Choose the automation approach that fits your engineering work

A dated, source-linked comparison of configured design automation, engineering AI, plant piping tools and MST's current mechanical assembly workflow.

Edition 1.0 | 2026-09-05

Use one task and one acceptance standard

The relevant tools overlap. Existing native parts, assembly automation, engineering knowledge and piping workflows are not exclusive to MST. This comparison summarizes the cited official pages and then proposes questions for a like-for-like evaluation. MST has not independently benchmarked the other products for this paper.

Start with your repeated task. Is it configuring a known product family, finding engineering knowledge and reusable parts, developing plant piping, or translating reviewed process requirements and a qualified library into a native module assembly? More than one product may be appropriate. Ask each vendor to demonstrate the same authorized case and disclose setup, limitations and actual output checks.

DriveWorks: rules-based SOLIDWORKS design automation

DriveWorks describes capturing parameters from existing SOLIDWORKS parts, assemblies and drawings, applying engineering rules, and generating order-specific models, assemblies, drawings and BOMs. Its official design-automation page also describes reusing existing files and component replacements. Native component reuse and assembly automation are areas of overlap with MST.

Evaluate it when a repeatable product family can be expressed through captured parameters and rules. For your case, ask how much configuration setup is required, how non-parametric process changes are handled and what validation is included. This suggested fit is MST's interpretation of the cited workflow, not a restriction stated by DriveWorks.

Source: DriveWorks: Design automation for SOLIDWORKS

Leo: engineering knowledge, part reuse and assembly capability

Leo's official homepage describes engineering knowledge grounded in organizational information, calculations, part search and reuse, and building assemblies. It also lists CAD/PDM/PLM integrations. Its published scope spans engineering assistance and reuse as well as assembly capability.

Evaluate it when engineering knowledge access, calculations and component reuse are important. For a like-for-like comparison, ask Leo to demonstrate the same authorized gas-module case and provide the native output and result checks.

Source: Leo: official product overview

Smap3D: integrated P&ID and plant-piping workflows

Smap3D documents P&ID creation and management, CAD-integrated 3D piping and downstream isometrics. Its Piping product supports SOLIDWORKS, Inventor and Solid Edge, uses company/project pipe specifications and connects P&ID information to piping through a to-do-list workflow. It is a relevant existing option for P&ID-to-3D plant and piping work.

Evaluate it when piping specifications, plant design and related documentation dominate the task. Ask how your module components and interfaces fit its workflow, what preparation is needed and which routing and fabrication outputs are covered.

Source: Smap3D: CAD-integrated 3D piping

Source: Smap3D: P&ID flow diagrams

MST: reviewed process requirements to a configured native assembly

MST's current focus is the engineering handoff from reviewed P&ID/BOM and authorized native component models through qualified interfaces and supported layout/connection planning to a customer-side SOLIDWORKS Agent. The initial application is configured gas-system and semiconductor process-equipment modules. This is a workflow focus, not a claim of exclusive ownership of assembly automation.

MST needs qualification for unfamiliar families and deployment-specific agreement on data handling, supported CAD operation and acceptance checks. The public execution recording is available, but it is not an end-to-end comparative benchmark or independent customer reference. Broader industry coverage and additional drawing modules must not be assumed from the current demonstration.

Source: MST: current product scope

Source: MST: public evidence boundary

In-house automation: compare the maintenance burden too

An internal macro, rule engine or integration can be a sensible option for a stable, narrow workflow your team understands well. This is a general build-versus-buy consideration, not a claim about a particular tool. Include the cost of maintenance, CAD upgrades, rule qualification, incident recovery and key-person dependence alongside initial implementation.

Ask who owns the expected-result tests and who maintains them when models, interfaces or requirements change. The same question applies to purchased software. A vendor label or an AI label does not remove the need for accountable ownership.

Bring these six questions to every vendor

Vendor names and product names identify the compared offerings; their inclusion does not imply an affiliation or endorsement. Capabilities and packaging change. Confirm current scope directly with each vendor before procurement.

- Can you use our authorized native components and preserve the required identity, configuration and revision?
- What must be prepared before the first accepted result, and what work remains on the next variation?
- Which process, interface, spatial and routing rules are supported in this specific case?
- What native artifact will we receive, and what reopen/read-back or other verification can we inspect?
- What happens on an unsupported family, ambiguity, CAD interruption or failed required check?
- What are the actual deployment, data-flow, support, licensing and change-scope terms?

Sources and next steps

DriveWorks: Design automation for SOLIDWORKS

Leo: official product overview

Smap3D: CAD-integrated 3D piping

Smap3D: P&ID flow diagrams

MST: current product scope

MST: public evidence boundary

Read the online edition and related resources

Request an MST workflow evaluation

Technical scope: Reviewed 5 September 2026. Not a hands-on comparative benchmark; public-documentation gaps are not proof of missing capability.