

What is Set-Based Design?

ASNE DAY April 8, 2009

David J. Singer, Ph.D.

Assistant Research Scientist & Adjunct Professor Department of Naval Architecture and Marine Engineering University of Michigan

CAPT Norbert Doerry, USN, Ph.D.

Technical Director, Future Concepts and Surface Ship Design Naval Sea Systems Command

Michael E. Buckley

Senior Systems Engineer, Systems Engineering Division CDI Marine Technologies Inc.

Approved for Public Release





Approved for Public Release CAPT Doerry

April 2009





• Can support high level of modeling detail

Approved for Public Release CAPT Doerry Veights

Slabilih

Powering



SECNAVINST 5000.2D 2 Pass 6 Gate Process



Why not go directly to Spiral / Point Based Design?

- Problem 1: Designing in Cost
 - Costs are committed early, when there isn't sufficient information to accurately predict cost or performance





Percent of Development Complete

(Bernstein 1998)

Why not go directly to Spiral / Point Based Design?

- Problem 2: Requirements Understanding During Design vs. Influence / Impact on Cost
 - When knowledge is known, remaining Management influence is low







April 2009

Approved for Public Release CAPT Doerry

Why not go directly to Spiral / Point Based Design?

- Problem 3: Ship design requires both objective knowledge (mathematical models) and subjective knowledge (expert opinion)
 - Objective and subjective knowledge require domain experts
 - In real world domain experts are not collocated
 - Design enabling communication tools are not sufficient to support tightly coupled Spiral Design methods









- Delay Cost Commitment until sufficient design detail enables a good choice
- Maximize Management Influence as long as possible





Set Based Design Process

Understand the design space

- Define feasible regions
- Explore tradeoffs by designing multiple alternatives
- Communicate sets of possibilities

Integrate by intersection

- Look for intersections of feasible sets
- Impose minimum (maximum) constraint
- Seek conceptual robustness

Establish feasibility before commitment

- Narrow sets gradually while increasing detail
- Stay within set once committed
- Control by managing uncertainty at process gates



Decide at the last responsible moment



- Identify the different "Specialties"
- Identify key attributes that define the "set" for each "Specialty"
- Define the initial boundaries for each "set"
- Look for an intersection of the "sets"
- If none exist, or the area of intersection is small, expand the "sets" until the intersection is robust







- For an Electrical Plant
 - Scalable from 40 MW to 80 MW
 - Common 4160 VAC architecture
 - Combination of 4 and 8 MW Diesel GENSETS and 22 MW Gas Turbine Generator Sets
 - Scalable transformers for zonal distribution
- For a hull
 - Scalable hull / family of hulls from 20,000 to 40,000 LT
 - May also have a variable length to beam ratio and a variable beam to draft ratio.
 - May also have a variable length parallel midbody.

MANJEA Containership SBD Example



NAVAL SEA SYSTEMS COMMAND



Comparing Point and Set Based Design

<u>Task</u>	Point Based	Set Based
	Design	Design
Search: How should solutions be found?	Iterate an existing idea by modifying it to achieve objectives and improve performance. Brainstorm new ideas	Define a feasible design space, then constrict it by removing regions where solutions are proven to be inferior
Communication: Which ideas are communicated to others?	Communicate the best idea.	Communicate sets of possibilities that are not Pareto dominated.
Integration: How should the system be integrated?	Provide teams design budgets and constraints. If a team can't meet budget or constraints, reallocate to other teams	Look for intersections that meet total system requirements.



Comparing Point and Set Based Design (continued)

<u>Task</u>	Point Based	Set Based
	<u>Design</u>	Design
Selection: How is the best idea identified?	Formal schemes for selecting the best alternative. Simulate or make prototypes to confirm that the solution works	Design alternatives in parallel. Eliminate alternatives proven inferior to others. Use low cost tests to prove infeasibility or identify Pareto dominance
Optimization: How should the design be optimized?	Analyze and test the design. Modify the design to achieve objectives and improve performance.	Design alternatives in parallel. Eliminate alternatives when proven inferior to others.
Specification: How should you constrain others with respect to your own subsystem design?	Maximize constraints in specifications to assure functionality and interface fit.	Use minimum control specifications to allow optimization and mutual adjustment.



Comparing Point and Set Based Design (continued)

Task	Point Based	Set Based
	Design	Design
Decision Risk Control: How should one minimize the risk of "going down the wrong path?"	Establish feedback channels. Communicate often. Respond quickly to changes.	Establish feasibility before commitment. Pursue options in parallel. Seek solutions robust to physical, market, and design variation.
Rework risk control: How should one minimize damage from unreliable communications? How should the communication process be controlled?	Establish feedback channels. Communicate often. Respond quickly to changes. Review designs and manage information at transition points.	Stay within sets once committed. Manage uncertainty at process gates.



- Consider a large number of design alternative by understanding the design space,
- Allow specialists to consider a design from their own perspective and use the intersection between individual sets to optimize a design and
- Establish feasibility before commitment
 - Narrowing sets gradually while increasing detail,
 - Staying within a set once committed and
 - Maintaining control by managing uncertainty at process gates.





April 2009