




A Matter of Millimeters: Defining the Processes for Critical Clearances on Curiosity

B. Florow

Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of
Technology

3/5/2013





Overview



- Immense packaging problem
 - A rover the size of a car with a sky crane landing system all packed tightly into a spacecraft
- Creates many areas of close and critical clearances.
 - Critical Clearances: hardware-to-hardware or hardware-to-envelope clearances which fall below a pre-established location dependent threshold and pose a risk of hardware to hardware contact during events such as launch, entry, landing, and operations.
 - Close Clearances: any clearance value that is chosen to be tracked but is larger than the critical clearance threshold for its region. Close clearances may be tracked for various reasons including uncertainty in design, large expected dynamic motion, etc.
- Critical Clearances in the past
 - Before the Mars Exploration Rovers (MER) – critical clearances tracked by individual cognizant engineers (Cog-Es) or subsystem mechanical leads in an ad hoc manner
 - During MER – methodology was developed to capture a larger number of close clearances
 - During MSL – number of close clearances being tracked was expected to grow significantly through the development and implementation phases
 - In order to deal with the large number of clearances the position of close clearance engineer was introduced and a systematic procedure, implementing and expanding upon the MER methodology, was put in place to define, identify, track, resolve, measure, and disposition clearances.
 - MSL tracked 249 static, 25 separation, and 378 operational clearances.

The Critical Clearance Policy



- MSL developed a critical clearance policy to handle its large number of close and critical clearances.
 - Provided a set of guidelines to configure the spacecraft which minimized the risk of unwanted hardware contact
 - Defined the processes for identifying and positioning clearances
 - Led to the development of tracking tools
- First step was to define what warranted a clearance being tracked
 - Thresholds were calculated based on the predicted relative motion between subsystems
 - Used to identify high risk configurations

Static Clearances		Separation Clearances	
CS-CS	20mm	CS-EV	25.4mm
CS-EV	30mm	HS-EV	70mm
BPS-BPS	20mm	PDV-BS (after guide rails)	80mm
BPS-DS	10mm	RVR-DS sep envelope	20mm
PDS-DS	30mm	BUD-RVR @ Sep	40mm
BS-DS	50mm	BUD-RVR @ TD	40mm
DS-DS	50.8mm	BUD-RVR @ Release	76.2mm
DS-RVR top deck	40mm		
DS-RVR appendage	60mm		
DS-HS	50mm		
RVR-RVR	20mm		
AS-RVR	40mm		

AS=Aeroshell; BS=Backshell; BPS=Backshell Parachute System; BUD=Bridle Umbilical Device; CS=Cruise Stage; DS=Descent Stage; EV=Entry Vehicle; HS=Heatshield; PDS=Powered Descent Vehicle; RVR=Rover

Example thresholds – these are not the values that were used on MSL



Identifying Risk



- A system to highlight the amount of risk each clearance posed was developed
 - A numbering system combined with a color coding system was used to easily identify the highest risks
 - With over 650 total clearances being tracked it was important to focus on the highest risks

Criticality Number	Definition	Example*
0	Above the criticality threshold	>25.4mm
1	Between 2/3 of the criticality threshold and the criticality threshold	16.9 - 25.4mm
2	Between 1/3 of the criticality threshold and 2/3 of the criticality threshold	8.5 - 16.9mm
3	Between interference and 1/3 of the criticality threshold	0 - 8.5mm
4	Interference	0mm

*Example based on a threshold of 25.4mm

STATIC/DYNAMIC CLEARANCES




- Static clearances were focused on early in the design phase
 - Clearances between two subsystems that are in close proximity to each other
 - Helped to define design envelopes and identify where subsystem Cognizant Engineers (Cog-Es) needed more interaction with one another
- Dynamic clearances came into focus a little later in the design phase
 - Using the list of static clearances being tracked, dynamic clearances added further information as to the level of risk between hardware in close proximity
 - While these are two different types of clearances, they were tracked together as they both contribute to the overall risk of a particular clearance



- Several ways of identifying close and critical clearances
 - Each Cog-E was responsible for identifying any critical clearance to their hardware
 - Close clearance engineer spent hours with the MSL CAD model looking for possible issues.
 - Brought to the attention of the Cog-Es involved to see what the impact was and decide whether they needed to be tracked.
 - Examine the hardware during fabrication/assembly.
 - Helped to capture any clearances that were missed by the other methods, and caught issues caused by assembly tolerances, hardware not matching the CAD model exactly, and areas not well defined in the model (i.e. propulsion lines, cabling, blanketing, etc.).
- Close clearance engineer responsible for tracking all clearances
 - Tracking tool was created to easily identify the highest risk clearances and to display a myriad of information
 - A description to easily identify what hardware was involved.
 - A criticality level was assigned as explained above.
 - The nominal clearance as measured in the CAD model was recorded.
 - Clearance losses due to assembly tolerance, backlash, and launch and entry loads were calculated to get the final clearance value.
 - The actual as-measured clearance (on the flight vehicle) was recorded along with the date of measurement and the procedure number.
 - And the dates that the clearance was first submitted, updated, and closed (along with who approved the closure and why) were also included.
 - Tracking tool was regularly updated and put on a MSL project shared site and a link was provided next to each clearance to bring up a screenshot of the area in question.
- The mechanical leads and the close clearance engineer would work with the Cog-Es to either redesign the affected hardware or analyze it enough to prove that it was an acceptable risk.
- During Assembly, Test, and Launch Operations (ATLO) all critical clearances with a criticality of 3, a dynamic clearance loss greater than 50%, or in an area of special interest were measured on the flight vehicle.
 - Measurements were made mostly using tools such as feeler gauges/pins, T-gauges, go/no-go gauges, etc., however, laser metrology was used in areas where there was no physical access.
 - Procedures were generated to verify the measurements.
 - A list was created to track all of the measurements made during ATLO and each measurement was signed off by the close clearance engineer, the mechanical leads for the systems involved, and the ATLO mechanical lead as a part of the closeout procedures.

- Dynamic analysis was performed for both launch and entry loads.
 - All clearances with a criticality 3 (unless negligible motion was expected) as well as all clearances with high expected clearance loss regardless of criticality rating were analyzed.
 - The analysis was performed using a finite element model (FEM) with specific clearance items coded in with “feeler gauges” to measure relative displacement.
- For each point of interest, a pair of nodes was defined in the spacecraft coordinate frame by the close clearance engineer.
 - These nodes represented the closest approach between two pieces of hardware as modeled in CAD. Rigid body elements (RBE) were used to attach these nodes to their respective components.
 - Relative displacement gauges – basically elements with no mass – were attached to each node to measure the clearance loss. See Figure 1 below as an example (RBE’s are shown in yellow and the relative displacement gauge is in red).







SEPARATIONS




- Separations in most areas were handled similarly to the static/dynamic clearances
 - The same tracking tool was used with separation clearances getting an “S” in front of the three digit ID number
 - CAD model was used to identify clearances.
- Two areas were found to have issues; CS-EV and DS-RVR.
 - Nominal measurements were made in the CAD model and high risk clearances were measured on the hardware.
 - Clearance losses were calculated differently however.
 - For the CS-EV, in some areas a separation cone was used, creating an envelope around the separating hardware in the CAD model which was analyzed to see if there was an interference.
 - Elsewhere, the CAD model was manipulated, rotating or moving specific hardware to see where there were issues.
 - Both of these methods used maximum values based on the Automatic Dynamic Analysis of Mechanical Systems (ADAMS) multibody dynamics model.
 - DS-RVR separations were handled differently as that phase presented the most amount of clearances.

Descent Stage to Rover Separation


- Preliminary Descent Stage separation envelopes were created in the MSL CAD model to identify DS-RVR clearances.
 - Based on DS-Rover separation dynamics analysis performed using the CAST dynamics model.
 - Included 50% margin, 10mm of design uncertainty, and 25.4mm of clearance.
 - Attached to the DS CAD model for measurements to the Rover CAD model




- List of DS-RVR separation clearances generated based on measurements from preliminary envelopes
 - Highest criticality (3 or 4) were the focus of a second separations study – more accurate/less conservative
 - Coordinate points were generated for use in the ADAMS Monte Carlo Separations analysis
 - The points in the CAD model that came closest to each other on the descent stage and rover hardware during separation.
- Monte Carlo separations analysis
 - Determined the final separation clearance of 27 DS points
 - Points were tracked in the rover frame during the first meter of separation and 1000 simulations were run
- Bounding envelopes were generated using these trajectories
 - These bounding envelopes were imported into the MSL CAD model
 - Measurements were retaken at each of the locations



NOTE: Geometry Exaggerated



Every 5mm of z-axis separation, a circle encompassing all trajectories, centered on the mean XY location is drawn to make a trajectory envelope.





Operational close clearances were by far the most abundant.

- Several configurations that needed to be checked with several variables in each configuration.
- Required a separate tracking tool with different information and were dispositioned in a different way.
- Identification
 - Started with identifying all of the configurations that the rover would be in during surface operations (and all of the variables for each configuration)
 - Generated a list of all of the possible tool placements (Portioner dropoff to CHEMIN, Drill to Bit Box, Dust Removal Tool to Observation Tray, etc.).
 - Nominal position, teach point, and some off nominal positions for certain configurations.
 - Also had to consider swept envelopes (Scoop, Inlet Covers, Mobility, etc.)
 - Arm was then placed into these various configurations in the CAD model and close clearances were recorded
 - Same criticality rating system was used to identify the clearances with the highest risk, but the tracking tool was slightly different.
 - Tracking tool was separate, but similar to other tool
- Measurements
 - Measurements made during testing both on the flight vehicle and on the engineering model
 - Not every configuration was tested – not every clearance was measured
 - Amount and variety of clearances that were measured proved that there was a strong correlation between the CAD model and the actual hardware
- Dispositioning
 - Clearances were reviewed with the close clearance engineer and the SA-SPaH mechanical lead.
 - Dispositioned as one of the following:
 - Use As Is – the clearance doesn't pose a risk of hardware damage.
 - Fault Case (Update Operational Rules) – this was used for envelope clearances. If the scoop, inlet cover, etc. failed these clearances would need to be revisited based on the type of failure (open, closed, or unknown). The clearances identify configurations where there would be a problem and the operational rules would need to be updated to reflect that.
 - Write Flight Rule – this was used for known, persistent issues such as the mobility interfering with the arm in certain configurations or the Portioner only being able to reach certain points on the Engineering Tray. Flight rules would need to be written to restrict motion in these areas.
 - Hardware Redesign – used to identify areas that needed work (no clearance was closed with this disposition)
 - Obsolete – hardware was redesigned or configuration was no longer necessary making this clearance a nonissue.



Collision Avoidance Model



- For operations, a collision avoidance model was created to ensure that no hardware would collide during Rover movements.
 - This model was created using envelopes that encased Rover hardware.
 - The model would check to make sure that the envelopes never touched when the Rover was commanded to move.
 - This ensures that there is margin during operations and no hardware is damaged from inadvertent contact.
- The collision avoidance model was tested using the Rover engineering model.
 - The turret was positioned in a series of configurations that brought it into close proximity with rover hardware and the tolerance on the collision avoidance model was increased until a collision was detected.
 - The actual clearance of the hardware was then measured and compared to the model.
 - The results showed that the collision avoidance model detection was comparable with the as measured clearances and was conservative, ensuring no damage to the hardware.



LESSONS LEARNED



- Future missions will benefit from the processes created during MER and expanded upon during MSL for dealing with close clearances. Using the process described in this paper and tailoring it to the mission's specific needs will ensure that this is an area of minimal issues.
- Defining the clearance thresholds early in the design phase will save time and money in the future. Creating a critical clearance policy fairly early on in the design phase helped MSL to catch problems early. This gave engineers plenty of time to analyze and fix these issues with minimal impact to cost and schedule.
- Large projects (as with MSL) should consider a close clearance engineer as the main focus for clearance issues. Without a single point of contact issues can be lost, or not discovered until too late.
- Maintaining regular communication is very important. Weekly meetings made sure that everyone involved (close clearance engineer, mechanical leads, Cog-Es, designers, etc.) were on the same page and were aware of any and all issues with the design.
- CAD systems are not always good modelers of certain subsystems such as propulsion lines and especially cabling. These systems should be looked at early, often, and thoroughly. And margin should be held for any CAD measurements. Cable mockups for MSL helped to identify issues not seen in the CAD model, and examining the hardware as soon as it was available caught issues as well. Also, items such as MLI are often not modeled and should be considered when trying to identify problem areas.
- Many areas are hard to access during ATLO for verifying clearance measurements. Having a clear plan as to which methods will be used for which clearances as well as when measurements will be made in the ATLO flow is important. Without such a plan clearances that need to be verified can be missed. The close clearance engineer on MSL worked with the Cog-Es, mechanical leads, and ATLO lead to identify when hardware would be accessible and what method could be used to ensure that all measurements were made. (A special thanks to the technicians who, at times, had to become contortionists to get to some of these measurements).



CONCLUSION



- MSL was launched in November 2011 and landed on August 5th, 2012. Even though it is one of the biggest and most complex systems JPL has ever built and was packed tightly into an Entry Vehicle with a Sky crane there have been no issues from hardware to hardware contact. This mission continues to operate on the surface of Mars without clearance issues.
- The clearance policy of MSL was very successful. The process defined in this paper identified, tracked, analyzed, measured, and dispositioned over 650 items. There were 274 static/dynamic and separation clearances, with 128 measurements made on the flight vehicle. 378 operational clearances were also identified with 68 measurements made on the flight vehicle and engineering model; and more measurements were made during the collision avoidance model testing as well. Detailed studies were conducted, trades were made, and hardware was redesigned in some cases. Dynamic analysis verified that no interferences occurred during launch or entry. The final separations study showed that no interferences were indicated for any of the areas of biggest risk for contact during separation. The disposition of the operational clearances along with the collision avoidance model ensures that no interferences will occur during surface operations.
- This research was carried out at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, under a contract with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

I would like to thank the following people for their contribution to the development of the critical clearance policy used on Curiosity: Tom Rivellini, Louise Jandura, Chris Voorhees, Jaime Waydo, Ben Thoma, Bill Allen, John Gallon, Mark Yerdon, Walter Tsuha, and Steve Sell.