



Launch Vehicle Production and Operations Cost Metrics

Dr. Michael D. Watson NASA Marshall Space Flight Center Jim Neeley and Ruby Blackburn Jacobs ESSSA Group



Introduction



Traditional Cost Metrics

- Cost per Mass
 - Assumes 100% payload mass capacity utilized
 - Must have a common reference orbit
 - Altitude and Inclination
 - Examples:
 - Delta IV Medium
 - (1030 kg, GEO: 0 deg at 35,786 km circular)
 - (4210 kg, GTO: 27.0 deg at 35,786 km x 185 km)
 - (9190 kg, LEO: 28.7 deg at 200 km circular)
 - (8510 kg, LEO ISS: 51.6 deg at 407 km circular)
 - (7690 kg, LEO Polar: 90 deg at 200 km circular)
 - Reference: ULA Atlas and Delta Product Card, March 2013
 - Atlas V 501
 - (3780 kg, GTO: 27.0 deg at 35,786 km x 185 km)
 - (8210 kg, LEO: 28.7 deg at 200 km circular)
 - (7540 kg, LEO ISS: 51.6 deg at 407 km circular)
 - (6770 kg, LEO Polar: 90 deg at 200 km circular)
 - Reference: ULA Atlas and Delta Product Card, March 2013



- Falcon 9
 - \$4296/kg (\$56.5M/13,150 kg, 28.5 deg inclination to LEO)
 - \$11,649/kg (\$56.5M/4,850 kg, 27.0 deg inclination to GEO)
 - Reference: <u>http://www.spacex.com/about/capabilities</u>, accessed 4/18/2014







Test

Functional

Performance

Environmental

Qualification

Manufacturing

Forming

Welding

Assembly

Coating

Plant

Maintenance

Work Breakdown Structure (WBS)

- Labor Cost View
 - Tasks across all vehicles
 - Manufacturing Base embedded
 - Unit Cost not visible

Product Breakdown Structure (PBS)

- Unit Cost View
 - Cost per unit
 - Manufacturing Base Separate
 - Labor tasks may span multiple products



_aunch Vehicle

Project

Management

Manifesting

Planning

Cost Control

Launch Operations

Assembly

est & Checkou

Roll Out

Launch

Safety and Mission

Assurance

Organizational Safety

Flight Safety

Quality

Reliability

Sustaining Engineering

Problem

Resolution

Obsolescence Management

Maintenance

Mission Desig

nfrastructure

Engineering

Payload

Customer

Interface

Integration

Life Cycle Costs

- Add costs of Development Phase and Production and Operations Phase
- Advantages
 - Full life of the program view
- Limitations
 - Must assume program duration
 - P&O costs are weighted more heavily the longer the program duration extends after development
 - Shuttle anticipated 10 years of operations, achieved 30 years
 - B-52 projected to be operational for almost 100 years at end of life
 - Greatly skews results
 - Funding is done on annual basis, not on a lifetime basis
 - U.S. Government Space programs are funded annually
 - Corporations report annual earnings, not life cycle earnings









Cost Model





Cost Drivers



Development Testing

- Primary cost driver in the Development phase
 - Driven by prototype production
 - Test facility costs

Manufacturing Base

- Maintenance of
 - equipment and facilities
 - training and retention of the workforce
 - retained viability during any low launch periods

Manufacturing processes

- labor required to operate and maintain the equipment
- Material costs are not generally substantial compared to labor cost











Cost Drivers



Launch Site Base Operations

- Maintenance of
 - servicing facilities
 - launch pad services
 - launch towers
 - consumables (i.e., fuel and oxidizer)
 - control center
- 20 35% of the annual launch vehicle program costs

Learning Curve

• Reduction in production and launch site operation costs as experience gained in production, assembly, launch of launch vehicle

Inflation Rate

- Varies with economy
- Significant over time







Annual Production and Operations Cost

- Provides the annual cost of all production costs and operations costs
- Based on unit cost
 - Constant cost independent of payload mass or orbit achieved
- Production
 - Manufacturing costs for each unit leading to unit delivery
- Operations
 - Post manufacturing unit costs
 - Green run testing
 - Shipping
 - Assembly
 - Launch
- Learning curve sources are visible in production and operations
- Inflation rate is visible on P&O costs, manufacturing base, and launch site base

operations













	 Includes fixed costs (Manufacturing Base and Launch 	
	Site Base Operations)	
	- Separately identifiable	
	 Fixed costs are generally independent of flight rate with the 	
	follow exceptions	75%
100% efficient variable cost	 Flight rate << production/operations capacity leads to higher fixed costs to maintain unused facilities and equipment 	efficient variable
	 – Idle systems experience freeze up, lose calibration, increased corrosion, and soft goods expiration – Failures due to these cases are not often detected until manufacturing and operations restart. 	COSI
Fixed Cost	 If capacity is leased out, the leased uses affect machine wear and life. Low utilization of work force tends to lead to many continuous improvement ideas for production and operation performance 	Fixed Cost
	 Flight rate >> production/operations capacity leads to higher fixed costs to expand facilities and equipment to meet flight rate 	

- Added production lines
- Storage facilities to allow lower rate lines build ahead and store for higher flight rates



Manufacturing Base and Launch Operations maintenance costs provide partial unit cost capability

- Varies by manufacturing and launch site
- Overlap defined by comparing unit cost to base cost
 - Effort to produce unit assigned as part of unit cost
 - Effort to maintain facilities and equipment assigned to base cost
 - If a production lapse occurs, all costs revert to base case
 - Transition is accounted for as production stop and restart costs





1. Payload Fairing

2. Acoustic Blankets

7. Hydrazine Bottle

11. Centerbody

3. Payload Attach Fitting

4. Second-Stage Fuel (LH₂) Tank

8, Second-Stage Engine (RL10)

10, Common Booster Core

13, Solid Rocket Motor

12, First-Stage Fuel (LH.) Tank

9. First-Stage Oxidizer (LO.) Tank

6. Second-Stage Oxidizer (LO.) Tank

5. Second-Stage Intertank Truss Assembly



Unit Cost

- Advantages
 - Calculates cost of a single unit
 - Constant cost independent of payload mass or orbit achieved
 - Metric compares actual unit cost to planned unit cost
 - Includes all costs associated with vehicle production and launch
 - Production
 - Manufacturing costs for each unit leading to unit delivery
 - Operations
 - Post manufacturing unit costs
 - Green run testing
 - Shipping
 - Assembly
 - Launch
- Limitations
 - Manufacturing base and launch site base operations are not accounted
 - Can be amortized but varies greatly with launch rate fluxuations
 - Extreme low actual flight rates from planned flight rates eliminate this as a useful metric
 - Shuttle had early estimates of 50-150 flights per year, and averaged 5
 - Learning curve and Inflaction causes unit cost to be a variable
 - Must be accommodated for when using unit cost



14. First-Stage Engine (RS-68)

16. High-Pressure Helium Bottle

17, Second-Stage Equipment Shelf

21, Solid Rocket Motor Nosecone

24. First-Stage Fuel (LH2) Feedline

25. Solid Rocket Motor Nozzle

22. Solid Rocket Propellant

15, Spacecraft

18. Interstage Adapter

19, Anti-slosh Baffle

23, Isogrid Structure

26, Thermal Shield



- \$/Ib, \$/Kg, (€/Kg) to orbit
 - Traditional Metric
 - Metric is an idealistic optimum
 - Rarely, if ever, do vehicles carry the maximum mass to orbit
 - Orbits very greatly with missions
 - GEO: 0 deg at 35,786 km circular
 - GTO: 27.0 deg at 35,786 km x 185 km
 - LEO: 28.7 deg at 200 km circular
 - LEO ISS: 51.6 deg at 407 km circular
 - LEO Polar: 90 deg at 200 km circular
 - Reference: ULA Atlas and Delta Product Card, March 2013
- high Earth & geosynchronous orbit (≥35,780 km) mid Earth orbit (2,000-35,780 km) low Earth orbit (180-2,000 km)

Earth

- Launch Vehicle costs vary directly with launch vehicle mass between launch vehicle classes and inversely within a specific class of launch vehicle
 - Simpler manufacturing costs, more economic materials, are generally higher mass solutions at lower cost







• \$/lb, \$/Kg, (€/Kg) to orbit

- Manufacturing base, launch site base operations are amortized (over an assumed program duration and flight rate) and are very uncertain
- Learning curve and inflation rate are not visible (would need to be averaged over assumed program duration)
- Scaling in the cost/mass calculation lead to a sensitivity reduction of 4 or 5 magnitudes
 - Very small variations represent significant cost changes
- The large number of assumptions required make this metric very uncertain





COST METRICS



Options

	1 Budget Baseline vs P&O Cost Model	2 Unit Cost Goal vs Model Unit Cost	3 \$/# to LEO	
Learning Curve	×	1	4	
Inflation	1			
Learning Curve & Inflation	1	1	1	
Mnfg/Ops Base	\checkmark			
w/o Mnfg/Ops Base	~	×	~	
	Comparison Sensitivities			
	Sensitive to all Cost Factors	Not Sensitive to - Budget Inflation - Mnfg/Ops Base	 Based on Total Mass to Orbit Capability Not Sensitive to Budget Inflation Manufacturing/Oper. Weakly Sensitive Learning Curve Big Changes on Cost Make Small Changes in Metric 	



Summary



WBS vs. PBS

- Both breakdown structures are useful to manage programs
- PBS provides basis for unit costs necessary in metrics

Life Cycle Costs

• Requires assumption on program duration

Cost Drivers

- Development Testing
 - Major cost during development relying on early P&O capabilities
- Manufacturing Base and Launch Site Base Operations

 Significant costs during P&O
- Learning Curve
- Inflation Rate

Cost Metrics

- Cost/Mass to orbit
 - Traditional
 - Requires assumptions on flight rate, 100% payload mass, orbit, program duration
 - Inherent scaling makes metric weakly sensitive to major changes
 - Large uncertainty
- Unit Cost
 - Relative measure to planned cost
 - Insensitive to manufacturing base and launch site base operations costs
- Annual Production and Operation Costs
 - Direct measure of actual costs
 - Not dependent on program duration assumptions
 - Sensitive to all major cost drivers



