INCOSE

ASIA-OCEANIA SYSTEMS ENGINEERING CONFERENCE

Reengineering Systems Engineering

Lessons from 15 years of Automotive Disruption

INCOSE AOSEC · 2025

AUTHORS

Raul Leal

PUBLICATION DATE

July, 2026

SUBMISSION #

10

INCOSE PUBLICATIONS

REENGINEERING SYSTEMS ENGINEERING: LESSONS FROM 15 YEARS OF AUTOMOTIVE DISRUPTION

Raul Leal Ascencio
Rabdan Academy
P.O. Box 114646
Abu Dhabi, UAE
rleal@ra.ac.ae

Abstract

Over the past 15 years, the global automotive industry has experienced a profound transformation, propelled by digitization, electrification, the rise of Chinese manufacturing capabilities, and the emergence of ACES (Autonomous, Connected, Electric, and Shared) technologies. This article explores the implications of these developments for systems engineering, drawing key lessons from industry disruptions and proposing extensions inspired by the UCL 5 Principles of Systems Engineering Management. We argue that while these principles remain foundational, they require reinterpretation and extension to accommodate new paradigms of agility, integration, and continuous lifecycle adaptation.

Keywords

Systems Engineering Principles, Automotive Engineering, Chinese Manufacturing

Introduction

The automotive sector is at the epicentre of a systems engineering revolution. Technological convergence, economic shifts, and policy pressures have transformed vehicles from mechanical products into complex, data-driven cyber-physical systems. Chinese OEMs such as BYD and Chery have leveraged vertical integration, rapid development cycles, and simulation-led design to gain competitive advantage (Reuters, 2025a). Simultaneously, Industry 4.0 -- encompassing digital twins, smart manufacturing, and cyber-physical integration -- has redefined production capabilities (Schuh et al., 2020).

This disruption is tightly coupled with the emergence of ACES vehicles. These systems demand constant updates, integrated digital infrastructures, and cross-disciplinary collaboration -- features foreign to traditional systems engineering practices. With software now central to vehicle functionality, engineering processes must respond dynamically across the full product lifecycle (Adler et al., 2020).

In this context, the UCL 5 Principles of Systems Engineering Management serve as a crucial benchmark (Emes et al., 2012). However, their interpretation must evolve to reflect a world of accelerated innovation, digital feedback loops, and systemic interdependence. This article analyses automotive sector transformations to identify corresponding shifts in systems engineering practice, culminating in a new set of context-aware principles.

The Automotive Disruption: A 15-Year Retrospective

The global automotive industry has undergone not only a technological evolution but also a systemic realignment in production philosophy, policy orientation, and competitive dynamics. These changes have been particularly visible in the consolidation of design and production cycles, the global reorganisation of supply chains, and the digitisation of vehicle lifecycles. We are taking the start of this disruption to be between 2005 and 2010 when vehicles started to transition into high-performance computing platforms, driven by the proliferation of ECUs and software-defined features. A deeper understanding of these shifts can be drawn by comparing practices across geographies and connecting macro-level patterns to firm-level innovation.

Chinese Industrial Ascent

Chinese automotive firms have rapidly advanced through strategic mastery of vertically integrated production models. BYD's ability to produce over 70% of components in-house -- from semiconductors to batteries -- has significantly compressed time-to-market and reduced external dependency (Yin et al., 2023). These advantages are amplified by access to low-cost labour, government subsidies, and an ecosystem of co-located suppliers. Chinese OEMs adopt a "design--simulate--build--revise" cycle that allows continuous iteration without waiting for full-scale testing or market feedback (Reuters, 2025).

Furthermore, the Chinese government's industrial policy actively promotes automotive sector self-sufficiency, combining research funding with trade barriers and domestic incentives. As a result, OEMs like NIO and XPeng also innovate in vehicle architecture and connectivity, challenging long-held Western dominance in design sophistication.

Comparative studies show that while Western OEMs rely more heavily on modular outsourcing and global supply chains, Chinese manufacturers have doubled down on national resilience strategies and whole-system optimisation (Feng et al., 2022). For example, BYD's dominance in battery technology is not solely a function of scale but of their integration of R&D, raw material acquisition, and recycling capabilities -- making them less vulnerable to geopolitical disruptions than competitors reliant on third-party cell suppliers (Shen & Wang, 2023).

Research also highlights that simulation-based development plays a key role in reducing the cost and time of vehicle validation. The use of hardware-in-the-loop (HIL) and software-in-the-loop (SIL) environments across Chinese automotive firms allows for thousands of parameter variations and corner-case assessments to be evaluated in digital domains, reducing physical prototyping and associated risk (Li & Chen, 2021).

The Chinese automotive model demonstrates a systems-level coherence rarely seen in legacy OEMs. Strategy, design, manufacturing, and deployment are conceived as a single enterprise system, rather than distributed operations coordinated through layered bureaucracy. This holistic approach presents significant lessons for systems engineering, especially concerning the value of vertical integration, organisational agility, and the alignment of national policy with industrial capability.

EV Leadership and Ecosystem Control

While Tesla released the Roadster in 2008, it was a low-volume, proof-of-concept sports car based on a Lotus chassis. The Model S was the company's first ground-up, high-volume electric sedan, built on a Tesla-designed platform. Its success marked the beginning of Tesla's significant commercial and technological impact on the automotive industry.

China's leadership in EV production in contrast, is not merely quantitative but systemic. State-owned and private players have synchronised upstream extraction of rare-earth elements and lithium with downstream battery cell and module production, all the way to end-of-life recycling. CATL, for instance, supplies most domestic OEMs and increasingly exports to global clients (BloombergNEF, 2024).

This strategic consolidation underpins the resilience of the Chinese EV ecosystem. Analysts argue that China's "from mine to module" capability provides a hedge against global material scarcity, cost volatility, and supply chain disruption (Tan et al., 2021). The nation's commitment to battery standardisation has also enabled high-volume, low-cost production, while flexible platform engineering has allowed rapid reconfiguration for different vehicle classes (Zhou & Liu, 2022).

Architecturally, EV-specific design strategies such as the skateboard chassis (flat-floor battery layout) have radically improved space efficiency, safety, and manufacturing agility. This configuration is particularly amenable to modular vehicle concepts, where common platforms can be used for multiple body styles. These platforms also support streamlined integration of next-generation propulsion systems and solid-state batteries, as evidenced by recent BYD and NIO prototypes.

Moreover, the integration of embedded electronics and AI into battery management systems (BMS) facilitates adaptive charge-discharge profiles, lifetime prediction, and predictive maintenance. Such systems, combined with vehicle-wide over-the-air (OTA) software frameworks, allow OEMs to improve performance, efficiency, and safety without physical recalls -- a marked contrast to traditional recall-based correction cycles (Hu & Zhang, 2023).

From a systems engineering standpoint, this closed-loop capability -- spanning material procurement, component design, digital integration, and in-use optimisation -- exemplifies end-to-end lifecycle thinking. The Chinese EV model reinforces the importance of concurrent development across mechanical, electrical, and digital domains, enabled by vertically integrated control over value chains and aligned national strategy.

In addition, EV-specific architectural strategies -- such as flat-floor skateboard platforms -- have emerged as enablers of model agility and interior redesign. This innovation accelerates variant creation and reduces homologation cycles. Chinese EV producers integrate these physical platforms with software-defined components, where embedded intelligence and OTA (over-the-air) update capabilities offer a continuous post-sale relationship with customers.

Rise of ACES

Tesla's Model S was the company's first ground-up, high-volume electric sedan, built on a Tesla-designed platform in 2012. Its success marked the beginning of Tesla's significant commercial and technological impact on the automotive industry. The ACES paradigm -- autonomous, connected, electric, and shared -- introduces new dimensions of complexity and interdependency. Electrification not only changes the required engineering knowledge base, but also the topology and weight distribution of vehicles, demanding re-optimised structures and new thermal management systems. Connectivity layers necessitate cybersecure gateways, V2X (vehicle-to-everything) protocols, and digital certificate management. Autonomy requires not only robust sensor suites but also ethically aware decision algorithms.

Recent advances in vehicle autonomy reveal a trend towards increased sensor fusion and AI-driven perception algorithms, which require high-performance computing platforms and software architectures capable of continuous learning and fault tolerance (Liu et al., 2022). In this context, ensuring safe and certifiable autonomous functions demands not only simulation-based validation, but also the orchestration of large-scale real-world data collection, annotation, and iterative model retraining.

In terms of connectivity, automotive systems are increasingly reliant on multi-access edge computing (MEC) infrastructure to support low-latency applications such as collision avoidance, dynamic route planning, and platooning (Park et al., 2020). This shift demands an overhaul of systems engineering approaches to include distributed computing models and security risk assessments.

Shared mobility introduces service-oriented complexity. Fleet vehicles experience diverse usage environments and undergo frequent configuration changes, necessitating modularity in both physical design and digital architecture. Firms like Didi and Uber are developing shared EV platforms with modular telematics and adaptive range estimation, which challenge traditional ownership-based engineering assumptions (Nguyen & Gough, 2021).

From a systems engineering perspective, managing ACES demands integration of multidisciplinary requirements, continuous update pipelines, and dynamic certification strategies. Verification and validation are no longer confined to pre-release gates but are instead maintained across the product's life through telemetry, predictive diagnostics, and AI-enabled observability. ACES systems are thus exemplars of cyber-physical ecosystems -- reinforcing the need for a paradigm shift in systems engineering education, tooling, and governance.

Systems engineering in this space must therefore account for probabilistic system behaviour, continuous software calibration, and context-aware service delivery. The integration of mobility-as-a-service with real-time operational analytics requires digital architectures that are flexible and trustworthy by design (Broy et al., 2021).

Systems Engineering Lessons from Automotive Practice

The transition from mechanistic to data-driven vehicle architectures has demanded a recalibration of systems engineering strategies. Traditional waterfall models no longer align with the pace or nature of contemporary automotive development. Industry experience demonstrates that agility, system-wide integration, and continuous operational validation are now central to success. These lessons are supported by a growing body of literature in systems and automotive engineering (e.g., Estefan, 2007; Eisenbart et al., 2015), which shows that organisational readiness and cross-functional capabilities are as critical as technological innovation.

Agility Over Bureaucracy

Traditional systems engineering favours fixed-requirements, plan-driven processes. However, automotive leaders are shifting towards agile systems engineering that incorporates modular backlogs, concurrent design streams, and responsive architecture decisions. Agile-at-scale methods -- such as SAFe or LeSS -- enable coordination across teams working on propulsion, infotainment, and compliance simultaneously (Arnaud et al., 2023).

These frameworks rely on rhythm and cadence rather than checkpoints, allowing faster reaction to regulation shifts or supplier constraints. Evidence from BMW and Volvo suggests that agile cross-functional teams shorten feedback loops between software updates and customer experience validation. Agile systems engineering promotes resilience and modularity -- critical in ACES product families.

This shift is supported by systems engineering literature highlighting the growing convergence of systems and agile thinking (Boehm & Turner, 2005; Conforto et al., 2016). While agility has its roots in software, its adaptation to physical and cyber-physical domains now enables early architectural feedback, dynamic requirement handling, and continuous integration of stakeholder feedback. For instance, General Motors has adopted iterative hardware-software cycles to synchronise propulsion system development with evolving regulatory standards and real-world test data (Evans et al., 2020).

Moreover, research on agile systems engineering maturity models emphasises the need for structural and cultural transformation within firms. This includes flattened hierarchies, cross-functional teams, and tooling ecosystems that facilitate shared ownership and fast decision-making (Garcia-Mireles et al., 2021). These practices counter the inertia commonly associated with complex organisational systems, enabling engineering teams to deliver validated, high-quality functionality at a faster cadence.

Agile methods also shift the balance of engineering investment: from front-loaded definition phases to ongoing co-evolution of solution and need. This requires new tools for digital collaboration, version control across disciplines, and architectural models that support incremental elaboration without losing coherence. In summary, agility -- when institutionalised across organisational and technical dimensions -- represents a fundamental enabler of modern systems engineering in automotive.

Integration Over Interface

In recent years model-based systems engineering (MBSE) has been growing in popularity and take-up by the automotive industry. Where previous engineering approaches often involved decoupled subsystems with managed interfaces, MBSE now facilitates, in principle, system-wide coherence. By modelling interactions, dependencies, and behaviours, MBSE enables engineers to anticipate emergent properties and cascading failures before physical instantiation (Reers & Graham, 2025).

Digital thread architectures unify CAD, software, simulation, test, and production systems, enabling traceability and design intent preservation. Leading OEMs integrate MBSE with functional safety (ISO 26262) and cybersecurity frameworks (UN R155), treating system definition as a living digital asset rather than a static specification.

Beyond MBSE's role in formalising system models, the practical implementation of integrated toolchains is becoming a differentiator in automotive development efficiency. Firms such as Ford and Daimler have adopted platforms like Dassault Systèmes' 3DEXPERIENCE and Siemens' Teamcenter to align systems architecture with manufacturing process design, ensuring that engineering intent is preserved from concept through to execution (Kuhn et al., 2020).

Empirical studies indicate that integration gaps between domain-specific tools -- such as mechanical CAD, embedded software development environments, and requirements management platforms -- can significantly slow development cycles and introduce inconsistency (Borg et al., 2020). MBSE, when supported by semantic interoperability standards like OSLC (Open Services for Lifecycle Collaboration), enables engineering teams to align views, synchronize updates, and maintain coherence across evolving configurations.

From a systems engineering perspective, this level of integration fosters greater modularity, facilitates impact analysis, and reduces late-stage rework. Integration over interface thus reflects a philosophical shift -- from managing boundaries between silos to cultivating continuous collaboration and holistic visibility throughout the engineering lifecycle.

Validation as Evolution

Validation is increasingly seen not as a milestone but as an embedded, continuous function. With digital twins providing executable models of vehicle subsystems, validation activities extend into operational environments. Data streams from fleet telemetry -- including driver behaviour, component wear, and environmental exposure -- inform real-time system adjustments (Giaimo & Berger, 2020).

For instance, Tesla's fleet data enables software rollbacks, energy management tuning, and improved autonomous behaviour in response to observed patterns. This approach shifts the emphasis from defect detection to performance optimisation and trust-building across the lifecycle. It requires systems engineering practices that blend model-based simulation, real-time analytics, and continuous deployment protocols.

Recent research has shown that runtime validation frameworks can provide assurance in safety-critical automotive applications, particularly when coupled with AI-based anomaly detection and model predictive control systems (Ding et al., 2021). These approaches allow systems to not only identify unexpected behaviour but also adjust operational parameters in real time, strengthening resilience and adaptability.

Digital twin validation also facilitates knowledge reuse, where parameterised models and operational data can be fed into design environments to inform next-generation architectures. For example, Audi and Bosch have developed validation environments that link simulation outputs directly to requirements engineering tools, reducing time-to-certification and enhancing design traceability (Schäfer et al., 2022).

From a systems engineering perspective, this redefinition of validation represents a shift toward living assurance -- an approach where compliance, performance, and stakeholder satisfaction are continuously monitored and acted upon. This paradigm necessitates tight integration between operations, engineering, and data science functions, along with governance structures capable of managing in-lifecycle risk and adaptation.

Reinterpreting the UCL 5 Principles

The UCL 5 Principles of Systems Engineering Management were formulated to foster effective governance, structured development, and comprehensive stakeholder engagement across complex engineering projects (Emes et al., 2012). However, in the context of today's automotive landscape, each principle demands reinterpretation to remain fit-for-purpose. This section elaborates on how each principle evolves when applied to cyber-physical, data-driven, and rapidly iterating mobility ecosystems.

Principles Govern Process: This principle remains current but must involve the reading of the new industrial reality. It now demands adaptive governance in organisations. In automotive systems engineering, continuous integration and real-time data from vehicles in operation challenge linear process models. Instead, development must be organised as a responsive ecosystem -- synchronised through principles rather than checkpoints. Governance should enable flexibility in tooling, processes, methods, and decision-making, while ensuring alignment with safety, sustainability, and performance goals.

Seek Alternative Perspectives: While the original emphasis was on stakeholder inclusion and boundary definition, today's systems demand a richer plurality of views. This includes perspectives from data science (e.g., telemetry-informed decision-making), cybersecurity (threat models and secure architecture), environmental demands (updated standards and regulations), AI ethics (decision autonomy in automated systems), and lifecycle services (subscription and fleet usage models). Engineering practices must integrate these viewpoints dynamically, using models, simulations, and real-time feedback loops to explore design space more effectively.

Understand the Enterprise Context: Rather than focusing solely on internal enterprise structure or customer needs, this principle must now expand to embrace the entire human, socio-technical and geopolitical ecosystem. For instance, understanding battery supply chain risk or compliance with software update regulations (e.g., UNECE WP.29) is critical. Automotive systems engineers must navigate market volatility, sustainability targets, and platform strategy under global constraints, making systems thinking at the enterprise level more urgent and expansive.

Integrate SE and Project Management: Historically, this integration was framed around schedule coordination and deliverable alignment. In modern automotive systems, integration means managing concurrent lifecycles across hardware and software, where project boundaries blur under continuous delivery and cross-functional collaboration. MBSE tools and agile cadences must be jointly adopted by project managers and systems engineers to maintain alignment, with shared artifacts and integrated version control enabling adaptive planning.

Invest Early: While early architectural exploration and requirement capture remain essential, investment must now include simulation infrastructure, test automation, and telemetry frameworks. Early deployment of digital twins and synthetic environments enables faster de-risking, model validation, and policy testing. Investing in early-stage digital capabilities is key to building platforms that remain resilient and updatable across a dynamic operational lifecycle.

Towards a Set of Automotive Extensions to the Principles

The reinterpretation of the UCL 5 Principles reflects a broader transformation in engineering values. However, the pace and nature of automotive change require more than a reassessment, they demand a set of extensions to the guiding principles. The following six extensions are rooted in the empirical realities of contemporary automotive development and are intended to support future-ready systems engineering practices. We define an extension as an expression of a reality in the automotive domain that should shape the engineering practice.

Digital--Physical Continuity

Contemporary vehicles are conceived, tested, and evolved through digital models that mirror their physical counterparts. Digital twins are not just used during the design phase but throughout the vehicle lifecycle. This principle encourages full-spectrum use of simulation, digital threads, and data-driven feedback loops to ensure that physical assets remain synchronised with their digital representations. For instance, Ford and Audi integrate digital twin environments into their production pipelines, allowing design updates to be propagated directly into manufacturing and service contexts (Schäfer et al., 2022).

Scaled--Agile Ecosystems

The increasing convergence of hardware, software, and embedded intelligence requires development frameworks that support agile practices across disciplines. Scaled Agile Frameworks (SAFe) and LeSS are already in use among automotive OEMs to manage platform evolution and subsystem interdependencies. These models enable early testing, distributed responsibility, and adaptive re-prioritisation. In firms like GM and Volvo, agile synchronisation is supported by shared backlogs, system architecture epics, and continuous stakeholder review cycles (Evans et al., 2020).

MBSE with Embedded Security and Compliance

Model-Based Systems Engineering provides a very capable tool for complex architecture design. However, models now need to encode not only function and structure but also cybersecurity (e.g., ISO/SAE 21434), functional safety (ISO 26262), human behaviour, and regulatory compliance. AUTOSAR-compliant SysML libraries and secure model repositories support traceability, governance, and automatic policy enforcement. Integration of these models across the lifecycle---from concept to post-deployment---helps ensure system integrity under dynamic operating conditions (Kuhn et al., 2020).

Resilient and Circular Supply Chains

As highlighted in Section II, Chinese EV manufacturers have illustrated the value of vertical integration and closed-loop resource strategies. This extension emphasises the design of systems that account for upstream resource availability, downstream recycling, and midstream flexibility. Supply chain resilience must be modelled alongside technical performance. This requires systems engineers to collaborate with procurement, legal, policy, and environmental teams to anticipate risks and plan for adaptive capacity (Tan et al., 2021; Shen & Wang, 2023).

Telemetry--Driven Lifecycle Engineering

The shift from fixed to adaptive systems demands real-time data utilisation. Vehicles now serve as edge-computing nodes, continuously generating performance, usage, and environmental data. This extension supports architectures that can be monitored, updated, and evolved based on in-use conditions. Tesla's over-the-air (OTA) model and Bosch's fleet analytics demonstrate how telemetry can drive requirements refinement, error mitigation, and new feature development. For systems engineers, this means designing feedback architectures and governance structures for safe continuous deployment (Giaimo & Berger, 2020).

Human-centred development

The integration of decision-making with daily routines and physical proximity to production sites creates a distinct socio-technical system where human commitment is instrumental. This mirrors socio-technical systems thinking and supports a principle recognizing how human structure and collective behaviour are key enablers or constraints. The complexity of systems increasingly involves not just technical but organizational and societal layers. Engineers must address values like trust, inclusion, and sustainability, dimensions directly tied to human behaviour and perception. This reinforces that effective systems engineering requires direct attention to human collaboration, cognition, and communication. The trends in ACES vehicles, data governance, and organizational complexity point to the necessity to make the human layer a formal object of systems engineering reasoning and intervention (D'Ambrosio & Soremekun, 2017; INCOSE, 2021).

Together, these six extensions offer a practical complement of the UCL framework. They encourage engineers to move beyond the top-level ideals, toward specific adaptability, observability, and multi-lifecycle thinking. They also reflect the critical importance of integrating technical and socio-political awareness into systems decisions, especially in domains where mobility, data, and sustainability intersect.

Conclusion

The automotive industry has emerged as a proving ground for the next generation of systems engineering. The confluence of digitisation, electrification, automation, and global supply chain realignment has not only reshaped what vehicles are but also how they are engineered, validated, and evolved. This transformation reveals profound lessons for the systems engineering community, lessons that go beyond incremental improvement to demand a fundamental shift in assumptions, practices, and principles.

This article has argued that while the UCL 5 Principles of Systems Engineering Management remain foundational, their application must be reinterpreted in the face of evolving technological and organisational realities. Each principle, whether concerning governance, perspective-taking, enterprise understanding, integration with project management, or early-stage investment, gains new meaning in an environment characterised by rapid iteration, cyber-physical integration, and dynamic market conditions.

To complement this reinterpretation, we proposed six extensions grounded in contemporary automotive industry experience: Digital--Physical Continuity, Scaled--Agile Ecosystems, MBSE with Embedded Security and Compliance, Resilient and Circular Supply Chains, and Telemetry--Driven Lifecycle Engineering. These extensions reflect the need for real-time adaptability, model-centric collaboration, cross-functional agility, and long-term ecological responsibility. They help shift systems engineering from a discipline of bounded rationality and static milestones to one of ongoing negotiation between designed (sometimes co-designed) intent and emergent context.

Importantly, the case of the automotive industry highlights the centrality of socio-technical coherence. Engineering no longer ends at system delivery, it extends across lifecycles, value chains, policy regimes, and societal expectations. Systems engineers must now design not just for performance or cost, but for resilience, adaptability, and responsibility. The next evolution of systems engineering, therefore, must be anticipatory, reflexive, and integrative.

There is also a cautionary tale in this evolution. Our reflection has centred around the implications of the changes to the automotive industry for the systems engineering profession. Nevertheless, a large part of the changes come from business, markets and geo-political forces. More recently the story is turning, as China's automotive industry has been driven into a state of turmoil by government policies that prioritize production targets over market demand. The central critique is that this model has led to a vastly oversupplied market and unsustainable competition. There have been reports of overcapacity and lack of profitability, irregular sales practices, zero-mileage "used" cars and fire sales, government incentives driving overinvestment, negative impact on the wider industry, wider economic risk, (Reuters, 2025b).

Future research should aim to test and refine these extensions in adjacent domains such as aerospace, energy, and healthcare, fields that are undergoing similar transformations in complexity and integration. There is also a need to embed these lessons into systems engineering education and professional development, ensuring that the next generation of practitioners is equipped to lead in contexts of uncertainty, interdisciplinarity, and global interdependence.

In conclusion, the automotive transformation offers both a challenge and an opportunity. It challenges legacy practices but also provides a clear path forward: one in which principles are not static rules but adaptive commitments, continuously interpreted in dialogue with a changing world. That path, we argue, leads not just to better vehicles, but to better systems, and better engineering.

References

Adler, M. W., Peer, S., & Sinozic, T. (2020). Autonomous, connected, electric shared vehicles (ACES) and public finance: An explorative analysis. *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, *37*, 100515.

Arnaud, J., Heine, R., & Palm, H. (2023). Framework for continuous transition to agile systems engineering in the automotive industry. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2311.12502.

BloombergNEF. (2024). *Battery supply chain ranking 2024*. https://about.bnef.com

Boehm, B., & Turner, R. (2005). Management challenges to implementing agile processes in traditional development organizations. *IEEE Software*, *22*(5), 30--39.

Borg, M., Olsson, T., & Sandberg, A. (2020). Industrial experiences from aligning MBSE toolchains in automotive. *Journal of Systems and Software*, *169*, 110714.

Broy, M., Krüger, I. H., & Pretschner, A. (2021). Complexity in automotive software engineering. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, *109*(6), 929--947.

Conforto, E. C., Rebentisch, E., & Amaral, D. C. (2016). Project management agility in complex projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, *34*(7), 1183--1197.

D'Ambrosio, J & Soremekun G., (2017). Systems Engineering Challenges and MBSE Opportunities for Automotive System Design. *IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics*, Banff Center, Banff, Canada, October 5-8.

Ding, D., Zhang, Y., & Jin, D. (2021). Runtime safety assurance for learning-enabled cyber-physical systems in automotive applications. *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, *17*(8), 5678--5686.

Emes, M. R., Smith, A., James, A. M., Whyndham, M. W., Leal, R., & Jackson, S. C. (2012). Principles of systems engineering management. *INCOSE International Symposium*, 9-12 July 2012, Rome.

Evans, R., Tappenden, R., & Burdon, M. (2020). Scaled agile implementation in a global automotive OEM: Challenges and successes. *SAE Technical Paper Series*. https://doi.org/10.4271/2020-01-1337

Feng, W., Liang, X., & Wang, J. (2022). Comparative study on automotive supply chain resilience between China and the West. *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review*, *157*, 102548.

Garcia-Mireles, G. A., Yilmaz, M., & Clarke, P. (2021). An agile systems engineering maturity model. *Systems Engineering*, *24*(3), 253--266.

Giaimo, F., & Berger, C. (2020). Continuous experimentation for automotive software on the example of a heavy commercial vehicle in daily operation. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2003.03799.

Hu, X., & Zhang, C. (2023). Smart battery management systems for electric vehicles: A review of recent developments. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *165*, 112569.

Kuhn, T., Baier, T., & Zeller, T. (2020). Integrated MBSE platforms: Experiences from OEM implementation. *International Journal of Product Lifecycle Management*, *13*(2), 113--129.

INCOSE. (2021). *Systems Engineering Vision 2035*. International Council on Systems Engineering. https://www.incose.org/sevision

Li, Y., & Chen, Q. (2021). Simulation-based development in Chinese automotive OEMs. *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, *107*, 102178.

Liu, Y., Wang, F. Y., & Zhang, W. (2022). Deep learning architectures for automotive perception systems: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, *23*(1), 300--316.

Nguyen, T., & Gough, M. (2021). Shared mobility and EV architecture: Engineering for uncertainty. *Sustainable Mobility Review*, *7*(2), 34--48.

Park, S., Kim, H., & Lee, Y. (2020). Multi-access edge computing for connected vehicles: A survey. *IEEE Access*, *8*, 213915--213936.

Reers, J., & Graham, G. (2025). Model-Based Systems Engineering: A simpler way to build smarter vehicles. *RTInsights*. https://www.rtinsights.com

Reuters. (2025a, July 3). How China's new auto giants left GM, VW and Tesla in the dust. https://www.reuters.com

Reuters. (2025b, September 17). China is sending its world-beating auto industry into a tailspin. https://www.reuters.com

Schäfer, M., Hofmann, M., & Müller, T. (2022). Digital twin validation workflows in automotive systems engineering. *IEEE Systems Journal*, *16*(2), 1856--1866.

Schuh, G., Potente, T., Thomas, C., & Hauptvogel, A. (2020). Industrie 4.0: The impact of smart production on the automotive industry. *Procedia CIRP*, *41*, 785--790.

Shen, L., & Wang, Y. (2023). Strategic resilience in the Chinese EV battery value chain. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, *29*(1), 51--68.

Tan, Y., Li, J., & Zhao, K. (2021). Risk mitigation strategies for critical material supply in EV manufacturing. *Resources Policy*, *72*, 102113.

Yin, R., Wang, Z., & Zhang, Y. (2023). The architecture of China's vertically integrated electric vehicle supply chain. *Journal of Manufacturing Systems*, *68*, 138--149.

Zhou, J., & Liu, T. (2022). Design for flexibility: Chinese EV platform strategies. *Automotive Design and Manufacturing*, *8*(3), 215--229.

Biography

Raul R. Leal Ascencio

Dr. Leal Ascencio is Associate Professor and Head of Systems Engineering at Rabdan Academy in Abu Dhabi. He holds a PhD from the University of Manchester (UMIST) and has over 25 years of experience in systems engineering, systems thinking, and complex systems management. Previously, he served as Associate Professor and Director of Industrial Engagement at University College London's Centre for Systems Engineering, where he led substantial industry partnerships with organizations including Jaguar Land Rover, BAE Systems, and Leonardo. His research focuses on the application of systems thinking to organizational management and the human dimensions of complex engineering systems.