M., Franzago, M., Koziolek, A., Scandurra, P., Trubiani, C., Weyns, D., Zdun, U. (Eds.), Software Architecture. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 477–489.
- Lagally, M., Matsukura, R., Kawaguchi, T., Toumura, K., Kajimoto, K., 2021. Web of things (WoT) architecture 1.1 - W3C editor's draft 27 May 2021. https://w3c. github.io/wot-architecture/.
- Lazaro, O., Gonzales, A., Sola, J., 2015. FITMAN future internet enablers for the sensing enterprise: A FIWARE approach & industrial trialing. In: Zelm, M. (Ed.), Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Enterprise Interoperability, NîMes, France, 27-05-2015. Vol. 6. pp. 605–48008, Published At http://ceur-ws.org.
- Lee, J., Azamfar, M., Singh, J., 2019. A blockchain enabled Cyber-Physical System architecture for Industry 4.0 manufacturing systems. Manuf. Lett. 20, 34–39. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mfglet.2019.05.003.
- Lee, J., Bagheri, B., Kao, H.A., 2015. A Cyber-Physical Systems architecture for Industry 4.0-based manufacturing systems. Manuf. Lett. 3, 18–23. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1016/j.mfglet.2014.12.001.
- Leitão, P., Restivo, F., 2006. ADACOR: A holonic architecture for agile and adaptive manufacturing control. Comput. Ind. 57, 121–130. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j. compind.2005.05.005.
- Li, Q., Tang, Q., Chan, I., Wei, H., Pu, Y., Jiang, H., Li, J., Zhou, J., 2018. Smart manufacturing standardization: Architectures, reference models and standards framework. Comput. Ind. 101, 91–106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2018. 06.005.
- Liu, C., Jiang, P., 2016. A cyber-physical system architecture in shop floor for intelligent manufacturing. Procedia CIRP 56, 372–377. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.procir. 2016.10.059.

- Lu, Y., Morris, K., Frechette, S., 2016a. Current Standards Landscape for Smart Manufacturing Systems. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD, http://dx.doi.org/10.6028/NIST.IR.8107.
- Lu, Y., Riddick, F., Ivezic, N., 2016b. The paradigm shift in smart manufacturing system architecture. IFIP Adv. Inf. Commun. Technol. 488, 767–776. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1007/978-3-319-51133-7_90.
- Macherki, D., Diallo, T.M., Choley, J.Y., Guizani, A., Barkallah, M., Haddar, M., 2021. Qhar: Q-holonic-based architecture for self-configuration of cyber–physical production systems. Appl. Sci. (Switzerland) 11, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ app11199013.
- Marques, M.R.N., Maciel, B.K., Balota, G.M., Fonseca, R.T., Simosa, M., Conceição, H.S., Gonçalves, E.M.N., Botelho, S.S.D.C., 2018. Embedded agent based on cyber physical systems: Architecture, hardware definition and application in industry 4.0 context. In: ICINCO 2018 - Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Informatics in Control, Automation and Robotics. Vol. 2. SciTePress, pp. 584–591. http://dx.doi.org/10.5220/0006863505840591.
- Martínez, N.L., Martínez-Ortega, J.F., Rodríguez-Molina, J., Zhai, Z., 2020. Proposal of an automated mission manager for Cooperative Autonomous Underwater Vehicles. Appl. Sci. 10, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/app10030855.
- Maturana, F., Shen, W., Norrie, D.H., 1999. MetaMorph: An adaptive agent-based architecture for intelligent manufacturing. Int. J. Prod. Res. 37, 2159–2173. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1080/002075499190699.
- McFarlane, D., Ratchev, S., Thorne, A., Parlikad, A.K., de Silva, L., Schönfuß, B., Hawkridge, G., Terrazas, G., Tlegenov, Y., 2020. Digital manufacturing on a shoestring: Low cost digital solutions for SMEs. In: Borangiu, T., Trentesaux, D., Leitão, P., Giret Boggino, A., Botti, V. (Eds.), Service Oriented, Holonic and Multi-Agent Manufacturing Systems for Industry of the Future. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 40–51.
- Megow, J., 2020. Reference architecture models for industry 4.0, smart manufacturing and IOT an introduction.
- Melo, P.F., Godoy, E.P., Ferrari, P., Sisinni, E., 2021. Open source control device for industry 4.0 based on RAMI 4.0. Electronics 10, http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/ electronics10070869.
- Mittal, S., Khan, M.A., Romero, D., Wuest, T., 2019. Smart manufacturing: Characteristics, technologies and enabling factors. Proc. Inst. Mech. Eng. B 233, 1342–1361. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0954405417736547.
- Moghaddam, M., Cadavid, M.N., Kenley, C.R., Deshmukh, A.V., 2018. Reference architectures for smart manufacturing: A critical review. J. Manuf. Syst. 49, 215–225. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2018.10.006.
- Monostori, L., 2014. Cyber-physical production systems: Roots, expectations and R&D challenges. Procedia CIRP 17, 9–13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2014.03. 115.
- Mortellec, A.L., Clarhaut, J., Sallez, Y., Berger, T., Trentesaux, D., 2013. Embedded holonic fault diagnosis of complex transportation systems. Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell. 26, 227–240. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2012.09.008.
- Moses, J., 2010. Architecting engineering systems. Philos. Eng. Technol. 2, 275–284. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-2804-4_23.
- Moss, S.P., 1989. A management and control architecture for factory-floor systems: From concept to reality. Int. J. Comput. Integr. Manuf. 2, 106–113. http://dx.doi. org/10.1080/09511928908944388.
- Nakagawa, E.Y., Antonino, P.O., Schnicke, F., Capilla, R., Kuhn, T., Liggesmeyer, P., 2021. Industry 4.0 reference architectures: State of the art and future trends. Comput. Ind. Eng. 156, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2021.107241.
- Nazarenko, A.A., Lopes, C., Ferreira, J., Usher, P., Sarraipa, J., 2020. ZDMP core services and middleware. In: Proceedings of Interoperability for Enterprise Systems and Applications Workshops Co-Located with 10th International Conference on Interoperability for Enterprise Systems and Applications. I-ESA 2020.
- Object Management Group, 2017. OMG Unified Modeling Language (OMG UML) version 2.5.1.
- Otto, B., Auer, S., Cirullies, J., Jürjens, J., Menz, N., Schon, J., Wenzel, S., 2016. Industrial data space digital sovereignity over data.
- Pach, C., Berger, T., Bonte, T., Trentesaux, D., 2014. ORCA-FMS: A dynamic architecture for the optimized and reactive control of flexible manufacturing scheduling. Comput. Ind. 65, 706–720. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2014.02.005.
- Paolucci, M., Sacile, R., 2005. Agent-Based Manufacturing and Control Systems: New Agile Manufacturing Solutions for Achieving Peak Performance. CRC Press, p. 269.
- Papazoglou, M.P., Heuvel, W.J.V.D., 2007. Service oriented architectures: Approaches, technologies and research issues. VLDB J. 16, 389–415. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/ s00778-007-0044-3.
- Papazoglou, M.P., Heuvel, W.J.V.D., Mascolo, J.E., 2015. A reference architecture and knowledge-based structures for smart manufacturing networks. IEEE Softw. 32, 61–69. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MS.2015.57.
- Pedone, G., Mezgár, I., 2018. Model similarity evidence and interoperability affinity in cloud-ready industry 4.0 technologies. Comput. Ind. 100, 278–286. http://dx.doi. org/10.1016/j.compind.2018.05.003.
- Pérez, F., Irisarri, E., Orive, D., Marcos, M., Estevez, E., 2015. A CPPS architecture approach for industry 4.0. 2015-October. In: IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation. ETFA, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ETFA.2015.7301606.

- Pirvu, B.C., Zamfirescu, C.B., Gorecky, D., 2016. Engineering insights from an anthropocentric cyber-physical system: A case study for an assembly station. Mechatronics 34, 147–159. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mechatronics.2015.08.010.
- Pivoto, D.G., de Almeida, L.F., da Rosa Righi, R., Rodrigues, J.J., Lugli, A.B., Alberti, A.M., 2021. Cyber-physical systems architectures for industrial internet of things applications in Industry 4.0: A literature review. J. Manuf. Syst. 58, 176–192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2020.11.017.
- Pujo, P., Broissin, N., Ounnar, F., 2009. PROSIS: An isoarchic structure for HMS control. Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell. 22, 1034–1045. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2009. 01.011.
- Quintanilla, F.G., Cardin, O., L'Anton, A., Castagna, P., 2016. A modeling framework for manufacturing services in Service-oriented Holonic Manufacturing Systems. Eng. Appl. Artif. Intell. 55, 26–36. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2016.06.004.
- Rembold, U., C., B., Dillmann, R., 1985. Computer Integrated Manufacturing Technology and Systems. Marcel Decker, New York.
- Resman, M., Pipan, M., Simic, M., Herakovič, N., 2019. A new architecture model for smart manufacturing: A performance analysis and comparison with the RAMI 4.0 reference model. Adv. Prod. Eng.0 Manag. 14, 153–165. http://dx.doi.org/10. 14743/apem2019.2.318.
- Rojko, A., 2017. Industry 4.0 concept: Background and overview. Int. J. Interact. Mob. Technol. 11, 77–90. http://dx.doi.org/10.3991/ijim.v11i5.7072.
- Sisinni, E., Saifullah, A., Han, S., Jennehag, U., Gidlund, M., 2018. Industrial Internet of Things: Challenges, opportunities, and directions. IEEE Trans. Ind. Inform. 14, 4724–4734. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/TII.2018.2852491.
- Soares, N., Monteiro, P., Duarte, F.J., Machado, R.J., 2020. An aligned reference model for digital factories. In: Proceedings of 2020 IEEE 10th International Conference on Intelligent Systems.
- Soares, N., Monteiro, P., Duarte, F.J., Machado, R.J., 2021. Extending the scope of reference models for smart factories. Procedia Comput. Sci. 180, 102–111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.01.134.
- Swert, K.D., Valckenaers, P., German, B.S., Verstraete, P., Hadeli, Brussel, H.V., 2006. Coordination and control for railroad networks inspired by manufacturing control. In: Proceedings - DIS 2006: IEEE Workshop on Distributed Intelligent Systems -Collective Intelligence and Its Applications. 2006. pp. 201–206. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1109/DIS.2006.21.
- Tao, F., Cheng, J., Qi, Q., Zhang, M., Zhang, H., Sui, F., 2018. Digital twin-driven product design, manufacturing and service with big data. Int. J. Adv. Manuf. Technol. 94, 3563–3576. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00170-017-0233-1.

- Traganos, K., Grefen, P., Vanderfeesten, I., Erasmus, J., Boultadakis, G., Bouklis, P., 2021. The HORSE framework: A reference architecture for cyber-physical systems in hybrid smart manufacturing. J. Manuf. Syst. 61, 461–494. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1016/j.jmsy.2021.09.003.
- Unver, H.O., 2013. An ISA-95-based manufacturing intelligence system in support of lean initiatives. Int. J. Adv. Manuf. Technol. 65, 853–866. http://dx.doi.org/10. 1007/s00170-012-4223-z.
- Valckenaers, P., 2019. ARTI reference architecture PROSA revisited. In: Borangiu, T., Trentesaux, D., Thomas, A., Cavalieri, S. (Eds.), Service Orientation in Holonic and Multi-Agent Manufacturing. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 1–19.
- Vallespir, B., Merle, C., Doumeingts, G., 1992. The GRAI integrated method: a technicoeconomical methodology to design manufacturing systems. IFAC Proc. Vol. 25, 73–78. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/s1474-6670(17)52231-4.
- Varga, P., Blomstedt, F., Ferreira, L.L., Eliasson, J., Johansson, M., Delsing, J., de Soria, I.M., 2017. Making system of systems interoperable – The core components of the arrowhead framework. J. Netw. Comput. Appl. 81, 85–95. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1016/j.jnca.2016.08.028.
- Verstraete, P., Germain, B.S., Valckenaers, P., Brussel, H.V., Belle, J.V., Karuna, H., Belle, J.V., Karuna, H., 2008. Engineering manufacturing control systems using PROSA and delegate MAS. Int. J. Agent-Oriented Softw. Eng. 2, 62–89. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1504/IJAOSE.2008.016800.
- Wei, S., Hu, J., Cheng, Y., Ma, Y., Yu, Y., 2017. The essential elements of intelligent manufacturing system architecture. In: 13th IEEE Conference on Automation Science and Engineering. CASE.
- Weyrich, M., Ebert, C., 2016. Reference architectures for the internet of things. IEEE Softw. 33, 112–116. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MS.2016.20.
- Williams, T.J., 1994. The purdue enterprise reference architecture. Comput. Ind. 24, 141–158.
- Willner, A., Gowtham, V., 2020. Preprint: Toward a reference architecture model for industrial edge computing.
- Ye, X., Hong, S.H., 2018. An AutomationML/OPC UA-based industry 4.0 solution for a manufacturing system. In: IEEE International Conference on Emerging Technologies and Factory Automation, ETFA. 2018-September. Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Inc, pp. 543–550. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/ETFA.2018. 8502637.
- Yu, C., Xu, X., Lu, Y., 2015. Computer-integrated manufacturing, cyber-physical systems and cloud manufacturing - concepts and relationships. Manuf. Lett. 6, 5–9. http: //dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.mfglet.2015.11.005.
- Zhang, C., Zhou, G., Li, H., Cao, Y., 2020. Manufacturing blockchain of things for the configuration of a data- and knowledge-driven digital twin manufacturing cell. IEEE Internet Things J. 7, 11884–11894. http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/JIOT.2020.3005729.